

## EXCURSUS: AGRIPPA II A.D. 50-(?)92/3

## Bibliography

- Derenbourg, J., *Histoire de la Palestine*, pp. 252-4.  
 Saulcy, F. de, 'Étude chronologique de la vie et des monnaies des rois juifs Agrippa I et Agrippa II', *Mém. Soc. Franç. de Num. et d'Arch.* 3 (1869), pp. 26-56.  
 Brann, M., 'Biographie Agrippa's II', *MGWJ* 19 (1870), pp. 433-44, 529-48; 20 (1871), pp. 13-28.  
 Baerwald, H., *Josephus in Galiläa, sein Verhältniss zu den Parteien, insbesondere zu Justus von Tiberias und Agrippa II* (1877).  
 Rosenberg, A., *RE* s.v. 'Iulius' (54).  
 Abel, F.-M., *Histoire de la Palestine* I (1952), pp. 475-7.  
 Winter, P., *On the Trial of Jesus* (1961), pp. 75 ff., 127 ff.  
 Frankfort, T., 'Le royaume d'Agrippa II et son annexion par Domitien', *Mélanges Grenier* (1962), pp. 659-72.  
 Seyrig, M., 'Les ères d'Agrippa II', *RN* 6 (1964), pp. 55-65.  
 Avi-Yonah, M., 'The Epitaph of Mucius Clemens', *IEJ* 16 (1966), pp. 258-64.  
 See also the bibliographies above in §§ 16-18.

Agrippa II, whose full name as given on coins and inscriptions was Marcus Iulius Agrippa,<sup>1</sup> son of Agrippa I, seems like almost all the members of the Herodian family to have been educated in Rome. He was there, in any case, when his father died in A.D. 44 and Claudius wished to appoint him as successor to the throne.<sup>2</sup> As has been seen, at the instigation of the emperor's counsellors, who pleaded Agrippa's immaturity, this did not happen. The young prince remained for a time in Rome, where he made use of his connexions at court to be of service to his compatriots, as in the dispute over the High Priest's vestments,<sup>3</sup> and in the conflict during the time of Cumanus.<sup>4</sup> It was mainly due to him that Cumanus did not escape the punishment he

1. On the coins of Agrippa cf. F. W. Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage*, pp. 113-33; *Coins of the Jews* (1881), pp. 139-69; *BMC Palestine*, pp. xcvi-c, 239-47; A. Reifenberg, *Ancient Jewish Coins* (1947), pp. 25-7, 49-54; Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (1967), pp. 81-7, 141-53; *idem*, 'A New Type of Coins of Agrippa II', *IEJ* 21 (1971), pp. 164-5. The basic modern study of the eras of Agrippa II, attested mainly by the coins, is H. Seyrig, 'Les ères d'Agrippa II', *RN* 6 (1964), pp. 55-65. The name Marcus occurs on a coin from the time of Nero: Βασιλέως (sic) Μάρκου Ἀγρίππου (Madden, *Coins*, p. 146). In the light of this, an inscription at Halbut, not far from Abila of Lysanias, should probably be completed in the following manner: Ἐπι Βασιλέως μεγάλου Μάρκου Ἰουλίου Ἀγρίππα φίλοῦ καίσαρος καὶ φιλορωμαίων (sic), OGIS 420. The name Iulius appears on an inscription at El Hit, north of Hauran; Ἐπι βασιλέω[s . . .] Ἰουλίου Ἀγρίππα, OGIS 421. The connexion of the inscription with Agrippa II is not absolutely certain but very probable. In any case, even without this evidence the appellation Iulius may be assumed *a priori* for Agrippa II, since the whole family bore the name; see above, p. 452.

2. *Ant.* xix 9, 2 (360-3).

3. *Ant.* xx 1, 2 (10-14); xv 11, 4 (403-9). Cf. above, p. 456.

4. *Ant.* xx 6, 3 (134-6). Cf. above, p. 459.

deserved. But this incident occurred already in A.D. 52,<sup>5</sup> by which time Claudius, in compensation for the loss of his father's territories, had bestowed on him another, though smaller, kingdom. For, some time after the death of his uncle, Herod of Chalcis (see Appendix I), in perhaps A.D. 50, he was given the latter's kingdom in the Lebanon and the same charge of the Temple and right to appoint the High Priests that his uncle had enjoyed.<sup>6</sup> He made frequent use of this right, deposing and nominating High Priests, until the outbreak of the war in A.D. 66. He probably stayed in Rome at first, and did not actually assume the government of his kingdom until after A.D. 52.

He can barely have returned to Palestine, and perhaps not at all, when in A.D. 53 (the 13th year of Claudius) he was granted, in return for the surrender of the small kingdom of Chalcis, a larger realm, namely, the tetrarchy of Philip (Batanaea, Trachonitis and Gaulanitis), the tetrarchy of Lysanias (Abila), as well as the territory of Varus.<sup>7</sup> This territory was enlarged still further after the death of Claudius by Nero, who added to it important parts of Galilee and Peraea, namely

5. About this time, probably in A.D. 53, a text partially preserved in Egyptian papyri, the *Acta Isidori*, represents Agrippa as being accused in Rome by an Alexandrian Greek delegation led by Isidorus. See H. A. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum* (1954), no. IV; see the commentary on pp. 117-40; the Agrippa concerned may however be Agrippa I, and the date A.D. 41; see CPJ, no. 156, and p. 398 above.

6. *Ant.* xx 5, 2 (104); *B.J.* ii 12, 1 (223); cf. *Ant.* xx 9, 7 (222) 'Ἐπιπλοῦντο γὰρ ὑπὸ Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τοῦ ἱεροῦ. There is no mention of the transference of the right to appoint High Priests, but only of its actual exercise (cf. below, § 23, iv). That the grant of the kingdom was not made before A.D. 50 may be concluded from *B.J.* ii 14, 4 (284), according to which Agrippa had reached the 17th year of his reign when war broke out in the month of Artemisius (Iyyar) of A.D. 66. So if he is regarded as a Jewish king and his reign reckoned, in accordance with mR.Sh. 1:1, from 1 Nisan to 1 Nisan, his seventeenth year began on the 1st Nisan A.D. 66, and his first, on the 1st Nisan A.D. 50 at the earliest, but probably somewhat later.

7. *Ant.* xx 7, 1 (138); *B.J.* ii 12, 8 (247). To the tetrarchy of Lysanias doubtless belonged Helbon (not far from Abila Lysanias), where the inscription mentioned above (note 1) was found. Josephus explains ἐπαρχία Οὐάρου in *Vita*, II (48 ff.). For the Varus mentioned here (=Noarus, *B.J.* ii 18, 6 (481-6)), whom Josephus describes as ἑκγονος Σοέμου τοῦ περὶ τὸν Λίβανον τετραρχοῦντος, is most probably identical with our Varus. Again, his father Sohaemus was none other than the Soaemus who at the end of A.D. 38 obtained from Caligula τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῶν Ἀράβων . . . ἀρχήν (Dio lix 12, 2), which territory he governed until his death in A.D. 49, when it was incorporated into the province of Syria (Tac. *Ann.* xii 23). It may therefore be assumed that part of the territory in the Lebanon had been left to his son Varus for a time, and that this is the ἐπαρχία Οὐάρου which Claudius bestowed on Agrippa. Since Agrippa received the new territory in the 13th year of Claudius (24 January 53 to the same date in 54) after ruling over Chalcis for four years (δυναστεύσας ταύτης ἔτη τέσσαρα), and since his 4th year according to the reckoning above (note 5) began on the 1st Nisan A.D. 53, the gift must have been bestowed towards the end of A.D. 53.

the cities of Tiberias and Tarichea with their surrounding districts, and the city of Julias with fourteen neighbouring villages.<sup>8</sup>

8. *Ant.* xx 8, 4 (159); *B.J.* ii 13, 2 (252). In the latter passage, Abila is mentioned as being in Peraea; cf. vol. II, § 23, i. By Julias, A. Schlatter, *Zur Topogr. und Gesch. Palästinas*, p. 50, understands not Julias-Bethsaida, but Julias-Livias, in the vicinity of which there was also an Abel or Abila (see vol. II, § 23, i). These possessions must therefore have been enclaves in southern Peraea widely separated from the rest of Agrippa's territory, cf. A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, p. 275, and Frankfort, *op. cit.*, p. 662. A fragment of an inscription bearing Agrippa's name, which was found in southern Peraea, allegedly east of Philadelphia, appears to support this supposition (C. Clermont-Ganneau, CRAI 1898, p. 811; also his *Archaeological Researches in Palestine I* (1899), pp. 499-501). However, the locality of the find is doubtful (Wadi el Kittar? east of Philadelphia), and so is the connexion of the inscription with King Agrippa II (definitely legible is only φιλο . . . ιου Αγριπ . . . Κοκκηριου Ακ; the completion φιλο[ρωμαιου] is not certain, and the completion [Ιου]λιου unlikely according to the remains available, since before ιου there is not Α but Ν or Η) If one of the two kings of this name is meant at all, Agrippa I is the more likely. Thus this evidence does not amount to further proof that the possessions of Agrippa II extended so far to the south. When exactly Nero's gift was made, cannot be determined with certainty. On the later coins of Agrippa, his regnal years are reckoned according to an era beginning in A.D. 61. It is possible that the basis of this era is that this was the year in which Agrippa's territories were increased by Nero. The separation of the respective regions of Galilee and Peraea would then have taken place immediately after the departure of Felix and assumption of office by Festus. This could be the meaning of a passing reference according to which Tiberias remained under Roman rule μέχρι Φήλικος προεσταμένου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, *Vita* 9 (37). Yet this μέχρι does not of itself mean 'until the end of Felix's term of office'; and this lends uncertainty to the assumption concerning an era of Agrippa beginning in A.D. 56. Nero's enlargement of Agrippa's territory might be adduced as the basis of this also (so Graetz, MGWJ (1877), pp. 344-9, for whom the rebuilding of Caesarea Philippi=Neronias is the basis of the era starting in A.D. 61; this view may be supported by the hypothesis of Meshorer, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-7, that certain coins marked ΕΠΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕ(ΩΣ) ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙ(ΟΥ) ΝΕΡΩΝΙ(ΑΔΟΣ?) Ε refer to the refoundation in the fifth year of Agrippa's era). The era of A.D. 61 can be calculated from certain coins on which the 26th year of Agrippa is made to synchronize with the 12th consulship of Domitian (Meshorer, *op. cit.*, nos. 141-3) and another on which the 25th year of Agrippa is likewise synchronized with the 12th consulship of Domitian (Meshorer, no. 140). Since this consulship occurs in A.D. 86, the 26th year of Agrippa also began in that year, and consequently the era according to which he reckons, in A.D. 61. For a new type with this era see Y. Meshorer, 'A New Type of Coins of Agrippa II', *IEJ* 21 (1971), pp. 164-5. An era beginning five years earlier is indicated by two coins and an inscription. Both coins bear the date ετους α' του και ω (the figure represents the number 6); see Meshorer, nos. 99 and 100. The 11th regnal year of Agrippa according to one era is therefore identical with the 6th according to the other. Both of these eras are applied on an inscription found at Sanamen in Hauran: ετους λζ' του και λβ' βασιλείως Ἀγρίππα, OGIS 426=IGR III 1127, and one from Soueida (years 16 and 21), Syria 5 (1924), p. 324=SEG VII 970. In each case, one era begins five years before the other. H. Seyrig, *op. cit.* (n. 1), argues that the era of 56 is the basis of the great majority of the year numbers on Agrippa's coinage. Apart from a few coins with the head of Nero, and attributed by Meshorer (above) to A.D. 61 as foundation coins of Neronias, the known coins of Agrippa will thus stretch from A.D. 69/70 to 90/91,

Of Agrippa's private life there is little favourable to report. His sister Berenice,<sup>9</sup> widowed by the death of Herod of Chalcis in A.D. 48 (see below, Appendix I), lived from then on in her brother's house and soon had that weak man so much in her power that—the mother of two children—she was credited with the worst reputation. When the scandal became public, Berenice took steps to quash the evil gossip by inducing King Polemon of Cilicia to marry her and to submit to circumcision for that purpose. The marriage probably did not take place until after A.D. 64.<sup>10</sup> Berenice did not persevere long with Polemon but returned to her brother and seems to have resumed the old relationship with him. At least, this was later spoken about quite openly in Rome.<sup>11</sup>

In matters of foreign policy, Agrippa renounced even the small measure of independence which his father had sought to secure and subordinated himself unconditionally to Rome. He provided auxiliary troops for the Parthian campaign (A.D. 54),<sup>12</sup> and when the new procurator, Festus, came to Palestine in about A.D. 60, he and his sister Berenice hastened with great pomp (*μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας*) to welcome him.<sup>13</sup> He named his capital, Caesarea Philippi, Neronias in honour of the emperor, and the city of Berytus, which his father had adorned with magnificent specimens of pagan art, owed further gifts to his gracious favour.<sup>14</sup> His coins, almost without exception, bear the

9. On Berenice, see RE s.v. 'Berenike' (15); PIR<sup>2</sup> I 651 (Julia Berenice); E. Miraux, *La reine Bérénice* (1951).

10. Polemon was king of Pontus from A.D. 38 to 64. In A.D. 41, he was awarded in addition part of Cilicia, which he retained when in A.D. 63 Pontus became a Roman province. He ruled in Cilicia until at least the time of Galba (see above, p. 450). As Josephus describes him on the occasion of his marriage merely as *Κιλίκίας βασιλεύς*, *Ant.* xx 7, 3 (145), it probably did not take place until after A.D. 64. Support for this is found in the fact that Berenice had already been a widow for a long time after A.D. 48, when Herod of Chalcis died (*πολὸν χρόνον ἐπιχρηεύσασα*). She was at any rate back in Judaea from A.D. 66; but the period A.D. 64–66 leaves enough time for the marriage, which was of short duration. According to the context in Josephus, it seems that the wedding took place before the death of Claudius (A.D. 54). But as is now apparent, this implication is deceptive. Berenice's age causes least difficulties for she was still able to charm Titus in A.D. 70.

11. *Ant.* xx 7, 3 (145). Cf. Juvenal, *Sat.* vi, 156–60:

... deinde adamans notissimus et Berenices  
in digito factus pretiosior; hunc dedit olim  
barbarus incestae, dedit hunc Agrippa sorori,  
observant ubi festa mero pede sabbata reges,  
et vetus indulget senibus clementia porcis.

12. Tac. *Ann.* xiii 7.

13. Acts 25:13, 23

14. *Ant.* xx 9, 4 (211). The city is named Neronias also on the coins (see n. 7 above). That the capital was not Tiberias—and therefore certainly Neronias—is clear from Josephus, *Vita* 9 (37–9).

names and images of the reigning emperors: Nero, Vespasian, Titus and Domitian. Like his father, he too styled himself *βασιλεὺς μέγας φιλόκαισαρ εὐσεβῆς καὶ φιλορώμαιος*.<sup>15</sup>

That he was altogether more attached to the Roman rather than to the Jewish side is evident from an incident characteristic in yet another connexion of his indolence and weakness. When he visited Jerusalem, he used to stay in the former palace of the Hasmonaeans.<sup>16</sup> This building, which was already tall, he made considerably higher by the addition of a tower so that he could survey the city and the Temple from there, and during his idle hours observe the sacred proceedings. To the priests, this indolent onlooker was offensive, and they blocked his view by building a wall. Agrippa then turned for assistance to his friend, the procurator Festus, who was ready to help. But a Jewish deputation went expressly to Rome and through the mediation of the empress Poppaea arranged that the wall should stay. So from then on Agrippa had to dispense with his pleasant pastime.<sup>17</sup>

In spite of his unconditional submission to Rome, Agrippa nevertheless tried to keep on good terms with Judaism. His brothers-in-law, Azizus of Emesa and Polemon of Cilicia, were required on their marriage to his sisters to submit to circumcision.<sup>18</sup> Rabbinical tradition tells of questions concerning the law which Agrippa's minister, or the king himself, addressed to the famous Rabbi Eliezer (ben Hyrcanus).<sup>19</sup> Even Berenice, who was as bigoted as she was dissolute, appears once as a Nazirite in Jerusalem.<sup>20</sup> Although, according to the Acts of the Apostles, Agrippa and Berenice were curious to see and hear Paul (Acts 25:22 ff.), to the Apostle's fervent testimony, the king would only reply, 'You think it will not take much to make a Christian of me!' (Acts 26:28); from which it is clear that he was admittedly free from fanaticism, but also from any real involvement in religious questions.<sup>21</sup>

15. So OGIS 419=IGR III 1244 (see above, n. 1); cf. OGIS 420=IGR III 1089, 1090, corr. in CRAI 1928, p. 213=SEG VII 217. *βασιλεὺς μέγας* is also found in OGIS 422=IGR III 1194 and OGIS 425=IGR III 1144.

16. According to *Ant.* xx 8, 11 (189 f.) and *B.J.* ii 16, 3 (344), this palace was situated on the so-called Xystus, a public square, from which a bridge led direct to the Temple, *B.J.* vi 6, 2 (325).

17. *Ant.* xx 8, 11 (190–5).

18. *Ant.* xx 7, 1 (139); 3 (145).

19. See Tanh., *Lekh* 20; bSuk. 27a; bPes. 107b. Cf. J. Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 252–4; Graetz, *MGWJ* (1881), pp. 483–93. Tradition cites sometimes Agrippa's steward, sometimes the king himself, as the questioner.

20. *B.J.* ii 15, 1 (313–14).

21. The words of Agrippa (Acts 26:28) are not meant to be taken ironically: 'The king confesses that with the few words he had spoken Paul had made him feel inclined to become a Christian.' (F. Overbeck, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum N.T.* I/4 (1870), pp. 446 f. Cf. also E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (1956), p. 620, n. 1; E.T. (1971), p. 689, n. 2.) But the fact that he does

Whether motivated by personal conviction or by considerations of mere political expediency, Agrippa certainly promoted the cause of Judaism in various connexions. To support the Temple when its foundations began to sink, and raise it by 20 cubits, he had timber of immense size and beauty imported from the Lebanon at much expense. But owing to the outbreak of the great insurrection, the wood was never put to the use for which it was intended, and later served for the manufacture of engines of war.<sup>22</sup> At their request, he allowed the Levites who sang the psalms in the Temple to wear the linen garments which until then had been a privilege of the priests—a departure from the law of which Josephus expressly disapproves.<sup>23</sup> When in the time of Albinus the building of the Herodian Temple was completed, Agrippa had the city paved with white marble so that the crowds of building workers should not be unemployed.<sup>24</sup> 'And thus at least as costumer-maker, woodcutter, paver and an active inspector of the Temple, he deserved well of Jerusalem in its last years.'<sup>25</sup>

When the revolution broke out in the spring of A.D. 66, Agrippa was in Alexandria, where he had gone to pay his respects to the Prefect of Egypt, Tiberius Iulius Alexander, while his sister Berenice remained in Jerusalem because of a Nazirite vow.<sup>26</sup> Agrippa immediately hastened back, and both brother and sister did all in their power to avert the threatening storm. But in vain. Open hostilities began in Jerusalem between the parties for and against the war, in which the king's troops participated on the side of the peace party. When the latter were defeated, and the palaces of Agrippa and Berenice, among others, fell victim to popular fury, the choice of party was decided for him.<sup>27</sup> He stood by the Romans unhesitatingly throughout the war. When Cestius Gallus undertook his unfortunate expedition against Jerusalem, King Agrippa was in his train also, with a considerable number of auxiliary troops.<sup>28</sup> In the further course of the revolt, which proved favourable to the Jews, he lost a large part of his territory. The cities of Tiberias, Tarichea and Gamala joined the revolution. But the king

nothing further about it, shows his indifference. Agrippa's saying may also be rendered: 'Soon you will persuade me to play the Christian.' Here *ποιεῖν* (to act) is to be understood as a theatrical *terminus technicus* (cf. Haenchen, *ibid.*).

22. *B.J.* v 1, 5 (36); *Ant.* xv 11, 3 (391).

23. *Ant.* xx 9, 6 (216-18). See J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (1969), pp. 212-13.

24. *Ant.* xx 9, 7 (219-22).

25. Th. Keim, *Bibelllex.* III, p. 59.

26. *B.J.* ii 15, 1 (309-14).

27. *B.J.* ii 17, 6 (426).

28. *B.J.* ii 18, 9 (500-3); 19, 3 (523-5).

remained unswervingly loyal to the Roman cause.<sup>29</sup> After the capture of Jotapata in the summer of A.D. 67, he entertained the commander-in-chief Vespasian most splendidly in his capital, Caesarea Philippi,<sup>30</sup> and having in the meanwhile been slightly wounded at the siege of Gamala,<sup>31</sup> was soon afterwards able to repossess his kingdom. For towards the end of A.D. 67, the whole of northern Palestine submitted once more to the Romans.

After the death of Nero (9 June A.D. 68), Titus went to Rome, accompanied by Agrippa, to pay homage to the new emperor, Galba. On the way, they received the news of Galba's murder (15 January A.D. 69). While Titus hastened back to his father, Agrippa continued his journey to Rome, where he stayed for the time being.<sup>32</sup> But after Vespasian was elected emperor by the Egyptian and Syrian legions in July A.D. 69, Berenice—who throughout had strongly supported the Flavian party—hurried to recall her brother to Palestine to pay homage.<sup>33</sup> From this time on, Agrippa was to be found in the company of Titus, to whom Vespasian had entrusted the continued prosecution of the war.<sup>34</sup> And when Titus sponsored magnificent games at great expense in Caesarea Philippi to celebrate the conquest of Jerusalem<sup>35</sup>, King Agrippa was no doubt also present, rejoicing as a Roman in the defeat of his people.

After the war ended, Agrippa, as Vespasian's faithful ally, was not only confirmed in the possession of his kingdom but presented with considerable territorial increments, though no details are known of

29. Full details of Agrippa's conduct during the war are given in Keim, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-3. Agrippa was not in Palestine during the interval between the defeat of Cestius Gallus and the advance of Vespasian. He delegated the administration of his kingdom to a certain Noarus or Varus, and when he began to indulge in gross high-handedness, to a certain Aequus Modius (*B.J.* ii 18, 6 (481-3); *Vita* 11 (48-61) and 36 (180); cf. 24 (114)). Of the three cities (Tiberias, Tarichea, Gamala), Gamala was of special importance as a strong fortress. It was at first held faithfully for the king by Philip, an officer of Agrippa, *Vita* 11 (46 ff.). But when Philip was recalled by Agrippa, the city went over to the rebels, *Vita* 35-7 (177-85); *B.J.* ii 20, 4 (568) and 6 (574). Agrippa then ordered Aequus Modius to recapture Gamala, *Vita* 24 (114). But a seven months' siege failed to take it, *B.J.* iv 1, 2 (10). Another of Agrippa's officers, Sulla, fought against Josephus, *Vita* 71-3 (398-406). Agrippa remained in Berytus until the spring of A.D. 67, *Vita* 36 (181); 65 (357), then awaited with his troops the arrival of Vespasian in Antioch, *B.J.* iii 2, 4 (29), advanced with Vespasian to Tyre, *Vita* 74 (407) and Ptolemais, *Vita* 65 (342-3) and 74 (410), and seems generally to have kept in close contact with Vespasian, *B.J.* iii 4, 2 (68); 9, 7-8 (443-61); 10, 10 (540-1); iv 1, 3 (14-15).

30. *B.J.* iii 9, 7 (444).

31. *B.J.* iv 1, 3 (14).

32. *B.J.* iv 9, 2 (498-500); Tac. *Hist.* ii 1-2.

33. Tac. *Hist.* ii 81.

34. Tac. *Hist.* v 1.

35. *B.J.* vii 2, 1 (23-4).

their extent.<sup>36</sup> Josephus notes in passing that Arcea (Arca in northern Lebanon, north-east of Tripolis) belonged to the kingdom of Agrippa.<sup>37</sup> From this it may be inferred that his new possessions stretched far to the north. Josephus's failure to mention these northern possessions when describing Agrippa's territory in *B.J.* iii 3, 5 (56-7), might be explained by the hypothesis that at the time of writing these increases in his former territory had not yet taken place; in fact, Josephus does not mention them because in that particular passage he is not concerned to describe the whole of Agrippa's kingdom, but only areas more or less inhabited by Jews. It is perhaps possible that certain of his southern

36. Photius, *Bibliotheca* 33, on Justus of Tiberias, says about Agrippa: *παρέλαβε μὲν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου, ἠρξήθη δὲ ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ ἐπὶ μᾶλλον ὑπὸ Οὐεσσαίου, τελευτᾷ δὲ ἔτει τρίτῳ Τραϊανῶ.*

37. *B.J.* vii 5, 1 (96-9). Josephus tells here how Titus, on the march from Berytus to Antioch, came upon the so-called Sabbatical river which flows μέσος Ἀρκας τῆς Ἀγρίππας βασιλείας καὶ Ῥαφαναίας. Thus a city to the north of Berytus is intended, this being undoubtedly the Arcea which, according to the ancient Itineraries, lay between Tripolis and Antaradus, 16-18 Roman miles north of Tripolis, and 32 Roman miles south of Antaradus (18 *mil. pass.*—*Itinerarium Antonini*, ed. Cuntz, p. 21; 16 *mil. pass.*—*Itinerarium Burdigalense*, *ibid.*, p. 94; *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. Geyer (1898), p. 18; CCL clxxv, p. 12; they agree on the figure 32 for the distance from Antaradus). The name is preserved to the present day in a village in northern Lebanon in the place indicated in the Itineraries. In ancient times the city was very well known. The Arkites are named in the genealogical table of the nations in Genesis (Gen. 10:17). Josephus, *Ant.* i 6, 2 (138) calls it, *Ἀρκην τὴν ἐν τῷ Λιβάνῳ* (to be distinguished from the Arca mentioned in *Ant.* v 1, 22 (85), which lay much further south; in *Ant.* viii 2, 3 (37) Niese reads *Ἀρκή*, but for this, *Ant.* ix 14, 2 (285) has *Ἀρκη*). Pliny, *NH* v 18/74, and Ptolemy v 15, 21, simply mention the name. Stephanus Byzant. remarks: *Ἀρκη, πόλις Φουίκης, ἣ νῦν Ἀρκαί καλουμένη.* Jerome interprets Gen. 10:17: 'Aracaeus, qui Arcas condidit, oppidum contra Tripolim in radicibus Libani situm' (*Quaest. Hebr. in Genesim*, *opp.* ed. Vallarsi III, 321=PL xxiii, col. 954; CCL lxxii, p. 13). In the period of the empire, Arca was especially known as the birthplace of Severus Alexander (SHA *V. Sev. Alex.* i, 5, 13; Aurel. Victor, *Caes.* 24). It was now also called Caesarea (SHA *V. Sev. Alex.* 13: 'apud Arcam Caesaream'; Aurel. Victor, *Caes.* 24: 'cui duplex, Caesarea et Arca, nomen est'). On coins this name occurs as early as the time of Marcus Aurelius (ΚΑΙΣΑΡΕΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΕΝ Τῷ ΛΙΒΑΝῶ or ΚΑΙΣΑΡΕΙΑΣ ΛΙΒΑΝΟΥ). From the time of Elagabal, if not earlier, it appears on coins as a Roman colony: *Col. Caesaria Lib(ani)*. An inscription found by E. Renan in the neighbourhood of Botrys refers to a boundary dispute between the Caesareans and Gigartenians (CIL III 183=ILS 5974=Renan, *Mission de Phénicie*, p. 149: *Fines positi inter Caesarenses ad Libanum et Gigartenos de vico Sidonior(um) iussu . . .*), from which it should not be concluded that their frontiers adjoined continuously (see Mommsen's remarks in CIL and Renan's, *loc. cit.*; the position of Gigarta may be determined from Pliny's specification, *NH* v 17/78: 'Botrys, Gigarta, Trieris, Calamos, Tripolis'). The plural form, *Ἀρκαί*, used by Stephanus Byz. is confirmed by the Itineraries, Jerome, Socrates (*HE* vii 36) and Hierocles (*Synecdemus*, ed. Parthey, p. 43). Cf. RE s.v. 'Arka' (3); Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, esp. pp. 281-2. On the coins, see *BMC Phoenicia*, pp. lxxi-iii and 108-10.

possessions were taken from Agrippa before his death. At the time, anyway, when Josephus wrote his *Antiquities* (A.D. 93/94) the Jewish colony of Bathyra in Batanaea no longer belonged to Agrippa.<sup>38</sup> It is more probable, however (see below), that Agrippa had died before this.

In 75 A.D. Agrippa and Berenice arrived in Rome and there Berenice continued the love affair with Titus which had started in Palestine.<sup>39</sup> The Jewish queen lived with Titus on the Palatine, while her brother was favoured with the rank of praetor. It was generally expected that there would soon be a formal marriage, a union to which Titus had allegedly committed himself. But dissatisfaction over this in Rome was so great that Titus found himself obliged to send Berenice away.<sup>40</sup> After the death of Vespasian (23 June A.D. 79), she was once more in Rome. But Titus had come to the conclusion that such liaisons were not compatible with the dignity of an emperor, and he ignored her.<sup>41</sup> Thus disappointed, she doubtless returned to Palestine.

Almost nothing more is known of the later life of Berenice and

38. *Ant.* xvii 2, 2 (28). In *B.J.* iii 3, 5 (56), Batanaea is reckoned as still part of the territory of Agrippa. On an inscription found by Ewing at Sur in Trachonitis appears: *Ἡράδ(η) Αἰμου στρατοπεδάρχῃσαντι ἱππέων κολωνειῶν καὶ στρατιωτῶν καὶ στρατηγῆσας (sic) βασιλεὶ μεγάλῳ Ἀγρίππῃ κυρίῳ* (OGIS 425=IGR III 1144; the inscription dates from the year 20, viz. of Agrippa). The *ἱππεῖς κολωνεῖται* were presumably a cavalry division, formed from the descendants of the colonists settled in Trachonitis and Batanaea by Herod the Great (see above, pp. 338, 419). They therefore also served under Agrippa II.

39. Even Titus's return to Palestine on the news of Galba's death was ascribed by cynics to his longing for Berenice (*Tac. Hist.* ii 2).

40. Dio lxvi 15, 3-4; Suet. *Div. Tit.* 7: 'insignem reginae Berenices amorem cui etiam nuptias pollicitus ferebatur'. Berenice even publicly assumed the role of Titus's wife (*πάντα ἤδη ὡς γυνὴ αὐτοῦ οὖσα ἐποίει*, Dio *loc. cit.*). Any approaches made to her evoked Titus's jealous suspicion (*Epit. de Caes.* 10: 'Caecinam consularem adhibitum coenae, vixdum triclinio egressum, ob suspicionem stupratae Berenices uxoris suae, iugulari iussit').

41. Dio lxvi 18, 1; *Epit. de Caes.* 10: 'ut subiit pondus regum, Berenicen nuptias suas sperantem regredi domum . . . praecepit'; Suet. *Div. Tit.* 7: 'Berenicen statim ab urbe dimisit, invitum invitam'. The *Epitome* and Suetonius speak only of a dismissal of Berenice after Titus's accession to the throne (for *statim* in Suetonius can be understood only in this sense). But Dio distinguishes clearly between two occurrences: the compulsory dismissal before his accession to the throne, and the disregard of Berenice after his accession. On her travels between Palestine and Rome, Berenice seems also to have formed certain connections in Athens, which the council and people commemorated in the following inscription (OGIS 428=IG 11/111<sup>a</sup> 3449); on the name Iulia, see above, p. 452:

*Ἡ βουλὴ ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου καὶ ἡ βουλὴ τῶν χ' καὶ ὁ δῆμος Ἰουλιαν Βερενείκην βασίλισσαν μεγάλην, Ἰουλίου Ἀγρίππῃ βασιλέως θυγατέρα καὶ μεγάλων βασιλέων εὐεργετῶν τῆς πόλεως ἔκγονον . . .*

Agrippa. We are told only that Agrippa corresponded with Josephus about his history of the Jewish war, praised it for its reliability, and bought a copy of the work.<sup>42</sup> Numerous coins of Agrippa confirm the continuance of his reign at least into that of Domitian. The many inaccuracies on these coins in respect to the imperial title have caused much trouble to numismatists. But it is precisely these inaccuracies that are instructive.<sup>43</sup>

In a chronological notice preserved by the so-called Chronographer of A.D. 354, Agrippa's reign, as it seems, lasted until A.D. 85 or 86. Although little weight can be attached to this remark because of the unreliable transmission of the text, it is none the less possible that it stems from sound tradition. It would then be necessary to regard

42. *Vita* 65 (362-7); *c.Ap.* i 9 (51-2).

43. For the literature on the coins, see above, p. 471. The facts of the case are as follows. Besides coins of the time of Nero (see above, p. 473, n. 8) we have coins of Agrippa, (1) from the years 14, 15, 18, 26, 27, 29 of his reign with the inscription *ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΙ ΟΥΔΕΣΙΑΣ(ΑΝΩ) ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ*, (2) from the years 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 26, 29 of Agrippa with the inscription *ΑΥΤΟΚΡ(ΑΤΩΡ) ΤΥΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣ(ΤΟΣ)*, (3) from the years 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 35, of Agrippa with the name of Domitian: to the year 23 inclusive only *Δομιτιανός ΚΑΙΣΑΡ*, from the year 24, though not consistently, with the addition *Γερμανικός*. From the years 34 and 35 we have coins based on the era of A.D. 56, in the latter year with the inscription *ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΑ ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑ(ΝΩΝ) ΚΑΙΣΑΡΑ ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΩΝ*. See Seyrig, *op. cit.*, and Meshorer; *loc. cit.* The agreement in the year numbers on the coins of all three Flavians puts it beyond doubt that on all these coins the same era is employed, and that Agrippa in his 14th year simultaneously stamped coins bearing the names of Vespasian, Titus and Domitian, and so on. But the era used can only be that of A.D. 61, which is employed on the bilingual coins of Agrippa from his 25th and 26th regnal years (= Domitian's 12th consulate, i.e. A.D. 86; cf. above, n. 7). From these data emerge the following results. (1) The coins from the years 26, 27 and 29 were minted after the deaths of Vespasian and Titus; nevertheless, the term 'divus' is missing from the title of both emperors, perhaps on religious grounds. (2) The coins of the years 14, 15 and 18 were minted during Vespasian's lifetime; nevertheless, Titus is already called *Σεβαστός*. Incorrect though this is, it is indicative of the opinion held in the East in regard to Titus's standing. He was regarded as nothing less than co-regent. (3) The title of Domitian is correct in so far as he is called on the coins of the years 14-19 only *ΚΑΙΣΑΡ*, and on the coins from the year 24 (= A.D. 84) bears the title *Γερμανικός*, which he in fact received in A.D. 84. On the other hand, it was a serious mistake to omit the title *Σεβαστός*, and in some instances also the title *ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ*, on the coins of the years 23-35, which all belong within the period of Domitian's reign, i.e. A.D. 83/4-89/90 and 89/90-90/91. The coins therefore show 'that in Galilee they were not altogether informed concerning the kingdom of this world' (Mommsen). Only the bilingual coins of the year 26 have the correct Latin title: *Imp(erator) Caes(ar) divi Vesp(asianus) Domitian(us) Au(gustus) Ger(manicus)*. The attributions of the coins of the years 34 and 35 to the era of A.D. 56 is a hypothesis based on two considerations: (1) the existence of two concurrent eras is clearly attested (n. 7); (2) there are other reasons (see n. 47 below) for concluding that Agrippa had ceased to rule a few years before the death of Domitian (A.D. 96). Cf., however, the survey by B. Kanael in *Jahrb. f. Num. u. Geldgesch.* 17 (1967), pp. 177-9.

A.D. 85 or 86, not as the year of Agrippa's death,<sup>44</sup> but merely as marking the end of his reign over Jewish territory: the year, that is to say, in which he was deprived of the Jewish colonies which, according to *Ant.* xvii 2, 2 (28), were no longer part of his realm when Josephus wrote his antiquities.<sup>45</sup> It is, however, more likely that Josephus is referring by implication to the death of Agrippa and the passage of his whole kingdom to direct Roman rule (see below).

According to the testimony of Photius,<sup>46</sup> Agrippa died in the third year of Trajan (A.D. 100). The validity of this evidence has been much discussed, but both from Josephus and local inscriptions it seems necessary to conclude that it is unreliable and that Agrippa died about A.D. 92/3.<sup>47</sup> It would appear that he left no

[Text continues on page 483]

44. So C. Erbes, who bases his investigation concerning the year of Agrippa's death on this passage, *ZWTh* 39 (1896), pp. 415-32; but cf. e.g. RE s.v. 'Iulius' (54), col. 150.

45. On the Chronographer of A.D. 354, see RE III, 2477 ff.; H. Stern, *Le calendrier de 354* (1956). In this collective chronographic work at the end of the *liber generationis* is the following computation. (*Chronica minorae saec. IV, V, VI, VII*, ed. Mommsen, vol. I = *Monum. Germ., Ant. antiquiss.*, IX, 1 (1892), p. 140; the related editions of the *liber generationis* do not have this section): *Ex quo ergo munus constitutus est usque ad Cyrum regem Persarum anni sunt IIIIBCCCCXVI. deinde Iudaei reversi sunt in Iudeam de Babilonia et servierunt annos CCXXX. deinde cum Alexander Magnus Macedo devicit Darium et venit in Iudeam et devicit Perses et deprecavit regnum eorum, et sub Macedonibus fuerunt Iudaei ann. CCLXX. inde reversi sunt a Macedonibus et sub suis regibus fuerunt usque ad Agrippam, qui novissimus fuit rex Iudaeorum ann. CCCXLV. iterum ab Agrippa usque ad L. Septimum Severum urbis consulens . . . anni sunt V DCCCLXX. iterum a Severo usque ad Emilianum (sic) et Aquilinum cons. anni sunt LVII. ab Emilianus usque ad Diocletianum IX et Maximianum VIII. cons. anni sunt LV.* On the various errors in the received text of this section, see Mommsen, *loc. cit.* At the place indicated by dots something has obviously been omitted. Since the years previously mentioned (4916 + 230 + 270 + 345) amount to 5751, whereas the final total is given as 5870, the number 109 must have been omitted, covering the time from Agrippa until the consulship of Septimius Severus, which fell in A.D. 194. Accordingly, Agrippa's reign must have ended in A.D. 85. This coincides remarkably with the date of the bilingual coins from the 12th consulship of Domitian (A.D. 86), which bear on the reverse side, *ἐπι βασι(λεύς) ΑΥΡ(ΑΝΝΑ) ἑ(ως) κζ' or κς'*. The coins bear the letters S.C. and were therefore minted *senatus consulto*. This seems to point to some alteration in Agrippa's circumstances at that time. If the Jewish territory was taken from him then, as is perhaps to be inferred from the Chronographer, he must still have retained the region around Trachonitis for the inscription mentioned above (n. 7) of the year 37 = 32 of his reign (*ἔτους λζ' τοῦ κα' αβ' βασιλεύς Ἀγρίππας*, therefore A.D. 92), was found in Sanamen on the northwestern border of Trachonitis.

46. *Bibliotheca, cod.* 33; see above, n. 35.

47. For discussion of this problem see M. Brann, *MGWJ* (1871), pp. 26-8; Graetz, *MGWJ* (1877), pp. 337-52; N. Brüll, *Jahrbücher für jüd. Gesch. und Literatur* 7 (1885), pp. 51-3; A. Schlatter, *Der Chronograph aus dem zehnten Jahre Antonins*, TU XII 1 (1894), pp. 40 ff.; C. Erbes, *loc. cit.*; RE s.v. 'Iulius' (54),

cols. 149-50; A. H. M. Jones, *The Herods of Judaea* (<sup>2</sup>1967), p. 259; *idem*, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (1941; <sup>2</sup>1971), p. 271; T. Frankfort, 'La date de l'autobiographie de Flavius Josèphe et des oeuvres de Justus de Tiberiade', *Revue Belge de philologie et d'histoire* 39 (1961), pp. 52-8; 'Le royaume d'Agrippa II et son annexion par Domitien', *Hommages Grenier* (1962), pp. 659-72; Seyrig, *op. cit.* (in n. 1 above); PIR<sup>2</sup> I 132.

A number of different items of evidence have to be taken into consideration. Most are unfortunately open to some doubt:

(1) The statement of Justus of Tiberias, as reported by Photius, *Bib.* 33, that Agrippa died in the third year of Trajan. The epigraphic evidence (see (7) below) makes it certain that Agrippa had ceased to rule at least in Auranitis and Batanaea by the end of the reign of Domitian (A.D. 96), and a reference in the *Antiquities* (see (3) below) that Batanaea had passed to Roman control by A.D. 93/4. Note also that the sentence in Photius *loc. cit.*, *τελευτῆ δὲ ἐν τρίτῳ Τραϊάνου οὐ καὶ ἡ ἱστορία κατέληξεν* (which refers, if to a work of Justus, to his *χρονικόν*, not to the work on the Jewish war which Josephus attacks in his *Vita*), falls between that part of the entry relating to Agrippa II and that relating to Justus himself. Furthermore, in Jerome's *de viris illustribus* the entry on Justus (xiv) is followed by that on Clement, which contains the words 'obiit tertio Traiani anno' (PL xxiii, cols. 631-4). These uncertainties serve to weaken further the claim of this passing reference in a late source to refute the implications both of Josephus, (2)-(4) below, and contemporary documents, (5)-(7).

(2) Josephus, *Vita* 65 (367) *πορρῶ γὰρ ἦν ἐκείνος* (Agrippa) *τοιούτης κακοθείας*. The reference is to Agrippa's approval by letter of Josephus's account of the war, but the tense seems none the less to imply that Agrippa was by now dead. Moreover in 65 (359-60) he states clearly that Vespasian, Titus and Agrippa *οὐκέτι εἶσι μεθ' ἡμῶν*. If Photius's evidence is rejected, it becomes unnecessary to suppose a second edition of the *Autobiography* and *Antiquities* (so most recently M. Gelzer, 'Die Vita des Josephos', *Hermes* 80 (1952), pp. 67-90, and A. Pelletier, *Flavius Josèphe, Autobiographie* (1959), pp. xiii-xiv. The natural implication of *Vita* 76 (430) (and cf. Euseb. *HE* vii 10, 8) is that the *Autobiography* was completed near in time to the *Antiquities* (A.D. 93/4) and formed a pendant to it. Note also that *Vita* 76 (429) refers favourably to Domitian, but mentions no later Emperor. Cf. p. 54 above.

(3) Josephus, *Ant.* xvii 2, 2 (28) *Ἀγρίππας μέντοι γε ὁ μέγας καὶ ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ δμῶνυμος καὶ πάνυ ἐξεπύχωσαν αὐτοῦς* (the Babylonian Jewish colony at Bathyra in Batanaea), *οὐ μέντοι τὰ τῆς ἐλευθερίας κινεῖν ἠθέλησαν. παρ' ὧν Ῥωμαῖοι δεσόμενοι τὴν ἀρχὴν. . .* As mentioned above, the passage is compatible with merely the loss of some territory by Agrippa, but reads more naturally as if his reign had ended altogether by the time (A.D. 93/4) at which the *Antiquities* was completed.

(4) The report of the rumoured incest between Agrippa and Berenice, *Ant.* xx 7, 3 (145), is more likely to have been written after Agrippa's death. This argument cannot of course be decisive.

(5) The coins giving the years 34 and 35 of Agrippa could relate either to the era of 56 or that of 61, so to either 89/90 and 90/91, or to 94/5 and 95/6 (see n. 43).

(6) The latest inscriptional evidence for Agrippa's reign is OGIS 426 = IGR III 1127 (see n. 7) from Aerè (Sanamein) in Batanaea which gives the years 37 and 32, i.e. 92/3.

(7) An inscription carved on the local basalt stone and now in the museum at Soueida in the Hauran (Auranitis), M. Dunand, *Mission archéologique au Djebel Druze: le musée de Soueida* (1934), p. 49, no. 75., is dated by the 16th year of Domitian, A.D. 96. It clearly implies that Agrippa's rule had ended, as does IGR III 1176 from Aeritae in Trachonitis, dated to the first year of Nerva,

children.<sup>48</sup> His kingdom was without doubt incorporated in the province of Syria.

A.D. 96/7. These inscriptions constitute the decisive evidence for rejecting the date apparently quoted by Photius from Justus of Tiberias.

(8) Compare now the inscription emanating from the Hauran or Djebel Druze and now in the Musée National in Beirut, published by H. Seyrig, *Syria* 42 (1965), pp. 31-4, *Ἀρχιεὺς ὁ ἐπὶ Ἀγρίππου βασιλέως γενόμενος κεντρῶν δεκαοκτῶ ἔτους καὶ ἐπὶ Τραϊανοῦ στρατηγῶν (sic) δέκα*. But for (7) above it would undoubtedly suggest that the man's service under Trajan had succeeded that under Agrippa directly.

48. It is not known whether he married. In the Talmud (bSukk. 27a) the story is told that Agrippa's steward (*epitropos*) addressed a question to R. Eliezer in view of which it was assumed that the questioner had two wives, one in Tiberias, the other in Sephoris. On the strength of this, writers, supposing that the steward asked the question in the name of the king, ascribe two wives to Agrippa (so Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 252-4; Brann, *MGWJ* (1871), pp. 13 f.), but this is purely speculative.