

§ 15. HEROD THE GREAT 37-4 B.C.

Sources

- Jos. *Ant.* xv, xvi, xvii 1-8 (1-205); *B.J.* i 18-33 (347-673).
 On the lost works of Herod, Ptolemy, Nicolaus of Damascus and Justus of Tiberias, see pp. 26-37 above.
 Rabbinic traditions: bBaba Bathra 3b-4a
 bTaanith 23a
 Leviticus Rabbah 35:8
 Numbers Rabbah 14:20
 Cf. Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-65.
 The coins are given in *EMC Palestine*, pp. 220-7; A. Raifenberg, *Ancient Jewish Coins* (1947), pp. 42-3; Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (1967), pp. 127-30. See n. 85 below

Bibliography

- Graetz, H., *Geschichte der Juden* III (1905-6), pp. 196-244.
 Reran, E., *Histoire du peuple d'Israël* V (1893), pp. 248-304.
 Wellhausen, J., *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, (1958), pp. 304-26.
 Otto, H., 'Herodes' RE VIII, Suppl. 2 (1913), cols. 1-158 (the basic modern study).
 Momigliano, A. D., 'Herod of Judaea', CAH X (1934), pp. 316-39.
 Jones, A. H. M., *The Herods of Judaea* (1938, 1967), pp. 39-155.
 Abel, F.-M., *Histoire de la Palestine I* (1952), pp. 347-406.
 Buchheim, H., *Die Orientpolitik des Triumvirn M. Antonius* (1960), pp. 68-74.
 Bowersock, G. W., *Augustus and the Greek World* (1965), esp. pp. 54-7.
 Schalit, A., *König Herodes: der Mann und sein Werk* (1969).
 Applebaum, Sh., 'Herod I', Enc. Jud. VIII (1971), cols. 375-85, 387.

Chronological Summary¹

- B.C.
 37 Conquest of Jerusalem (some time in July?).
 Executions, *Ant.* xv 1, 2 (5-10), cf. xiv 9, 4 (175); *B.J.* i 18, 4 (358-60).
 37/6? Antonius grants to Cleopatra Chalcis, Coele-Syria, the coastal strip from the Eleutherus to Egypt (except Tyre and Sidon), Cilicia and Cyprus.
 For the date, *Plut. Ant.* 36; Porphyry, FGrH 260 F 2 (17); cf. *Ant.* xv 3, 8 (79), 4, 1 (95); Dio xlix 32 4-5 (under 36 B.C.).²
 36 Hyrcanus II returns from his Parthian imprisonment, *Ant.* xv 2, 1-4 (11-22).
 35 Beginning of the year: Aristobulus III, Mariamme's brother, is nominated.

1. We start with this summary because the following sections do not keep entirely to a chronological sequence.

2. For the evidence for the chronology of Antonius's territorial grants to Cleopatra see n. 5 below.

B.C.

- High Priest by Herod at the instigation of his mother Alexandra, *Ant.* xv 2, 5-7 (23-38); 3, 1 (39-41).³
- End of the year: on the instructions of Herod, Aristobulus III is drowned in the bath at Jericho (soon after the Feast of Tabernacles), τὴν δ' ἀρχιερωσύνην κατασχὼν ἐνιαυτῶν, *Ant.* xv 3, 3 (50-6); *B.J.* i 22, 2 (437).
- 35/4 Herod is summoned by Antonius to Laodicea to answer for the death of Aristobulus but is graciously released by Antonius, *Ant.* xv 3, 5 (62-7) and 8-9 (74-87).⁴
- 34 Joseph, the husband of Herod's sister Salome, is executed, *Ant.* xv 3, 9 (80-7).
- Antonius grants to Cleopatra the balsam plantations near Jericho and some parts of the territory of Malchus of Nabataea, *B.J.* i 18, 5 (361-2), *Ant.* xv 4, 2 (96).⁵

3. The nomination was made some time after Alexandra had sent the portraits of Aristobulus and Mariamme to Antonius in Egypt, *Ant.* xv 2, 6 (27); *B.J.* i 22, 3 (439). Since Antonius did not arrive in Egypt until the end of 36 B.C. (see p. 252 above), the nomination cannot have taken place earlier than the beginning of 35 B.C.

4. Since, as stated above, Aristobulus died at the end of 35 B.C., this summons to Laodicea fell in the winter of 35/34 B.C., before Antonius undertook the campaign against Armenia (Dio xlix 39); when Josephus states that Antonius advanced at that time against the Parthians, *Ant.* xv 3, 9 (80), he is inaccurate but not positively wrong, for Antonius did in fact assert that he was advancing against the Parthians (see Dio xlix 39, 3). Moreover, in *B.J.* i 18, 5 (362) Josephus also writes erroneously 'Parthians' instead of 'Armenians'. The campaign (ἐπὶ Πάρθους) mentioned in *Ant.* xv 3, 9 (80) is accordingly identical with the one ἐπὶ Ἀρμενίων mentioned in *Ant.* xv 4, 2 (96).

5. These donations are also mentioned by Plut. *Ant.* 36 (Φοινίκην, κοίλην Συρίαν, Κύπρον, Κιλικίας πολλήν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς τε Ἰουδαίων τὴν τὸ βάλαμον φέρουσαν καὶ τῆς Ναβαταίων Ἀραβίας ὁση πρὸς τὴν ἐκτὸς ἀποκλίνει θάλασσαν) and by Dio xlix 32, 5 (πολλὰ μὲν τῆς Ἀραβίας τῆς τε Μάλχου καὶ τῆς τῶν Ἰγυραίων, τὸν γὰρ Λυσανίαν . . . ἀπέκτευν . . . πολλὰ δὲ καὶ τῆς Φοινίκης τῆς τε Παλαιστίνης, Κρήτης τε πᾶσα καὶ Κυρήνην τὴν τε Κύπρον). Both place them in 36 B.C., before the beginning of the Parthian campaign, in the case of Plutarch, and after the return from it, in that of Dio. On the other hand, according to Josephus the gift of parts of Arabia, Judaea and Phoenicia took place in 34 B.C., when Antonius was about to advance against Armenia. For comparison with Dio xlix 39-40 shows without doubt that this is the campaign alluded to in *Ant.* xv 4, 1-5 (88-105), *B.J.* i 18, 5 (361-3). The date given by Plutarch and Dio is seemingly confirmed by Porphyry's observation that Cleopatra counted the sixteenth year of her reign also as its first, because that was the year in which Antonius, after the death of Lysimachus (Lysanias is intended) had bestowed upon her the kingdom of Chalcis (Porphyry in Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene I, p. 170 (=FGrH 260 F2 (17), τὸ δ' ἑκκαδέκατον ὠνομάσθη τὸ καὶ πρῶτον, ἐπειδὴ τελευτήσαντος Λυσιμάχου [i. Λυσανίου] τῆς ἐν Συρίᾳ Χαλκίδος βασιλέως, Μάρκος Ἀντώνιος ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ τὴν τε Χαλκίδα καὶ τοὺς περὶ αὐτὴν τόπους παρέδωκε τῇ Κλεοπάτρᾳ). This dual reckoning of the years of Cleopatra's reign is attested by various papyri and inscriptions, see T. C. Skeat, *The Reigns of the Ptolemies* (1954), p. 42, and by coins of Cleopatra, struck in Berytus, J. N. Svoronos, *Die Münzen der Ptolemaeer IV* (1908), pp. 377 and 385-7, but not those of Egypt itself, *op. cit.* p. 377. For the view that the first year of the Syrian era of Cleopatra was 37/6 see the valuable studies of the coinage by H. Seyrig, 'Sur les ères de quelques

B.C.

- Cleopatra with Herod in Jerusalem, *Ant.* xv 4, 2 (96-103); *B.J.* i 18, 5 (362).
- 32/1 War of Herod with the Nabataeans after the outbreak of hostilities between Antonius and Octavian, *Ant.* xv 5, 1 (108-20); *B.J.* i 19, 1-3 (334-72).
- 31 Earthquake in Palestine, *Ant.* xv 5, 2 (121-2); *B.J.* i 19, 3 (370) κατ' ἔτος μὲν τῆς βασιλείας ἑβδομον, ἀκμάζοντος δὲ τοῦ περὶ Ἀκτιον πολέμου, ἀρχομένου ἔαρος.⁶
- Herod defeats the Nabataeans, *Ant.* xv 5, 2-5 (123-60); *B.J.* i 19, 3-6 (371-85).
- After the battle of Actium (2 Sept.) Herod sides with Octavian, supporting Didius in the fighting against the gladiators of Antonius, *Ant.* xv 6, 7 (194-201); *B.J.* i 20, 2 (391-2). Cf. p. 254 above.
- 30 Spring: Hyrcanus II is executed, *Ant.* xv 6, 1-4 (161-82); *B.J.* i 22, 1 (431-4); πλείω μὲν ἢ ὀγδοήκοντα γεγονὸς ἐτύγγαθεν ἔτη, *Ant.* xv 6, 3 (178).⁷ Herod visits Octavian at Rhodes and is confirmed by him as king, *Ant.* xv 6, 5-7 (183-97); *B.J.* i 20, 1-3 (386-93).
- At Ptolemais he welcomes Octavian on his march to Egypt, *Ant.* xv 6, 7 (198-201); *B.J.* i 20, 3 (394-5).
- Autumn: Herod visits Octavian in Egypt and receives back from him Jericho and also Gadara, Hippos, Samaria, Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa and Straton's Tower, *Ant.* xv 7, 3 (215-17); *B.J.* i 20, 3 (396-7).
- End of the year: He accompanies Augustus on his return from Egypt as far as Antioch, *Ant.* xv 7, 4 (218).
- 29 End of the year: Mariamme is executed, *Ant.* xv 7, 4-6 (218-39); *B.J.* i 22, 3-5 (438-44), *Ant.* xv 7, 4 (221) ἢ τε ὑποψία τρεφομένη παρέτευν ἐνιαυτοῦ μήκος ἐξ οὗ παρὰ Καίσαρος Ἡρώδης ὑπεστρόφει.
- 28? Alexandra is executed, *Ant.* xv 7, 8 (247-52).
- 27? Costobar, the second husband of Salome, and the sons of Babas, are executed, *Ant.* xv 7, 10 (259-66). A later date is indicated by the statement of Salome: ὅτι διασώζουτο παρ' αὐτῷ χρόνον ἐνιαυτῶν ἡδὴ δώδεκα

villes de Syrie', Syria 27 (1950), pp. 5-50, on pp. 110-13; and 'Le monnayage de Ptolemais de Phénicie', RN 4 (1962), pp. 25-50. Since the 16th year of Cleopatra runs from 1 Thoth=1 Sept. 37 to 5 Epag.=31 Aug. 36 (Skeat, *op. cit.*, p. 18), her new era commences precisely with this year. Cf. however A. E. Samuel, *Ptolemaic Chronology* (1962), p. 159, who explains the new era as marking the joint rule of Cleopatra and Caesarion. The appearance of the double era on the coins of Berytus but not those of Egypt is, however, a strong argument for accepting Porphyry's statement. Without further documentary evidence, the statements of Josephus, Plutarch and Dio about the various territorial grants by Antonius to Cleopatra cannot be reconciled in any universally acceptable way. For a full discussion see J. Dobiasz, 'La donation d' Antoine à Cléopâtre en l'an 34 av. J.-C.', *Mélanges Bidez* (1934), pp. 287-314. The chronology suggested here is that of H. Buchheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-74, and Schalit, *op. cit.*, Anhang XII.

6. The 7th year of Herod=31/30 B.C. reckoned from 1st Nisan to 1st Nisan. See n. 165 below. The earthquake therefore took place in Nisan 31 B.C. Elsewhere also Nisan is considered the beginning of spring. See *B.J.* iv 8, 1 (443) (ὑπὸ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ ἔαρος); cf. iv 7, 3 (413) (τετράδι Δύστρου). According to the Mishnah, Taan. 1:2, Ned. 8:5, B.M. 8:6, the rainy season was reckoned from the Feast of Tabernacles to Passover, i.e., to the middle or even the end of Nisan.

7. Zonaras, V 14 *fin.* ἦν ἐτῶν ὀγδοήκοντα πρὸς ἐν. Some of the manuscripts of Josephus also have 81. Hyrcanus, however, cannot have been so old in 27 B.C. for his mother Alexandra Salome did not marry his father Alexander Jannaeus until after the death of her first husband Aristobulus I in 104 B.C.

B.C.

[al. δεκαδύο], i.e. after the conquest of Jerusalem in 37 B.C.; but see Otto, *op. cit.*, cols. 53-4, 56.

? Start of the quadrennial athletic contests. Theatre and amphitheatre built in Jerusalem, *Ant.* xv 8, 1 (267-76).

Conspiracy against Herod, *Ant.* xv 8, 3-4 (280-91).

27/25? Herod sends 500 soldiers to the campaign of Aelius Gallus against Arabia, *Ant.* xv 9, 3 (317), cf. Strabo xvi 4, 23 (780) τῶν συμμάχων, ὧν ἦσαν Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν πεντακόσιοι. The campaign probably ended in 25 B.C.; having caused heavy losses and brought no tangible results.⁸

25? Samaria rebuilt and named Sebaste in honour of Augustus, *Ant.* xv 8, 5 (292-8); *B.J.* i 21, 2 (403).⁹

8. The most detailed description of the campaign is given by Strabo, xvi 4, 22-4 (780-2), shorter accounts by Dio liii 29, Pliny, *NH* vi 32/160-1, and in *Res Gestae* 26. Cf. generally, Mommsen, *Röm. Geschichte* V, pp. 608 ff. T. Rice Holmes, *The Architect of the Roman Empire* II, pp. 18-20; J. G. C. Anderson in *CAH* X, pp. 248-52. For the geography see D. H. Müller, 'Arabia', *RE* II, 344-59; Abel, *Géog. Pal.* I (1933), pp. 288-98; map in Rice Holmes, *op. cit.*, facing p. 15. The chronological problem has been newly discussed by S. Jameson 'Chronology of the Campaigns of Aelius Gallus and C. Petronius' *JRS* 58 (1968), pp. 71-84. Dio places the whole campaign in the tenth consulship of Augustus, 24 B.C. But according to Strabo the campaign proper did not take place until after Aelius Gallus had gone with great losses, the year before, to Leuce Come, and had been obliged to spend the winter there because of much sickness in his army (Strabo xvi 4, 24 (781) ἡραγκάσθη γοῦν τό τε θέρος καὶ τὸν χειμῶνα διατελέσαι αὐτόθι τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας ἀνακτώμενος). But since Petronius's prefecture began in 25 B.C. (below) Aelius's campaign must be earlier, probably 26-5 B.C. On the other hand it has sometimes been doubted whether Aelius Gallus conducted the campaign as governor of Egypt and was followed in this office by Petronius, or whether Petronius was governor of Egypt at the time of the Arabian campaign and was succeeded by Gallus. It is known for certain that both held the office of *praefectus Aegypti* (see on Aelius Gallus: Strabo ii 5, 12 (118) and xvii 1, 29 (806); Dio liii 29, 3; on Petronius: Strabo xvii 1, 3 (788) and i, 53 (819); Dio liv 5, 4; Pliny *NH* vi 35/181). It is also known that Petronius undertook several campaigns against the Ethiopians at about the same time as the expedition of Aelius Gallus to Arabia, *RG* 26 'Meo iussu at auspicio ducti sunt duo exercitus eodem fere tempore in Aethiopia in et in Arabiam quae appellatur Eudaemon'; Strabo xvii 1, 54 (820-1); Dio liv 5, 4-6; Pliny *NH* vi 35/181; according to Strabo the Ethiopians invaded the Thebaid when the Egyptian garrison was weakened by the departure of Aelius Gallus; it was this that necessitated the expedition of Petronius. Dio puts this expedition under 22 B.C. On the other hand, it is clear that Aelius Gallus conducted the Arabian campaign as prefect of Egypt (Dio liii 29, 3 ὁ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἄρχων) and that Petronius was his successor in Egypt (Strabo 820). Since according to Strabo, Petronius conducted two Ethiopian campaigns, they should date to 25-4 B.C.—at the conclusion of which he sent captives to Augustus *πρωστὴ ἐκ Καντάβρων ἦκοντι* (Strabo 821), i.e., 24 B.C.—and the second in perhaps 23-2 B.C. Petronius will have succeeded Gallus in the second half of 25 B.C., the 13th year of Herod, cf. *Ant.* xv 9, 1-2 (299-307).

9. According to Josephus it certainly appears as if the rebuilding took place in 25 B.C. For after reporting it in *Ant.* xv 8, 5 (292-8), he continues in xv 9, 1 (299) κατὰ τοῦτον μὲν οὖν τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τρισκαίδέκατον ὄντα τῆς Ἡρώδου βασιλείας. But the 13th year of Herod began on 1st Nisan 25 B.C. The coins of Samaria (see *BMC Palestine*, pp. xxxvii-xli, do not provide any reliable evidence for putting

B.C.

Famine and pestilence, κατὰ τοῦτον μὲν οὖν τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν, τρισκαίδέκατον ὄντα τῆς Ἡρώδου βασιλείας=25/24 B.C., from Nisan to Nisan, *Ant.* xv 9, 1 (299). The famine persisted through a further failure of the harvest, *Ant.* xv 9, 1 (302), and Herod appealed for aid to Petronius, Prefect of Egypt, *Ant.* xv 9, 2 (307).

? Herod builds himself a royal palace and marries the priest's daughter, Mariamme, *Ant.* xv 9, 3 (317-22). For the name see *B.J.* i 28, 4 (562); 29, 2 (573); 30, 7 (599).

23/2 The sons of the first Mariamme, Alexander and Aristobulus, are sent to Rome for their education, *Ant.* xv 10, 1 (342); cf. Otto, *op. cit.*, col. 70 and note.

Augustus gives Herod the districts of Trachonitis, Batanaea and Auranitis, *Ant.* xv 10, 1 (343-8); *B.J.* i 20, 4 (398-400) μετὰ δὲ τὴν πρώτην Ἀκτιάδα.¹⁰

Herod visits Agrippa in Mytilenē in Lesbos, *Ant.* xv 10, 2 (350).¹¹

The building of Caesarea is started, *Ant.* xv 9, 6 (331-41). As it was completed in 10 B.C. after twelve years of work (see below), operations must have begun in 22 B.C.

20 Augustus comes to Syria and presents Herod with the territory of Zenodorus, *Ant.* xv 10, 3 (354) ἤδη δ' αὐτοῦ τῆς βασιλείας ἑπτακαίδεκάτου

the date any further back; the name of the city at any rate cannot precede 27 B.C., the year in which (in January) the Emperor received the name "Augustus". There are, however, clear chronological uncertainties here. The execution of Costobar, recorded in *Ant.* xv 7, 10 (259-66), took place apparently in the 13th year of Herod. After this, in xv 8, 1-5 (267-98), follows a whole series of happenings which cannot possibly all have occurred within one year. And then, in xv 9, 1 (299), we find ourselves still in the 13th year of Herod. In addition, the whole section xv 8, 1-5 (267-98) has obviously been composed for a particular purpose, in that Josephus is assembling accounts of how Herod caused offence and annoyance through illegal actions; of how the people's irritation expressed itself in words and deeds; and of the precautions Herod took to control the masses inclined to rebellion. Considering all this, and bearing in mind that Josephus worked from several sources (see p. 51 above), it is highly probable that in Josephus's main source xv 9, 1 (299 ff.) followed immediately xv 7, 10 (259-66); that xv 8, 1-5 (267-98) has been interpolated from another source; and that the words κατὰ τοῦτον μὲν οὖν τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν etc. of Josephus have been taken over without alteration from his main source where it referred, not to the time of the rebuilding of Samaria, but to that of Costobar's execution. In this way, all the difficulties are solved. Otto, *Herodes*, col. 80 also dissociates xv 9, 1 (299 ff.) from xv 8, 1-5 (267-98), but he does not regard it as the immediate continuation of xv 7, 10 (259-66). Moreover, Otto, col. 56, note, suggests a textual emendation by which the execution of Costobar would date to 28/7 B.C.

10. The games at Actium were celebrated on 2 Sept., for the first time in 28 B.C., then in the years, 24, 20, 16 etc. The extension of territory made 'on the completion of the first Actiad' thus took place at the end of 24 or the beginning of 23 B.C.

11. Josephus says merely that Herod visited Agrippa *περὶ Μυτιλήνην χειμάζοντι*. Since Agrippa was in Mytilene from the spring of 23 to the spring of 21 B.C., this can have been the winter of either 23/22 or 22/21 B.C. Otto, *Herodes* (1913), p. 70, prefers the latter date. But if, as is generally agreed, the chief aim of Herod's visit was to prove his loyalty, he is likely to have made it as soon as possible, i.e. in the winter of 23/22 rather than that of 22/21 B.C.; thus M. Reinhold, *Marcus Agrippa* (1933), p. 84, n. 47.

B.C.

- παρελθόντος ἔτους (the 17th year of Herod ended on 1 Nisan 20 B.C.), *B.J.* i 20, 4 (399) ἔτει δεκάτῳ πάλιν ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν ἐπαρχίαν (i.e. reckoned from the end of 30 B.C.). Dio liv 7, 4-6, places the journey of Augustus to Syria in the consulship of M. Appuleius and P. Silius Nerva (20 B.C.). Dio liv 9, 3 also mentions the gift.
- Pheroras is named tetrarch of Peraea, *Ant.* xv 10, 3 (362); *B.J.* i 24, 5 (483), cf. 30, 3 (586).
- 20/19 Herod remits one third of the taxes, *Ant.* xv 10, 4 (365). The building of the Temple starts, *Ant.* xv 11, 1 (380) ὀκτωκαιδέκατον τῆς Ἡρώδου βασιλείας γεγονότος ἐνιαυτοῦ (=20/19).¹²
- 18/17 Herod brings home his sons Alexander and Aristobulus from Rome (Herod's first Roman journey),¹³ *Ant.* xvi 1, 2 (6). Since Herod met Augustus in Italy but Augustus did not return there till the summer of 19 B.C., Herod's journey must have occurred after the middle of 19 B.C., but before the summer of 16 B.C., since Augustus was in Gaul from the summer of 16 to the spring of 13 B.C.¹⁴
- 15 Agrippa visits Herod in Jerusalem, *Ant.* xvi 2, 1 (13); Philo, *Legatio* 37 (294-7). He leaves Judaea again before the end of the year: ἐπιβαίνοντος τοῦ χειμῶνος.¹⁵
- 14 Herod with Agrippa in Asia Minor, *Ant.* xvi 2, 2-5 (16-62) ἔαρος ἠπέιγετο συντηρεῖν αὐτῷ. Cf. also *Ant.* xii 3, 2 (125-6); Nic. Dam., FGrH 90 F 134. On his return he remits a quarter of the taxes, *Ant.* xvi 2, 5 (64).

¹² According to *B.J.* i 21, 1 (401) in the 15th year, which is either incorrect or refers to the start of building preparations. That the construction of the Temple began in 20/19 B.C. is certain because it coincided with the arrival of the emperor in Syria, which according to Dio liv 7, 6, took place in the spring or summer of 20 B.C. Construction of the outer courts lasted eight years, and that of the Temple itself a year and a half (*Ant.* xv 11, 5-6 (410-23)); it is not clear whether these 8 + 1½ years should be added together, or whether the year and a half represents the first part of the building period as a whole). After the completion of the Temple a great festival was arranged. As this occurred on the day of Herod's accession to the throne, *Ant.* xv 11, 6 (423), the building of the Temple began—provided we are right in assuming that the accession took place in July—in the winter, i.e. at the end of 20, or the beginning of 19 B.C. Accordingly, the statement in Jn. 2:20, at the time of a Passover, that the Temple was built in forty-six years (τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἔτεσιν ᾠκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος), points—depending on whether the 46th year is regarded as current or ended—to the Passover of A.D. 27 or A.D. 28. See C. Wieseler, *Chronolog. Synopse*, pp. 165 f. (E.T. pp. 151 ff.); *Beiträge*, pp. 156 ff.; J. van Bebbber, *Zur Chronologie des Lebens Jesu* (1898), pp. 123 ff.; T. Corbishley, 'The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great', *JThSt* 36 (1935), pp. 22-32; G. Ogg, *The Chronology of the Public Ministry of Jesus* (1940), pp. 153-67; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John* (1955), p. 167; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (1969), pp. 21-2.

¹³ I.e. since his accession to the throne, therefore without counting the journey made in 40/39 B.C.

¹⁴ For the evidence on Augustus's movements see RE X, cols. 355-8.

¹⁵ For the chronology of Agrippa's movements in the East, to which he went in late 17 or early 16 B.C., see M. Reinhold, *Marcus Agrippa* (1933), pp. 106-23. That Agrippa did not arrive in Palestine till 15 B.C., and that Herod did not go to Agrippa in Asia Minor till 14 B.C., follows from the fact that Herod met Agrippa in Sinope on his expedition to the Crimea, and that expedition, according to Dio liv 24 (cf. Euseb. *Chron. ad ann. Abr.* 2003) took place in 14 B.C.

B.C.

- Beginning of the dissensions with Alexander and Aristobulus, the sons of Mariamne. Antipater is brought to the court, *Ant.* xvi 3, 1-3 (66-85); *B.J.* i 23, 1 (445-48).
- 13 Antipater is sent to Rome with Agrippa to present himself to the emperor, *Ant.* xvi 3, 3 (86); *B.J.* i 23, 2 (451). On the date cf. Dio liv 28, 1.
- 12 Herod goes to Rome with his sons Alexander and Aristobulus to accuse them before the emperor (Herod's second Roman journey). He meets the emperor in Aquileia. Augustus settles the quarrel. Antipater accompanies them back to Judaea, *Ant.* xvi 4, 1-6 (87-135); *B.J.* i 23, 3-5 (452-66).¹⁶
- 10 The dedication of Caesarea takes place εἰς ὄδσον καὶ εἰκοστὸν ἔτος τῆς ἀρχῆς (=10/9 B.C.), *Ant.* xvi 5, 1 (136), after 12 years of building, *Ant.* xv 9, 6 (341) ἐξετελέσθη δώδεκαετεί χρόνῳ. xvi 5, 1 (136) is probably wrong in giving ten years). On the building cf. also *B.J.* i 21, 5-8 (408-16).
- ? The discord in Herod's family grows increasingly serious and complex, *Ant.* xvi 7, 2-6 (188-228); *B.J.* i 24, 1-6 (467-87).
- ? Herod tries to establish Alexander's guilt by torturing his supporters; Alexander is imprisoned, *Ant.* xvi 8, 1-5 (229-60); *B.J.* i 24, 7-8 (488-97).
- 10? Archelaus, king of Cappadocia and Alexander's father-in-law, effects another reconciliation between Herod and his sons, *Ant.* xvi 8, 6 (261-70). *B.J.* i 25, 1-6 (498-512).
- ? Herod's third journey to Rome, *Ant.* xvi 8, 6-9, 1 (270-1).¹⁷
- 9? Campaign against the Nabataeans, *Ant.* xvi 9, 2 (282-5).
- 8? Herod in disfavour with Augustus, *Ant.* xvi 9, 3 (286-92). Herod extorts by torture new incriminatory statements against Alexander and Aristobulus, has them both imprisoned, and brings an accusation against them of high treason to Augustus, *Ant.* xvi 10, 3-7 (313-34); *B.J.* i 26, 3 (526-9), 27, 1 (534-7).

¹⁶ Decisive for this date is the fact that during Herod's stay on that occasion in Rome, Augustus promoted games and 'distributed presents among the Roman people' (Jos. *Ant.* xvi 4, 5 (128): Ἡρώδης μὲν ἔδωκεν τῷ Καίσαρι τριακοσίοις ταλάντοις θέας τε καὶ διανομὰς ποιοῦμενον τῷ Ῥωμαίων δήμῳ). This must be the fourth *liberalitas* of Augustus dating to 12 B.C.; there was no other between 24 B.C. and 5 B.C. (they are listed in *Res Gestae*, 15); see *Dizionario Epigrafico* s.v. 'liberalitas', p. 840. There is admittedly no direct evidence that Augustus went to Aquileia in this year. But he may well have done so on the occasion of Tiberius's Pannonian campaign, which took place then (Dio liv 31; cf. Suet. *Div. Aug.* 20: 'Reliqua bella per legatos administravit, ut tamen quibusdam Pannonicis atque Germanicis aut interveniret aut non longe abesset, Ravennam vel Mediolanium vel Aquileiam usque ab urbe progrediens').

¹⁷ It is not universally accepted that Herod made a third journey to Rome. Concluding his account of the reconciliation affected by Archelaus, Josephus in *B.J.* i 25, 5 (510) has δὲν μὲντοι πάντως ἔφη πέμπειν αὐτὸν (Alexander) εἰς Ῥώμην Καίσαρι διαλεξόμενον, but in *Ant.* xvi 8, 6-9, 1 (270-1) he has (Herod) ἐποιήσατο δὲ καὶ συνθήκας εἰς Ῥώμην ἐλθεῖν . . . γενομένῳ δὲ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ κάκειθεν ἐπανήκοντι συνέστη πόλεμος πρὸς τοὺς Ἀραβας: ἐξ αἰτίας ταυτῆς. The subsequent narrative (273) refers to Herod πλείσσαντος δ' εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην δὲ καὶ τοῦ παιδὸς Ἀλεξάνδρου κατηγορεῖ (clearly the second journey of 12 B.C.) and then a second time to Herod's return from Rome (276). Otto, *op. cit.*, cols. 125-6 therefore argues, probably correctly, that this evidence does not support the view that there was a third journey. Schalit, *op. cit.*, p. 613, accepts the third journey but without detailed discussion.

B.C.

- 7? Augustus, with whom, through the good offices of Nicolaus of Damascus, Herod is once more in favour, *Ant.* xvi 10, 8-9 (335-55), authorizes him to deal with his sons according to his own discretion, *Ant.* xvi 11, 1 (356); *B.J.* i 27, 1 (537).
- Alexander and Aristobulus are condemned to death at Berytus and strangled at Sebaste (Samaria), *Ant.* xvi 11, 2-7 (361-94); *B.J.* i 27, 2-6 (538-51).¹⁸
- Antipater is all-powerful at Herod's court, *Ant.* xvii 1, 1 (1-11), 2, 4 (32-40); *B.J.* i 28, 1 (552-5), 29, 1 (567-70).
- Execution of suspected Pharisees, *Ant.* xvii 2, 4 (41-5).
- 6? Antipater goes to Rome, *Ant.* xvii 3, 2 (52 f.); *B.J.* i 29, 2 (573).
- Herod's first will, nominating Antipater as his successor, or if the latter should predecease him, the son of the second Mariamme, *Ant.* xvii 3, 2 (53); *B.J.* i 29, 2 (573).
- 5 Beginning of the year: death of Pheroras, Herod's brother, *Ant.* xvii 3, 3 (59); *B.J.* i 29, 4 (580).
- Herod learns of Antipater's conspiracy, *Ant.* xvii 4, 1-2 (61-78); *B.J.* i 30, 1-7 (582-600).
- Antipater returns to Judaea, *Ant.* xvii 5, 1-2 (83-92); *B.J.* i 31, 3-5 (608-19), seven months after Herod made his discovery, *Ant.* xvii 4, 3 (82); *B.J.* i 1, 32 (606).
- Antipater on trial; he defends himself without success and is put in irons, *Ant.* xvii 5, 3-7 (93-132); *B.J.* i 32, 1-5 (620-40).
- Herod sends a report to the emperor, *Ant.* xvii 5, 7-8 (133-45); *B.J.* i 32, 5 (640).
- Herod falls ill and makes a second will naming his youngest son, Antipas, as his successor, *Ant.* xvii 6, 1 (146); *B.J.* i 32, 7 (645-6).
- 4 Popular uprising under the leadership of the rabbis Judas and Matthias sternly avenged by Herod, *Ant.* xvii 6, 2-4 (149-67); *B.J.* i 33, 1-4 (647-55).
- Herod's health deteriorates, *Ant.* xvii 6, 5 (168-79); *B.J.* i 33, 5 (656-8).
- On the authority of the emperor, Antipater is executed, *Ant.* xvii 7 (182-7); *B.J.* i 33, 7 (661-4).
- Herod alters his will once more, naming Archelaus king, and Antipas and Philip tetrarchs, *Ant.* xvii 8, 1 (189-90); *B.J.* i 33, 7 (664).
- Herod dies five days after Antipater's execution βασιλεύσας μεθ' ὃ μὲν ἀνέλειεν Ἀντίγονον, ἔτη τέσσαρα καὶ τριάκοντα, μεθ' ὃ δὲ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἀπεδέδεικτο, ἐπὶ καὶ τριάκοντα, *Ant.* xvii 8, 1 (191); *B.J.* i 33, 8 (665).¹⁹

Herod²⁰, it seemed, was born to rule. Endowed with strength and stamina, he accustomed himself from an early age to hardships of

18. Since Saturninus was governor of Syria at the time of the condemnation, *Ant.* xvi 11, 3 (368), and indeed for some time afterwards, *Ant.* xvii 1, 1 (6); 2, 1 (24); 3, 2 (37), it must have taken place in 7 B.C., for he left Syria not later than the first half of 6 B.C. (see p. 257).

19. On the year of Herod's death, see note 165 below.

20. The name Ἡρώδης (from ἥρως) also occurs elsewhere, see CIG, index p. 92, Pape-Benseler, *Wörterb. der griech. Eigennamen*, s.v. For Athenians of this name in the pre-Christian period, see Kirchner, *Prosopographia* (1901-3), nos. 6537-45.

all sorts. He was an excellent horseman and a good hunter. In contests he was feared. His lance went home unflinching, and his arrow seldom missed its mark.²¹ He was trained in war from his youth. By the time he was twenty-five years old, he had already won a reputation by his campaign against the brigands in Galilee. And again in the last years of his life, as a man over sixty, he personally led a campaign against the Nabataeans.²² Success seldom eluded him when he himself directed a military enterprise.

By nature he was wild, passionate, hard and unyielding. Finer feelings and tenderness were foreign to him. Wherever his own interests seemed to demand it, he wielded an iron hand even at the cost of rivers of blood. If necessary, he spared neither his nearest relations nor his passionately loved wife.

He was furthermore shrewd, clever and resourceful, with a clear understanding of what measures to apply to an existing situation. Hard and relentless towards all who were in his power, he was nevertheless meek and pliable towards his superiors. His eye was sufficiently wide in its range, and his judgment sufficiently acute, to perceive that in the international position of that time nothing could be achieved except through the favour, and with the help, of the Romans. It was, therefore, an inviolable principle of his policy to maintain his friendship with Rome under all circumstances and at any price. And he managed with luck and skill to implement this principle. Thus in him cunning and enterprise went hand in hand. These conspicuous talents were set in motion by an insatiable ambition. All his thoughts, desires, plans and actions were at all times directed to the one end, the extension of his power, dominion and glory.²³ This stimulus kept all his resources ceaselessly active. Difficulties and hindrances were for him just so many incentives to increased effort. And this flexibility, this spirit of untiring endeavour, remained with him until extreme old age.

It was only through the combination of all these qualities that he

Compare the famous second century A.D. rhetor Herodes Atticus, i.e. L. Vibullius Hipparchus T. Claudius Atticus Herodes, PIR² C 802, cf. 801. Since the name is doubtless contracted from Ἡρωίδης, the spelling with iota subscript (Ἡρώιδης) is certainly preferable. In inscriptions we find Ἡρώιδης, IG² II 4992, OGIS III, 1. 14; 130, II. 3, 18, also Ἡρωίδας (e.g. OGIS 8 1. 37, also Ἡρώιδεια, e.g. IG XIV 645, II. 15, 42, 55, 87, 89, 114. One of the manuscripts of Josephus, the very correct *cod. Ambrosianus* has Ἡρώιδης throughout (Niese III, p. vii). *The Etymologicum magnum* ed. Gaisford, col. 397, states s.v. Ἡρώιδης: "Ἐχει τὸ ἰ προσγεγραμμένον etc.

21. Cf. the description given in *B.J.* i 21, 13 (429-30).

22. *Ant.* xvi 9, 2 (282-5).

23. Cf. the apposite characterization in *Jos. Ant.* xvi 5, 4 (150-9).

was able, in such testing conditions, to achieve as much as he undoubtedly did.²⁴

His reign may be divided into three periods.²⁵ The first, extending from about 37 to 25 B.C., sees the consolidation of his authority. He has still to contend with many hostile powers, but emerges victorious from all his battles. The second period, 25-13 B.C., is the era of his prosperity. His friendship of Rome is at its zenith. Agrippa visits Herod in Jerusalem. Herod is repeatedly received by the emperor. It is also the period of his great buildings, of works of peace in general. The third period, 13-4 B.C., sees his domestic miseries, which now take precedence over everything else.

I

In the first period of his reign Herod had to contend with four hostile forces: the people, the nobility, the Hasmonaean family and Cleopatra.

The people, who were largely influenced by the Pharisees, bore with profound reluctance the rule of the Idumaeans, a half-Jew and friend of the Romans.²⁶ Herod's first preoccupation must have been to ensure their obedience. By using the utmost severity he managed to suppress the opposition, and won over the more-tractable with favours and honours. Two of the Pharisees themselves, Pollio (Abtalion), and his pupil Sameas (Shernaiah or Shammai?), rendered Herod good service in this connexion. They saw subjection to a foreigner as a divine punishment which should be borne willingly.²⁷ Among the Jerusalem nobility there were still numerous adherents of Antigonus. Herod disposed of these by executing forty-five of the most eminent and wealthy among them. By confiscating their property, he came at the same time into possession of great wealth, which he badly needed if he were to keep his patron Antonius in good humour.²⁸

Of the members of the Hasmonaean family, Herod's mother-in-law

24. Unfortunately, no portrait exists of Herod the Great. A statue of him must have stood in the temple at Si'a near Kanawat, but only its base has been preserved, OGIS 415 (see note 61 below); see D. Sourdél, *Les cultes du Hawan à l'époque romaine* (1952), p. 21. Herod's coins never show his effigy. Cf. A. Reifenberg, 'Portrait Coins of the Herodian Kings', Numismatic Circular 43 (1935), pp. 172-6.

25. Compare the slightly different periodisation in Otto *op. cit.*

26. Herod is called 'Ἰδουμαῖος' in *Ant.* xiv 15, 2 (403). The Idumaeans were first converted by John Hyrcanus. See p. 207 above. On Herod's ancestry see p. 234.

27. *Ant.* xv 1, 1 (3 f.); cf. xiv 9, 4 (172-6). On Pollio and Sameas see vol. II, § 25, iv; cf. Schalit, *op. cit.*, Anhang X.

28. *Ant.* xv 1, 2 (5-7); cf. xiv 9, 4 (175); *B.J.* i 18, 4 (358).

in particular, Alexandra, the mother of Mariamme, treated him with undisguised enmity. The aged Hyrcanus had of course returned from his Parthian captivity,²⁹ but he had always been on good terms with Herod. And this harmony continued undisturbed. As Hyrcanus was unable to resume the office of High Priest because of his physical mutilation, Herod chose as High Priest a completely unknown and insignificant Babylonian Jew of sacerdotal lineage named Hananel.³⁰ But Alexandra regarded even this as an infringement of Hasmonaean privileges. In her opinion, her young son Aristobulus, Mariamme's brother, was the only person entitled to be High Priest. She accordingly set out to enforce her claim. In particular, she turned to Cleopatra with the idea that, through her influence with Antonius, Herod might be compelled to install Aristobulus. Mariamme also importuned her husband with petitions in favour of her brother. In the end, Herod found himself obliged to remove Hananel (which was unlawful since the High Priest held office for life), and to install the seventeen-year-old Aristobulus as High Priest (beginning of 35 B.C.).³¹

Peace, however, did not last for long. Not without reason, Herod saw all the members of the Hasmonaean family as his natural enemies. He could not rid himself of suspicion and distrust, especially in regard to Alexandra, and had her carefully watched. Alexandra for her part found this intolerable and planned to escape his supervision. Coffins were prepared in which she and her son Aristobulus were to be carried out of the city by night so that they could then travel by sea to Egypt and Cleopatra. But the scheme was betrayed and thwarted, and served merely to intensify Herod's mistrust.³² When, in addition to all this, the people at the next Feast of Tabernacles (35 B.C.) openly acclaimed the young Aristobulus while he officiated as High Priest, Herod firmly determined to rid himself of him without delay as his most dangerous rival. The opportunity to do so soon came. Herod was invited by Alexandra to a banquet in Jericho. As the young Aristobulus was amusing himself after the meal with the others in the bath, he was ducked as though in fun by some companions bribed by Herod and held under until he drowned. Afterwards, Herod stimulated the deepest grief and shed tears, which no one regarded as genuine.³³

Alexandra, who realized the true facts of the case, again agitated

29. *Ant.* xv 2, 1-4 (11-22).

30. *Ant.* xv 2, 4 (22). Herod could not himself assume the dignity because he was not even of pure Jewish descent, let alone of sacerdotal lineage. On Hananel see Schalit, *op. cit.*, pp. 693-5; J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia I* (1969), pp. 37-8.

31. *Ant.* xv 2, 5-7 (23-38); 3, 1 (39-41). For the chronology, the reader is referred once and for all to the summary given above.

32. *Ant.* xv 3, 2 (42-9).

33. *Ant.* xv 3, 3-4 (50-61); *B.J.* i 22, 2 (435-7).

with Cleopatra that Herod should be held to account before Antonius. Antonius, who had again been in the east since the spring of 36 B.C. under the spell of Cleopatra, was just then (spring of 34 B.C.) undertaking a new expedition eastwards, ostensibly against the Parthians, but actually against the Armenian king Artavasdes. When he arrived in Laodicea (no doubt the Laodicea on the coast south of Antioch) Herod was summoned to meet him there—for Alexandria with the help of Cleopatra had obtained her wish—to account for the misdeed. Herod dared not refuse, and although with a heavy heart, presented himself before Antonius. Needless to say he did not arrive empty-handed, and this circumstance, together with his adroit performance, soon dispelled the clouds. He was acquitted, and returned to Jerusalem.³⁴

His absence was the cause of fresh difficulties. On his departure, he had appointed as regent his uncle Joseph (who was also his brother-in-law, for he had married his sister Salome), and had entrusted Mariamme to his care. Regarding his journey to Antonius as dangerous, he had commanded Joseph, if he failed to return, to put Mariamme to death also, for in his passionate love of her he could not bear the thought that anyone else should have his beloved. But when he came back, Salome slandered her own husband, alleging that he had been guilty of adultery with Mariamme. At first, Herod turned a deaf ear to the slander, since Mariamme protested her innocence. But on learning that she was aware of his secret command, which the garrulous old man had imparted to her as proof of Herod's special love, Herod saw this as confirming the charges and ordered Joseph to be executed without a hearing.³⁵

The fourth hostile force in this first period of Herod's reign was Cleopatra. She had already brought him trouble through her association with Alexandria. Worse than this, however, she now wished to employ her influence over Antonius to acquire new territories. Antonius first offered some resistance to her demands. But probably in 37/6 B.C. he was persuaded to grant her the whole Phoenician and Philistine coast south of the Eleutherus, with the exception of Tyre and Sidon, and in addition, in 34 B.C., a part of Nabataean territory and the most beautiful and fertile region of Herod's kingdom, the celebrated district of Jericho with its palm and balsam plantations.³⁶ Opposition on the

(Text continues on p. 300)

34. *Ant.* xv 3, 5 (62-7), 8-9 (74-87).

35. *Ant.* xv 3, 5-6 (62-70); 9 (80-7). On the parallel passages *B.J.* i 22, 4-5 (441-4) see n. 51 below.

36. The region of Jericho was at that time the most fertile and productive part of Palestine. This is stated in clear terms by Strabo xvi 2, 41 (763) and Josephus *B.J.* iv 8, 3 (459-75). Near *Ἰερικοῦς* there was, according to Strabo, the palm grove (*δὲ φοινικῶν*) extending to a hundred stadia, and the balsam garden (*δὲ τῶ*

βαλοῦμον παράδεισος) which yielded the expensive balsam resin used as a medicament. Josephus, also, emphasises that the date palm and the balsam bush were the two main crops of the district. The area, which owing to its abundant water and hot climate was peculiarly productive, is estimated by Josephus as extending to twenty stadia in breadth and seventy in length. Because of the high value of both these products, cf. Strabo xvii 15 (800), Josephus rightly designates the district a *θεῖον χωρίον, ἐν ᾧ δαψιλῆ τὰ σπανιώτατα καὶ κάλλιστα γεννᾶται*, *B.J.* iv 8, 3 (469). Elsewhere, also, he takes every opportunity to emphasize the fertility of the district of Jericho with its palm and balsam plantations, *Ant.* iv 6, 1 (100); xv 4, 1 (54) = *B.J.* i 6, 6 (138); *Ant.* xv 4, 2 (96) = *B.J.* i 18, 5 (361). In one passage he expressly declares it the most fruitful district of Judaea, *B.J.* i 6, 6 (138) *τὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας πύσιον*. Herod later extended the palm plantations as far as Phasaelis (see vol. II, § 23, 1). Archelaus built near Jericho a new aqueduct to irrigate the palm grove there, *Ant.* xvii 13, 1 (340). In Pompeius Trogus also Jericho is mentioned as the centre of the palm and balsam plantations of the Jordan valley, Justin, *Epit.* xxxvi 3, 1-3, 'Opes genti ex vectigalibus opobalsami crevere, quod in his tantum regionibus gignitur. Est namque vallis, quae continuis montibus velut muro quodam ad instar hortorum clauditur (spatium loci ducenta iugera; nomine Ericus dicitur). In ea silva est et ubertate et amoenitate insignis, siquidem palmeto et opobalsameto distinguitur'. (There follows a description of the balsam bush, which is cultivated in the same way as the vine and exudes balsam yearly at a certain season.) Diodorus places the palm and balsam plantations in general in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea, for after describing the latter he proceeds (ii 48, 9, almost word-for-word as in xix 98, 4): *ἀγαθὴ δ' ἐστὶ φοινικώφυτος . . . γίνεται δὲ περὶ τοὺς τόπους τούτους ἐν αἰθιοπῶν τιμῇ καὶ τὸ καλούμενον βάλαμον, ἐξ οὗ πρόσδοτον λαμπρὰν, [xix 98, 4: ἄδρὰν] λαμβάνουσαν, οὐδαμῶς μὲν τῆς ἀλλῆς οἰκουμένης εὐρισκομένου τοῦ φυτοῦ τούτου, τῆς δ' ἐξ αὐτοῦ χρείας εἰς φάρμακα τοῖς ἰατροῖς καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εὐθετούσης*. According to Pliny the dates of Jericho were the choicest in the world, *NH* xiii 9/44 'sed ut copia ibi [in Aethiopiae fine] atque fertilitas, ita nobilitas in Iudaea, nec in tota, sed Hiericunte maxime, quamquam laudata et Archelaide et Phaselide atque Liviade, gentis eiusdem convallibus'. Cf. xiii 6/26 'Iudaea vero incluta est vel magis palmis'; xiii 9/49 'Servantur hi demum qui nascuntur in salsis atque sabulosis, ut in Iudaea atque Cyrenaica Africa'. Pliny's detailed discussion of the balsam (*NH* xii 54/111-23) opens with the following words: 'Sed omnibus odoribus praefertur balsamum, uni terrarum Iudaeae concessum, quondam in duobus tantum hortis, utroque regio, altero iugerum XX non amplius, altero pauciorum'. The extraction of the balsam was effected in this way: the bark was slit with a stone, not iron, instrument; the thick sap then gushed out and was collected in small vessels. Tacitus also in *Hist.* v 6 mentions 'balsamum et palmae' as peculiar products of Palestine. He describes the extraction of the balsam as does Pliny, cf. also Strabo xvi, 2 41 (763) and Josephus, *Ant.* xiv 4, 1 (54); *B.J.* i 6, 6 (138); Pausanias stresses as a special excellence of Palestine the fact that in it the palm trees 'always' (i.e. every year) yield an enjoyable fruit (in ix 19, 8 he says of the shrine at Mycalessus in Boeotia *Φοίνικες δὲ πρὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ πεφύκασαν οὐκ ἐς ἅπαν ἐδάδιμον παρεχόμενοι καρπὸν ὡς περ ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ*). To Horace the material worth of these plantations was well known. He speaks of 'Herodis palmetis pinguibus' (*Epist.* ii 2, 184) as an example of a particularly rich and productive estate. According to Dioscorides i 19, 1, the balsam used as a medicament grew only in Judaea and Egypt, *βάλαμον . . . γεννώμενον ἐν μόνῃ Ἰουδαίᾳ κατὰ τινα αἰθιοπῶν [καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ]*. The existence of the palm groves of Jericho can be traced throughout a period of some two thousand years. In the Old Testament Jericho is already called 'the city of palm trees' (*עִיר הַתְּמָרִים*, Dt. 34:3; Jg. 1:16; 3:13; 2 Chr. 28:15). Among Greek writers, Theophrastus, the pupil of Aristotle, already mentions the palm and balsam plantations of the Jordan valley. He says of the

part of Herod was unthinkable, and he was now obliged to lease his own land from Cleopatra.³⁷ Moreover, he had to put a good face on it, and receive Cleopatra with all honours and entertain her royally when she visited Judaea on her way back from the Euphrates, where she had accompanied Antonius. But when she tried to seduce him too, and thus trap him, he was astute enough not to have closer dealings with her.³⁸

The first four or five years of Herod's reign were thus spent in various struggles for his own existence. The outbreak of the war between Antonius and Octavian in 32 B.C. brought fresh anxieties. Herod wished to hasten to Antonius's aid with a considerable military force, but at Cleopatra's instigation, was commanded by Antonius to make war on the Nabataean king. Latterly, this king had not been paying his regular tribute to Cleopatra and was to be punished for it. And Cleopatra desired the war to be transferred to Herod so that the two vassal princes might weaken and exhaust one another. So, instead of advancing against Octavian, Herod marched against the Nabataeans. At first he was successful. But when Athenion, Cleopatra's general,

palms that it is only in three places in Coele-Syria with a saline soil that fruit can be grown suitable for preservation (*Hist. Plant.* ii 6, 2 καὶ τῆς Συρίας δὲ τῆς Κολύης, ἐν ἧ γ' οἱ πλείστοι τυγχάνουσιν, ἐν τρισὶ μόνοις τόποις ἀλιμώδεον εἶναι τοὺς δυναμένους θησαυρίζεσθαι. Cf. ii 6, 8 θησαυρίζεσθαι δὲ μόνους δύνασθαι φασὶ τῶν ἐν Συρίᾳ τοὺς ἐν τῷ-αἰθάλῳ. According to ii 6, 5 this αἰθάλῳ of Syria, where the palms grow, extends to the Red Sea). With regard to the balsam he says in *Hist. Plant.* ix 6, 1 τὸ δὲ βάλαμον γίνεται μὲν ἐν τῷ αἰθάλῳ τῷ περὶ Συρίαν. παραδείσου. δ' εἶναι φασὶ δύο μόνους, τὸν μὲν ὅσον εἴκοσι πλέθρων τὸν δ' ἕτερον πολλῷ ἐλάττωρα (Pliny follows this in the passage given above). In the Mishnah it is related that the inhabitants of Jericho are in the habit of grafting the palm (mPes. 4:8). Cf. *Expositio totius mundi* (ed. Rougé, 1966), 31. The existence of the palm groves there continues to be attested by the Christian pilgrims Arculf in the seventh century (see Tobler and Molinier, *Itinera Hierosolymitana* I (1879), p. 176 = Geyer, *Itinera Hierosol.* (1898), pp. 263 f.; *Early Travels in Palestine*, ed. T. Wright (1848), p. 7), and Saewulf in the beginning of the twelfth century (see Guérin, *Samarie* I, p. 49; *Early Travels in Palestine*, p. 45). In 1838, Robinson saw there one palm tree (Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine* (21856) I, p. 559), which in 1888 was only a stump (ZDPV II (1888), p. 98). Cf. the articles 'Balsambaum' RE II, 2836 ff.; 'Balsam' and 'Palm Tree' in *Ency. Bibl.* I, cols. 466-8; III, cols. 3551-3 and in JE, I, pp. 466-7; IX, pp. 505-6; H.N. and A. L. Moldenke, *Plants of the Bible* (1952), pp. 169-72 (on the palm tree), pp. 183 f. (on balsam); W. Walker, *All the Plants of the Bible* (1958). On Jericho and its neighbourhood, see *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs by Conder and Kitchener* III, p. 222 (with plan of the aqueducts near Jericho in Roman times); E. Sellin and C. Watzinger, *Jericho. Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen* (1913); J. and J. B. E. Garstang, *The Story of Jericho* (1948); J. L. Kelso and D. C. Baramki, *Excavations at N.T. Jericho and Kherbet en-Nitla* (1955); K. M. Kenyon, *Digging up Jericho* (1957); J. B. Pritchard, *The Excavations at Herodian Jericho*, 1951 (1958).

37. *Ant.* xv 4, 1-2 (88-103); *B.J.* i 18, 5 (361-2). *Plut.*, *Ant.* 36.

38. *Ant.* xv 4, 2 (97-103); *B.J.* i 18, 5 (361-2).

went to their help, Herod was severely defeated and found himself obliged to discontinue the major war and apply himself merely to expeditions of robbery and plunder.³⁹

Meanwhile, in the spring of 31 B.C., he was overcome by a new calamity: a terrible earthquake struck the country, costing the lives of 30,000 people. Herod now wished to negotiate for peace with the Nabataeans, but they assassinated his envoys and renewed their attack. Herod needed to use all his eloquence to induce his dejected troops to renew the struggle. But this time his fortune in war once more held good. He completely routed the Nabataean army, and compelled the remnant, which had taken refuge in a fortress, into an early surrender. Proud of this brilliant success, he returned home.⁴⁰

Soon afterwards, on 2 Sept. 31 B.C., the decisive battle of Actium was fought in which Antonius lost his power for good. It was at the same time a severe blow for Herod. But with the adroitness characteristic of him, he went over at the right time to the victor's camp, and soon found an opportunity to give concrete proof of his change of heart. In Cyzicus, a troop of Antonius's gladiators had been training for the games with which Antonius had intended to celebrate his victory over Octavian. When these men heard of their master's defeat, they wished to hurry to Egypt to his help. But Didius, the governor of Syria, prevented them from marching through, and in this Herod lent him enthusiastic and effective assistance.⁴¹

Having thus proved himself, he could go before Augustus. But to be quite sure, he first had the aged Hyrcanus removed, the only person who could be dangerous to him as having a more valid claim to the throne. Taking into consideration Hyrcanus's character and great age, it is very improbable that, as Herod's own annals assert, he brought death on himself by conspiring with the Nabataean king. Other sources, *Ant.* xv 6, 3 (174), expressly declare his innocence. For Herod in his critical situation, the mere existence of Hyrcanus was sufficient motive for the murder. Thus fell the last of the Hasmonæans, an old man and a memorial of bygone times, as a sacrifice to Herod's suspicion and ambition.⁴²

Herod now set out to meet Augustus in Rhodes in the spring of 30 B.C. In the encounter, Herod played his part daringly. He boasted of his friendship with Antonius, and of the services he had rendered him, with the intention of showing how useful he could be to those with whom he sided. Augustus set little store by these speeches but found it advantageous to win the adherence of this Idumæan, who

39. *Ant.* xv 5, 1 (108-20); *B.J.* i 19, 1-3 (364-72).

40. *Ant.* xv 5, 2-5 (121-60); *B.J.* i 19, 3-6 (369-85).

41. *Ant.* xv 6, 7 (195); *B.J.* i 20, 2 (392); *Dio* li 7.

42. *Ant.* xv 6, 1-4 (161-82); *B.J.* i 22, 1 (431-4).

was as clever and energetic as he was friendly to the Romans. He was very gracious to him, and confirmed him in his royal status. On receiving this happy response, Herod returned to his homeland.⁴³

Soon afterwards, in the summer, Augustus marched from Asia Minor along the Phoenician coast towards Egypt, and Herod did not fail to receive him with all pomp at Ptolemais and to arrange that the army should wait for nothing in its travels during the hot season of the year.⁴⁴

After Augustus had finished with Antonius in Egypt, and the latter, like Cleopatra, had committed suicide (August 30 B.C.), Herod once more visited him, doubtless to wish him success, and if possible to be rewarded for doing so. And this he achieved. For Augustus returned to him not only the region of Jericho, but also Gadara, Hippos, Samaria, Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa and Straton's Tower.⁴⁵ As proof of his gratitude, Herod escorted his patron as far as Antioch on his return from Egypt at the end of 30 B.C.⁴⁶

While danger from without turned to good fortune, in his own house Herod experienced nothing but misery. Before travelling to Rhodes, he committed Mariamme to the protection of a certain Soaemus, and gave him the same order as he had once given to Joseph.⁴⁷ Again Mariamme came to know of it, and on Herod's return showed unconcealed signs of her dislike.⁴⁸ Herod's mother, Cyprus, and his sister Salome, both of whom had long been ill-disposed towards the proud Mariamme, welcomed this misunderstanding and managed to intensify it by spreading scandalous rumours. Finally, Salome bribed the king's cupbearer to declare that Mariamme had given him a poisoned drink to hand to Herod. When Herod heard of this, he had Mariamme's eunuch interrogated under torture. The latter knew nothing of the poisoned drink, but admitted that Mariamme hated her husband because of his order to Soaemus. Discovering that, like Joseph, Soaemus had also divulged his order, he again saw in this proof of unlawful relation and, frantic with rage, claimed that now he had proof of his wife's infidelity. Soaemus was executed immediately; Mariamme was tried, condemned, and at the end of 29 B.C. executed also.⁴⁹

43. *Ant.* xv 6, 5-7 (183-98); *B.J.* i 20, 1-3 (386-93).

44. *Ant.* xv 6, 7 (198-201); *B.J.* i 20, 3 (394-7).

45. *Ant.* xv 7, 3 (217); *B.J.* i 20, 3 (396). On all these cities see vol. II, § 23, 1.

46. *Ant.* xv 7, 4 (218).

47. *Ant.* xv 6, 5 (185-6).

48. *Ant.* xv 7, 1-2 (202-12).

49. *Ant.* xv 7, 3-6 (213-39). For a legendary Talmudic account of Mariamme's death see bB. B. 3b; bKid. 70b. In criticism of the story told by Josephus and repeated here, J. von Destinon *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus* (1882), p. 113, observes: 'It is striking with what uniformity the events connected with the two journeys of the king, the one to Antonius and the other to Augustus, run their

All Herod's savagery and sensuality revealed themselves in his relationship with Mariamme. His hatred was as ungovernable and passionate as his love the moment he thought his wife had deceived him. But just as ungovernable and passionate was his longing for the loved one whom he himself had murdered. To deaden his grief, he sought distraction in wild entertainments, drinking bouts and hunting. But even his strong body could not endure such immoderation. He fell ill while hunting in Samaria and had to take to his bed. As it was doubtful whether he would recover, Alexandra turned her mind to how she could secure the throne for herself in the event of his death. She approached the commanders of the two fortresses in Jerusalem and attempted to win them over. But they denounced her to Herod, and Alexandra, who had long deserved it far more than the others, was likewise executed (in about 28 B.C.).⁵⁰

Herod gradually recovered and soon found occasion for further executions. An eminent Idumaeen, Costobar, was appointed governor of Idumaea by Herod soon after his accession to the throne, and later married Salome, whose first husband, Joseph, was executed in 34 B.C. Even in this first period he had conspired secretly with Cleopatra against Herod, but at Salome's request, had been pardoned.⁵¹ But now Salome herself was tired of her husband, and to get rid of him grasped at an opportunity to denounce him. She knew that the sons

course, *Ant.* xv 3, 5-6 (62-70) and 9 (80-7); xv 6, 5 (183-6); 7, 1-6 (202-39). On both occasions he leaves his wife in the care of a friend with the command to put her to death if something should happen to him; on both occasions the guardians, meaning no harm, impart the secret to her; the king returns, discovers this, suspects a greater familiarity, and has the culprits executed. . . . Moreover, in *Jewish War* the whole of the second account is missing, *B.J.* i 22, 4-5 (441-4). In this work, Herod kills Joseph as well as Mariamme immediately after his return from Antonius. It may be thought that the two accounts in *Antiquities* refer to one and the same event; perhaps Josephus found the second report in a secondary source, regarded it because of the different name, Soaemus, as distinct from that contained in his main source, and in order not to miss anything out, linked it to Herod's journey to Augustus. One would accept this interpretation without further argument were it not for the fact that *Bellum Judaicum* frequently reproduces in a greatly abridged form the same source as is used in *Antiquities*, and that in the second story in the *Antiquities* the first is expressly presupposed, xv 7, 1 (204) τὰς Ἰωσήφου δοθείσας ἐντολὰς ἀνεμνημόνευεν. That the same story is repeated in an almost identical form is of course improbable. But it seems that both stories were given in Josephus's main source, in particular because in both passages the domestic narrative is closely bound up with the political story (the latter being inserted between the beginning and end of the domestic narrative). According to R. Marcus in *Josephus* (Loeb) VIII, pp. 42 f., note a, 'the accounts in *Ant.* appear preferable to that in *B.J.* with its evident anachronisms'.

50. *Ant.* xv 7, 7-8 (240-52).

1. *Ant.* xv 7, 9 (253-8).

of Babas,⁵² who were apparently distantly related to the Hasmonaean house, and whom since his conquest of Jerusalem Herod had tried in vain to trace, were concealed by her husband in his home. She informed her brother Herod of this. When he heard he quickly made up his mind. Costobar and his protégées, whose hiding-place Salome had disclosed, were seized and executed (in about 27 B.C.). And Herod was then able to tell himself with an easy mind that of all the relatives of the aged Hyrcanus, none was left to dispute his claim to the throne.⁵³ With this, the first period ends, the period of conflict.

II

The period 25-13 B.C. is the one of splendour and enjoyment, though not of uninterrupted and unclouded enjoyment.

To the splendour of the time belong, above all, magnificent building enterprises. All the provinces at that time competed with one another in emperor worship, and in celebrating the quadrennial games in Caesar's honour; temples to the emperor (*Καيسάρεια*) were raised, and theatres, amphitheatres, stadia and hippodromes. New cities, too, were founded in Caesar's honour and named after him. 'Provinciarum pleraeque super templa et aras ludos quoque quinquennales paene oppidatim constituerunt. Reges amici atque socii et singuli in suo quisque regno Caesareae urbes condiderunt.'⁵⁴ All these ventures were tackled by Herod with the energy characteristic of him. But he was also tireless in erecting other buildings for purposes of utility and luxury, and in founding whole cities.⁵⁵

In Jerusalem a theatre was constructed, and in the plain near Jerusalem, an amphitheatre.⁵⁶ Some time later, about 24 B.C., Herod built himself a royal palace adorned with marble and gold. It was

52. Instead of *Βαβας* Niese reads *Σαββας* with *cod. Pal.*, but says *utrum verius difficile dictum*. The name *Βαβας* occurs in an inscription given by J. Euting, SAB (1885), p. 685, table xi, n. 80. *בבא בן בוטא* appears in mKer. 6:3; *יהודה בן בבא* in mErub. 2:4-5; mYeb. 16:3, 5, 7; mEduy. 6:1; 8:2 (the Cambridge manuscript has *בבא בן בבא* four times, *בן אבא* three times: cf. W. H. Lowe, *The Mishnah on which the Palestinian Talmud rests* (1883) *in loc.*).

53. *Ant.* xv 7, 10 (259-66). At the close of the narrative Josephus says expressly: *ὄσι' εἶναι μηδὲν ὑπόλοιπον ἐκ τῆς Ἰρκανοῦ συγγενείας*. By this he probably means only the male relatives. For according to *Ant.* xvii 5, 2 (92) the daughter of Antigonos, the last Hasmonaean king, who married Herod's oldest son Antipater, was still alive about twenty years later.

54. Suet. *Div. Aug.* 59-60. On the imperial cult cf. vol. II, § 22, ii, 1.

55. On Herod's buildings cf. P. Watzinger, *Denkmäler Palästinas* II (1935), pp. 31-78; F.-M. Abel, *Hist. Pal.* I (1952), pp. 363-79; G. E. Wright, *Biblical Archaeology* (1957), pp. 218-26; Schalit, *op. cit.*, pp. 328-403.

56. *Ant.* xv 8, 1 (268) *καὶ θέατρον ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκδομήσεν, αὐτὸς τ' ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ μέγιστον ἀμφιθέατρον*. The hippodrome in Jerusalem which is mentioned occasionally, *Ant.* xvii 10, 3 (255); *B.J.* ii 3, 1 (44), was also doubtless built by Herod; so too, the theatre, amphitheatre and hippodrome in Jericho (on which

provided with stout fortifications, and so also served as a castle for the upper city.⁵⁷ Already in Antonius's time he had had the fortress north of the Temple reconstructed and named Antonia in honour of his patron.⁵⁸ In the non-Jewish cities of his realm, and farther afield in the province of Syria, he built numerous temples, especially temples in honour of Caesar (*Καيسάρεια*), and adorned them with most beautiful sculpture.⁵⁹

see vol. II, § 22, ii, 2). An interesting report concerning a theatre near Jerusalem which he discovered is given by C. Schick in PEFQS (1887), pp. 161-6 (with plans). It lies south of the city (south-south-west of Bir Eiyub, north of Wadi Yasul). The semicircular auditorium can still be clearly recognized; it is cut from the natural rock on the north side of a hill so that spectators had a glimpse of the city. The diameter below the seats amounts to 132 feet and the seats rise at a regular angle of 37 degrees. But it is curious that Schick should describe his discovery as an amphitheatre, for his sketch and description leave no doubt that it is, on the contrary, a theatre (the amphitheatre was always an ellipse, in the middle of which was the arena for gladiatorial contests and animal baiting, whereas the theatre was in the form of a semicircle, on the open side of which was the stage for dramatic performances). Schick was led to this mistake by Josephus's statement that Herod's theatre was ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, whereas the site discovered by Schick lies outside the city. But he himself has to admit that his discovery is by no means ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ, which according to Josephus was true of the amphitheatre built by Herod. If then ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις meant 'within the city walls', the site found by Schick could not be either Herod's theatre or amphitheatre. But such an interpretation is in no way inevitable; the identification of Schick's theatre with that of Herod is therefore quite possible and even probable. Even in Hadrian's restoration of the city, the site once prepared by Herod will not have been abandoned. On the theatre and amphitheatre built by Herod see G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem. The Topography, Economics and History from the Earliest Times to A.D. 70* II (1908), pp. 492-4; Schalit, *op. cit.*, pp. 370-1. On the hippodrome probably built by Herod see L. H. Vincent and F.-M. Abel, *Jérusalem* II, p. 34, pl. I; cf. L. H. Vincent and A. M. Stève, *Jérusalem de l'Ancien Testament* II-III (1956), pp. 708-9.

57. *Ant.* xv 9, 3 (318); *B.J.* i 21, 1 (402). Cf. the description given in *B.J.* v 4, 3-4 (156-85). One tower of Herod's palace is today still in a partial state of preservation, the so-called Tower of David. See the description of it given by Schick in ZDPV I (1878), pp. 226-37; see also G. A. Smith, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 486-90; Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine* I, pp. 365-7; C. N. Johns, 'The Citadel, Jerusalem—A Summary of Work since 1934', *QDAP* 14 (1950), pp. 121-90. Schalit, *op. cit.*, pp. 371-2. R. Amiran, A. Eitan, 'Excavations in the Courtyard of the Citadel, Jerusalem'. *IEJ* 20 (1970), pp. 9-17.

58. *Ant.* xv 8, 5 (292); *II*, 4 (409); *xviii* 4, 3 (91); *B.J.* i 21, 1 (401). Cf. the description in *B.J.* v 5, 8 (238-47); *Tac. Hist.* v 11. On the earlier history of the fortress see note on p. 154 above; cf. J. Simons, *Jerusalem in the O.T.* (1952); Vincent, *Jérusalem de l'A.T.* I (1954), pp. 193-221; S. M. Aline de Sion, *La Forteresse Antonia à Jérusalem et la question du Prétoire* (1955); see now P. Benoît, 'L'Antonia d'Hérode le Grand et le Forum Oriental d'Aelia Capitolina', *HThR* 64 (1971), pp. 135-67.

59. *Ant.* xv 9, 5 (328 f.); *B.J.* i 21, 4 (407). Cf. *Ant.* xv 10, 3 (363); *B.J.* i 21, 3 (404) (the temple at Paneion); cf. *RE* XXXVI 3, 594-600. It was of white marble and apparently stood on the hill above Caesarea Philippi, the ancient Panias,

A whole group of new cities took shape at his command. He was responsible for a most impressive reconstruction of the former city of Samaria, which had already been rebuilt by Gabinius after its destruction by John Hyrcanus. Herod re-named it Sebaste.⁶⁰ Not content with this, in around 22 B.C. he embarked on the even grander undertaking of establishing a new city of enormous size on the coast, on the site of Straton's Tower, giving it the name of Caesarea. Josephus mentions the town's great harbour as particularly noteworthy. To protect ships from storms, a powerful breakwater was thrown up far out into the sea, the material for which must have been brought from a considerable distance. On this breakwater, dwellings were built for the seamen, and in front of them a promenade. In the middle of the city there was a hill, and on this a temple of Caesar was built which could be seen well out to sea. The building of the city lasted twelve full years. And when it was finished, it was dedicated with great pomp in the 28th year of Herod (= 10/9 B.C.).⁶¹

Herod's enthusiasm for building was, however, still not satisfied. On the site of ancient Capharsaba he laid out a city which he called Antipatris, in honour of his father. At Jericho he built a fortress to which he gave the name of his mother, Cyprus. In the Jordan valley, north of Jericho, he founded a new city in a fertile but undeveloped area and called it after his brother Phasaelis.⁶² He rebuilt ancient Anthon and named it Agrippium in honour of Agrippa.⁶³ In his own honour the name Herodium was given to two new fortresses, one of them in the mountains towards Arabia, the other three hours' journey south of Jerusalem, on the site of his victory over the Jews who

but its exact site is not known; it is possibly the temple represented on coins of the tetrarch Herod Philip; cf. Hill, *BMC Syria*, pl. xxiv no. 21; Reifenberg, *Ancient Jewish Coins*,² pl. iv, nos. 42, 44). There was also a temple of Augustus in each of the reconstructed cities of Sebaste and Caesarea. De Vogüé and Waddington found at Si'a (½ hour from El-Kanawat, at the western foot of the Hauran) the ruins of a temple of the Herodian period (illustrated in de Vogüé, *Syrie Centrale, Architecture Civile et Religieuse*, pl. 2 and 3). Among them was also found the following inscription on the lower part of what had once been a statue of Herod; [βα]σιλει. Ἡρώδου κυρίῳ Ὀβαίσατος Σαύδου ἔθηκα τὸν ἀνδριάντα ταῖς ἐμαῖς δαπάναι[s], OGIS 415. Cf. n. 24 above.

60. *Ant.* xv 8, 5 (292 f.); *B.J.* i 21, 2 (403); Strabo xvi 2, 34 (760). For further particulars see vol. II, § 23, i; on the time of its construction see p. 293 above.

61. *Ant.* xv 9, 6 (331-41); xvi 5, 1 (136-41); *B.J.* i 21, 5-8 (408-16). Cf. also *Ant.* xv 8, 5 (292-8); Pliny, *NH* v 14/69. For the rest of the history of Caesarea see vol. II, § 23 i.

62. *Ant.* xvi 5, 2 (142-5); *B.J.* i 21, 9 (417 f.). On Antipatris and Phasaelis see vol. II, § 23, 1. Note G. Harder, 'Herodes-Burgen und Herodes-Städte im Jordangraben', *ZDPV* 78 (1962), pp. 49-63.

63. *B.J.* i 21, 8 (416); cf. *Ant.* xiii 13, 3 (357); *B.J.* i 4, 2 (87). In the two latter passages the name given is Agrippias. On the history of the city see vol. II, § 23, i.

pursued him when he fled from the city. This second fortress was also furnished with magnificent quarters for the king.⁶⁴ He re-fortified the strongholds of Alexandrium and Hyrcania, built by the Hasmonaeans but destroyed by Gabinius,⁶⁵ and dealt similarly with the fortresses of Machaerus and Masada, both of which he embellished with royal

64. *B.J.* i 21, 10 (419). On the second named and more important of these fortresses see also *Ant.* xv 9, 4 (323-5); cf. *Ant.* xiv 13, 9 (360); *B.J.* i 13, 8 (265). In the Roman period it was the centre of a toparchy (*B.J.* iii 3, 5 (55); Pliny, *NH* v 14/70: 'Herodium cum oppido inlustri eiusdem nominis'; in the war of Vespasian it was one of the last of the rebels' sanctuaries, *B.J.* vii 6, 1 (163). According to *B.J.* iv 9, 5 (518), Herodium lay in the neighbourhood of Tekoa (στρατοπεδευσάμενος δὲ κατὰ τῆν κώμην, Θεκούε καλεῖται, πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Ἡρωδείῳ φρουρούς, ὅπερ ἦν πλησίον); according to *Ant.* xiv 13, 9 (359), xv 9, 4 (324), *B.J.* i 13, 8 (265), i 21, 10 (419), its position was sixty stadia south of Jerusalem. As modern Tekoa is more than sixty stadia from Jerusalem, Herodium must have been situated somewhat to the north of it. Cf. also Petrus Diaconus (in Geyer, *Itinera Hierosolymitana* (1898), p. 110) 'in quo itinere (from Jerusalem to Tekoa) contra mons est, quem excavavit Eroses et fecit sibi palatium super heremum contra mare mortuum'. From this there can be no doubt that the steep conical mass known as Jebel el-Fureidis (paradise, orchard) is to be identified as Herodium. Its distance from Jerusalem is exactly 8 Roman miles, i.e. 64 stadia, as the crow flies. On the hill are still to be found the remains of the round towers, which according to Josephus in *Ant.* xv 9, 4 (324), *B.J.* i 21, 10 (420), Herod built there. Traces are also still discernible of the stone steps described by Josephus as leading up the citadel. Cf. Schick, *ZDPV* 3 (1880), pp. 88-99 (with plans); *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs of Conder and Kitchener* III, pp. 315 f. 330-2; A. Schlatter, *Zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästina's* (1893), pp. 120 ff.; Schick's map of the more distant environs of Jerusalem, *ZDPV* 19 (1896); Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 348; Schalit, *op. cit.*, pp. 357-8; for recent excavations see V. Corbo, 'L'Herodion di Gebal Fureidis', *Liber Annus Studii Biblici Franciscani* 13 (1962-3), pp. 219-77; 17 (1967), pp. 65-121; cf. RB 71 (1964), pp. 158-63, and 75 (1968), pp. 424-8. On the other Herodium see A. Maillon, 'Deux forteresses au pied des monts de Moab', *Biblica* 14 (1933), pp. 401-7.

65. Both fortresses are first mentioned in the time of Alexandra, *Ant.* xiii 16, 3 (417). In Alexandrium Aristobulus awaited the arrival of Pompey but was obliged to surrender the fortress to him, *Ant.* xiv 3, 4 (48-53); *B.J.* i 6, 5 (133-7). Both fortresses were razed by Gabinius because they had served Alexander as bastions at the time of his revolt, *Ant.* xiv 5, 2-4 (82-91); *B.J.* i 8, 2-5 (160-70). Alexandrium was re-fortified by Pheroras, *Ant.* xiv 15, 4 (419); *B.J.* i 16, 3 (308). Hyrcania served for a long time as a refuge to the sister of Antigonos; it was not until shortly before the battle of Actium that Herod acquired control of it, *B.J.* i 19, 1 (364). The new fortresses which Herod established in both these places were so remarkable that he showed them to Agrippa on the occasion of the latter's visit, *Ant.* xvi 2, 1 (13). The site of Hyrcania has been identified with Khirbet Mird in the wilderness of Judaea, about 8 miles south-east of Jerusalem; so Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 350. See also A. E. Mader, *Oriens Christianus* 34 (1937) pp. 27-58, 192-212; G. R. H. Wright, 'The Archaeological Remains at El Mird in the Wilderness of Judaea', *Biblica* 43 (1961), pp. 1-27. Alexandrium is probably identical with the present-day Qarn Sartaba on the edge of the Jordan plain north of Jericho (see p. 238 above). Cf. Abel in RB 10 (1913), pp. 227-34; *Géog. Pal.* II, pp. 241 f.; W. J. Moulton, 'A Visit to Qarn Sartabeh', *BASOR* 62 (1936), pp. 14-18.

palaces.⁶⁶ Military purposes were also served by the rebuilding of Gaba in Galilee and Heshbon in Peraea, where he established military colonies.⁶⁷

Architecture far beyond the borders of Palestine also testified to Herod's liberality. For the Rhodians he built at his own expense a Pythian temple. He assisted the city of Nicopolis, founded near Actium by Augustus, to erect most of its public buildings. In Antioch he built colonnades on both sides of the main street.⁶⁸ When he was once in Chios, he contributed an enormous sum towards the rebuilding of the pillared hall destroyed in the Mithridatic war.⁶⁹ In Ashkelon he built baths and fountains; and Tyre, Sidon, Byblus and Berytus, Tripolis, Ptolemais and Damascus were also indebted to him. In fact, proofs of his generosity reached as far as Athens.⁷⁰

The most magnificent of all his building operations was, however, the reconstruction of the Temple of Jerusalem. The old Temple built by Zerubbabel no longer corresponded to the splendour of the new age. The palaces nearby surpassed it in magnificence. Now, as was fitting, it was to be made to conform to these splendid environs. The undertaking began in the 18th year of Herod's reign (20/19 B.C.). When the Temple proper was completed, it was provisionally consecrated, but work on it continued long afterwards until the time of Albinus (A.D. 62-4); a few years before its destruction. Its grandeur was proverbial. 'Whoever has not seen Herod's building, has never seen anything beautiful', was a proverb of that time.⁷¹

66. Machaerus was first fortified by Alexander Jannaeus, *B.J.* vii 6, 2 (171). Herod's new buildings are described by Josephus in detail in *B.J.* vii 6, 2 (172-7). Masada is said to have been fortified by the High Priest Jonathan, *B.J.* vii 8, 3 (285), which is hardly possible since in Jonathan's time Jewish territory did not reach as far as Masada. On Herod's new buildings see *B.J.* vii 8, 3 (285-94). On the archaeological remains of Herodian Masada, see Y. Yadin, *Masada, Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand* (1966), esp. pp. 40-156. Both fortresses played an important part in the war of Vespasian. For fuller details of their sites and history, see pp. 511-12.

67. *Ant.* xv 8, 5 (294). Cf. *B.J.* iii 3, 1 (36). For further evidence on these two places, see vol. II, § 23, 1.

68. *Ant.* xvi 5, 3 (146-9).

69. *Ant.* xvi 2, 2 (18-19).

70. *B.J.* i 21, 11 (422-5). Berenice (PIR² I 651), the daughter of Agrippa I, is called on an inscription in Athens (IG² II 3449=OGIS 428) *μεγάλων βασιλέων ἐπιφανῶν τῆς πόλεως ἕκγονος*. Cf. IG² II 3440=OGIS 414 *Ὁ δῆμος βασιλέα Ἡρώδην φιλοπομπῶν ἐπιφανῶν ἐνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν* (the people of Athens). Cf. IG² II 3441.

71. On the history of its construction see *Ant.* xv 11 (380-425); *B.J.* i 21, 1 (401-2). In the first text, Josephus also gives a detailed description of the whole Temple area with its splendid porticoes. (On a fragment of a pillar probably deriving from Herod's building, see Clermont-Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine* I (1899), pp. 254-8). The inner courts and the Temple proper are described most minutely in *B.J.* v 15 (184-247). The statements of Josephus are

In addition to architecture, spectacular games ranked among the splendours of the Augustan age. In this connexion Herod again did not fall short of the requirements of the time. He instituted four-yearly athletic contests, not only in Caesarea, which was predominantly Gentile, but even in Jerusalem.⁷² In the eyes of orthodox Jews, these pagan spectacles with their disregard for the life of men and animals were a grievous offence only tolerated under the pressure of external

well assembled by F. Spiess in *Das Jerusalem des Josephus* (1881), pp. 46-94; also in ZDPV 15 (1892), pp. 234-56. The account appearing in the Mishnah tractate Middoth agrees in essentials with that of Josephus; see I. Hildesheimer, *Die Beschreibung des herodianischen Tempels im Tractate Middoth und bei Flavius Josephus* (*Jahresbericht des Rabbiner-Seminars für das orthodoxe Judenth.* (1876/77)); F. J. Hollis, *The Archaeology of Herod's Temple: with a Commentary on the Tractate Middoth* (1934); L. H. Vincent, 'Le Temple hérodien d'après la Mišnah', RB 61 (1954), pp. 5-35, 398-418; cf. Schalit, *op. cit.*, pp. 372-97 and J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (1969), pp. 21-7. A brief description is given in Philo, *Spec. leg.* I 13 (71-5). On the Jewish proverb and other rabbinical traditions see bB.B. 4a; bTaan. 23a. With all its magnificence the Temple was nevertheless inferior to Herod's palace, *B.J.* i 21, 1 (402). On the duration of the construction work, see p. 292 above. On its completion in the time of Albinus, see *Ant.* xx 9, 7 (219). On the measures taken to avoid disturbance of worship see mEduy. 8:6: 'R. Eliezer said: I have heard that when the Temple (*היכל*) was being built, curtains (*מ'ע'ל'ק*) were drawn round the Temple and curtains round the courtyards; and the walls of the Temple were built outside the curtains, whereas those of the courtyards were built inside the curtains'. It is said that while the Temple was being built it rained only by night (*Jos. Ant.* xv 11, 7 (425); bTaan. 23a). On the basis of the description given by Josephus and in the tractate Middoth, Herod's Temple has been dealt with countless times in more recent literature. Comprehensive accounts are given in articles on the Temple; IDB IV, pp. 534-60 and esp. JE XIII, pp. 85-9 (Temple of Herod), pp. 92-7 (rabbinical literature). See also H. Schmidt, *Der heilige Fels in Jerusalem: eine archäologische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie* (1933); J. Simons, *Jerusalem in the Old Testament* (1952), pp. 391-429; Vincent, *Jérusalem* I, pp. 193-221; II-III, pp. 373-610; A. Parrot, *The Temple of Jerusalem* (1957). For the determination of questions of topography, particularly in regard to the outer Temple area and its gates, an accurate description is given by M. De Vogüé, *Le temple de Jérusalem* (1864). On the Temple gates see J. Jeremias and A. M. Schneider, 'Das westliche Südtor des herodianischen Tempels', ZDPV 65 (1942), pp. 112-21; S. Corbett, 'Some Observations on the Gateways to the Herodian Temple in Jerusalem', PEQ 84 (1952), pp. 7-14, pls. I-V; M. Avi-Yonah, 'The Façade of Herod's Temple—An attempted Reconstruction', *Religions in Antiquity—Essays in Memory of E. R. Goodenough* (1968), pp. 327-35. See now Enc. Jud. XV, cols. 960-9.

Note the recently-published Aramaic ossuary inscription, from Giv'at ha-Mivtar; *סמונ בונה הכלה*, 'Simon, builder of the Sanctuary'. J. Naveh, IEJ 20 (1970), pp. 33-4.

72. In Caesarea: *Ant.* xvi 5, 1 (137); *B.J.* i 21, 8 (415). In Jerusalem: *Ant.* xv 8, 1 (268). The expressions *κατὰ πενταετηρίδα*; *Ant.* xvi 5, 1 (138), *πενταετηρικοί ἄγῶνες*; *B.J.* i 21, 8 (415) and *πανήγυρις τῆς πενταετηρίδος*, *Ant.* xv 8, 1 (269) do not mean that the games were celebrated every fifth year, but every fourth year. See vol. II, § 22, ii, 2.

authority.⁷³ But the king's enthusiasm was such that he even gave generous financial support to the ancient Olympic Games.⁷⁴

How tirelessly and unsparingly Herod promoted culture and luxury in other ways also may be deduced from Josephus. He colonized the districts east of the Lake of Gennesaret, through which until then only thieving nomads had roamed.⁷⁵ He adorned the parks about his palace in Jerusalem at great expense. Walks and water channels traversed the gardens; everywhere there were pools, with bronze statuary through which the water streamed. Nearby stood many towers with tamed wild doves.⁷⁶ The king seems to have had a special fondness for the breeding of doves; it is in fact only due to this that his name is mentioned in the Mishnah. 'Herodian doves' is a phrase used here to describe birds kept in captivity.⁷⁷ So it looks as though Herod was the first person in Judaea to keep and breed wild doves in enclosures.

To prove himself a man of culture in the eyes of the Graeco-Roman world, Herod—who in his inmost heart remained a barbarian—surrounded himself with men of Greek education. The highest offices of state were entrusted to Greek rhetoricians, and in all matters of importance he availed himself of their counsel and collaboration. The most eminent among them was Nicolaus of Damascus, a man of wide erudition, well acquainted with natural science, conversant with Aristotle and renowned as a historian.⁷⁸ He enjoyed Herod's absolute confidence, and all the more difficult diplomatic missions were delegated to him. With him was his brother Ptolemy, likewise a trusted friend of

73. On the attitude to the games of orthodox Judaism see vol. II, § 22, ii, 2, and the literature mentioned there.

74. *Ant.* xvi 5, 3 (149); *B.J.* i 21, 12 (427).

75. *Ant.* xvi 9, 2 (285) (a colony of three thousand Idumaeans); *Ant.* xvii 2, 1-3 (23-31) (a colony of Babylonian Jews). Cf. also § 17a and Vol. II, § 22, 1.

76. *B.J.* v 4, 4 (181): πολλοὶ . . . πύργοι πελειάδων ἡμέρων (in the same place there is a general description of the park).

77. In the Mishnah Herod's name occurs only in the following two passages: mShab. 24:3: 'Water may not be set before bees and doves on the Sabbath, but before geese and hens and Herodian doves (הרודיאיות)'. mHul. 12:1: The law of Deut. 22:6-7 (that only fledglings may be taken from the nest, but the mother must be allowed to fly) holds good only for birds that nest in the open, e.g. geese and barnyard fowls, but not for those that nest in the house, e.g. Herodian doves (הרודיאיות): In both passages 'Herodian doves', refers to birds kept in captivity as distinct from those that fly free. The Josephus passage *B.J.* v 4, 4 (181) shows that wild doves (πελειάδες) are meant, not domestic doves (περιστεραι). The reading (הרודיאיות) appears already in bHul. 139b alongside the other, but it is certainly false. The *Avukh*, the rabbinical lexicon of Nathan ben Yehiel (ed. Kohut, IV, pp. 116-17) gives s.v. יין the following explanation: 'King Herod brought doves from the wilderness and bred them in inhabited places'. Cf. Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* (s.v. הרודיאיות); HDB I, pp. 619 f. (s.v. 'Dove'); JE IV, pp. 644-5. See, however, E. D. Oren, 'The "Herodian Doves" in the light of recent archaeological discoveries', PEQ 100/101 (1968-9), pp. 56-61.

78. Cf. pp. 28-32 above.

the king. Another Ptolemy was head of the financial administration and had the king's signet-ring.⁷⁹ Two further Greeks formed part of the king's immediate entourage, Andromachus and Gemellus, the latter of whom was tutor to Herod's son Alexander.⁸⁰ Finally a Greek rhetorician, Irenaeus, is encountered in the proceedings following Herod's death.⁸¹ Distinguished Greeks also spent short periods as guests at the king's court, among them Euaratus of Cos,⁸² and the ill-reputed Lacedaemonian, Eurycles, who contributed not a little to the dissension between Herod and his sons.⁸³

Herod's Judaism was, by all accounts, very superficial. His ambition was directed towards promoting education and culture. But the world of that time scarcely recognised any culture other than that of

79. That there were two men called Ptolemy at Herod's court is quite clear from events immediately following his death. At that time, Ptolemy the brother of Nicolaus of Damascus stood on the side of Antipas, *Ant.* xvii 9, 4 (225); *B.J.* ii 2, 3 (21), whilst another Ptolemy attended to the interests of Archelaus (*Ant.* xvii 8, 2 (195) = *B.J.* i 33, 8 (667); *Ant.* xvii 9, 3 and 5 (219 and 228) = *B.J.* ii 2, 1 and 4 (14 and 24)). It was through the latter that Archelaus handed over Herod's accounts and signet-ring to the emperor in Rome, *Ant.* xvii 9, 5 (228) *Καίσαρ δὲ Ἀρχελάου εἰσπέμφαντος . . . τοὺς λογισμοὺς τῶν Ἡρόδου χρημάτων σὺν τῷ σηματήρι κομίζοντα Πτολεμαῖον*, *B.J.* ii 2, 4 (24): *Ἀρχέλαος . . . τὸν δακτύλιον τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοὺς λόγους εἰσπέμπει διὰ Πτολεμαίου*. In Herod's lifetime this same Ptolemy had charge of his signet-ring, and on his death read out his will, *Ant.* xvii 8, 2 (195) = *B.J.* i 23, 8 (667). The διοικητὴς τῶν τῆς βασιλείας πραγμάτων of *Ant.* xvi 7, 2-3 (191, 197) is doubtless identical with him, as also the person mentioned in the parallel passage *B.J.* i 24, 2 (473). Cf. also *Ant.* xvi 8, 5 (257); cf. Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch* s.v. 'Ptolemaios' 7 and 8.

80. *Ant.* xvi 8, 3 (241-3).

81. *Ant.* xvii 9, 4 (226); *B.J.* ii, 2, 3 (21).

82. Euaratus, the correct reading in *Ant.* xvi 10, 2 (312); *B.J.* i 26, 5 (532), is conceivably identical with the Γάιος Ἰούλιος Εὐάρατος υἱὸς Εὐάρατος whose name appears in a list of priests of Apollo at Halasarna on the island of Cos about 12 B.C. (IGR IV 1101). In any case, the name Εὐάρατος recurs fairly often in this list and also appears elsewhere in Cos (Paton and Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos*, index p. 371).

83. *Ant.* xvi 10, 1 (300-10); *B.J.* i 26, 1-4 (513-31). Eurycles is described by Josephus as a distinguished person (*Ant.*, *loc. cit.*, οὐκ ἄσμος τῶν ἐκεῖ). Of his later destiny, Josephus writes in *Ant.* xvi, 10, 1 (310) that he continued his intrigues in Lacedaemon and because of his misdeeds was in the end banished from his land. In *B.J.* i 26, 4 (531) it is reported in more detail that on two occasions he was accused before the emperor of plunging the whole of Achaia into uproar and plundering the cities (ἐπὶ τῷ στάσει ἐμπλήσαι τὴν Ἀχαίαν καὶ περιδύειν τὰς πόλεις), and that he was therefore banished. He is in consequence certainly the Eurycles who according to Strabo, 'introduced unrest among the Lacedaemonians, inasmuch as he thought he could misuse the emperor's friendship to obtain domination over them; but the tumult soon ended when he died and his son rejected all such ambition': Strabo viii 5, 5 (366) *νεωστὶ δ' Εὐρυκλῆς αὐτοὺς ἐτάραξε δόξας ἀποχρησασθαι τῇ Καίσαρος φιλίᾳ πέρα τοῦ μετρίου πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστασίαν αὐτῶν, ἐπαύσατο δ' ἡ ἀρχὴ [palimpsest παραχῆ] ταχέως, ἐκείνου μὲν παραχωρήσαντος εἰς τὸ χρέων, τοῦ δ' υἱοῦ τὴν φιλίαν [pal. φιλοτιμίαν] ἀπεστραμμένου τὴν τοιαύτην πᾶσαν*. The correct explanation of this frequently misunderstood

Hellenism. So, under the guidance of Nicolaus of Damascus, he submitted to instruction in Greek philosophy, rhetoric and history, and prided himself on being closer to the Hellenes than to the Jews.⁸⁴ But the culture which he endeavoured to spread throughout his land was essentially Gentile. He even erected pagan temples in the non-Jewish cities of his kingdom. Under these circumstances, it is interesting to note his attitude towards the Law and the national outlook of his people. Since the reaction under Alexandra, the Pharisaic movement had grown so powerful, and had become so firmly rooted, that forcible Hellenization under Herod similar to that carried out by Antiochus Epiphanes was unthinkable. He was clever enough to respect the views of the Pharisees on many points. Thus it is particularly noteworthy that his coins bear no human likeness, but only innocuous symbols such as those on Maccabaeian coins; one coin at the most, perhaps from Herod's latest period, has the image of an eagle.⁸⁵ When he was

passage is given by Bowersock *op. cit.* (below), pp. 113-14. In another passage Strabo viii 5, 1 (363), calls him *ὁ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἡγεμῶν*. On coins also he appears as a dynast. His full name, C. Iulius Eurycles, is given in the inscription *Syll.*³ 787, cf. 788. In Corinth he built baths, and in Sparta a gymnasium (Pausan. ii 3, 5; iii 14, 6). Games founded by him, or in his honour, were still being celebrated at a later time. Cf. G. W. Bowersock, 'Eurycles of Sparta', *JRS* 51 (1961), pp. 112-18; *PIR*² I 301.

84. *Ant.* xix 7, 3 (329): *Ἕλλησι πλέον ἢ Ἰουδαίους οἰκείως ἔχειν*. On the literary studies in which Herod engaged under the direction of Nicolaus of Damascus, see Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 135 *Ἡρώδης πάλιν διαμεθεῖς τὸν φιλοσοφίας ἔρωτα . . . ἐπεθύμησε πάλιν ῥητορικῆς, καὶ Νικόλαον ἠνάγκαζε συρρητορεύειν αὐτῷ, καὶ κοινῇ ἐρρητόρευον. αὐτῷ δ' ἱστορίας αὐτὸν [ἔρωσ] ἔλαβεν, ἐπαινέσαντος Νικόλαου τὸ πρᾶγμα καὶ πολιτικώτατον εἶναι λέγοντος, χρήσιμον δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖ, ὡς τὰ τῶν προτέρων ἔργα καὶ πράξεις ἱστοροῦν . . . ἐκ τούτου πλέον εἰς Πάμην ὡς Καίσαρα Ἡρώδης ἐπήγε[το] τὸν Νικόλαον ὁμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς νηός, καὶ κοινῇ ἐφιλοσόφουν.*

85. On the coins of Herod see Eckhel III, pp. 483-6; Mionnet V, pp. 565; de Saulcy, *Recherches sur la Numismatique judaïque*, pp. 127-33; Madden, *History of the Jewish Coinage*, pp. 81-91; *Coins of the Jews*, pp. 105-14. *BMC Palestine*, pp. xcvi f.; Reifenberg, *Ancient Jewish Coins*², pp. 18-19; Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (1967), pp. 64-8. The coins have the simple inscription *HPΩΔΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ* or *HPΩΔΗΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ* and various emblems; some have the number of the year 3 (*ΛΓ*); cf. B. Kanael, *JQR* 42 (1951/2), pp. 261-4, and U. Rappaport, *RN* 10 (1968), pp. 64-75. No effigy is found on any coin; on the other hand, it is probable that a small copper coin bearing an eagle (Reifenberg, *op. cit.*, no. 34), of which various exemplars have been found in Jerusalem, belongs to Herod the Great and not to Herod of Chalcis, who never reigned in Jerusalem; see de Saulcy, *Recherches*, p. 131; C. Wieseler, *Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien*, pp. 86-8; Madden, *Coins*, p. 114; for Herod of Chalcis: Madden, *History*, pp. 111-13. Reinach dated it to the last period of Herod's reign, when he treated Jewish feelings with less consideration than previously, Reinach, *Les monnaies juives* (1887), p. 32; cf. Meshorer, *op. cit.*, p. 66, and J. Meyshan, 'The Symbols on the Coinage of Herod the Great and their Meanings', *PEQ* 91 (1959), pp. 109-21.

Note the stone weight dated by the 32nd year of Herod published by Y. Meshorer, *IEJ* 20 (1970), pp. 97-8.

building the Temple he was at great pains to avoid giving offence. He permitted only priests to build the Temple itself, and did not himself dare to set foot in the inner precincts where only priests were allowed.⁸⁶ No images were placed on any of the many splendid buildings in Jerusalem. And when on one occasion the people greeted with suspicion the imperial victory trophies which had been set up in the theatre at Jerusalem, thinking they were statues dressed with armour, Herod had the trophies taken down in the presence of the most distinguished, and showed them, to everyone's amusement, the bare wooden framework.⁸⁷ When the Nabataean Syllaeus sought the hand of Herod's sister Salome, he was required to adopt Jewish customs (*ἐγγραφήναι τοῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθεσι*), whereupon the marriage plans broke down.⁸⁸ Herod even held in high esteem some of the most reputable Pharisees, among whom Pollio and Sameas are mentioned in particular, and allowed them to go unpunished when they refused to take the oath of allegiance.⁸⁹

However, in view of his cultural aspirations, strict observance of Pharisaic principles was not possible, or even intended. What he gave with the one hand, he occasionally withdrew with the other. Having scrupulously satisfied Pharisaic demands in the building of the Temple, he mounted, as though in mockery, an eagle over the Temple gate.⁹⁰ Theatres and amphitheatres were in themselves pagan abominations. The king's Greek entourage, the administration of state affairs by men of Greek education, the display of heathen pomp in the Holy Land, the furtherance of Hellenistic worship on the borders of Judaea, in the king's own land, all heavily outweighed the concessions made to Pharisaism, and in spite of them imparted to Herod's reign a character that was more Gentile than Jewish. The Sanhedrin, which in the people's view constituted the only rightful tribunal, lost all significance under Herod, so that it has even been doubted whether it existed.⁹¹ The High Priests, whom he removed and installed as he pleased, were his creatures, and furthermore in part Alexandrians: men, that is to say, with a smattering of Hellenistic culture, and in consequence offensive to the Pharisees.⁹² His treatment of the High Priesthood is quite typical of the king's domestic politics. Whereas on the one hand he thrust aside with reckless brutality the old Sadducean aristocracy because of their Hasmonaean sentiments (see p. 296 above), on the

86. *Ant.* xv 11, 5-6 (410-23).

87. *Ant.* xv 8, 1-2 (267-79).

88. *Ant.* xvi 7, 6 (220-8).

89. *Ant.* xv 1, 1 (3); 10, 4 (370).

90. *Ant.* xvii 6, 2 (149-54); *B.J.* i 33, 2 (648-50).

91. Cf., however, H. Mantel, *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin* (1961), pp. 54-101; P. Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus* (1961), pp. 75-6.

92. On the High Priests see vol. II, § 23. iv.

other, he did anything but satisfy the Pharisees. Their ideals extended far beyond the king's concessions, and his Pharisaic friendships were merely exceptions.⁹³

Bearing in mind that this disregard of the opinions and actual or supposed rights of the people was accompanied by the pressure of heavy taxes, it is understandable that Herod's rule aroused resentment. All the outward brilliance could not but be offensive to the people so long as it was secured by oppressing the citizens and slighting the statutes of their fathers. Most Pharisees refused to recognize the government of the Roman vassal king as legally valid, and twice refused to take the oath of loyalty, which Herod demanded first for himself, and then for the emperor.⁹⁴ On one occasion during the earlier period of his reign (c. 25 B.C.), the general dissatisfaction found vent in conspiracy.

93. J. Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, pp. 105-9, has rightly pointed out that the Pharisees could accept Herod more readily than the Sadducees. But while this reflection is correct, he emphasised it too strongly; cf. J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, pp. 228-32, 246-67; G. Allon, 'The Attitude of the Pharisees to the Roman Government and the House of Herod', *Scrip. Hier.* 7 (1961), pp. 53-78.

94. The two cases of refusal to take the oath reported in *Ant.* xv 10, 4 (368-72) and xvii 2, 4 (42) seem to be quite distinct. In the first passage it is said that Herod persecuted his enemies in all kinds of ways; as for the rest of the populace he demanded that they submit to taking an oath of loyalty, and he compelled them to make a sworn declaration that they would maintain a friendly attitude to his rule (*Ant.* xv 10, 4 (368) τὸ δ' ἄλλο πλῆθος ὄρκους ἤξιον πρὸς τὴν πίστιν ὑπάγεσθαι, καὶ συνγράγκαζεν ἐνώμοτον αὐτῷ τὴν εὐνοίαν ἢ μὴν διαφυλάξειν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὁμολογεῖν). It was a question, therefore, of an oath of loyalty to the king. The Pharisees who refused went unmolested out of regard for Pollio and Sameas; similarly the Essenes; but others were punished. The other passage recounts that when the whole Jewish people vowed on oath to submit to the emperor and the king, more than 6,000 Pharisees refused to swear (*Ant.* xvii 2, 4 (42) παντὸς γούν τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ βεβαίωσαντος δι' ὄρκων ἢ μὴν εὐνοῆσαι Καίσαρι καὶ τοῖς βασιλέως πράγμασι, οἶδε οἱ ἄνδρες οὐκ ὤμωσαν, ὄντες ὑπὲρ ἐξακισχίλιοι). Here the oath to the emperor seems to have been the main issue. The objectors were sentenced to pay a fine, which was settled by the wife of Pheroras. Cf. G. Allon, *art. cit.*, pp. 53-78. The latter passage is possibly the earliest evidence we have that in the period of the empire not only soldiers and officials, but also the people in Italy and the provinces, had to take an oath of loyalty to the emperor. Note, however, the inscription from Samos published by P. Herrmann, *Ath. Mitt.* 75 (1960), pp. 70 ff., mentioning a ὄρκος to Augustus and probably dating to 5 B.C. Subsequent examples, see in general S. Weinstock, 'Treueid und Kaiserkult', *Ath. Mitt.* 77 (1962), pp. 306-27, are (1) the oath of Gangra in Paphlagonia, 3 B.C.: OGIS 532 = ILS 878; (2) the Cypriot oath of A.D. 14: T. B. Mitford, *JRS* 50 (1960), pp. 75-9 = AE 1962, 248; cf. Tac. *Ann.* I 34 (Germanicus administering the oath in Gaul); (3) two oaths of A.D. 37, (a) from Arsitium in Lusitania, ILS 190, (b) from Assos in the Troad, *Syll.*³ 797 = IGR IV 251; cf. Jos. *Ant.* xviii 5, 3 (124)—Vitellius, *legatus* of Syria, administering the oath in Jerusalem—and IG VII 2711 (Acraephia, Boeotia), referring to the oath taken in 37 by the League of Achaeans, Boeotians, Locrians and Euboians. Compare Pliny, *Ep.* X, 52 and 102. See now P. Herrmann, *Der römische Kaisereid* (1968), esp. pp. 122-6 (texts of surviving oaths).

Ten citizens conspired to murder the king in the theatre. Their plan failed because it was betrayed beforehand. They were seized as they were about to set off, and were brought before Herod and immediately condemned to death.⁹⁵

To keep the refractory populace in check, Herod used force; thus the longer his reign lasted, the more despotic it became. The fortresses, some of which were his own new foundations, and some refortified by him, served as a protection, not only against external enemies, but also as a means of suppressing his own people. The most important of them were Herodium, Alexandrium, Hyrcania, Machaerus and Masada, as well as the military colonies at Gaba in Galilee and Heshbon in Peraea (cf. pp. 307-8 above). Hyrcania, in particular, was a centre to which many political offenders were transported, to vanish there for ever.⁹⁶ To support his government against internal as well as external enemies, Herod possessed a dependable army of mercenaries composed of numerous Thracians, Germans and Gauls.⁹⁷ But in the last resort, he set out to smother every attempt at insurrection by means of rigorous police measures. Loitering in the streets, gatherings, indeed even walking together, was forbidden. And where anything contrary was done, the king heard of it immediately through his spies. He is even said sometimes to have acted the spy himself.⁹⁸

To be just, it must nevertheless be acknowledged that his government had also its good points. Among his buildings, many were of great benefit. One has only to think of the harbour at Caesarea. His strong hand created orderly conditions conducive to the security of trade and traffic. Also, he made at least some attempts to win over his subjects with proofs of his magnanimity. Thus, in 20 B.C., he cut taxes by a third,⁹⁹ and in 14 B.C. by a quarter.¹⁰⁰ He also showed admirable energy in trying to check the great famine which afflicted his land in 25 B.C. He is said at that time to have sent even his own table-ware to the mint.¹⁰¹

But in face of the evil for which he was responsible, the people's memory of his benefits was short. So although, by and large, his reign was brilliant, it was not happy.

The glory of his reign was his foreign policy, in which field his accomplishments were undeniably great. He succeeded in gaining the

95. *Ant.* xv 8, 3-4 (280-91).

96. *Ant.* xv 10, 4 (365-7).

97. *Ant.* xvii 8, 3 (198); *B.J.* i 33, 9 (672). The army also included substantial levies from both the Jewish and the non-Jewish inhabitants of his kingdom; cf. Schalit, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-83.

98. *Ant.* xv 10, 4 (366-7).

99. *Ant.* xv 10, 4 (365).

100. *Ant.* xvi 2, 5 (64).

101. *Ant.* xv 9, 1-2 (299-316).

confidence of Augustus to such a degree that through imperial favour the extent of his territory was about doubled.

A description is called for at this juncture of the essential features of the constitutional position of a *rex socius* in the Roman empire of that time.¹⁰² The dependence on Roman power of all the kings this side of the Euphrates was primarily manifest in the inability of any of them to exercise royal authority, or bear the title of king, without the emperor's explicit sanction (with or without the senate's confirmation).¹⁰³ The title was, as a rule, only conferred on princes reigning over larger territories; lesser princes had to be satisfied with the title of tetrarch or something similar. The title held good only for the person on whom it was bestowed and became extinct on his death. There were, strictly speaking, no hereditary monarchies within the domain of Roman power. Even a son appointed by his father as his successor could not assume office until his appointment had been ratified by the emperor. This ratification was refused if there were reasons for doing so, and the paternal territory was either bestowed on the son with its boundaries reduced and his title diminished, or it was given to another, or it was even brought under direct Roman administration, i.e. turned into a province. All this is evident from the history of the Herodian dynasty; but it is also confirmed by all other evidence. The title *socius et amicus populi Romani* (*φίλος καὶ σύμμαχος Ῥωμαίων*) seems to have been bestowed as a special distinction on particular individuals; not all of those who actually assumed this position were permitted to adopt the title formally.¹⁰⁴ Possession of Roman citizenship, although explicitly attested only in relation to a few, was probably a characteristic of them all. Herod's family obtained such citizenships through his father,

102. Cf. Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht* III, 1 (1887), pp. 645-715; W. T. Arnold, *Roman Provincial Administration* (1914); J. Gagé, 'L'Empereur romain et les rois', *Revue Historique* 221 (1959), pp. 221-60; M. Lemosse, *Le régime des relations internationales dans le Haut-Empire romain* (1967), pp. 20-126 *passim*.

103. Herod had his kingdom *δόσει Κάλσαρος καὶ δόγματι Ῥωμαίων*, *Ant.* xv 6, 7 (196).

104. Even in the case of Herod whom *Ant.* xvii 9, 6 (246) calls *φίλος καὶ σύμμαχος*, there have been doubts whether the title was officially due to him. But the *συμμαχία* of King Agrippa I (Herod's grandson) with the Roman senate and people in the time of the emperor Claudius is testified by a coin (Madden, *Coins of the Jews*, pp. 136 f.; Reifenberg, *Ancient Jewish Coins*², no. 63 cf. § 18 below). Since his authority was certainly not greater than that of his grandfather, the latter will also have been recognised officially as *σύμμαχος* of the Romans. Even in regard to Hyrcanus II, who was nominated by Caesar merely as *ἐθνάρχης*, it is said in the decree of his appointment, *Ant.* xiv 10, 2 (194) *εἶναι τε αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ συμμάχους ἡμῶν*. On the title *amicus populi Romani* see RE I, cols. 1832-3; F. C. Sands, *The Client Princes of the Roman Empire under the Republic* (1908), pp. 10-48; cf. H. Heuss, *Die völkerrechtliche Grundlagen der römischen Aussempolitik in republikanischer Zeit*, *Klio Beiheft* 31 (1933), pp. 1-59; A. J. Marshall, 'Friends of the Roman People', *AJPh* 89 (1968), pp. 39-55.

Antipater.¹⁰⁵ From the time of Caligula, senatorial rights (praetorian and consular rank) were also occasionally bestowed upon confederate kings.¹⁰⁶ Their power was restricted in the following respects. (1) They were not supposed to conclude alliances with other states or to engage in war independently, and could thus only exercise their sovereignty within the boundaries of their own land. (2) They had only a limited right of coinage. Almost all of them seem to have been prohibited from minting gold coins, and many, among them Herod and his successors, were also forbidden to mint silver coins; at any rate, only copper coins survive from the time of Herodian princes. This fact is particularly instructive as it shows that Herod was by no means one of the most privileged of these kings, whatever may be implied by Josephus.¹⁰⁷ (3) One of their essential obligations was to supply auxiliary troops in the event of war and to protect the empire's boundaries against foreign enemies. In special instances contributions in the form of money were also demanded. But during the earlier period of the empire, no regular tribute seems to have been levied on the kings. It is testified only of Antonius that he appointed kings *ἐπὶ φόροις τεταγμένους*. There was a similar occurrence in the second century also. But there seems to have been no fixed rule. It is improbable, from all the information available, that Herod paid tribute under Augustus.¹⁰⁸ The rights of sovereignty allowed to dependent kings comprised, under the restrictions already described, the administration of internal affairs and the judicature. They had unlimited power over the life and death of their subjects. No part of their territory was regarded as belonging to the province. They could levy taxes at will within the boundaries of their land, and could regulate the administration of their revenue independently. Their army, also, was under their own command and organized by themselves.

105. *Ant.* xiv 8, 3 (137); *B.J.* i 9, 5 (194).

106. Agrippa I was given firstly praetorian rank, Philo, *Flacc.* 6 (40), and later consular rank (Dio lx 8, 2), cf. PIR² I 131; Herod of Chalcis, praetorian rank (Dio lx 8, 3), cf. PIR² H 156; Agrippa II, likewise praetorian rank (Dio lxvi 15, 4), cf. PIR² I 132. The bestowal of senatorial rights (*ornamenta, τιμαί*) on non-senators is first encountered in the time of Tiberius (Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht*³ I, p. 463). It was a matter simply of the right to sit among the senators on public occasions and to appear in the *insignia* of their respective ranks (Mommsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 455-67).

107. Cf. on the rights of coinage of *reges socii*: Mommsen, *Geschichte des römischen Münzwesens* (1860), pp. 661-736; *Röm. Staatsrecht*³ III, 1, pp. 709-14, Bohn, *Qua conditione iuris reges socii populi Romani fuerint* (1877), pp. 42-9.

108. On Antonius's procedure see Appian, *BC* v 75/319. Later, in the time of Lucian, king Eupator of the Bosphorus paid a yearly tribute to the governor of Bithynia (Lucian, *Alexander* 57 *ἐνθα ἐγὼ παραπλέοντας εὐρῶν Βοσποριανούς τινας πρέσβεις παρ' Εὐπάτορος τοῦ βασιλέως ἐς τὴν Βιθυνίαν ἀπύοντας ἐπὶ κομῆσιν τῆς ἐπερείου συντάξουσιν*). On Herod and his successors see further details below

Of the position thus assigned to them, one that afforded ample scope for individual devotion, Herod took full advantage. He availed himself, like the others, of every opportunity of presenting himself before the emperor with proofs of his loyalty.¹⁰⁹ By late 30 B.C. he had already visited Augustus several times.¹¹⁰ Ten years later, in 20 B.C., Augustus returned to Syria, and Herod did not fail to pay his respects once again.¹¹¹ In 18 or 17 B.C. Herod fetched his two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, from Rome, where they had been receiving their education, and on this occasion, too, he was graciously received by the emperor.¹¹² Later he was with Augustus once or twice more (in 12 B.C. and about 10 B.C.),¹¹³ Herod was also on friendly relations with Agrippa, the intimate friend and son-in-law of Augustus. Agrippa was visited by Herod when he was staying in Mytilene (23-21 B.C.).¹¹⁴ In 15 B.C. Agrippa himself went to Judaea and offered a hecatomb in the Temple in Jerusalem. The people were so charmed by this Roman friendly to the Jews that they accompanied him with blessings to his ship, strewing his path with flowers and admiring his piety.¹¹⁵ In the following spring (14 B.C.), Herod returned Agrippa's visit and, knowing that Agrippa intended to lead an expedition to the Crimea, even took a fleet with him to render him assistance. He met his noble friend in Sinope and after the business of the war had been attended to, traversed a large part of Asia Minor with him, everywhere distributing gifts and dealing with petitions.¹¹⁶ His relations with Augustus and Agrippa were so intimate that flatterers asserted that Augustus liked him best after Agrippa, and Agrippa liked him best after Augustus.¹¹⁷

in the Excursus on the census of Quirinius (§ 17, Appendix I). The view that *reges socii* paid a regular tribute was advocated by Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* I (1881), pp. 405-8 (in reference to Judaea). Against this: Bohn, *Qua condicione juris* etc., pp. 55-64. Cf. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*³ III, p. 683, and Momigliano, *Ricerche*, pp. 41-4.

109. Cf. Suet. *Div. Aug.* 60 'Reges amici atque socii . . . saepe regnis relictis, non Romae modo sed et provincias peragranti cotidiana officia togati ac sine regio insigni, more clientium praestiterunt'.

110. See p. 289 above.

111. *Ant.* xv 10, 3 (354-64). Augustus does not seem to have visited Judaea.

112. *Ant.* xvi 1, 2 (6).

113. *Ant.* xvi 4, 1-5 (87-129) and 9, 1 (271). Cf. p. 293 above.

114. *Ant.* xv 10, 2 (350).

115. *Ant.* xvi 2, 1 (12-15); Philo, *Legatio* 37 (294-7) *εὐφημηθεὶς μύρια παρεπέμθη μέχρι λιμένων, οὐχ ὑπὸ μᾶς πόλεως, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς χώρας ἀπάσης, φυλλοβολουμένους τε καὶ θαυμαζόμενος ἐπ' εὐσεβείᾳ*. In regard to the hecatomb cf. vol. II, § 24, iv. (On sacrifices by pagans in Jerusalem see § 24, iv, Appendix.) On Agrippa and Herod see V. Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit* I 2, pp. 838 ff., II 2, pp. 486 ff.; M. Reinhold, *Marcus Agrippa* (1933), pp. 84-5, 106, 112-13, 114-18, 133-4.

116. *Ant.* xvi 2, 2-5 (16-65). Cf. Nic. Dam., FGrH 90 F 134.

117. *Ant.* xv 10, 3 (361); *B.J.* i 20, 4 (400).

These Roman friendships also bore fruit. As early as 30 B.C., when Herod was with Augustus in Egypt, he received from him an important territorial increase (see p. 289 above). New gifts were added later. In 27/25 B.C., Herod supplied the campaign of Aelius Gallus against the Arabians with five hundred selected auxiliaries.¹¹⁸ There is possibly a connection between this and the fact that soon afterwards, in 23 B.C., at about the time when he sent his sons Alexander and Aristobulus to Rome for their education, he was awarded the districts of Trachonitis, Batanaea and Auranitis; previously this country had been inhabited by thieving nomads with whom the neighbouring tetrarch Zenodorus had made common cause.¹¹⁹ When Augustus went to Syria some years later, in 20 B.C., he presented Herod with Zenodorus's own tetrarchy, the districts of Ulatha and Pania, and the surrounding territory north and north-east of the lake of Gennesaret.¹²⁰ At the same time, Herod obtained permission to appoint his brother Pheroras tetrarch of Peraea.¹²¹ But the absolute confidence placed in him by Augustus is evident, especially from the fact that (perhaps only while Agrippa was absent from the East, see p. 256 above) he commanded the procurators of Syria (Coele-Syria?) to seek Herod's advice in all matters.¹²²

It should also be mentioned that Herod applied his influence with his Roman masters to securing Jews in the Diaspora against oppression and impairment of their rights on the part of the non-Jewish world.¹²³ The powerful position of the Jewish king thus proved beneficial even for Jews not directly under his rule.

The period 20 to 14 B.C. was the most splendid in his reign. In spite of dependence on Rome, in so far as external grandeur was concerned it could bear comparison with the best times the nation had known.

118. *Ant.* xv 9, 3 (317); Strabo xvi 4, 23 (780). For further details see p. 290 above.

119. *Ant.* xv 10, 1 (342-8); *B.J.* i 20, 4 (398-400). The districts named all lie east of the Lake of Gennesaret (cf. § 17a). On Zenodorus, see Appendix I.

120. *Ant.* xv 10, 3 (354-64); *B.J.* i 20, 4 (398-400); Dio liv 9, 3.

121. *Ant.* xv 10, 3 (362); *B.J.* i 24, 5 (483).

122. *Ant.* xv 10, 3 (360); *B.J.* i 20, 4 (399). The somewhat obscure reference to the procurators in *Ant.* xv 10, 3 (360) reads *ἐγκαταμίγνυσσι δ' αὐτὸν [Niese αὐτήν] τοῖς ἐπιτροπεύουσι τῆς Συρίας ἐντειλάμενος μετὰ τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης τὰ πάντα ποιεῖν, but in B.J. i 20, 4 (399) κατέστῃσε δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ Συρίας ὅλης ἐπίτροπον, . . . ὡς μὴδὲν εἶναι δίχα τῆς ἐκείνου συμβουλίας τοῖς ἐπιτρόποις διοικεῖν*. There cannot in the nature of things be any question of a formal subordination to Herod of the procurators of Syria, but, as is clear from the expression *συμβουλίας* in the second passage, only of instructions to the procurators (the finance officials of the province) to make use of Herod's counsel. It is also possible that instead of *Συρίας ὅλης* (or *Συρίας*) we should read *Συρίας κοίλης*. Cf. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*² I (1881), p. 408; Otto, *Herodes*, col. 74 note. This evidence should perhaps not be taken too seriously, since it probably comes from the flattering pen of Nicolaus of Damascus.

123. *Ant.* xvi 2, 3-5 (27-65). Cf. also xvi 6, 1-8 (160-78) and xii 3, 2 (125-8).

Internally there was of course much that was bad. It was only with distaste that the people suffered the Idumaeans' semi-pagan rule and only his iron, despotic fist that prevented the outbreak of rebellion.

III

Herod's last nine years (13-4 B.C.) was a time of domestic misery during which, in particular, his irreparable quarrel with the sons of Mariamme cast a profound shadow.¹²⁴

Herod's family was a large one. He altogether had ten wives, which as Josephus points out, was permitted by the Law but nevertheless proof of his sensuality.¹²⁵ His first wife was Doris, by whom he had one son, Antipater.¹²⁶ He repudiated them both, and Antipater was only allowed in Jerusalem at the great feasts.¹²⁷ In 37 B.C. Herod married Mariamme, the grand-daughter of Hyrcanus (see p. 283 above), who bore him five children, three sons and two daughters. The youngest of these sons died in Rome,¹²⁸ the two older ones, Alexander and Aristobulus, are the heroes of the following events.¹²⁹ The third wife, whom Herod married about 24 B.C., was likewise called Mariamme. She was the daughter of a distinguished priest from Alexandria who was appointed High Priest by Herod when he married his daughter.¹³⁰ By

124. During this time occurs much of what has already been dealt with in the preceding section. But there can be no firm demarcation of periods. It is at all events generally correct that domestic conflict was the predominating factor in the years 13 B.C. to 4 B.C.

125. *B.J.* i 24, 2 (477); *Ant.* xvii 1, 2 (14): *πάτριον γὰρ πλείωσιν ἐν ταύτῳ ἡμῶν συνοικεῖν*. According to the Mishnah (mSanh. 2:4) eighteen wives were allowed to the king. How many a private man could have, is not stated expressly; it is assumed, however, that he could have four or five (four: mYeb 4:11; mKet. 10:1-6; five: mKer. 3:7; cf. in general also mKid. 2:7; mBekh. 8:4). In noteworthy agreement with this is Justin, *Dial.* 134 *βελτιόν ἐστιν, ὕμῶν τῷ θεῷ ἕπεσθαι ἢ τοῖς ἀσυνέτοις καὶ τυφλοῖς διδασκάλοις ὑμῶν, οἵτινες καὶ μέχρι νῦν καὶ τέσσαρας καὶ πέντε ἔχει ὑμᾶς γυναῖκας ἕκαστον συγχωροῦσι*. Cf. J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, pp. 90, 93 f., 369. According to the Qumran sect, both the king and the commoners were to be monogamous (cf. CDC iv 20-v 2; G. Vermes, *ALUOS* 6 (1969), pp. 88-9).

126. *Ant.* xiv 12, 1 (300). According to *Ant.* xvii 5, 2 (92) Antipater married a daughter of the last Hasmonaean, Antigonus.

127. *Ant.* xvi 3, 3 (78, 85); *B.J.* i 22, 1 (433).

128. *B.J.* i 22, 2 (435).

129. The two daughters were called Salampsio and Cyprus. Their descendants are listed in *Ant.* xviii 5, 4 (130-42). The name Salampsio, *Σαλαμψιώ* is the same as the Hebrew *שלמפסיון* which occurs in inscriptions as a Hebrew woman's name, C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches* I (1899), pp. 386-92; cf. J. B. Frey, *CIJ* nos. 1223, 1265, 1297. For examples found in the Judaean Desert, cf. above p. 229, n. 2.

130. *Ant.* xv 9, 3 (319-22). The name Mariamme is given in *B.J.* i 28, 4 (562) and elsewhere. Josephus in *Ant.* xv 9, 3 (320) gives her father's name as Simon and her grandfather's as Boethus. According to other passages Boethus was her father. See vol. II, § 23, iv.

her he had a son called Herod.¹³¹ Of the remaining seven wives, whom Josephus carefully lists in *Ant.* xvii 1, 3 (19-32) and *B.J.* i 28, 4 (562-3), only the Samaritan, Malthace, the mother of Archelaus and Antipas, and Cleopatra of Jerusalem, the mother of Philip, are of interest.

About 23 B.C., Herod sent the sons of the first Mariamme, Alexander and Aristobulus, for their education to Rome, where they were hospitably received in the house of Pollio.¹³² Some five years later, in 18 or 17 B.C., he himself fetched them home, and kept them from then on at the court in Jerusalem.¹³³ They would then have been about 17 or 18 years old and, in accordance with the custom of time and country, were soon married. Alexander was given Glaphyra, a daughter of the Cappadocian king Archelaus, and Aristobulus Berenice, daughter of Herod's sister Salome.¹³⁴ But although the Hasmonaean and Idumaeans lines of the Herodian house were thus most closely related by marriage, hostility between them was acute. The sons of Mariamme, conscious of their royal blood, looked down on their Idumaeans relations, and these, particularly the worthy Salome, retaliated with common slander. Thus hardly had the sons re-entered their father's house when the plot began to thicken, to become eventually more and more insoluble. Nevertheless for the time being Herod did not allow these slanders to affect his love for his sons.¹³⁵

The king's guilty conscience was, however, too fertile a soil for such seed not to take root and bear fruit. He had to admit that it was the natural heritage of sons to avenge their mother's death, and with Salome constantly depicting the danger with which they both threatened him, he began at last to believe in it, and to view the sons with suspicion.¹³⁶

To counter their ambition and show them that there was someone else who might possibly inherit the throne, he recalled Antipater, whom he had repudiated, and soon afterwards sent him to Rome in the company of Agrippa, who just then, in 13 B.C., was leaving the East to present himself to the emperor.¹³⁷ But in doing so, he put power into

131. *Ant.* xvii 1, 2 (14).

132. *Ant.* xv 10, 1 (342). This is almost universally assumed to be Asinius Pollio; cf. L. H. Feldman, 'Asinius Pollio and his Jewish Interests', *TAPhA* 84 (1953), pp. 73-80; but possibly Vedius Pollio, the notorious friend of Augustus, see R. Syme, 'Who was Vedius Pollio?', *JRS* 51 (1961), pp. 23-30.

133. *Ant.* xvi 1, 2 (6).

134. *Ant.* xvi 1, 2 (11). Berenice was a daughter of Salome and Costobar, *Ant.* xviii 5, 4 (133). She is also mentioned by Strabo xvi 2, 46 (765). King Archelaus of Cappadocia reigned from probably 36 B.C. to A.D. 17; cf. *PIR*² A 1023.

135. *Ant.* xvi 1, 2 (6-11).

136. *Ant.* xvi 3, 1-2 (66-77).

137. *Ant.* xvi 3, 3 (78-86); *B.J.* i 23, 1-2 (445-51).

the hands of the worst enemy of his domestic peace. For from then on, Antipater worked unceasingly, by slandering his half-brothers, to prepare his own way to the throne. The change in their father's mood was naturally not without effect on Alexander and Aristobulus. They responded to his suspicion with undisguised dislike, and complained publicly of their mother's death and their own mortifying treatment.¹³⁸ The rift between father and sons thus deepened, until finally, in 12 B.C., Herod decided to denounce his sons before the emperor. He made the journey with them, and appeared before the emperor at Aquileia as accuser of his sons. By his mild earnestness Augustus succeeded on this occasion in settling the quarrel and re-establishing domestic peace. Having thanked the emperor, father and sons returned home; and Antipater joined them and pretended to be glad at the reconciliation.¹³⁹

Hardly were they back when trouble began once more. Antipater, who was again in the king's entourage, continued tirelessly with his scandalmongering, loyally supported by Herod's brother and sister, Pheroras and Salome. On the other side, Alexander and Aristobulus adopted an increasingly hostile attitude.¹⁴⁰ Peace between father and sons was therefore soon over. The king's suspicion, daily provided with fresh nourishment, became more and more unhealthy until it bordered on mania.¹⁴¹ He had Alexander's supporters interrogated under torture, at first unsuccessfully, until finally one of them made incriminating statements. Thereupon Alexander was committed to prison.¹⁴² When the Cappadocian king Archelaus, Alexander's father-in-law, heard of the ugly situation at the Jewish court, he began to fear for his daughter and son-in-law, and travelled to Jerusalem to attempt a reconciliation. He presented himself to Herod as being very angry with his ill-advised son-in-law, threatened to take his daughter home, and generally behaved with such fury that Herod himself sided with his son and took him under his protection against Archelaus. By this ruse, the crafty Cappadocian brought about the desired reconciliation and was able to return home well satisfied.¹⁴³ The storm was thus once more interrupted by a brief lull.

During this troubled period Herod had also to contend with external enemies, and even with imperial disfavour. The lawless inhabitants of Trachonitis were no longer willing to submit to his severe rule, and some forty of the worst disturbers of the peace found admission to neighbouring Nabataea, where a certain Syllaeus had taken over power

138. *Ant.* xvi 3, 3 (84).

139. *Ant.* xvi 4, 1-6 (87-135); *B.J.* i 23, 3-5 (452-66).

140. *Ant.* xvi 7, 2 ff. (188 ff.); *B.J.* i 24, 1 ff. (467 ff.).

141. Cf. especially *Ant.* xvi 8, 2 (235-40), 5 (254-60); *B.J.* i 24, 8 (492-7).

142. *Ant.* xvi 8, 4 (244-53); *B.J.* i 24, 8 (492-7).

143. *Ant.* xvi 8, 6 (261-70); *B.J.* i 25, 1-6 (498-512).

in place of the weak king, Obodas. When Syllaeus refused to surrender them, Herod, with the consent of Saturninus, the governor of Syria, launched a campaign against the Nabataeans and enforced his rights.¹⁴⁴ But Syllaeus then agitated in Rome. He represented the matter as an unlawful breach of the peace, and was able to go so far as to cause Herod a serious fall from the emperor's favour.¹⁴⁵ To justify his conduct, Herod sent an embassy to Rome, and when this was not received, he sent a second delegation led by Nicolaus of Damascus.¹⁴⁶

Meanwhile, the family discord was rapidly approaching its tragic end. The reconciliation, needless to say, did not last long. To complete the unhappiness, the scheming Lacedaemonian dynast, Eurycles, now came to the court and incited father against sons, and sons against father.¹⁴⁷ The rest of the scandalmongers also continued their work. In the end, matters came to such a pass that Herod committed Alexander and Aristobulus to prison and accused them of high treason before the emperor.¹⁴⁸

Nicolaus of Damascus had in the meantime accomplished his task and won over the emperor to Herod.¹⁴⁹ When the messengers arrived with their accusation, they therefore found Augustus in a favourable mood, and at once handed over their documents. Augustus gave Herod full power to proceed in the matter himself, but advised him to assemble a judicial council at Berytus consisting of Roman officials and his own friends, and to have it examine his sons' guilt.¹⁵⁰

Herod followed the emperor's counsel. The judicial council pronounced the death sentence almost unanimously. Only the governor Saturninus and his three sons opposed it. Yet it was still doubtful

144. *Ant.* xvi 9, 1-2 (271-85).

145. *Ant.* xvi 9, 3 (286-92). Cf. Nic. Dam. FGrH 90 F 136.

146. *Ant.* xvi 9, 4 (293-9).

147. *Ant.* xvi 10, 1 (300-10); *B.J.* i 26, 1-4 (513-33). On Eurycles see pp. 311-12 above.

148. *Ant.* xvi 10, 5-7 (320-34); *B.J.* i 27, 1 (534-7).

149. *Ant.* xvi 10, 8-9 (335-55). Nic. Dam., *loc. cit.* (n. 145).

150. *Ant.* xvi 11, 1 (356-60); *B.J.* i 27, 1 (534-7). Berytus was recommended by Augustus because it was a Roman colony, i.e. a centre of Roman life in the neighbourhood of Palestine. According to Strabo xvi 2, 19 (755-6) Agrippa settled two legions (i.e. the veterans of two legions) at Berytus. This he will have done in 15 B.C., on the occasion of his visit to that region (see p. 292 above). Eusebius dates the founding of the colony of Berytus (from the text of Jerome, which is to be preferred to the Armenian) in the year 2003 from Abraham or the 30th of Augustus (Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene II, p. 143), i.e. 14 B.C. (for Eusebius reckons 43 B.C., as the first year of Augustus). Augustus states in the *Res Gestae* 16 that in 14 B.C., *consulibus M. Crasso et Cn. Lentulo*, he paid large sums to cities for estates which he assigned to veterans. The two legions were leg. V Mac. and VIII Aug. The full name of Berytus as a colony was *Colonia Iulia Augusta Felix Berytus* (CIL III, nos. 161, 165, 166, 6041). Cf. also Pliny, *NH* v 20/78; Jos. *B.J.* vii 3, 1 (39); *Digest.* 15, 1, 1; 7, 8, 3. The coins are in Eckhel,

whether Herod would carry out the sentence; an old soldier, Teron, even ventured to plead publicly in favour of the condemned. But he and 300 others denounced as adherents of Alexander and Aristobulus, paid for it with their lives. The sentence was then executed without delay. In Sebaste (Samaria), where Mariamme's marriage had been celebrated thirty years earlier, her sons were executed by strangulation (probably in 7 B.C.).¹⁵¹

Peace, however, did not return to Herod's house. Antipater was now all-powerful at court and enjoyed his father's absolute confidence. But he was not satisfied. He wanted total power, and could hardly wait for his father to die. In the meantime, he set out to secure a following by giving lavish presents. He also had secret conferences with Herod's brother, Pheroras, the tetrarch of Peraea, which aroused suspicion. Salome soon heard of them and secretly informed the king.¹⁵² As a result, relations between Herod and Antipater gradually became strained, and to avoid conflict Antipater found it convenient to have himself sent to Rome. That Herod still did not suspect him is evident from his will at that time naming Antipater as heir to the throne; Herod, the son of the High Priest's daughter Mariamme, was named successor, only in the event that Antipater died before his father.¹⁵³

When Antipater was in Rome, Pheroras died.¹⁵⁴ With this, the fate of Antipater was also sealed. A number of Pheroras's freedmen went to Herod and advanced the opinion that Pheroras had been poisoned; Herod should investigate the matter more closely. The investigation proved that poison was present, but that although it had come from Antipater, was not intended for Pheroras. It had been handed to him by Antipater so that he would administer it to Herod. Herod now also heard through the female slaves of Pheroras's house about the statements which Antipater had made during his secret conferences, about his complaints over the king's longevity, about the uncertainty of his

Doctr. Num. III, 354-9; Mionnet, *Descr. de médailles ant.* V, 334-51, Suppl. VIII, 238-50; Babelon, *Catalogues des monnaies grecques de la Bibliothèque nationale, Les Perses Achéménides etc.* (1893), pp. 166-91; *BMC Phoenicia*, pp. xlvi-lx. See in general R. Mouterde, J. Lauffray, *Beyrouth ville romaine: histoire et monuments* (1952); R. Mouterde, 'Regards sur Beyrouth phénicienne, hellénistique et romaine', *Mél. Univ. St. Joseph* 40 (1964), pp. 145-90. In the later period of the empire there was in Berytus a celebrated school of Roman law, *Cod. Just.* I, 17, 2, 9; X 49, 1; P. Collinet, *Histoire de l'École de droit de Beyrouth* (1925).

151. *Ant.* xvi 11, 2-7 (361-94); *B.J.* i 27, 2-6 (538-51). *Nic. Dam.* FG¹H 90 F 136 (4). On punishment by strangulation among the Jews: *mSanh.* 7:1, 3; also *mTer.* 7:2; *mKet.* 4:3; *mSanh.* 6:5; 9:3, 6; 11:1; cf. P. Winter, *Trial*, pp. 70-4; among the Romans: *RE s.v.* 'Laqueus'. See also § 10, n. 22 above.

152. *Ant.* xvii 1, 1 (1-11); 2, 4 (32-45); *B.J.* i 28, 1 (552-5); 29, 1 (567-70).

153. *Ant.* xvii 3, 2 (52-3); *B.J.* i 29, 2 (573).

154. *Ant.* xvii 3, 3 (59-60); *B.J.* i 29, 4 (580).

prospects, and much else.¹⁵⁵ Herod could no longer be in any doubt concerning the hostile designs of his favourite son. Making all sorts of pretences he recalled him from Rome to put him on trial at home. Antipater, suspecting nothing, came and to his great surprise—for although his plots had been discovered seven months ago, he had heard nothing about it—was taken prisoner as he entered the royal palace.¹⁵⁶ The next day he was brought for trial before Varus, the governor of Syria. Since in the face of the factual evidence he was unable to produce anything in his defence, Herod put him in chains and sent a report to the emperor.¹⁵⁷

Herod was now almost seventy years old. His days, too, were numbered. He suffered from a malady from which he would not recover. In the new will which he now made, he named as his successor his youngest son Antipas, the son of the Samaritan Malthace.¹⁵⁸

During his sickness he was also to find out how anxiously the people longed to be free of him, and yearned for the moment when they would be able to cast off his semi-pagan rule. When news spread that his illness was incurable, two rabbis, Judas the son of Sapphorea and Matthias the son of Margaloth, incited the people to tear down the offensive eagle from the Temple gate.¹⁵⁹ They were listened to only too readily, and amidst a great hubbub the work pleasing to God was done. But Herod, in spite of his malady, was still strong enough to pronounce the death sentence, and he commanded the ringleaders to be burned alive.¹⁶⁰

The old king became increasingly sick; even the baths of Callirrhoe across the Jordan failed to bring him relief.¹⁶¹ On his return to Jericho,

155. *Ant.* xvii 4, 1-2 (61-78); *B.J.* i 30, 1-7 (582-600).

156. *Ant.* xvii 4, 3 (79-82); 5, 1-2 (83-92); *B.J.* i 31, 2-5 (604-19).

157. *Ant.* xvii 5, 3-7 (93-141); *B.J.* i 32, 1-5 (620-40). Cf. also *Nic. Dam.*, FG¹H 90 F 136 (5)-(7).

158. *Ant.* xvii 6, 1 (146-8); *B.J.* i 32, 7 (644-6).

159. The names of the rabbis are given in *Ant.* xvii 6, 2 (149) as: 'Ιούδας ὁ Σαριφαίου καὶ Μαθθίας ὁ Μαργαλόθου [Niese Μεργαλόθου], but in *B.J.* i 33, 2 (648): 'Ιούδας τε υἱὸς Σεπφωραίου [Niese Σεπφωραίου] καὶ Μαθθίας ἕτερος Μαργάλου. See Schalit, *op. cit.*, p. 638.

160. *Ant.* xvii 6, 2-4 (149-67); *B.J.* i 33, 1-4 (647-55).

161. *Ant.* xvii 6, 5 (168-79); *B.J.* i 33, 5 (656-8). Callirrhoe is also mentioned by Pliny, *NH* v 16/72; Ptolem. v 16, 9; Jerome, *Quaest. in Gen.* 10:19; on the mosaic map at Madaba (*θερμα Καλλιρροῆς*), M. Avi-Yonah, *The Madaba Mosaic Map* (1954), p. 40, and in rabbinical literature (S. Krauss, *Griech. und lat. Lehnwörter im Talmud etc.* II, p. 550; קלררה). Jewish tradition identifies Callirrhoe and the Biblical לַשֵׁׁלֵט: Tg. Ps.-Jon. and Neof. on Gen. 10:19 (קלררה); Ber. R., 37:6; following this, Jerome, *Quaest. Hebr. in Genes.* 10:19 (*opp.* ed. Vallarsi III, p. 321; PL xxiii, col. 955) 'hoc tantum adnotandum videtur, quod Lise ipsa sit quae nunc Callirrhoe dicitur, ubi aquae calidae prorumpentes in mare mortuum fluunt'. For a closer definition of its site, two warm springs (or groups of springs) have to be considered: (1) those in Wadi Zerka Ma'in (Conder, *The Survey of Eastern Palestine* I (1889), p. 102; Buhl, *Geogr.*, pp. 50 f.; Legendre, 'Callirrhoe'

he is said to have given orders that the distinguished men whom he had locked in the hippodrome should be shot down when he died so that at his funeral the mourning should be worthy of him.¹⁶² In all the suffering which his sickness caused him, he nevertheless experienced the satisfaction of promoting the death of his son Antipater, the principal instigator of his domestic misery. Permission arrived from the emperor for Antipater's execution in the very last days of Herod's life, and was soon afterwards carried out.¹⁶³

A few days before his death, Herod once again altered his will. This time he named Archelaus, the elder son of Malthace, as king, his brother Antipas as tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea, and Philip, the son of Cleopatra of Jerusalem, as tetrarch of Gaulanitis, Trachonitis, Batanaea and Pania.¹⁶⁴

Finally, five days after the execution of Antipater, he died in Jericho, unmourned by his family and hated by the whole nation (4 B.C.).¹⁶⁵

[Text continues on p. 328]

in DB II, pp. 69-72); (2) the springs of Es-Sara, on the Dead Sea, south of the mouth of Wadi Zerka Ma'in (Dechent in ZDPV 7 (1884), pp. 196-201; Buhl, p. 41). Earlier authorities associated Callirrhoe with the former. Dechent, *loc. cit.* (pp. 196-201), however, identified Callirrhoe with the springs of Es-Sara, and rightly so. For (1) they alone flow into the Dead Sea, as Josephus and Jerome assert of the springs of Callirrhoe. (2) The springs in Wadi Zerka, at some distance from its mouth, are obviously to be identified with the place *Badpas* described by Josephus in *B.J.* vii 6, 2 (178-89) (in the gorge north of Machaerus, with various hot springs). These springs of Baaru are also mentioned by Jerome (Euseb., *Onomast.*, ed. Klostermann, pp. 45-7 'iuxta Baaru in Arabia, ubi aquas calidas sponte humus effert', in the account of the life of Peter the Iberian (Raabe, *Petrus der Iberer* (1895), pp. 82 and 87), and on the Madaba mosaic map (for the mutilated . . . *apov*, characterized in the accompanying vignette as a place of warm springs, ought certainly to be restored as *Baapov*, see Avi-Yonah, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-40). But according to the mosaic map, Baaru and Callirrhoe are different places, which is in any case likely because Josephus does not mention the name Callirrhoe in his description of Baaras. Callirrhoe is therefore to be identified with the springs south of the mouth of the Zerka. See also Abel, *Géog. Pal.* I, pp. 87, 156, 461; H. Donner, 'Kallirrhoe', ZDPV 79 (1963), pp. 59-89.

162. *Ant.* xvii 6, 5 (173-5); *B.J.* i 33, 6 (659-60). The orders were not carried out, *Ant.* xvii 8, 2 (193); *B.J.* i 33, 8 (666). Cf. a similar rabbinic tradition in Meg. Taan. § 25 in connection with the death of Alexander Jannaeus. See Lichtenstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 271, 343; Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 164-5.

163. *Ant.* xvii 7 (182-7); *B.J.* i 33, 7 (661-4); Nic. Dam. *loc. cit.*

164. *Ant.* xvii 8, 1 (188-90); *B.J.* i 33, 7-8 (664-9).

165. *Ant.* xvii 8, 1 (191); *B.J.* i 33, 8 (665). On the actual date of his death we have the following evidence. Herod died shortly before a Passover, *Ant.* xvii 9, 3 (213); *B.J.* ii 1, 3 (10), therefore probably in March or April. Since Josephus states that he reigned 37 years from the date of his appointment (40 B.C.), 34 years from his conquest of Jerusalem, 37 B.C. Cf. *Ant.* xvii 8, 1 (191); *B.J.* i 33, 8 (665), it might appear as though he died in 3 B.C. But we know that Josephus reckons one year too many—according to our method of counting: e.g. 27 years from the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey to its conquest by Herod, *Ant.* xiv 16, 4 (488), whereas it is only 26 (63-37 B.C.); 107 years from the conquest by Herod to that

by Titus, *Ant.* xx 10, 5 (250), whereas it is only 106 (37 B.C.—A.D. 70). He counts the spring of 31 B.C. as Herod's seventh year, *Ant.* xv 5, 2 (121); *B.J.* i 19, 3 (370), whereas it was only the sixth from July 37 B.C. From this it is evident that he reckoned the portions of a year as full years, and probably counted regnal years (as the Mishnah suggests, from Nisan to Nisan (cf. mR.Sh. 1:1: באחד בניסן ראש השנה למלכים)). If this be the case, Herod's 34th year began on 1 Nisan of 4 B.C., and since he died before Passover, his death must have taken place between 1 and 14 Nisan 4 B.C. This reckoning is confirmed by an astronomical datum and the chronology of Herod's successors.

1. Shortly before Herod's death there was an eclipse of the moon, *Ant.* xvii 6, 4 (167). This probably indicates 4 B.C., in which year an eclipse of the moon was visible in Jerusalem during the night of 12/13 March, whereas in the years 3 and 2 B.C. there was no such phenomenon at all in Palestine; F. K. Ginzel, *Spezieller Kanon der Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse für das Ländergebiet der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften und den Zeitraum von 900 vor Chr. bis 600 nach Chr.* (1899), pp. 195-6; see also Ginzel, *Handbuch de math. und techn. Chronologie II* (1899), pp. 195-6; see also Ginzel, *Handbuch de math. und techn. Chronologie II* (1911), pp. 535-43. Only in 5 B.C., on 15 Sept., and in 1 B.C., on 9 Jan. were there also eclipses of the moon visible in Jerusalem (Ginzel, *op. cit.*). But from other evidence the later of these dates is excluded (see below), though the earlier remains at least possible. In 4 B.C. Passover (15 Nisan) fell on 11 April (Ginzel, *op. cit.*).

2. The chronology of Herod's two successors, Archelaus and Antipas, requires 4 B.C. as the year of Herod's death.

(a) Archelaus. According to Dio lv 27, 6, Archelaus was deposed by Augustus in A.D. 6 (the consulship of Aemilius Lepidus and L. Arruntius), in the tenth year of his reign (so *Ant.* xvii 13, 2 (342), cf. *Vita* 1 (5), correcting the earlier statement of *B.J.* ii 7, 3 (111) 'in the ninth'). Accordingly, he began his reign in 4 B.C.

(b) Antipas. Antipas was deposed by Caligula in the summer of A.D. 39 (see § 17b below). Since we have coins dating from the 43rd year of his reign, it began at the latest in 4 B.C.

From all the data, it thus emerges that Herod died in 4 B.C. shortly before Passover.

In reference to matters of detail the following points may be noted:

(1) The custom of reckoning a part, however small, of the calendar year at the beginning and end of a reign, as a full regnal year, undoubtedly holds good for Egypt. Not only the years of the Ptolemies, but also those of the Roman emperors were reckoned in this way in Egypt (cf. E. J. Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World* (1968), p. 66). Later this reckoning of the years of an emperor became usual outside Egypt (Mommsen, I, pp. 501 f., II 2, pp. 756 ff.). Unger believed that Josephus also reckoned the regnal years of the Hasmonaeans in this way (see pp. 200-1 above). (2) Of the coins of Antipas of the year 43 (MT) three exemplars are now known (Madden, *Coins of the Jews* (1881), pp. 121 f., two according to Lenormant, *Trésor de Numismatique*, p. 125, pl. LIX, nos. 19 and 20, one according to de Saulcy, *Mélanges de Numismatique II* (1877), p. 92). Their existence is thus beyond doubt. Difficulties, however, are created by coins alleged to bear the dates 44 (MA) and 45 (ME). The coin of the year 44 (MA) is not only described by the rather unreliable Vaillant, but also, in a manuscript travel narrative by Galand, who found it near Jericho in 1674 (communicated by Fréret in *Mémoires de l'Académie des inscr. et belles-lettres* 21 (1754), pp. 292 f.). In particular, Sanclemente, pp. 315-19 and Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* III, 487 f. have dealt with it thoroughly. Both conjecture that the date has been incorrectly read (it may well have been AA=34). Cf. also *pro* and *contra*: Madden, *History*, p. 99

A solemn funeral procession accompanied the royal corpse for eight stadia from Jericho in the direction of Herodium, where he was buried.¹⁶⁶

and *Coins*, p. 122; Riess (1880), pp. 55-7; Kellner, p. 176. Eckhel's reasons are very plausible; he points out in particular that, as regards its condition in other respects, the coin described by Galand agrees with those of the year 34, but not with those of 43. Difficulty arises only from the fact that in Fréret, p. 293 we read in reference to Galand's description: 'les lettres de l'époque *ME* sont très nettement figurées dans son manuscrit et absolument séparées l'une de l'autre'. But the drawing in Galand's manuscript is not decisive, and the coin itself can no longer be traced. During the last century a coin appeared with the year number 45 (*ME*) (see Wandel in *Neue kirchl. Zeitschrift* (1894), pp. 302 f.). According to an illustration of it produced by Wandel, it is related to the coin of the year 43, having on the reverse the inscription *Γαω Καισαρι Γερ Σε*. If as is asserted the date *ME* can really be read clearly, this must be a forgery. In no case can the death of Herod be placed earlier than 4 B.C. It would be preferable to extend the period of Antipas's reign to A.D. 40, although it would still not cope with the coin of the year 45. Later discussions (*BMC Palestine*, p. xcvi; Reifenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 19; Meshorér, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-5) implicitly accept these conclusions, but add nothing. (3) Attempts to determine the day of Herod's death more closely with the help of Jewish tradition are untenable. In Megillath Taanith 7 Kislev and 2 Shebat are described as days of rejoicing (see Derenbourg, *Histoire*, pp. 442-6, §§ 21 and 25; H. Lichtenstein, 'Die Fastenrolle', *HUCA* (1931-32), pp. 271-2, 293-5, 339, 343; S. Zeitlin, 'Megillat Taanit' *JQR* 10 (1919-20), pp. 272-6, 279-80; B. Z. Lurie, *Megillath Taanith* (1964), pp. 161-3. But only the Hebrew scholion, which is late and unsupported by any real tradition, observes that 7 Kislev was the day of Herod's death, and 2 Shebat that of the death of Jannæus. Therefore 4 B.C. is the generally accepted date for Herod's death, e.g. Otto, *op. cit.*, cols. 147-9, *PIR*² H 153; Schalit, *op. cit.*, p. 643. The argument for putting his death as late as 1 B.C. recently advanced by W. E. Filmer, 'The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great', *JThSt.* 17 (1966), pp. 283-98, has been conclusively refuted by T. D. Barnes, 'The Date of Herod's Death', *JThSt.* 19 (1968), pp. 204-9, who further revives the suggestion that the eclipse of the moon mentioned as occurring shortly before Herod's death, *Ant.* xvii 6, 4 (167), normally taken to be that of 13 March 4 B.C., could have been that of 15/16 Sept. 5 B.C. Herod's death may then have happened on 7 Kislev (December) 5 B.C. the date of the festival mentioned in Megillath Taanith and explained (see above) by a late commentator as the anniversary of his death. But 4 B.C. remains the most satisfactory solution.

166. *Ant.* xvii 8, 3 (199) ἤσαν δὲ ἐπὶ Ἡρώδειου στάδια ὀκτώ. *B.J.* i 33, 9 (673) σταδίου δὲ ἑκομίσθη τὸ σῶμα διακοσίου εἰς Ἡρώδειον. The former passage states how far the solemn procession accompanied the corpse, the latter gives the distance from Jericho to Herodium. By the reading *ἑβδομήκοντα* which is given in two manuscripts in *B.J.* i 33, 9 (673) must be meant the distance from Jerusalem, and for that very reason it cannot be original. Undoubtedly, the more important of the two fortresses of the same name is intended (see p. 307 above), nearly two hundred stadia from Jericho. Since Herod was buried there, the *μνημεῖον* of Herod near Jerusalem, *B.J.* v 3, 2 (109); 12, 2 (507), is only a memorial and does not mark the actual grave. On the hypogaeum in the Wadi Rababy commonly identified as the *μνημεῖον* of Herod, see L. H. Vincent and M. H. Stève, *Jerusalem de l'Ancient Testament* (1954), pp. 342-6 and 710; it was quite possibly a family tomb for the house of Herod.

The end of his reign was as bloody as its beginning. Its better times lay between the two. But even then, Herod was a despot, and despite all the brilliance of his reign, not a man of personal distinction. The epithet 'Great' by which it is customary to differentiate him from lesser descendants of the same name is justified only in this relative sense.¹⁶⁷

167. It is in this sense that *ὁ μέγας* is meant by Josephus in the sole passage where it appears, *Ant.* xviii 5, 4 (130).