JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES, VOL. LXI, NO. 2, AUTUMN 2010

The Founding of the City of Julias by the Tetrarch Philip in 30 CE

FRED STRICKERT
Wartburg College, Waverly, IA

Abstract

Philip, like his brother Antipas, was a city builder—a characteristic highlighted by Josephus in multiple, yet not totally parallel accounts. The purpose of this article is to show that the question of Philip's founding of Julias from a village named Bethsaida involves numerous factors, including the general pattern of founding cities during this period, the economic and political concerns of the founders themselves, the pattern of citation of city names in first-century literary sources, the relation of the naming of this city and the character of the honoree, the contradictory reports by Josephus, and finally coin evidence. In the end, it will be apparent that Julias was founded near the end of Philip's reign in 30 CE. Coin minting patterns show something of a competition between the two brothers late in their rule. Earlier, each had followed the wise practice of establishing new capitals at Sepphoris (8 CE) and Caesarea Philippi (1 CE). However, when Antipas founded a second city Tiberias in 20 CE, the balance was disrupted with Antipas controlling the lake economy even to the extent of encroaching upon Philip's southern territory. Philip's choice of a second city at Bethsaida on the northern shore of the lake was thus a natural response based on political and economic concerns. Philip's coinage in 30 CE following the death of Julia / Livia in 29 CE establishes an exact date for Philip's new city, consistent with Josephus' report in *Jewish War*.

The initiation of archaeological research at et-Tell just north of the Sea of Galilee some twenty-four years ago brought with it a quest to understood the Tetrarch Philip's founding of the city of Julias from an already existing village of Bethsaida. Almost simultaneous with the turning of the first spade of earth, Israeli Numismatist Arie Kindler was uncovering the coin record of Philip to propose a founding date of the city in 30 CE—a proposal later adopted by Rami Arav and members of the Bethsaida Excavation Project. More recently, however, Nikos Kokkinos has challenged Kindler's interpretation of coin evidence opting for a founding date of 2 BCE.[1] The issue, as has widely been discussed in several articles, is tied directly to the identity

[1] Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, vol. 2, rev. ed. by Geza Vermes and F. Millar (Edinburgh: Clark, 1973), 70; Louis Feldman, ed. *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities* (Loeb Classical Library), vol. 9 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 25; and most recently Nikos Kokkinos, 'The Foundation of Bethsaida-Julias by Philip the Tetrarch', *Journal of Jewish Studies*, LIX: 2 (2008), 236–51.

of the Julia honoured with this founding, whether the daughter of Augustus who was banned from Rome in 2 BCE for her multiple, public, adulterous affairs or the wife of Augustus who was extremely popular in the decades prior to her death in 29 CE. The purpose of this article is to show that the question of the founding of Julias involves numerous factors, including the general pattern of founding cities during this period, the economic and political concerns of the founders themselves, the pattern of citation of city names in first-century literary sources, the relation of the naming of this city and the character of the honoree, the contradictory reports by Josephus, and finally the coin evidence itself. In the end, it will be apparent that the date of 30 CE must be accepted.

As a builder of cities, Philip followed in his father's footsteps. Among his many building projects, King Herod had rebuilt Samaria renaming it Sebaste in 27 BCE and then founded the new city of Caesarea Maritima in 9 BCE. Building cities took a significant amount of time and required extensive resources. Construction on this latter city had in fact begun already in 22 BCE. To be sure, the cities of Herod's sons did not come close to rivaling the grandeur of those of their father, but these sons did not have the same level of resources as Herod. In Philip's territory, his father had signaled an interest in the ancient settlement of Paneas on the slopes of Mount Hermon. It was there that he had built an impressive Temple of Augustus in honour of the Emperor's 22 BCE visit. Whether or not Herod had any designs of establishing there a city, it is impossible to say. However, with construction underway at Caesarea Maritima and with his other building projects, a new city at Paneas would have to wait.

The timing was right for such a new city at Paneas with Philip's accession as tetrarch in 4 BCE. With Herod's Temple of Augustus as its centrepiece, the newly named Caesarea Philippi would serve as Philip's capital for the region northeast of the Sea of Galilee. His first issue of coins in his 5th year (1 CE) marked its commemoration.[2] The idea that Philip would have undertaken a second building project at Bethsaida so early in his rule, however, leaves a host of problems. Does it make sense that Philip would have undertaken the construction of two cities simultaneously—especially when he was granted the fewest financial resources in Herod's will? How does this measure up to standard building practices and expectations for a new ruler? How would the rebuilding of Bethsaida as Julias have impacted the construction activities at Caesarea Philippi? With the 2 BCE traditional date for the founding of Julias, this would mean that this secondary city was completed prior to Philip's own capital. Would not a prudent ruler have placed all his resources in the construction of his capital? Would he not have wanted to invest all his time and energy in the construction of a city that would honour both his own name and that of the emperor? How odd that Philip would have founded two cities in the first few years of his rule and then no more over the next 34 years of his long rule. The traditional interpretation does not make sense in terms of

[2] Ya'akov Meshorer, 'The Coins of Caesarea Paneas', *Israel Numismatic Journal,* VIII (1984/5), 40.

building practices.

The wiser course would seem to have been that taken by Philip's brother Antipas, who ruled Galilee from 4 BCE to 39 CE. He began construction on Sepphoris as his capital soon after ascending to his rule since the Romans had burned the city in punishment for an uprising at Herod's death. It likely began functioning as his capital within a few years although its official founding may have occurred in 8 CE, the 70th birthday of Augustus.[3] Antipas' second city Julia was founded in Perea to the east of the Jordan River, likely in 13 CE, the 70th birthday of Livia, the wife of Augustus. Apparently the city was first named Livia and then renamed Julia after Livia received that honourary name at the death of Augustus in 14 CE. Some twelve years after Sepphoris in 20 CE, Antipas dedicated his second Galilean city Tiberias on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee.

The building practice of Antipas provides a pattern that one might expect also for Philip. In addition, it offers a context for the founding of Julias. The wide range of archaeological excavations in the Galilee and the Golan over the past several decades provides hints that Bethsaida may have been upgraded in response to the founding of Tiberias. In his discussion about Sepphoris and Tiberias, Jonathan Reed notes: 'No area of Galilee lies outside a 25-km radius of these new urban centers.'[4] When one considers the third city of Julia in Perea, it is obvious that Antipas had planned well to extend his authority over his entire tetrarchy. This is a different model from that of Philip as described by Josephus:

> In his conduct of the government, he showed a moderate and easy-going disposition. Indeed, he spent all his time in the territory subject to him.
>
> When he went on circuits, he had only a few select companions. The throne on which he sat whenever he gave judgement accompanied him wherever he went. And so whenever anyone appealed to him for redress along the route, at once without a moment's delay, the throne was set up wherever it might be. He took his seat and gave the case a hearing. He fixed penalties for those who were convicted and released those who had been unjustly accused (Josephus, *Ant.* 18.106–07).

Philip's style of government was populist in nature and was dependent upon his personal connections throughout the region. Rather than traveling throughout the Galilee, Antipas extended his presence through these urban centres and government administrators who represented him. Reed suggests that a major change took place in lower Galilee when Antipas built Sepphoris as his capital. It developed a symbiotic relationship between the city and surrounding villages. The growing population required greater agricultural production from surrounding villages. Increased taxes from the villages helped

[3] Michael Avi-Yonah notes that the foundation of cities was often coordinated with important events in the lives of the emperors, 'The Foundation of Tiberias', *Israel Exploration Journal*, I (1950–1951), 168–69.

[4] Jonathan L. Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-examination of the Evidence* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 2000), 96. For a similar perspective of the role of Sepphoris and Tiberias, see Richard A. Horsley, *Archaeology, History, and Society in Galilee: The Social Context of Jesus and the Rabbis* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1996), 43–87.

to pay for public building projects in the city. Then a change in structure followed where villagers, who once held perhaps a dozen tracts of land with diversified crops, were taken over by wealthy landowners who employed the former subsistence farmers, now as tenant farmers, who now specialised in a cash crop in order to increase yields for 33% to 50% taxation. Some industry developed from the village Shikkin to sell pottery to Sepphoris and from the village Reina to provide stone vessels. The sphere of influence for Sepphoris, as Reed would suggest, was about 25 kilometres. Earlier studies of a local market economy in the Roman Empire had noted a figure of 15 kilometres as the distance peasants could travel from home to market in the early morning and then back home at the end of the day.[5] More recently David Aden-Bayewitz's study of the circulation of household pottery from the village of Kefar Hananya found that the pottery dominates this region, yet is absent beyond a distance of 25 kilometres from the kiln.[6] Production, trade, and taxation all played a role in establishing such a sphere of influence for Antipas and the city of Sepphoris. Similarly, with the foundation of Tiberias in 20 CE, the villages on the eastern edge of Galilee fell under his influence, as did the fishing industry on the Sea of Galilee.

One other change is that a monetary culture had already been emerging rather than a system based on reciprocity.[7] Coinage became extremely important. This is illustrated by the gospel story of the feeding of the 5000, which contrasts the value of hospitality and sharing of food with a stranger with the view that bread is a commodity: 'Two hundred denarii would not buy enough bread for each of them to get a little' (John 6:7). It is significant that both Philip and Antipas coordinated the minting of coins with the founding of cities. With the founding of Caesarea Philippi, Philip minted a coin with both his image and that of the Caesar.[8] In eight different years of his rule, Philip minted coins that served to extend his presence beyond his capital. So it would be misleading to say that Philip extended control only through a person-to-person model while Antipas employed symbols of power and structures of control and taxation.

Perhaps the biggest surprise in twenty-four years of excavating Bethsaida is a paucity of Philip coins. This is the city that Philip elevated as second in importance in his tetrarchy. Yet only five Philip coins have been discovered out of 480 coins uncovered. Danny Syon found in his study of coins excavated throughout the Galilee and Golan that Hasmonean rulers had flooded the coin markets to such an extent that these coins were still in circulation in the early Roman period so that the numbers of new coins minted were minimal.[9] However, that only five Philip coins have been found in Bethsaida is

[5] Ramsay MacMullen, 'Market Days in the Roman Empire', *Phoenix*, XXIV (1970), 333–41.

[6] David Adan-Bayewitz and Isadore Pearlman, 'The Local Trade of Sepphoris in the Roman Period', *Israel Exploration Journal*, XL (1990), pp. 153–72, especially 170.

[7] Clearly the Hasmoneans circulated thousands of their coins in the Galilee in the previous century, yet subsistence farming was the prominent model prior to the time of Antipas.

[8] Ya'akov Meshorer, *A Treasury of Jewish Coins* (Amphora Books, Nyack, NY, 2001), 86, plate 50: 95.

[9] Danny Syon, *Tyre and Gamla: A Study in the Monetary Influences of Southern Phoenecia on*

significant. Clearly Bethsaida is located far beyond the 25-kilometre circle of influence of Caesarea Philippi—at 45 kilometres nearly double the mark observed for the Galilean cities. Is this a sign that Bethsaida had not played that important a role within Philip's tetrarchy before its elevation to a city? Would we expect something different if Bethsaida had been established as Julias before 2 BCE?

Unlike Philip, Antipas waited to mint his first coins when Tiberias was founded in 20 CE.[10] Again the numbers of Antipas coins from Tiberias are not that great. Syon only identified 128 of them in excavations throughout Galilee and Golan. However, the range of circulation is interesting. The limit of circulation to the west is Jotapata where 14 Antipas coins were found—a distance of a little over 30 kilometres from Tiberias, but certainly within proximity to Sephhoris. The location of the greatest number of Antipas coin finds is a major surprise. Sixty-one Antipas coins were discovered, not in the Galilee, but within Philip's territory in the town of Gamla—far from Caesaerea Philippi, but not much over 25 kilometres northeast of Tiberias. One must understand that Gamla in many ways is an anomaly since 6314 coins altogether were excavated there. However, the presence of such a number of Antipas coins within the Golan is striking. In fact, twice as many Antipas coins appear at Gamla as Philip coins. These coins were meant only for local circulation. So when such a number appears across the border, one must consider the political and economical implications.

A scenario of possible competition appears between the minting patterns in the coins of Antipas and Philip within a decade of the foundation of Tiberias.

Year	*Coins of Philip*	*Event*	*Coins of Antipas*
4 BCE		Philip and Antipas begin reign	
1 CE	1st issue	Founding of Caesarea Philippi	
8 CE	2nd issue	Founding of Sepphoris	
12 CE	3rd issue	Livia, Perea approaching completion	
15 CE	4th issue	Livia renamed Julia	
20 CE		Founding of Tiberias	1st issue
26 CE	5th issue		
29 CE	6th issue		2nd issue
30 CE	7th issue		3rd issue
33 CE	8th issue		4th issue
34 CE		Death of Philip	
39 CE		Antipas Deposed	5th issue

For the first 29 years of their rule, Antipas minted coins on only one oc-

Galilee and the Golan in the Hellenistic and Romans Periods, Dissertation (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 2004). Summary of data is available in English in Morten Horning Jensen, *Herod Antipas in Galilee: The Literary and Archaeological Sources* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2006), 175–77 and 213–15.

[10] Meshorer (2001), 81–82.

casion and Philip on four occasions. Yet over the next eight years, Antipas minted coins on three occasions and Philip minted coins in four different years. Both issued coins simultaneously in the years 29 CE, 30 CE, and 33 CE. One could make a case that such correspondence reflected tension between the two rulers, one that had intensified following the founding of Tiberias.

With the establishment of Tiberias in 20 CE, the whole lake culture had been affected with wealthy representatives of Antipas controlling the fishing industry.[11] This situation is reflected in various gospel accounts. The city of Magdala north of Tiberias had taken upon itself the name Tarichaeae as it moved toward specialisation with fish processing. At centres like Capernaum, tax farmers like Levi represented Antipas waiting at table to take Antipas' share of the daily catch. The partnership of Simon and Andrew with the Zebedee family, as well as hired workers, is emblematic of the bonding together of independent fishermen to meet quotas and raised taxation. The movement of Simon and Andrew from their birth village Bethsaida to Capernaum may be related to the demands of Antipas' politico-economic expansion.[12] The use of the name 'Sea of Tiberias' in John 6:1 and 21:1 may well represent the evangelist's perspective rather than the period of the fishermen disciples, yet it is symbolic of the growing power of Tiberias. The frequent reports of crossings demonstrate that the lake had become a major thoroughfare. How much this had changed with the founding of Tiberias can only be speculation. Yet it would seem inevitable. The notation following the feeding of the 5000 in John 6 is that there had been boats from Tiberias docked at Bethsaida—some 10–11 kilometres distant by water. Tiberias and Bethsaida had become linked together. This is the situation in which Philip expanded the village and elevated it to the status of *polis*. Whether this was an attempt to compete with Tiberias or to join together in the benefits of increased trade is not clear. However, Philip was not to be left behind.

This pattern of economic development must be tested with the literary citations of the names Bethsaida and Julias in the first century. References to the village/city occur in all four gospels, Josephus, and Pliny. The following chart shows the name used in relation to various events:

City names used in first-century sources

Source:	Gospels	Josephus		Josephus	Pliny
Year: 4 BCE 1 CE	27 30	34		66	77
Name:	**Bethsaida**	**Julias**	**Julias**	**Julias**	**Julias**
Event:	Jesus' career	Philip's death	Agrippa's rule	Jewish Revolt battle	Cities by sea

[11] K. C. Hanson and Douglas E. Oakman, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 106–10.

[12] For a more benign interpretation of Galilean trade see Douglas R. Edwards, 'Identity and Social Location in Roman Galilean Villages', in *Religion, Ethnicity, and Identity in Ancient Galilee: A Region in Transition*, edited by Jürgen Zangenberg, Harold W. Attridge and Dale B. Martin (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 357–74. especially 367.

A clear pattern emerges. The city name Julias never occurs in a New Testament text while all four gospels consistently use Bethsaida[13] to describe events during the three years leading up to the death of Jesus on 7 April 30 CE.[14] Of course, the gospels were not composed as literary texts until four to six decades later. However, since the early second-century testimony of Bishop Papias of Hierapolis, scholars have recognised a dependence of these literary works upon the oral testimonies of the fishermen disciples Peter and John, who would have reflected the common usage of that early period for Bethsaida. The writing of Pliny demonstrates that the name Julias continued into the late first century. Josephus, writing at the same time as the gospels, also had first-hand information having taken part in a battle outside Julias in the first Jewish Revolt.[15] Thus his use of the name Julias must be considered accurate for that period. More significantly, Josephus uses the name Julias in describing its founding by Philip (including the only passage where Bethsaida and Julias occur together), for the location of Philip's death in 34 CE,[16] and also in connection with the subsequent rule of Agrippa I. According to this chart, the logical place for the founding of the city would be in the latter years of Philip's life, more precisely between the spring of 30 CE and 34 CE.

The reason that earlier scholars had mistakenly chosen an earlier date for the founding of Julias is that Josephus was inconsistent in his reporting. Writing in the mid 70s CE, Josephus located the founding of four cities following the death of Augustus in 14 CE:

> On the death of Augustus, who had directed the state for 57 years, six months, and two days, the empire of the Romans passed to Tiberius, son of Julia. On his accession, Herod Antipas and Philip continued to hold their tetrarchies and respectively founded cities: Philip built Caesarea, near the sources of the Jordan in the district of Paneas, and Julias in lower Gaulanitis; Herod built Tiberias in Galilee and a city which also took the name Julia in Perea (*Jewish War* 2.168).

That Josephus was intentionally connecting the founding of these cities to the period following 14 CE is supported by the omission of any reference to Sepphoris, founded in 8 CE. However, this passage is not without problems since Caesarea Philippi had clearly been established at an earlier date.[17]

[13] Seven references in the gospels are consistent in using the name Bethsaida. John's reference to Bethsaida as the home of Peter and Andrew occurs at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, perhaps around 27 CE (Jn 1:43–44). Shortly before Jesus' death, John refers to Greeks from Bethsaida who visit Jerusalem for Passover in Spring 30 CE (Jn 12:20–22), Several accounts related to the feeding of the 5000 and walking on water were likely to date to the previous Passover in 29 CE (Mk 6:45; Lk 9:10–11), and a bit later, the healing of a blind man (Mk 8:22–26). The Q saying in Mt 11:20–24 and Lk 10:13–15 is less clear regarding the date.

[14] Kokkinos has argued for an unusually late date for the death of Jesus (following even the death of Philip) in 36 CE which makes the changes from Bethsaida to Julias even more problematical. Nikos Kokkinos, 'Crucifixion in AD 36: The Keystone for Dating the Birth of Jesus', in *Chronos, Kairos, Christos: Nativity and Chronological Studies Presented to Jack Finegan*, ed. E. J. Vardaman and E. M. Yamauchi (Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, IN, 1989), pp. 133–63.

[15] Josephus, *Life* 398–406.

[16] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 18.4–6 and 106–08.

[17] Julia in Perea had likely been established shortly before Augustus' death though its name was subsequently changed from Livia to Julia.

In contrast, Josephus' other reference to the founding of cities by Antipas and Philip was introduced by a general comment that these events occurred after the two had taken up their tetrarchies. Writing in 93/94 CE Josephus described the building of four cities:

> Meanwhile Herod and Philip received and were taking in hand their respective tetrarchies. Herod fortified Sepphoris to be the ornament of all Galilee, and he called it Autocratoris. He also threw a wall about another city, Betharamphtha, which he called Julias, after the name of the emperor's wife. Philip too made improvements at Paneas, the city near the sources of the Jordan, and called it Caesarea. He also raised the village Bethsaida on Lake Gennesaritis to the status of city by adding residents and strengthening the fortifications. He named it after Julia, the emperor's daughter (*Jewish Antiquities* 18:27–28).

One could argue that the founding of these cities could have taken place at any time during the long tenure of Philip. Again Josephus omitted reference to one of Antipas' cities. This time it is Tiberias, founded in 20 CE. So there is a dilemma. Was Bethsaida founded as Julias early in Philip's rule or after the death of Augustus?

The traditional answer has revolved around the identification of the woman honoured by this naming with the names Julia and Julias playing an important role in both of Josephus' reports. Both preserve a balance of two cities with the name Julias, one in Perea and the other in Gaulanitis. In *Jewish War*, the name Julia stands out as the mother of Tiberius. This is significant because Tiberius' accession as emperor paralleled the name change that took place upon the reading of Augustus' will as Augustus' wife and Tiberius' mother Livia was granted the name Julia and the title Augusta or Sebaste. This Julia plays a prominent role in Josephus, mentioned no less than ten times, and always with the later name Julia, not Livia.[18] The implication is that both cities were named in her honour.

In *Jewish Antiquities*, the matter is more complicated since two epithets occur, 'the emperor's wife' and 'the emperor's daughter'. Were these names intended to stand in contrast? Or did these names stand in parallel? Emil Schürer adopted the former interpretation over a century ago—and is followed more recently by Nikos Kokkinos—in assuming that Bethsaida had been renamed in honour of Julia, the actual daughter of Augustus. However, as I demonstrated in an earlier *JJS* article, the title 'daughter of the emperor' is ambiguous. In the period following Livia's death, she is in fact known in both literature and inscriptions as 'Julia, daughter of Augustus'.[19] Although Kokkinos has cited this article, he ignores it, as if not being unaware of this evidence. It is no longer possible to say that Josephus' statement about the

[18] *Jewish War* 1:566, 641; 2:167; *Antiquities* 16:139; 17:10, 141, 146, 190; 18:31, 33. In contrast, Josephus twice mentions Julia, the biological daughter of Augustus, as the mother of Gaius, *Jewish War* 2:25; *Antiquities* 17: 229.

[19] Fred Strickert, 'Josephus' Reference to Julia, Caesar's Daughter: *Jewish Antiquities* 18.27–28', *Journal for Jewish Studies* LIII (2002), 27–34. The title occurs in Velleius Paterculus, *History of Rome* 2.75.3 and inscriptions at Velleia and Aphrodisias. See Elizabeth Bartman, *Portraits of Livia: Imaging the Imperial Woman in Augustan Rome* (Cambrige: Cambridge University Press, 1999) 211, epig. cat. no. 76 and p. 210, epig. cat. no. 70.

'emperor's daughter' is 'explicit' or that 'hardly any question can be raised'.[20]

When one considers the possibility that 'the emperor's daughter' can refer to both Julia, his biological daughter, and Livia / Julia, his wife and adopted daughter, the next step is to decide which is more likely. With regard to the latter, the honours of Livia are almost without parallel, including in a Palestinian provenance the appearance of the name Julia on coins of procurators Gratus and Pontius Pilate, the naming of Antipas' Perea city, and naming of Livia as recipient in the will of Herod's sister Salome. In contrast, what Julia, the biological daughter of Augustus, left behind was a tainted reputation due to her behaviour embarrassing to Augustus and Tiberius and to her banishment from Rome. Susan Wood notes that Julia's footprint has all but disappeared because of her downfall. A few coins remain, as do several inscriptions in Asia where she had lived with Agrippa, but all sculptures have disappeared.[21] Likewise Wood might add: and no cities were named in her honour. There is no question who was the more honoured of these two women.

If one is to accept the proposal that Bethsaida was named in honour of Julia, the biological daughter of Augustus, one is faced with several problems. First, is there evidence to explain why Philip might have honoured her? Second, was there sufficient time for such an honour before her banishment? Third, is it reasonable to believe that the name Julias would have continued after her fall, let alone in the second half of the first century?

To be sure, Julia did not always have this tainted reputation. As the wife of Agrippa, she had been well respected especially in her role as mother of Augustus' own chosen heirs to the empire. In 13/12 BCE a denarius (of C. Marius Tro.) displayed her image flanked by Augustus' grandsons Gaius and Lucius. This was likely the high point of her life. Shortly afterwards, she was faced with the tragic death of her husband Agrippa, and she was forced to undertake a short unhappy marriage to Tiberius which produced by 8 BCE only a dead newborn son and the self-exile and separation of her new husband to the island of Rhodes. In the next years, her reputation unraveled. So serious were the accusations against her that Augustus was left with no choice but to exile his only daughter in 2 BCE to the island of Pandateria and then Rhegium which continued without reconciliation until both their deaths in 14 CE.[22]

Like other sons of Herod, Philip had been educated in Rome under the watchful eye of Augustus' wife Livia, who had developed a close relationship with Herod and also his sister Salome. Born sometime between 22 and 20 BCE, Philip would likely have gone to Rome around 10 BCE and remained there until his return to Judea in 4 BCE shortly before Herod's death.[23] Unfortunately little is known about Philip's time in Rome. D. C. Braund concludes: 'No direct link between Julia and Philip is known but as the daughter of Au-

[20] Kokkinos (2008), abstract 236, 243.

[21] Susan E. Wood, *Imperial Women: A Study in Public Images, 40 BC–AD 68* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000), 27.

[22] Suetonius, *Augustus* 65; Dio *History* 55.10 and 12–16.

[23] Kokkinos' argument (2003) is partly dependent upon his earlier date for Philip's stay in Rome so that Philip would not have been present during Julia's most difficult period, 244.

gustus and wife of Agrippa she had a good claim to the friendship of the Herods.'[24] The most likely connection would have been through Gaius who was born at roughly the same time as Philip.[25] Anything else would be speculation. If one assumes that Philip knew Julia as mother of his friend, then one would also have to assume that he had been aware of her growing problems. There is nothing that would explain Philip naming a city after her.

Assuming for a minute that Philip had reason to honour her, the date of Julia's banishment in 2 BCE leaves only a very narrow window for Philip to have acted. With Herod's death in the spring of 4 BCE and the necessary time for the reading of his will in Rome, one can assume Philip's accession by late summer of 4 BCE at the earliest. Yet one must presume a steep learning curve for this teenaged heir with no previous ruling experience and with likely no previous familiarity with the Golan region. It would be surprising at best for Philip to have initiated the expansion of this village at this stage of his career.

If perhaps Philip earlier did have a reason to honour Julia, and if he had only later become aware of her demise, one would expect some sort of subsequent attempt to rectify the situation. It is difficult to imagine Philip announcing to Augustus a city Caesarea Philippi named in his honour, while at the same time reporting that he was rejecting the emperor's judgement by naming a second city in honour of Julia. As Nikos Kokkinos acknowledged, Philip's 'foundation of "Julias" will suddenly have seemed an embarrassment. The name may have easily reverted to Bethsaida, at least as long as Augustus and Tiberius were alive.'[26] However, there is no evidence that this was the case. It is true that the gospels use the name Bethsaida, yet in 77 CE Pliny the elder, describes 'Julias' as one of four 'lovely' cities on the Sea of Galilee[27] and in the next century Ptolemy writes in the *Geography* that Julias is one of four major cities of Galilee.[28] Clearly the name and the grandeur continued together. More importantly, the death of Philip is described as occurring in 'Julias' in 34 CE, while Tiberius was still alive.[29] There is simply no reason to explain a later resurgence of the name Julias if indeed Philip had named the city in honour of the disgraced daughter of the emperor. A simpler explanation is to be preferred.

One can only conclude from Josephus' report of the founding of cities in *Jewish Antiquities* 18.27–28 that his notation about Julia the daughter of Augustus is problematical. It does not seem logical that Philip would have founded a second city while engaged in the building of Caesarea Philippi and that he would certainly not have named a city for a disgraced Julia. This leads to the work by Ariel Kindler on the coins of Philip.

Careful attention to the coins of Philip demonstrates that the founding of Philip took place in the year 30 CE. For a long time, it had been noticed that

[24] D. C. Braund, *Rome and the Friendly King: The Character of Client Kingship* (Croom Helm, London, 1984), 108.
[25] Dio 54. 8. 5.
[26] Nikos Kokkinos (2008), 245.
[27] Pliny, *Natural History* 5.15.71.
[28] Ptolemy, *Geography* 5.16.4.
[29] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 18.4–6 and 106–08.

the standard Philip coin—with the image of the emperor of the obverse and the Paneas Temple on the reverse—included the four letters *KTIS* in addition to the regular epigraph *EPI PHILIPPOU TETRARCHOU* only in the 34th year of Philip's rule, or 30 CE. *KTIS* is an abbreviation for *KTISTES*, meaning 'founder', and corresponds to the verbal form *KTIZEI*, used by Josephus in the *Jewish War* 2.168 report about the founding of cities. Previously the assumption had been that this addition commemorated the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of Caesarea Philippi.[30] Yet that did not make a lot of sense when Philip's coin of 1 CE had not used this abbreviation. It makes more sense that the year 30 CE was a special year in itself. That was confirmed with a second Philip coin—depicting Philip himself—labeled as year 34. Kokkinos has misread that date from *LΛΔ* to *LΛΑ* or year 31 of Philip or 27 CE.[31] This reading is highly unlikely since Philip had previously issued coins in year 30 and no other Philip coins have been discovered for year 31. This coin was unusual in that it was a smaller denomination than he had previously minted, and on the obverse was an image of Philip himself.[32] This was something that Antipas was unable to do. All of the coins of Antipas continued the Herodian practice of avoiding human images. Yet minting coins in far-off Caesarea Philippi, Philip could theoretically spread his image throughout his tetrarchy via coins.

A third coin minted in year 34 is critical in explaining the confusion about renaming Bethsaida. This coin displays a woman's image and carries the inscription *IOULIA SEBASTE*.[33] In the whole corpus of Philip coinage, this is the single instance that Philip's own name does not appear. Ya'akov Meshorer (1982) first included it in a supplementary section of his catalogue, but Jacob Maltiel-Gerstenfeld (1982) identified it as a coin of Philip.[34] Shortly thereafter, numismatist Arie Kindler presented the paper that recognised the significance of the coin as designating the founding of Julias in Livia / Julia's

[30] Ya'akov Meshorer held this view in *Ancient Jewish Coinage, II*, (Dix Hills, NY: Amphora Books, 1982), 49. Since the coin included a depiction of the Temple of Augustus, the assumption was that the founding referred to Caesarea Philippi. However, in *A Treasury of Jewish Coins* (Amphora Books, Nyack, NY, 2001), 88, he accepts that KTIS points to the founding of Bethsaida in 30 CE. Michael Amandry, Andrew Burnett, and Pere Pau Ripollés, *Roman Provincial Coinage* (henceforth *RPC*), vol. 1: *From the Death of Caesar to the Death of Vitellius (44 BC–AD 69)* (London: British Museum Press, 2005), 4948.

[31] Kokkinos (2008), fn. 29, 246.

[32] In his first mint, Philip had portrayed himself on the reverse of a coin with Augustus on the obverse, but he discontinued this practice in favour of displaying the Temple of Augustus at Caesarea Philippi. Meshorer (2001), 89, plate 51: 108, 111. The year 30 CE coin catalogued by Meshorer weighed only 1.61 grams, only one quarter of the most regular Philip coins. *RPC* 1.4950.

[33] For a more extensive discussion see Fred Strickert, 'The First Woman to be Portrayed on a Jewish Coin: Julia Sebaste', *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, XXXI (2002), 65–91. The coin is half the size of Philip's standard issue, but twice the size of the smaller coin with Philip's own mint. So in this year Philip for the first time issued three denominations.

[34] Ya'akov Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage*, II (Dix Hills, NY: Amphora Books, 1982), supplement 3, 278, no. 1. Jacob Maltiel-Gerstenfeld, *260 Years of Ancient Jewish Coinage* (Kol Printing Service, Tel Aviv, 1982), 148, no. 120. Meshorer later came to agree that this is a Philip coin in *A Treasury of Jewish Coins* (Amphora Books, Nyack, NY, 2001), 88. *RPC* 1.4949.

honour in 30 CE.[35] However, members of the Bethsaida Excavations Project immediately recognised the importance of Kindler's observations in a series of publications[36] and numismatists now generally assign the coin to Philip. The epigraph, Julia Sebaste, made it clear that this coin could honour only two women: Julia the daughter of Augustus who, as mentioned above, had been exiled in 2 BCE and died in 14 CE, and Livia, the wife of Augustus, who following his death in 14 CE was officially adopted into the Julian clan and granted the title Sebaste.[37] As noted at the beginning of this paper, the coin would have to have been minted prior to 2 BCE to designate Julia the daughter of Augustus. Such an interpretation is within the realm of remote possibilities. Yet what ruler in a Palestinian provenance might mint such a coin in his 34th year and what would have been the occasion to honour this Julia? Herod the Great would be the only alternative of someone ruling so long in this period, yet he must be eliminated because of his practices of aniconic coins and of coins without dates (except in year 3).[38]

Rather it is Philip who always included images on his coins and who in fact minted coins in his 34th year. It makes perfect sense that Philip would have minted such a coin in 30 CE following the death of Livia in 29 CE.[39] In fact Pontius Pilate also recognised Livia's death on his coins in both 29 and 30 CE with the epigraph *IOULIA KAICAROC*.[40] This Julia Sebaste coin, therefore, provides the absolute evidence that solves the riddle of naming Philip's city Julias. It was not in honour of the daughter of Caesar, but of Livia who had left a well-honoured legacy throughout the empire and especially in Palestine.

The choice of Livia as honoree in the elevation of Bethsaida to the status of city is understandable because of the timing of her death. However, it can also be interpreted as a very wise move by Philip since Livia is portrayed as benefactress. For people in surrounding villages, the establishment of a city is a good news–bad news situation. The city provides public buildings and,

[35] Arie Kindler, 'The Coins of the Tetrarch Philip and Bethsaida', in *Bethsaida: A City by the North Shore of the Sea of Galilee*, vol. 2, ed. Rami Arav and Richard Freund (Truman State University Press, Kirksville, MO, 1999), 245–49. This article was first published in Hebrew in *Cathedra for the History of Eretz Israel and its Yishuv* 53 (Jerusalem, 1989), 24–26.

[36] H. W. Kuhn and Rami Arav, 'The Bethsaida Excavations: Historical and Archaeological Perspectives', in *The Future of Early Christianity*, ed. B. A. Pearson (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 77–107; Fred Strickert, 'The Coins of Philip', in Rami Arav and Richard Freund, *Bethsaida: A City by the North Shore of the Sea of Galilee*, vol. 1 (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 1995), 165–92; John T. Greene, 'The Honorific Naming of Bethsaida-Julia', Arav and Freund, vol. 2 (1999), 307–32; and Mark D. Smith, 'A Tale of Two Julias: Julia, Julias, and Josephus', Arav and Freund, vol. 2 (1999), 333–46).

[37] Tacitus, *Annals* 1.8.

[38] Meshorer (2001), 61. The 34th year of Herod would be 5/4 BCE.

[39] Nikos Kokkinos earlier had stated that this same coin 'must commemorate Livia's death' in *The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society, and Eclipse*, Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 30 (Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, 1998), footnote 123, p. 239. In his 2008 article, however, he has chosen to disregard the evidence because of the lack of Philip's name. Leading Israeli numismatists agree that Philip issued three or four coins in this banner year. Kokkinos has argued away the smaller Philip-image coin by reinterpreting the date to a very unlikely year (see fn 31, and the text) and he has argued away the Julia Sebaste coin to an alternative non-existent context.

[40] Meshorer (2001), plate 74: 331 and plate 75: 338. *RPC* 1.4967.

in cases like Sepphoris, theatres for public entertainment. Yet the city means an imposition upon the people who will suffer greater burdens of taxation. In naming his second city Tiberias, Antipas projected the authority of the emperor. Tiberias and Antipas were the major recipients of taxation. In contrast, Livia projected the image of motherhood and benevolence. Thus the inscription on the reverse of this Livia coin is *KARPOPHOROS*, 'fruitbearing'. Barbette Spaeth has demonstrated that this epithet has its roots in the Demeter myth and occurs in an Ephesus inscription for Livia in this regard.[41] Through the portrayal of Livia as Demeter on coins, inscriptions, and art, Augustus himself helped to create Livia as the model of motherhood in order to promote his own programmes of the *Pax Romana* and of family values.[42] As the nourishing, benevolent mother she is often portrayed with a cornucopia or with stalks of grain in her hands[43] as she is on the obverse of the coin of Philip.[44] The unique portrayal of the hand extended while holding the grain suggests that Livia's benevolence continues even after her death.

Rami Arav has also identified a structure from the early Roman period at Bethsaida as the 'Temple of Livia'.[45] Unfortunately, there are no inscriptions or the magnificent architectural style one might expect from Scythopolis, Caesarea Maritima, or even Caesarea Philippi. Yet, the floor-plan of the building and nearby finds of several bronze incense shovels, a patera, and a Livia-like figurine support Arav's conclusions. Philip's building programme went beyond anything that Herod or Antipas had been able to do across the lake in Galilee: provide a temple of the imperial cult. This would put Julias in the category of pilgrimage sites attracting not only individuals from within Philip's tetrarchy, but some also from the Galilee, especially non-Jewish members of Antipas' bureaucratic structure. Those traveling near Julias would be inclined to stop for religious reasons and leave with their money pouches a bit lighter.

Following the foundation of Julias in 30 CE, Philip issued coins again in 33 CE, including both the small coin with Philip's image, the Julia Sebaste coin, and his standard coin with the emperor's image and the Temple of Augustus. It is likely that he also issued a new variation with the dual images of Augustus and Livia with the epigraph *SEBASTWN*.[46] This is the only coin of Philip without a date. Since Livia was granted the title *SEBASTE* only after her husband's death in 14 CE, it could belong to any subsequent mint. However, the presence of both figures would have been appropriate in 33 CE, the 70th

[41] Barbette Stanley Spaeth, *The Roman Goddess Ceres* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), 130. See catalogue #1.4.

[42] Gertrude Grether, 'Livia and the Roman Imperial Cult', *American Journal of Philology* LXVII (1946), 222–52, especially 226. Bartman, 93.

[43] Bartman, 106. For illustrations, see Strickert, 'The First Woman' (2002).

[44] So also grain imagery on the *IOULIA* coins of Pilate.

[45] Rami Arav, 'Bethsaida Excavations: Preliminary Report, 1994–1996', in Arav and Freund, *Bethsaida*, vol 2 (1999), 15–44. Rami Arav, Richard A. Freund, and John F. Shroder, Jr, 'Bethsaida Rediscovered: Long-lost City Found North of Galilee Shore', *Biblical Archaeology Review* XXVI (Jan./Feb. 2000), 44–56.

[46] Meshorer (2001), plate 50: 100. Only in 39 CE, was Antipas emboldened to use the title *SEBASTOS* on a coin, as also the name of the emperor.

anniversary of their marriage and also the 90th anniversary of Livia's birth.[47] This would suggest a continued interest in the new city. Presumably Philip made Julias his residence, at least for a significant part of the year. Josephus reports that Philip died in Julias in 34 CE and that he was carried to the tomb that he had built for himself.[48] It is true that Josephus is not absolutely clear about the location of his tomb, but it would seem that Philip had constructed it near his new city.

The finds of the Bethsaida excavations have not been without criticism because they do not meet expectations for Philip's new city. However, this may simply be typical of smaller 'cities' with smaller financial resources.[49] It is also important to remember that Julias was founded very late in Philip's rule. It is unknown whether he had time to complete his building programme or whether certain projects remained unfinished. After Philip, there is no evidence that Julias had such an advocate. Philip's territory was first added to Syria, then given to Agrippa 1 and then to Agrippa 2, the latter two who had extensively expanded kingdoms. In his latter years Agrippa was occupied with improving the palace at Caesarea Philippi. Yet in 77 CE, Pliny the elder could refer to Julias as one of four 'lovely' cities on the Sea of Galilee.[50] The changes made by Philip in 30 CE had elevated the small village to a city recognised throughout the region.

[47] It is possible that this coin was also minted in 30 CE at the founding of Julias. Meshorer (2001), 87, prefers to date the coin in 14 CE just after Augustus' death.

[48] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 18.4–6 and 106–08.

[49] Jonathan Reed (2000), 93–94, remarks concerning the Galilean cities, 'It must be noted that neither Sepphoris nor Tiberias shows the same kind of appetite for materials, buildings, and particularly decorative elements that symbolised Greco-Roman culture, compared to Caesarea Maritima or Scythopolis, the major cities in Palestine.' With regard to Bethsaida, it should be also noted that the Bethsaida Excavations Project has restricted itself at this time to the acropolis. No probes have been dug along the southern slopes that would approach the port of the city.

[50] Pliny, *Natural History* 5. 15. 71.