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Preface

Coinage undisputedly constitutes the first illustrated mass medium of the ancient Mediterranean world. The coins from Palestine dating to the late Persian, the Hellenistic and the early Roman Imperial period are an almost uninterrupted attestation to the history and to the continuously changing and developing political and religious ideas of this time.¹ A separation of the religious-cultic and the secular-political spheres within this world is not reasonably possible, as both were intrinsically tied to each other. The objective with the following work is by no means to attempt a complete numismatic analysis of ancient Jewish coinage in Palestine, but to document, analyse and interpret the political use of the coin iconography, i.e. the historic value of this medium,² especially viewed against the continuously changing political and cultural context and diverse (religious) identities of the Jewish rulers and authorities. The iconography applied throughout the history of ancient Jewish coinage underwent both gradual and radical changes and to be able to understand this process a closer examination of the iconography of the coins and the identities of the authorities issuing these coins is the primary matter of subject. Archaeological and textual evidence is used extensively to enable a detailed outline of the multifaceted world in which the coins were issued and used.

The close coexistence of the various peoples, with different religions and cultural expressions, in Palestine had always led to complex situations, which were generally reflected in the material culture, but the interrelations between the cultures became especially articulated in the ancient coinages, since money as an eminent factor in daily life tended to mirror immediate cultural trends in a way that other material culture could not, thereby not disregarding the existence of immobile coin types existing throughout longer periods of time simultaneously testifying to a strong conservatism regarding the choice of iconographic displays.³ Contrary to the written and the archaeological sources, the numismatic material from the Hellenistic and particularly the Roman Imperial periods in Palestine makes out the only literally uninterrupted material source from which detailed

¹ Especially during the Roman Imperial period, on this HOWEGO 2007, 2.
² On this e.g. GÖBL 1987, 25-30.
³ WOLTERS 2003, 201.
knowledge of the political, cultural and to some extent social processes taking place during this time can be drawn.

As a thesis in classical archaeology the coinage is almost exclusively examined in regard to archaeological categories. Purely numismatic categories in a narrower sense as the financial respectively monetary and moreover the socio-economic aspects of the various coinages under investigation are to a great extend intentionally neglected in favour of reading and interpreting the coin iconography on the basis of the individual actors applying it. The examination of the context of these actors, i.e. the political figures, implementing the ancient coin iconography as a political instrument throughout the history of ancient Jewish coinage, enhances the understanding of the reasons for and modes of the usage of coin iconography, which may or may not have been consistent with the use of this medium by the contemporary ruling Hellenistic and Roman powers.

The narrow starting point of this study focused on the sacred iconography found in Jewish coinage evidently allows an only partial picture of the ongoing official political processes expressed in the medium coinage. However, as religion was a highly sensitised aspect of the Jewish interrelations with other cultures the utilisation of sacred iconography is not only a precise indicator of cultural-religious affiliation, but also of cultural-religious developments and changes taking place within the Jewish world, at least in relation with the Jewish ruling powers without making generalisations about the Jewish world as such. In the present work sacred iconography is used on the basis of this quality as this is the most immediate indicator of ancient cultural differences pertaining to the cultural interaction taking place between the ancient Pagan and Jewish worlds in the course of time. In some cases, the discussion is not limited to sacred iconography pending on the individual contexts. The term Pagan is here used as a general definition of iconography displaying components of ancient polytheistic belief systems, though the origin of the designation was a later development in Patristic literature used derogatorily to define all non-Christians except the Jews.4

The first question immediately imposing itself is what should be considered to be sacred iconography respectively what determines iconography as sacred? Sacred iconography defines itself as iconographic displays of transactions taking place with or directed at or via a god or a group of gods, whereby the cultural context of the coinage

---

issued to a great extent predetermine these. Unproblematic in this regard are the displays of specific objects used within specific cultic contexts, such as the Roman *lituus* or the representation of the *apex* of a Roman priest, or the display of temple architecture or altars. Also the depiction of deities, gods and goddesses clearly belong in the category of sacred iconography. More problematic are iconographic displays, which only through their specific context gain a sacred content, thereby not implying that such identifications would apply to objects when used in other contexts as well.

The research of Jewish coinage has often been determined by the idea that – due to their cultural context – the Jewish religion must have played a decisive role in the moulding of the coin iconography. Hence, iconography belonging in a Jewish cultural context should be identified accordingly. This is, however, a very exclusive approach to a much more complex subject. There can be little doubt that Jewish coinage did in fact at times distinguish itself from other contemporary coinages and that an individuality only specific for this group was cultivated, but the contours delineating the differences between Jewish coinage and first and foremost Hellenistic Greek and Roman imperial period coinage varied greatly throughout the centuries. However, it is most important to stress that Jewish coinage cannot be treated apart from its contemporary ancient numismatic context and viewed as a separate entity. Both the local use of the medium itself and the local context of its use should be examined in detail.

Ancient Jewish coinage only constituted a smaller part of the ancient coinages minted and issued in Palestine from the late 5th century BCE until the 3rd century CE by a number of different authorities. In this context the Jewish coinage is in many ways characteristic, as it has been made evident by a number of previous studies. The distinction between the identification of Jewish coins as Jewish and other coinages minted in Palestine is however primarily based on the ethnic cultural-religious origin of the minting authorities, disregarding iconographic similarities respectively dissimilarities with contemporary coinages or any considerations concerning the actual piety expressed by the individual issuing. It is important to be aware that a distinction of the coinage as Jewish does not automatically imply an identification of the images or motifs used in these coins as such. Furthermore, other coin issues can be argued to have been directed primarily at a Jewish audience, such as the coinages of the Roman prefects and procurators minting during the 1st century CE. As this study will show only in few cases it can
be stipulated without doubt that the images discussed can be interpreted as truly Jewish, although the displays applied may have been readable in multiple ways. Furthermore, images could be transferred between Jewish and Pagan coinage. This evokes different questions, amongst others how far the imitation of the images also mirrors a similar understanding and use of these images in their changed contexts or if – at least in some cases – a distinct development took place changing the meaning of the narrative of the images used. As the following will show, this is in many cases difficult to determine.

The chronological frame of this work is determined by the period during which Jewish coinage was issued, covering the time from the beginning of the 4th century BCE until the end of the Second Jewish War respectively the Bar Kokhba War in 135 CE (overview Appendix Table 1). The study is exclusively arranged according to chronological criteria, beginning with the early-Jewish coins of the 4th century BCE and ending with the coins of the Second Jewish War in 135 CE. Each group of coins is examined separately according to their established historic or dynastic attribution, a necessary premise before any comparisons can be made or conclusions can be drawn on the developing use of the sacred iconography and its political importance.

The geographic frame of this work follows the varying circulation areas of the Jewish coins as they have been found, determined by the historic and political development of the Jewish Palestinian world at different points in time. The term Palestine is here used according to the traditional European use going back to the Greek author Herodotus in the 5th century BCE in his Historiae (Herodot I 105, II 106, III 5). Although the meaning of the geographic appellation Palaistinē to some extent was variably applicable and the geographic borders of the ancient area were never stipulated clearly and precisely, the term is at least to be equated with the nucleus of the ancient Land of Israel, the Hebrew Eretz Israel used in the Hebrew biblical scriptures for the area compassing the native Jewish land. Further geographic termini used are – when necessary – dealt with in the course of the work.

---

5 Also LICHTENBERGER 2012, forthcoming.
6 STERN 1974, 6-7, no. 2; JACOBSON 1999, 65.
The natural borders of Palestine, the Mediterranean Sea to the west, the Negev desert to the south, and the basalt massif of Mount Hermon to the north framed the ancient area of Palestine – in the Israelite period the north-south reach (the settlement area of the Israelite people) was accordingly paraphrased ‘from Dan to Beersheva’.\(^8\) The topographic characteristics of Palestine shaped the regional and cultural differences found here already at an early point in time,\(^9\) which is clearly reflected in the development of different local variations in the early Palestinian coinages already during the 4th century BCE. Most prominent is the parallel development and existence of the different cultures to be found in the region of which the Phoenician culture situated in the Syro-Palestinian coastal area is a distinct example.

The term syncretism is not a true characterization of the encounter of the Jewish and the Greco-Roman religions, which dominated the Palestinian world during the time of the development of Jewish coinage. The Israelite-Jewish religion had always been compelled to interact and come to terms with foreign religions and other cultures, such as the Egyptian, Canaanite, Assyrian, Phoenician, Persian, Greek and Roman, with which the Jewish world had come into contact during its ancient history. The whole history of the Jewish religion might according to this be defined as syncretistic. The most precise use of the term is probably given, when therewith the conscious mix or adaptation of sacred elements or the consolidation of different cults is understood.\(^10\) It is however questionable how far these processes can be determined as having been conscious, if not supported by the use of sacred iconography in coinage. Over centuries cultural and religious acculturation took place within the different cultures and societies encountering each other in Palestine, which on different social levels found diverse ways of expression. The study of the sacred iconography in Jewish coinage is one area where the continuity of the material culture allows an insight into these processes, not only aiding in assessing the interaction and the developments taking place during this time, but especially the conscious political use of this element.

---

\(^8\) Judges 20:1; 1 Samuel 3:20; 2 Samuel 3:10; 2 Samuel 24:2, et al.

\(^9\) WENNING 2004, 35.

\(^10\) HENGEL 2005, 9, who as examples of this phenomenon lists the establishment of the cult of Serapis by Ptolemy I (recently discussed in detail by M. BERGMANN (2010, 109-135), who does not see the necessity of a possible syncretism to explain the existence of the Ptolemaic cult), later Gnostic texts such as the hymn of Naassene or magic papyri. Further examples for the enactment of a conscious syncretism would be the connection of the Greek god Dionysus and the Jewish god as described by Plutarch (see §2.1.2) or the attempted introduction of the cult of Zeus in the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem (see §2.2).
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Archäologischer Anzeiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSt</td>
<td>Archaeology and Biblical Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAJ</td>
<td>Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADPV</td>
<td>Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfO</td>
<td>Archiv für Orientforschung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJA</td>
<td>American Journal of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJN</td>
<td>American Journal of Numismatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJSLL</td>
<td>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AncHistB</td>
<td>The Ancient History Bulletin / Zeitschrift für die Alte Geschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANS</td>
<td>American Numismatic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJS Review</td>
<td>Association for Jewish Studies Review. Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AntK.B</td>
<td>Antike Kunst. Beihefte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Biblical Archaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAIAS</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society (since 2009: Strata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARIntSer</td>
<td>British Archaeological Reports. International Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BArR</td>
<td>Biblical Archaeology Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASOR</td>
<td>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCHSuppl</td>
<td>Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BiKi</td>
<td>Bibel und Kirche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMC</td>
<td>British Museum Catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boreas</td>
<td>Boreas. Münstersche Beiträge zur Archäologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZ</td>
<td>Biblische Zeitschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZNW</td>
<td>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedra</td>
<td>The Jerusalem Cathedra. Studies in the History, Archaeology, Geography and Ethnography of the Land of Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIJ</td>
<td>Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum, edited by J.-B. Frey (Rome 2 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIQ</td>
<td>The Classical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNG</td>
<td>Classical Numismatic Group, Inc. (<a href="http://www.cngcoins.com">www.cngcoins.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPJ</td>
<td>Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum I-III, edited by A. Fuks / V. Tcherikover (New York 1957-64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DaF</td>
<td>Damaszener Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMOA</td>
<td>Documenta et monumenta orientis antique. Studies in the Near Eastern Archaeology and Civilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrum</td>
<td>Electrum. Studia z historii starożytnjej/Studies in Ancient History (Kraków)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EncJud</td>
<td>Encyclopaedia Judaica. Edited by F. Skolnik / M. Berenbaum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Eretz-Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>Excavations and Surveys in Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAT II</td>
<td>Forschungen zum Alten Testament (2. Reihe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GeH</td>
<td>Geographica Historica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOr</td>
<td>Göttinger Orientforschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA-ESI</td>
<td>Hadashot Arkheologiyot – Excavations and Surveys in Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperia</td>
<td>Hesperia. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORIA</td>
<td>Historia. Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Houghton I  

Houghton II  
O.D. Hoover, Coins of the Seleucid Empire from the Collection of Arthur Houghton, Part II (New York 2007)

HThR  
Harvard Theological Review

IA  
Internationale Archäologie

IEJ  
Israel Exploration Journal

IJS  
Institute of Jewish Studies. London

INJ  
Israel Numismatic Journal

INR  
Israel Numismatic Research

ISACR  
Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion

JBL  
Journal of Biblical Literature

JQR  
Jewish Quarterly Review

JRA  
Journal of Roman Archaeology

JRA Suppl  
Journal of Roman Archaeology. Supplements

JRS  
Journal of Roman Studies

JSOT SS  

JSPE SS  
Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha. Supplement Series

JSJ  
Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period

KBS  
Kölner Beiträge zur Sportwissenschaft

Levant  
Levant. Journal of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem and the British Institute at Amman for Archaeology and History

LIMC  
Lexikon iconographicum mythologiae classicae

Maarev  
Maarev. A Journal for the Study of the Northwest Semitic Languages and Literatures

 MDB  
Le Monde de la Bible

MMAI  
Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique en Iran

Mus Haaretz  
Museum Haaretz Yearbook. Tel Aviv

NAU  
New American Standard Bible with Codes (1995)

NC  
Numismatic Circular

NEA  
Near Eastern Archaeology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>Transeuphratène. Recherches pluridisciplinaires sur une province de l’empire achéménide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJC</td>
<td>MESHORE 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSAJ</td>
<td>Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Vetus Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WiBiLex</td>
<td>Das wissenschaftliche Bibellexikon im Internet / The Scholarly Online Bible Lexicon (<a href="http://www.academic-bible.com/en/wibilex/">http://www.academic-bible.com/en/wibilex/</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUB</td>
<td>Welt und Umwelt der Bibel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUNT</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 1. Reihe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUNT II</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XeniaKonst</td>
<td>Xenia. Konstanzer althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDPV</td>
<td>Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZPE</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maps

Map 1. Palestine (Putzger Historischer Weltatlas, Berlin 1997, 32)
Map 2. The Persian Empire (WEIPPERT 1988, 688 Fig. 5.1)
Map 3. The Province of Judah (LIPSCHITS 2005, 183, Map 6)

Map 4. Jerusalem during the 5th century BCE (BAHAT 1996, 36)
Map 5. Jerusalem during the Hasmonaean period (BAHAT 1996, 38)
Map 6. Jerusalem at the time of the First Jewish War (after BAHAT 1996, 35)
Introduction

Considerations Concerning the Use of Iconography in Ancient Coinage

“As viewers change … so does the understanding of the story being depicted”. ¹¹ This seems very much to be the case when dealing with Jewish coin iconography. When working with ancient iconography in general we are confronted with certain problems, which concern our modern viewpoints and methods and our ability to understand the use and function of iconography within the ancient cultures and societies. This becomes even more true when dealing with coin iconography, which expresses the most condensed form of pictorial language in which the messages are reduced to their shortest possible form – the understanding of which literally resting in the hands of the user. ¹²

The identification and understanding of iconography in general – and probably even more so in the case of iconography associated with Jewish contexts – is very much determined by individual expectations. It is inevitable that a modern viewer examines the material at hand on the basis of visual experiences, which accordingly influence the understanding of the ancient iconography. ¹³ This is – despite every effort – most likely never to be in complete accordance with the original ancient view or understanding of the pictorial language used. The ideal would naturally be to embrace history and any group of material openly and without discrimination, objectively judging the material under investigation. This is, however, unlikely ever to be the case. Though, alone the awareness of possible complications can limit us in making wrong deductions. All researchers bring their own intellectual imprint in form of education, intellectual training, personal or religious attitudes and experiences, and the chosen field of research is most often flooded by the results of previous decades of scholarship, which tends to leave an impression on the knowledge we accumulate. The main objective seems to avoid setting

¹¹ STANSBURY-O’DONNELL 1999, 8.
¹² WOLTERS 2003, 202-203.
¹³ Which are mechanisms independent of the category or dating of the material examined. On the approach to an understanding of the pictorial narrative, see e.g. M. D. STANSBURY-O’DONNELL (1999, 1-8) and J. ELSNER (1995, 1-10).
our own traps even before we begin our work, but it is clear that the partiality framing our identifications in case of the study of iconography can never be completely avoided and that accordingly any work with ancient pictorial traditions can raise a multitude of varying and even contradictory modern responses. As for all fields of research this can—perhaps even more so—also be stated for the study of ancient Jewish coin iconography, which brings large ballast in form of a remarkable amount of previous research and to some extent much defined ideas about what the material should disclose.

Certain terms are repeatedly brought up in modern literature to define and describe the iconographic material at hand. In the contexts of coinage type, image, motif, and symbol are frequently recurring terms used when defining the iconography found. The terms type and image pose no problems. The type or coin type cannot be understood as anything but the reference to the overall iconographic composition, including the inscription, either of the obverse type or reverse type or of the fixed combination of both in the coin type.\textsuperscript{14} The image or image elements refer to the pictorial element or elements displayed on obverse or reverse types. Problems begin to rise, when the terms motif and symbol are applied, which to some extent is caused by academic customs and understanding of how these terms should be applied. The use of motif implies a pictorial display entailing a specific theme or meaning, however not saying anything about the character of the display, for example being allegorical or symbolic. Again a distinction needs to be drawn between the allegoric and symbolic display. The often used term symbol in connection with iconography and especially coin images is however problematic. The parallel use of the terms type and symbol can be found as early as in the work of P. Romanoff, one of the pioneers in the research on Jewish coin iconography, who from the beginning equates the use of these terms as common numismatic terminology.\textsuperscript{15} This is in everyway in accordance with a common comprehensive linguistic usage, which only secondarily accepts a—to some extent—situational meaning,\textsuperscript{16} however variable according to the context of use. The specific use of the term symbol in connection with the study of ancient iconography—i.e. within the field of classical archaeology—does however require a more distinct definition to avoid mistakes concerning a more general discussion of the nature of the iconography, according to which it

\textsuperscript{14} Göbl 1978, 41-44.
\textsuperscript{15} Romanoff 1942, i n. 1.
\textsuperscript{16} ThR XXXII (2001), 479.
will also be applied here. The use of the term *symbol* automatically implies that the image or iconographic composition studied has adapted the significance of something else and through this – in specific contexts – has come to hold another meaning; the most well-known examples in this context are of course the menorah representing Judaism and the cross representing Christianity.

The modern viewer is accustomed to an instinctive visual understanding on many levels, but it is questionable if we are allowed to view ancient Jewish coin iconography with these expectations. One of the most important considerations concerning ancient Jewish iconography is that compared with the Pagan polytheistic world it did not have comparable long established iconographic traditions to fall back upon. Hence, a heavy reliance on and imitation of the contemporary Greco-Roman pictorial traditions was inevitably caused. Still, similarities and imitations do not automatically imply that the images or pictorial elements displayed should automatically be associated with any certain ancient religious affiliation in which they are found. It is furthermore clear that not only the pictorial language found in the Jewish coin iconography, but iconography in Jewish contexts in general was in a continuous state of development, hence also subject to changes, which also pertained to the ability of reading the images.

Due to the reliance on the contemporary Pagan coin iconography during all the periods under discussion here a collective iconographic vocabulary developed which to a large extent was understandable beyond the context of Jewish coinage. Simultaneously a distinct Jewish iconographic vocabulary was developed, which to a large extent maintained a divergent form of its own – mirroring the distinctive form of ancient Judaism within the Pagan world at all times. This evokes different questions, amongst others how far the imitation of the images also mirrors a similar understanding and use of these images in their changed contexts or if – at least in some cases – a specific development took place changing the narrative of the images used. Accordingly, the explanatory models necessary for the identification and understanding of the coin iconography should be kept wide and to some extent be sought outside of the medium coinage. The use of imitations and possible further development respectively transformation of specific images must have been pursued out of specific reasons, which are more unver-
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17 Which is the case for all categories and groups of ancient iconography of the different historic periods, e.g. ELSNER 1995, 1-10; RITTER 2002, 13-18; concerning coinage WOLTERS 2003, 190-191.
standable when assessed over a longer period of time.\textsuperscript{18} The short term use of certain images also shows that clearly not all images were received equally well.

The source for the identification of the iconography found in Jewish coinage has in many cases been the texts of the Hebrew biblical scriptures. This is easily justified by the setting of the coin iconography within the Jewish culture and religion. It has proven possible to find many explanations in the texts, which are transferable to the coin images. Therewith possible interpretations are offered, which basically rely on the Jewish religious tradition. In a number of cases the interpretations are likely to be precise, but care has to taken in this approach. The varied setting of Jewish coinage at different time asks for more nuanced considerations.

Within ancient iconography coin iconography falls in its own category. Ancient coinage always served as a public official political medium instrumentalized accordingly, but variably. With this medium it was possible both as Hellenistic king or Roman emperor, as a local ruler or local magistrates within a short period of time to disperse statements and to communicate not only with the contemporary world, but in part also – due to the often long periods of circulation of the coins – with generations to follow through the development and use of an iconographic language. With its incomparable wide-ranging and quick circulation coinage served as the immediate tool for public political representation or propaganda on different levels, as an aid in public self-portrayal respectively the establishment of a public identity and as a mean of self-legitimisation, but also as tool for the dispersion of more general statements.\textsuperscript{19} Basically the medium coinage was – naturally apart from its basic monetary use – a communicative medium, which required an understanding on the part of the recipient.

Regarding Roman imperial coinage a longstanding discussion has taken place concerning the question of who was responsible for the selection of the iconography used and to which degree the audience was taken into consideration. Thereby, the two opposing research positions advocate – simplified expressed – either the Roman emperor or his immediate circle as the main controlling authority or the authorities of the

\textsuperscript{18} ELSNER 1995, 6; RITTER 2002, 18.
\textsuperscript{19} HOWEGO 2007, 16-17; See discussion of the use the term \textit{propaganda} as a modern concept transferred back onto ancient phenomena in WEBER / ZIMMERMANN (2003, 15-33) in the context of the early Roman Imperial period; WOLTERS 1999, 262. This can however not one-to-one be transferred to the contemporary Palestinian coinages, as here local and individual processes play an additional role.
imperial mint as having controlled the process of selection aiming the iconography at the emperor as recipient, especially the latter radically lessening the importance of the coin iconography for the general public.\textsuperscript{20} Coins did not always have to be issued to express political programs or the like, but could first and foremost be determined by economic considerations whereby the choice of iconography became subordinate, though not unimportant.\textsuperscript{21}

The processes behind the selection and use and the reception of coin iconography are not always readily defined or categorized.\textsuperscript{22} It can be discussed if these were similar or even identical in all parts of the ancient world, especially during the Roman imperial period, or if not closer attention should be paid to local differences regarding these processes.\textsuperscript{23} In the case of the Jewish coinage these processes seem to have varied greatly throughout time, as the medium was applied by various kinds of officials. The main approach observed here is that the rulers or persons close to them conceived and authorised the use of the coin iconography emitted. In the case of the earliest coins, the YHD coins, this is even more difficult to determine. To which degree the users of the coins as such were regarded in this process is subject to discussion and seems to have varied greatly.

It is to presume that the iconography in most cases was conceived and employed with very specific intentions in mind, relating to and conditioned by the cultural, religious and political context of each of the issuing rulers or elites. It should however not be overlooked that a traditionalism based on the value of recognition also played a role. Especially the iconography of coins issued by local authorities, primarily provincial rulers, municipal authorities of individual cities, or to some extent even by varying religious authorities, often displays an individual repetitive traditionalistic character or characteristic iconographic elements. These elements were explicitly defined by the political and religious-ideological background and context of these authorities, as an individual or as a group.\textsuperscript{24} The own religion or religious affiliation was of importance in all ancient societies and played an important role in the generation of public self-conception and increasingly in the pictorial displays of national identity.

\textsuperscript{21} WOLTERS 2003, 191-193.
\textsuperscript{22} BERGMANN 1998, 92-98; WEBER / ZIMMERMANN 2003, 19.
\textsuperscript{23} Compare e.g. with KATSARI 2006, 87-95, on the coinage of Roman Phrygia.
\textsuperscript{24} BELAYCHE 2001, 43-44; HOWGEGO 2007, 17.
When analysing the iconography of the ancient coins different factors, which had an impact on the visual communication taking place, must be taken into consideration. The two primary determining factors were unquestionably the issuing agents and the receiving audience, according to both the pictorial language was most likely formed. Our lack of information does, however, in some cases obscure these rather effectively. In the case of the Jewish authorities issuing, it is not always possible to clearly identify them or more specifically to reconstruct the monetary policies, the intended actions with or ambitions behind their use of iconography applied on the coins. Therefore it can also not be stated how or with which expectations the minting authorities acted. The same is to some extent the case concerning the expectations of the recipients or users of the ancient coins in Palestine. The coin iconography does hold some information which helps to clarify this picture.

The cultural complexity not only of the Jewish society – but of all the various peoples in Palestine in general – during the late Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods does, however, not allow straightforward assumptions concerning the identity of neither the ruling powers nor the users of the coins. It is far more questionable if all coin issues with certainty can be said to have been intended for all contemporary Jewish subordinates or if not at times specific parts of the Jewish society were targeted as recipients by the individual authorities or if other recipients to some extent also played a role. A change in the issuing authority did in most cases not also imply a change in users for which the coin images were intended, but the changes might have had an influence on which part of society was seen as the most important recipients. What we do not have any knowledge of is how the audience(s) received respectively thought about the coin iconography they were presented with, it is also difficult to determine the expectations placed on the coin iconography. This is to some extent based on the fact that we do not know which audience was intended, therefore generalisation must to some extend be made determining the recipients as ‘Jews’ or ‘Pagans’ knowing well that these are extreme simplifications of the religious-social structures of Palestine during the periods in question.

Since Jewish and Pagan users and viewers of Palestinian coinage relied on completely different experiences with images and probably also approached them with different expectations, neither the reception of nor the reaction to the images used can be
expected to have been uniform among the users of the coins. Compared with the ancient Pagan Greco-Roman world, the visual communication and approach of the Jewish world was largely – however not consistently – dominated by specific religious considerations. Hence, other methods of pictorial narration were in a variable degree applied by the issuing authorities, very much contrasting to the use of coin iconography in Pagan contexts with a primarily visual unlimited access to iconography, which on the one hand based on different traditions and experiences preconditioning the reception and on the other hand was defined by completely different religious expectations. The reaction of the audiences to the iconography displayed would in both cases have been very different, however thereby not implying a lack of mutual understanding – at least to some extent, since the main source of the iconographic traditions to a large degree remained the same.

Practically all ancient coins were minted to cover the financial needs of different areas. The circulation areas were amongst others defined through factors of the geographic boundaries of the political rule and – especially in the case of Jewish coinage – at times through the use of the Hebrew language in the coin legends, accordingly limiting the use of these coins outside the area of Jewish dominion. The use of different languages and scripts in ancient coinage was always meant to pronounce and underline conscious statements regarding official declarations of a political nature and at the same time emphasised the cultural and religious context of the emitted coinage. Scripts and languages were never applied randomly and were both made according to deliberate considerations and intentions, as well as to some extent predetermined by the context of the political actors using this medium. As especially evident by means of the epigraphic material, regionally restricted languages and dialects were put to use at different times and to a varying degree in Palestine, such as Hebrew, Aramaic, Phoenician, and others, but only few of these had an impact on the ancient coinages of the different areas. Only Hebrew respectively the Palaeo-Hebrew script – and to some extent the Phoenician language – was used over longer periods and recurred at times calling for strong nationalist statements, i.e. during the two Jewish wars. In the geographically limited region of

26 HÜBNER 2005, 177 n. 21.
27 Until the early Roman imperial period, after which the use of the language becomes rare, only to be found on the coins of Tyre, on this LICHTENBERGER 2009, 152, 154.
Palestine the result of the different religions and cultures clashing with each other throughout the different historic periods already preceding and during the Second Temple Period make this very clear. The enforcement and enactment of different sacred traditions could cause difficulties so terminal that they lead to political changes, as shown clearly by the example of the Maccabean Revolt and the establishment of the Hasmonaean rule during the 2nd century BCE. Within the archaeological record the outcome of such changes can be seen as noticeable modifications in the settlement patterns and in the composition of the archaeological findings, visible for example in Galilee from the early 1st century BCE and the time of Alexander Jannaeus.28 One of the most prominent places where such changes and developments show themselves immediately is in coinage, of which the two Jewish wars are probably the best examples. During the time of Jewish coinage (overview Appendix Table 1) only in three cases the use of iconography, which can be said to hold genuine Jewish elements, was provoked: during the 3-year reign of Mattathias Antigonus and during the two Jewish wars respectively. In all three cases the use of sacred iconography became essential to express the desired political statements. However, at least the two latter examples can in no terms be said to be the standard for the traditional development and use of ancient coinage.

The Jewish coin iconography of the Second Temple Period does seem to hold very few – if any – symbols, but many images which evoke specific religious associations, such as the images of Jewish sacred cult objects as the menorah, ethrog and lulav, due to our empirical knowledge. The conversion of images or motifs into symbols was primarily a development of the Late Antiquity.29 As it will become evident, allegorical compositions do not seem to have played any role in the iconography used until rudimentarily very late in the development of the Jewish coin iconography during the time of the late Herodians, Herod Agrippa I and his son Herod Agrippa II, in the second half of the 1st century CE and abstractions and symbolism were practically non-existent phenomena. The pictorial language implemented in Jewish coinage seems mainly to have concentrated on the use of uncomplicated compositions and recognisable images, the origin of the main part of which can be identified within the Greco-Roman traditions of ancient coinage.

29 HACHLILI 1998, 311-312.
In the ancient Jewish world neither religion, nor culture, nor society was at any given time a homogenous entity within which the development of a common iconographic language took place. The rejection of idolatry did not mean a general rejection of Greek philosophy and the Greek language was kept as the official language from the Hellenistic well into the Roman imperial period. Within the Jewish society the boundaries towards Greek customs – here generalized as the enforcement of the rules of purity – were set differently under varying circumstances by the diverse parts of the society according to the religious and social factors defining their lives.\(^{30}\) Though generally speaking, where connections between the cultures and cults could develop, through the use of specific Greco-Roman institutions, through particular conventions or traditions, boundaries were in most cases drawn between the Jewish and the Pagan cultures.\(^{31}\) This did however only to some extent apply to Jewish coin iconography during the centuries of its use. Without doubt the increasing contact with the Greco-Roman culture during this time resulted in considerable changes of the Jewish culture and in Jewish traditions on many levels,\(^{32}\) and clearly the relationship between the cultures was never just a question of assimilation or rejection.\(^{33}\)

\(^{30}\) {BERNETT 2007b, 350-351.}
\(^{31}\) {COLLINS 2005, 41-42.}
\(^{32}\) {HENGEL 1988, 192-193; FREYNE 1998, 101.}
\(^{33}\) {COLLINS / STERLING 2005, 3; COLLINS 2005, 39.}
PART 1

THE LATE PERSIAN AND HELLENISTIC PERIODS
(c. 400 – 37 BCE)
Chapter 1

The Emergence of Coinage in the Province of Judah

During the late Persian period – when the actual minting of coins in the heartland of the Jewish culture commenced – major regional and cultural differences can be seen in the material culture throughout the whole Palestinian region as a result of the interaction of the different cultures and religions. The question of the relationship between these different cultures and especially between the different religions encountering each other never remained just a question of simple assimilation or rejection, as it is also expressed in the coinages of this time. The changes found in a number of ancient sanctuaries of this region illustrate these developments very well, amongst others the sanctuaries of Dan, Carmel, and Mount Hermon, which display long cultic continuity from partly before the Iron Age until the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods (Map 1). The sanctuary of Dan (Laish/Leshem) situated at the foot of the Mount Hermon exemplifies this very well. Already in the 2nd millennium BCE the place was known as a sanctuary and it was here that king Jeroboam I during the late 10th century placed golden calves and established a cult place with priests. The 10th and 9th century remains of a ‘High Place’ found here have been identified as an Iron Age sanctuary, which probably was devoted to the worship of Hadad. The precise history of the site between the Iron Age and the Persian period is unclear, though a cultic continuity appears to have existed throughout the following centuries. Findings from the Hellenistic and Roman periods indicate that the sanctuary existed into the Roman Imperial period, until it was abandoned at the middle of the 4th century CE.
Within the core realm of the ancient pre-Hellenistic Jewish world, Judah, the cultural and religious interaction taking place is perhaps less obvious, but was nonetheless a fact to be taken into consideration at that time. One example is the worship of the old Canaanite god Baal, which finds its traces as far as into the city of Jerusalem (Zeph 1.4). The Baal cult probably existed parallel to the Jahveh cult for centuries and the attempted religious reforms carried out by the king Hezekiah in the 8th century BCE and later Josiah in the 7th century BCE in the local Jahveh-sanctuaries of Judah makes clear that a syncretism of the religions seems to have become a recognised threat to the Jahvistic religion.44

It was clearly not the conquests of Alexander the Great that set off the growing importance of the Greek culture in Palestine – which was eminent for the establishment and development of the local Palestinian coinages, with the extent of the so-called Hellenisation probably not reaching its greatest extent until the 2nd or 3rd century CE under Roman rule; the chronological boundaries of this process are not easily defined.45 At the latest from the beginning of the Iron Age active trading between the countries of eastern part of the Mediterranean world can be observed.46 In the Syro-Palestinian coastal areas, largely the area containing the Phoenician culture, the growing commercial and cultural contacts with the Greek culture become evident in the deposits of material culture from this time onwards. The sustainable presence of the Greeks and the Greek foundations in Palestine has for the Persian or pre-Hellenistic periods not been preserved in any detail in the literary evidence, a deficit in the evidence on the cross-cultural contacts valid for both Greek and Jewish written sources.47 In this respect, the primary source of this time remains the material culture and to a large extent the coinages found.

The development and the establishment of Jewish coinage proper in Palestine from the time of the Hasmonaean rule from the second half of the 2nd century BCE was largely determined by the coinage used and produced in this region throughout the preceding centuries: primarily by the YHD (Yehud) coinage minted in Judah under Persian authority during the 4th century BCE and under the Ptolemaic administration during the

46 STERN 2002, 51.
47 WENNING 2004, 38-42.
3rd century BCE dealt with here, to some extent by the Samarian coinage minted in Samaria during the 4th century BCE, the Greek coinage minted under the changing administration of the Hellenistic Greek rulers, and the so-called Philisto-Arabian and Phoenician coinage circulating in the Syro-Palestinian Region from the late 5th century BCE, including the autonomous coastal city coins of amongst others the cities of Ashdod, Ascalon, and Gaza minting well into the Hellenistic period; the common basis for all being the Attic Greek coinage circulating the region as the primary official currency during this time, as it is made evident by the wide use of the prototype of the Athenian owl and to some extent the image of Athena on all early city coins found (e.g. from Gaza, Ascalon, Ashdod, Samaria). These coins were primarily minted to cover the financial demands of the different provinces and cities and were for this reason produced by the local administrations.

1.1 The Introduction of Coinage in the Province of Judah during the Persian Period (4th Century BCE)

Compared with the other periods in Palestine the material information found on the Persian period – chronologically framed by the destruction of the Jewish Temple and the exile of the Jews to Babylonia in 586 BCE and Alexander the Great winning the battle of Issus in 333 BCE – is relatively sparse. During this time Palestine was part of the 5th Persian satrapy ‘Ēber han-Nāhār, translating as much as “the land west of the [Euphrates] river”, of which only the provinces of Samaria, Judah, Gaza and Ashdod are known by name (Map 2). The borders of the Province of Judah have been defined by the finds of Judahite stamp seal impressions and coins, which almost exclusively circulate within the area of the province. Only few numbers of both have been found outside this area. In keeping with the Persian government these provinces were under the administration of Persian governors, who in many cases are known to have descended from Persian nobility.
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local dynasties, as it can be reconstructed by the names of governors handed down from
the 6th, 5th and early 4th centuries BCE. The fact that the Persian government intention-
ally did not impose the concept of a – culturally and above all religiously – central-
ized state upon the satrapies and the provinces left room for the unfolding of local eth-
nic, cultural and religious differences, leaving the impression of the individual satrap-
ies functioning as semi-autonomous parts of the Achaemenid Empire.

The discontinuity and continuity found in the settlement patterns of Persian pe-
riod Judah between the late Iron Age and the early Hellenistic Period provides very re-
vealing evidence for not only understanding the rural nature of the Persian province, but
also the political administration of the area. Contrary to the distinct discontinuity in a
large number of settlements noticeable between the settlements of the late Iron Age and
the Persian period, the continuity between late Persian period and Hellenistic period sites
– regardless of the character of the settlements as residential, administrational or military
sites – seems to have been the rule, with few or no noticeable changes in the structures
and the material culture of these settlements. This continuity is equally visible in sanctu-
aries and cultic installments in Palestine in general between the periods. The same pic-
ture is reflected in the material of the Judahite seal impressions and coins, pointing to-
wards continuity in the administrative system between the late 4th century and early 3rd
century BCE in Judah. This continuity is probably also reflected by the epigraphic evi-
dence on tax collection from the 4th century, as for example it has been revealed by Ara-
maic ostraca from Khirbet el-Qom in Idumaea, where the same set phrases were used
into the early Hellenistic period, only replacing the Persian names with Greek names for
the officials. It is not unreasonable to deduce that the same practice could have applied to
the taxation system of neighbouring Judah.

According to the archaeological evidence the introduction of coinage in place of
the use of scales and cut silver took place in Palestine during the 5th century BCE. The
minting of coinage in the Persian province of Judah was probably initiated at the very
beginning of the 4th century BCE, most likely caused by a coincidence of different his-
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historical circumstances. Despite the cultural and religious liberties enabled by the Persian government, these coins should not be viewed as an independent autonomous Jewish coinage – the right to mint coins was not given to the Jews until the 2nd century BCE by Antiochus VII (mentioned in 1 Macc. 15:6), but as the primary forerunners of the actual Jewish coinage beginning under the Hasmonaean rulers in the 2nd century BCE and are therefore in this context rather to be understood as proto-Jewish coins.

In the larger context of the Persian Empire the minting of local coinages within the different (semi-)autonomous areas became an established procedure during the 4th century BCE. Especially in the Persian provinces of Asia Minor various coin series issued under Persian administration can be found, displaying a mixture of local and Persian iconography. As a rule the obverse of the coins made reference to the Persian administration, whereas the reverse was used to display a local design (e.g. Fig. 146 and Fig. 148).60 The monetary development of Persian coinage itself with the minting of the gold darics (Fig. 154) and silver sigloi (Fig. 153) as the imperial coinage was a development of the late 6th century BCE and strongly dependent on the Persian conquest of the provinces in Asia Minor and the existence of coinage in these areas.61 The introduction of the Persian coinage should be linked with the administrative and financial reorganization of the Persian Empire taking place under Darius I (521-486 BCE).62 The Persian Imperial coinage did however not circulate as standard currency throughout the whole Persian Empire. The silver sigloi were used relatively widely, but only in areas where coinage was already in use, such as in the provinces in Asia Minor,63 this traditional perception of the royal Persian coinage has however been questioned.64 Fact is, the necessity of coinage in the Achaemenid world did probably not develop until the contact between the Achaemenid Empire and the western world – primarily with the Greek culture – increased.65

In Palestine diverse historical circumstances probably lead to the development of a local coinage. Egypt had by the end of the 5th century BCE regained its independence

60 Kraay 1976, 32-33; Zahle 1996, 125.
61 Alram 1986, 101-102; Carradice 1987, 75-76.
64 P. Vargyas argues against a restriction of the circulation of the Persian sigloi and therewith for a revision of the idea that the Persian coinage was primarily restricted to Asia Minor, according to the evidence of the Babylonian tablets (Vargyas 1999, 246-262).
from the Persian Empire, which necessitated structural changes to the southern border of the 5th Persian satrapy, appearing in form of building activities in a row of administrative and military sites south of Judah, amongst others in Lachish, Beer-Sheva and En Gedi (Tel Goren), around 400 BCE, and a more firm involvement of the Persian government in the local provincial administration of the Jewish Temple State as the southern part of Palestine became the new Persian frontier. This development lead to noticeable changes in the material culture, amongst others visible in the form of the use of more standardised stamped seal impressions – which probably constitute the closest comparable group of material in relation to the iconography and legends of the coinage – than during the previous centuries.66

Jerusalem had been thoroughly destroyed during the second conquest of the city by the Babylonians in 586 BCE (1 Kings 24:10-25:1) and was almost completely abandoned upon the deportation of the Jews to Babylon. The city remained in this state of destruction with only minor adjustments, such as the erection of city walls by Nehemiah towards the end of the 6th century BCE (Nehemiah 2:11-15), for almost a century before it was slowly repopulated (Map 4).67 The introduction and development of coinage in Judah was probably directly associated with the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem and the re-institutionalisation of the cult during the early Persian period after the return from the Babylonian exile,68 and its establishment as a financial institution.

The payment of the taxes – especially the poll tax – to the temple can be traced in Biblical sources and through epigraphic evidence through approximately five centuries until the destruction of the Jewish Temple in 70 CE causing these payments to cease.69 The poll tax was possibly institutionalised in Judah by Ezra (Ezra 7) during the late 5th or very early 4th century BCE, with the introduction of new Persian regulations issued under the Achaemenid king Artaxerxes II (404-359 BCE).70 The Biblical text states that the priests and other servants of the Jewish Temple were to be exempted from...
paying this tax (Ezra 7:24), a procedure later revived respectively by Antiochus III (AJ 12.142-4) and Antiochus VII (1 Macc 15:5-6). The payment of this tax was according to the testimony of Matthew 17:24 continued into the 1st century CE, until the destruction of the Jewish Temple in 70 CE at the end of the First Jewish War. The monetary development in Judah was probably a direct response to the institutionalisation of these economic tax laws centred on the administration of the temple state, i.e. the temple, in Jerusalem. The speed with which the locally minted coinage gained ground in Judah is however very difficult to verify.

1.2 The YHD Coinage

The YHD coins, primarily found within the borders of the Jewish province (Map 3), were minted under Persian administration during the 4th century BCE and under Ptolemaic rule at least during the first half of the 3rd century BCE. They display a combination of iconographic elements which can specifically be attributed to the material culture of Persian, Greek, or Jewish dominated areas, only found to be characteristic for this small province. The coins carry the Persian name of the province of Judah, which at the same time was possibly also the name of the city of Jerusalem. In the beginning it was written only in Aramaic as YHD, but later under Ptolemaic rule also in Hebrew as YHDH (yehudah), almost always using the palaeo-Hebrew script; the simultaneous use of different languages and scripts on coins from the same place is a characteristic feature for all coins minted in Palestine during this time.
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1.2.1 The Typology of the YHD Coinage

Only a few types of these early Jewish coins were minted. Under Persian rule the YHD coins of the 4th century BCE particularly imitated the Athenian Greek coinage being the most common currency circulating during this time (Fig. 149), as it is obvious from the regular use of the head of Pallas Athena on the obverse and the use of the owl on the reverse found on the earlier coins, the palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD distinctly labelled them as belonging to the province of Judah (Fig. 1-2); a comparison of the coins furthermore displays the increasing stylisation of the original image taking place.

Also belonging to the most used standard types was the obverse carrying the head of the Persian king and on the reverse a falcon with its wings spread and the inscription YHD (Fig. 4-5), a few of these obverses are also found combined with the owl of Athena. Different additional images have been found in smaller numbers: a bird identified as a dove (Fig. 6), the lily (Fig. 7), the protome of a winged animal, the ear (Fig. 8), the so-called shofar-horn (Fig. 9), a helmet (Fig. 10),79 and further images partly only known from individual coins.80 Uncertainties still remain concerning the exact chronology of the coins – with the exception of the more securely identified Ptolemaic issues paralleled by the official royal silver coin issues emitted by the administration in Alexandria during the first part of the 3rd century BCE,81 which is dealt with in more detail below (§1.4). The somewhat rough rendering of both images and the irregular writing and placing of the palaeo-Hebrew letters on many YHD coins, could be viewed as the work of inexperienced workers, but also that the artistic quality of the coin images was not considered to be of high importance,82 the fact that occasionally coins were left blank on one side could be an indication of the latter.

Among the most noticeable images is the image of the lily (discussed further in §2.5), which came to play a significant role on the YHD coins. Probably at an early stage of the Persian imitations of the Athenian coins the lily replaced the olive twig on the coins and thereby the symbol of the minting city Jerusalem was introduced (Fig. 3).83 In doing so the identification of these coins as belonging to Judah/Jerusalem in
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addition to the use of the YHD inscription was highlighted. On later coins the image of the lily evolved from being a secondary element to be used as a main image (Fig. 7). The image enjoyed a continued importance in Palestinian coinage until the 1st century CE,\textsuperscript{84} which later will be dealt with in more detail (§2.5.1). Other images are difficult to explain, among these the image of the ear (Fig. 8), which has been identified either as a representation of Jahveh,\textsuperscript{85} or as a symbol for the shema prayer (the credo to God).\textsuperscript{86} The latter might be closer the nature of the ear depicted on the YHD coin. A secure identification of the image of the ear still has to be found or specified more clearly before it can be definitely stated what intention the ear was depicted or if it carried a meaning specific for the Jewish cult.

1.2.2 The Metrology of the YHD Coinage

It has long been generally accepted that the denomination system of the YHD coins followed the weight standard of the Greek Attic coinage; hence the early Jewish coins were divided into obols, half-obols, quarter-obol according to this standard. The metrological studies carried out by Y. Ronen on the YHD coins have however disclosed that the coins were produced according to two different weight standards during their time of use.\textsuperscript{87} These results were confirmed by the study of Ptolemaic YHD coins carried out by H. Gitler and C. Lorber.\textsuperscript{88} It has consequently been deduced that the denominational system of the coins during the late Persian period was based on the weight standard of the shekel, which subsequently was replaced by the Attic weight standard of the tetradrachm. The shekel with an average weight at this time of 11.4 g. was subdivided into 24 gerahs,\textsuperscript{89} with an average weight of approximately 0.48 g. and half-gerahs with an average weight of c. 0.26 g. Judging by the weights of the coins as found listed,\textsuperscript{90} they were issued in the following denominations beginning with the smallest: a quarter-gerahs (of an average of 0.13 g.), half-gerahs (average of 0.26 g.), gerahs (average of 0.48 g.). A

\textsuperscript{84} MESHORER 2001, 9, 10-11.
\textsuperscript{85} MESHORER 2001, 13-14.
\textsuperscript{86} GERSON 2001, 110; HENDIN 2010, 131.
\textsuperscript{87} RONEN 1998; RONEN 2006.
\textsuperscript{88} H. GITLER and C. LORBER (2006, 4-6).
\textsuperscript{89} Y. MESHORER and S. QEDAR consider it a possibility that gerah might be the Semitic name for the Greek obol (MESHORER / QEDAR 1999, 70).
\textsuperscript{90} MESHORER 2001, 197-200; HENDIN 2010, 126-132.
few larger coins have been found (tentatively named as quarter-shekels),\(^9\) which represent exceptions to this division and are direct imitations of Athenian coins, which may be dated among the earliest YHD coins issued.\(^2\)

According to the mentioning of the payment of the annual temple-tribute in the Hebrew Bible the shekel was always divided into 20 – and not 24 – *gerah* corresponding to the ordinance of the temple.\(^3\) This can however be explained by a change in the weight system of the shekel occurring during the late Iron Age or early Persian period.\(^4\) During the very early Hellenistic period this denominational system was then adjusted according to the Greek Attic weight standard of the tetradrachm with an average weight of 16.5 g., divided into 24 obols with an average weight of 0.69 g., the half-obol with an average weight of 0.34 g., and the silver quarter-obol or tetartemorion with an average weight of 0.17 g. were introduced according to the denominations otherwise prevalent in Palestinian coinage at this time.\(^5\)

The use of two different denominational systems during the late Persian and early Hellenistic Period should out of several reasons be given some consideration, though keeping in mind that the production methods of the early Jewish coins of this time allowed great variations not only within the quality of the execution of the coin images, but also the size and weight of the flans; a reason to be careful in assessing in what form the coins could have been used as payment of the annual poll-tax (below §1.3.1). General conclusions drawn from the material should therefore be viewed with caution, however not necessarily readily dismissed. The shift in weight standards between the two historic periods is in retrospect not unexpected. Noticeable is that contrary to otherwise common in the early Ptolemaic period this weight was not adapted to the reduced weight of the Ptolemaic weight standard of an approx. weight of 14.3 g. for a tetradrachm common from the early 3\(^{rd}\) century BCE, equivalent to the denominational system otherwise commonly used in Palestine at the time.\(^6\)

---

\(^9\) HENDIN 2010, 126.
\(^2\) E.g. MESHORER 2001, no. 2-3.
\(^3\) Exodus 30:13; Leviticus 27:25; Numbers 3:47, 18:16; Ezekiel 45:12.
\(^4\) RONEN 1996, 122-125.
\(^6\) MORKHOLM 1991, 9; NOESKE 2000, 21; GITLER / LORBER 2006, 4-5.
1.2.3 The Hebrew Language and Script

One of the most distinguishing elements of the early (as well as later) Jewish coins was the script and languages used on them, especially the palaeo-Hebrew script and the Hebrew language. Hebrew had until the time of the Babylonian exile (598-538 BCE) and the destruction of the first Jewish Temple in 586 BCE been the primary language in Judah, but it had already from the late 8th century BCE largely been restricted to this area. During the time of the exile the Aramaic language was introduced and by the end of the 4th century BCE this language had to a large extent superseded Hebrew in Judah not only as the colloquial language, but also as the lingua franca. The lack of documents written in Hebrew and the few probably early dating seals and stamp impressions found carrying this language show that Hebrew should not be considered a common everyday language past the early days of the Persian period.

The letters of the palaeo-Hebrew script were introduced into epigraphic sources and coinage during the 4th century BCE. Not only did from this time onwards Hebrew and the palaeo-Hebrew script apparently remain in use as a liturgical language and was continuously used in religious literature, as in a part of the Qumran texts written and used also long after the Persian period. The language was explicitly used to emphasise the own national affiliation, as it can be observed through the specific use of Hebrew for texts with a religious or national content contrary to secular texts in neighbouring Samaria. The question is, whether this language was also actively and continuously upheld as the cult-language within the Jewish Temple respectively the temple administration into the Roman Imperial period, until the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. The main source for the active use of the Hebrew language during the 1st and 2nd centuries CE is found in the Qumran-texts or stem from the documents of Bar Kokhba from the Judaean Desert – not to mention the early Hebrew inscriptions from Jerusalem and its environs, such as the one found on the façade of the Bene Ḥezir tomb overlooking the

97 WEIPPERT 1988, 687-691.
98 NAVEH 1970, 278-9; NAVEH 2009a, 4-5.
100 LEVINE 1998, 74; KOTTSIEPER 2007, 104.
101 LIPSCITS / VANDERHOOF 2007, 78-79.
103 NAVEH 1998, 92; NAVEH 2009, 35.
Kidron Valley (1st century BCE), or the Nash Papyrus from Egypt dated variously from between the 2nd century BCE to the 1st century CE. These texts may suggest that the Hebrew language was mainly used within circles of well-educated members of the Jewish society or among specific groups with highly developed religious-nationalistic ideologies. The later development of Rabbinic Hebrew is a result of the continued use of the Hebrew language. It is very difficult to ascertain where and exactly to what extent the languages were used during the preceding centuries, since neither the dominant Aramaic, nor Hebrew or the various dialects of both were used exclusively at any point in time.

1.3 Names and Titles on Persian Period YHD Coins

So far a very limited number of personal names and titles have been identified in the YHD coins: YWHNN HKHN (Yohanan ha-kohen) (the priest), YHZQYH HPHH (Yehezqiyah ha-pechah) (Yehezqiyah the Governor) or just YHZQYH, and YHDH (Yehudah). The use of the Hebrew names and titles deliver information that can enlighten the picture of the political situation of this time, and the transition into the early Hellenistic period, which cannot be found in the otherwise prevalent anonymity of the YHD coins on the identities of the minting authorities. It is noteworthy that these names are all written in Hebrew, and not in Aramaic. It should however be kept in mind that these only constitute a part of the YHD coinage.

1.3.1 YWHNN HKHN

So far only one coin with the inscription YWHNN HKHN has been found (Fig. 11). On the obverse is a human male head facing front, and on the reverse is an owl, the head facing front, and the palaeo-Hebrew inscription YWHNN (upwards left) and HKHN

---

104 LEVINE 1998, 75. The use of Hebrew in the Dead Sea Scrolls cannot be seen as an immediate mirror of the use of Hebrew as a colloquial language, although to some extent this seems to have been the case within the various religious groups, as different traditions of Hebrew have been identified in these writings; see SÁENZ-BADILLOS / ELWOLDE 1996, 132.
105 See, e.g., ALBRIGHT 1937, 145-76.
106 As pointed out by L. LEVINE (1998, 74-5).
According to the prevalent opinion among researchers the traditional dating of it to the mid 4th century BCE is to be considered appropriate. It is important to highlight the existence of this coin at this time, even though only one specimen of this type has so far been documented, displaying the clearly defined political figure of the priest – convincingly identified with the high-priest Yoḥanan II of the mid 4th century BCE by D. Barag. Interesting is however the use of both the head facing front, also sometimes identified as a mask, on the obverse and the owl on the reverse of a coin undoubtedly connected with a Jewish religious official. This could on the one hand be a testimony of a very different attitude towards the use of graven images prevalent during this time, but can on the other hand also be connected with the iconography of coins minted in other areas of the Persian Empire.

The approximate weight of the YWHḤNN HKHN coin of 0.16 grams is very close to the average weight of the tetartemorion, which would in fact speak against a date of this coin to the Persian period. The question is how far any conclusions concerning dating on the basis of weight can be drawn on account of one individual coin, since evidently the average weights of all coin groups classified according to their iconography could vary greatly (§1.2). Additional material would certainly be needed to be able to draw confident conclusions.

The reasons for a Jewish high priest to issue coins under Persian administration are perhaps not clear at first sight. It is however very likely that the office of the Persian governor and the position of the Jewish high-priest in some instances were combined in one person. This seems to be reflected in the use of the inscription HKHN, even though it is not explicitly stated that person in question was the ha-kohen ha-gadol, i.e. the high-priest. This would be conforming to the appointment of Persian governors during the previous centuries, where verifiably persons from existing local dynasties – to which also the Jewish high priests belonged – had been selected to hold these posi-

110 BARAG 1986-1987, 10-17.
111 BARAG 1985, 168.
112 Also dealt with by L.S. FRIED (2003, 69-82).
113 Not 0.51 g. as stated by Y. RONEN (1998, 125); see BARAG 1986-1987, 7; MESHORER 2001, 199 no. 20.
114 J. SCHAPER offers the possible explanation that both the high priests and the Persian governors equally minted coins, therewith deducing the rule of Judah to have been a diarchy of sorts (SCHAPER 2002, 157-159).
The continued increasing political influence of the high-priests in Jerusalem does not necessarily depend on a mergence of the religious and political functions.

A merging of the political positions of the high priest and the governor does however not have to be the only explanation for the appearance of the title HKHN on this coin. With the establishment of the new Persian regulations at the beginning of the 4th century BCE and with this probably also the implementation of a local coinage in Judah from this time, the Jewish Temple apparently came simultaneously to function as treasury, bank – and in extension of this possibly also as mint, most likely under the supervision of the high priest, who also – at least at times – acted as the appointed Persian provincial governor. Taxes were not only collected and administrated here, but the collected coins perhaps also melted down before they were send as tribute in form of bullions to the Achaemenid king, according to the standard practice of other ancient Near Eastern palaces and temples, corresponding with the Achaemenid practice of handling and refining of silver and gold as stated by Herodotus (Herodotus 3.96.2), even if the specific details concerning these procedures are still largely unknown. The high purity of the coins with an average of 97% silver used for the production of the coin would have made them eligible for the payment of the annual temple-tribute to the Temple in Jerusalem, which was to be paid according to the measure of half a shekel as stated in Ex 30:13 and 30:15. This was also conforming to the demands of a high metallic purity of the Persian administration. The original use of the weight standard of the shekel for the YHD coins could be understood as a further indication of this. It is furthermore possible that the Jewish Temple increasingly accumulated wealth and estab-

115 Compare with VANDERKAM 2004 und BRUTTI 2006 (dealing with the time from the beginning of the Ptolemaic rule of Palestine until the beginning of the Hasmonaean Dynasty).
117 This would be conforming to the conception of the high priest acting as the leader of the Jewish people also during the following periods, ZEITLIN 1957, 3-4.
118 SCHAPER argues against the concept of Judah being a temple state according to the model of the Mesopotamian temple states (SCHAPER 2002, 165).
120 Measurements of coins from the Ptolemaic period are listed by GITLER / LORBER 2006, 15, 21-24.
121 According to the Hebrew text, the tax of half a shekel paid to the temple was to be equivalent to the measure of half a shekel according to the standard of the temple shekel, without specifying the use of coins. In the Greek Septuagint version however, the payment of the temple tax is specified to be the half of a didrachm. As in Hebrew, in the Vulgata the payment is specified to be a dimidium sicii iuxta mensuram templi or sanctuarii (Exodus 30:13). From this it is not possible to deduce anything about the early coins having had been minted as the one-to-one equivalent of the required tax of half a shekel. It is more likely that the payment was measured according to the weight of half a shekel, rather than coin type – although this later changed.
122 ZOURNATZI 2000, 256-264.
lished land possessions as temple property during this period in line with the practices found in temples and sanctuaries in other parts of the Persian Empire.123

The foundation for the increasing political and economic power of the high priests established during this time was probably a result of the overall development of the Jewish Temple as a financial institution, which included the development and use of an own coinage.124 A comparable example is the local silver coinage minted during the early Hellenistic period (approx. 340-300 BCE) in Bambyce (later Hierapolis).125 According to their Aramaic inscriptions they were at least at first issued by the priests ‘BD HDD (Abd-hadad) and ‘BY’TY (Abyati).126 On the obverse of the coins the facing or profile head of Atargatis with a crown or a female head without headgear is displayed, on the reverse a priest with one hand raised in the fashion of praying figures known from Achaemenid iconography standing below a canopy or a chariot carrying a figure (the high priest himself?) with one hand raised and in front of him a charioteer is placed on the coin is displayed (Figs. 150-152).127 The names of the priests were later, probably under the rule of the Seleucids, replaced by the Hellenized ones, Alexandros and Se(leukos).128 A similar practise of combining political and religious positions can possibly be argued in the case of another local coin series – the so-called Frataraka series – minted at Istakhr in Persis.129 The dating of the series has been subject to some discussion, with proposed dates ranging between the first half of the 3rd century BCE until the first half of the 2nd century BCE.130 The coins carry the names of the priest-kings of Istakhr written in Aramaic. On the obverse of the coins the head of the priest-kings is displayed clad in variations of the typical Iranian headdress, the Baschlyk, as well as the Hellenistic ruler diadem respectively a tiara. On the reverse the type with a fire altar or more likely a temple façade was displayed with a figure raising the hand(s) in prayer and a standard to the left or right of the building (Fig. 155). The sacred iconography used in these cases unquestionably also held specific political implications to some ex-

---

123 BLENKINSOPP 2001, 61-68.
124 LEMAIRE 2007, 60 – with further references.
125 SEYRIG 1971, 11-21; ZAHLE 1996, 128-129.
126 SEYRIG 1971, 16 no. 1-3d (Abd-hadad), 19 no. 4a-b (Abyati).
127 The reverse type is an imitation of the royal Sidonian coinage of the 4th century BCE, BETLYON 1976, 11-35.
tent displaying a certain amount of local independence within the Seleucid Empire, but not quite reaching full autonomy, as it was the case in the Jewish coinage at this time. Furthermore, the apparent importance of these of temples respectively priests regarding local financial aspects is highlighted through these examples.

1.3.2 ḤZWQYH ḤPHH and ḤHZQYH

Two coin types carry the name ḤZWQYH (Yehezqiyah), one with the title ḤPHH (ha-pechah) and one without a title. The name ḤZWQYH has in both cases traditionally been considered to be a reference to the same person, identified as a Persian satrap or governor (pechah) by the name of Yehezqiyah minting coins during the late time of Persian authority in Judah and without the use of the title ḤPHH under the Macedonian occupancy of Palestine during the late 4th century BCE, but this chronology should be reversed.

On the obverse of the ḤZWQYH ḤPHH coins (here Fig. 15) the head of a man presumably representing ḤZWQYH is facing front. On the reverse the Athenian owl is displayed head facing front, on its right the inscription ḤZWQYH, on its left ḤPHH. The coins carrying the inscription ḤZWQYH without the title pechah are completely different (Fig. 12). On the obverse is the head of a youthful male facing left, on the reverse the protome of a winged and horned animal facing left or right and below it the palaeo-Hebrew inscription ḤZWQYH.

The use of the Persian title ḤPHH seemingly clarifies the political position of the Yehezqiyah named to belong within the Persian administration. The examination of the weight of the ḤZWQYH ḤPHH coins has however shown that the average weight of these with 0.18 g. is much closer to that of the denomination of the quarter-obol (0.17 g.) than that of the half-gerah (0.26 g.). This could tentatively suggest that the ḤZWQYH ḤPHH coins were in fact not minted under Persian authority, as assumed on the basis of the use of the Persian title of office, but was rather minted under Greek authority.

Contrarily to this a cautious survey of the weight of the ḤZWQYH (without the title) coins as found published shows that these coins are close to an average weight of

132 MILDENBERG 1998b, 72; FRIED 2003, 66.
134 MILDENBERG 1998b, 72.
which corresponds with the average weight of the half-gerah of 0.26 g. used during the time of the Persian rule. According to their average weight the chronology of the YḤZQYH and YḤZQYH HPHḤ coins should be revised, in accordance with the shift in the use of different weight-standards from the shekel to the Athenian drachm established to have taken place between the time of Persian authority and Macedonian respectively later the Ptolemaic authority, placing the YḤZQYH in the time of the Persian rule and the YḤZQYH HPHḤ coins in the transitional period between the rule of the Persians and that of the Ptolemies in Palestine.

This possible change of perspective motivates a new appraisal of the iconography of the YḤZQYH coins. The reverse of an individual coin also carrying the inscription YḤZQYH (without the title) could provide a further indication of the dating of these coins to the time of the Persian rule of Palestine. On the reverse of this coin the protome of a winged animal very similar to the reverse-type of the other known YḤZQYH coins is displayed, only here the head of the winged animal has been replaced by the head of the Persian king (Fig. 13); a type also known from Samarian coins (Fig. 161). On the obverse of this individual YḤZQYH coin the head of a horned cat-like beast is displayed. The typological similarities between all the coin reverses of the YḤZQYH coins and the use of the same palaeo-Hebrew inscription suggest that a Persian period connection can be assumed. It seems very unlikely that the head of the Persian king would have been placed on a coin minted under Greek rule. A contemporary similar representation of a youthful male head can be found on Cilician coins minted by (a) unknown Persian satrap(s) or governor(s) during the 4th century BCE (Fig. 146 and Fig. 147).

The title of pechah is well known in Palestine throughout the Persian period, and a chronological list of the governors of Judah can be reconstructed on the basis of the ancient texts and inscriptions found. It is however important to note that within the group of YHD stamp impressions no personal names and no official titles are to be

---

135 Mildenberg 1998a, pl. XXII nos. 19-20; Meshorer 2001, 199, Pl. 3 nos. 24-26; Spaer 1977, 201, Pl. 25 E-H; Gitler / Lorber 2006, Group 1, nos. 1-4; With coins varying in weight between 0.20 and 0.30 g.
136 Ronen 1998, 125.
137 Meshorer / Qedar 1999, Pl. 5 no. 24-29.
139 Troxell / Kagan 1989, 276 no. 3
140 Meshorer 2001, 16.
found together throughout the 4th century, contrary to the Persian period stamp impressions from the 6th and 5th centuries, where they are to be found on nine out of the twelve types identified.\textsuperscript{142} The lack of known names of Persian governors of the 4th century BCE is in comparison to the reconstructed list of governors from the 5th century BCE indeed noticeable.\textsuperscript{143} Also in all documents the title of pechah is used in connection with the name of the province, not together with personal names.\textsuperscript{144} So far no other known coins carry the title \textit{and} the personal name of any political officials in Palestine – or anywhere else in the Persian Empire – at this time;\textsuperscript{145} the coin presenting the priest YWHNN was equally a representation of a political entity, as – despite the religious implications of the title – the circumstances connected with the position of the high-priest in Jerusalem at this time implied a different political reality through a connection of the official positions.\textsuperscript{146} The chronological order of the minting of coins with the inscriptions YHZQYH HPHH and YHZQYH respectively on the basis of typological or historic considerations is not clear.\textsuperscript{147} The discrepancy in the average weight of the coins could suggest that the YHZQYH coins were minted previous to the YHZQYH HPHH coins. Y. Meshorer made the same suggestion on the basis of comparative studies with the Samarian coinage, where the title of office was always omitted, hence the YHZQYH were issued before the YHZQYH HPHH coins.\textsuperscript{148} This does however not explain why the title was used on the apparently later minted series of pechah coins.

Attempts have been made in identifying the historic figure of YHZQYH behind these coins. One person attested for in ancient literary sources that comes in question is the high-priest by the name of Hezekiah/Hiskia referred to by Flavius Josephus in \textit{Contra Apionem} 1.22 (186-189),\textsuperscript{149} who according to Josephus followed Ptolemy to Egypt after he had won the battle at Gaza in 312 BCE.\textsuperscript{150} The historic correctness of this brief

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[143] SCHAPER 2002, 160-164.
\item[144] KOTTSIEPER 2007, 107.
\item[146] WEIPPERT 1988, 687.
\item[147] MILDENBERG assumes that the title was omitted on the later coins, where YHZQYH would have been minting under Greek authority (MILDENBERG 1998b, 72); MESHORER is apparently not sure, leaving room for more viewpoints (2001, 16).
\item[148] MESHORER 2001, 16.
\item[149] Quoting the work of Pseudo-Hecataeus; According to P. SCHÄFER this text is a Jewish forgery from the mid 2nd century BCE (SCHÄFER 1995, 9).
\item[150] KINDLER 1974, 76; RONEN 1998, 125; MESHORER 2001, 15-17.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
reference is however controversial.\textsuperscript{151} It is known that Ptolemy – after his peaceful conquering of Jerusalem in 301 BCE after the battle of Ipsus – punished the anti-Ptolemaic fractions acting against him here in favour of his adversary Antigonus.\textsuperscript{152} It has been suggested that the apparent introduction of the title \textit{pechah} on the later coins of YḤZQYH could be explained as an attempt of showing the continuity in government in the person of YḤZQYH from the late Persian period into the beginning of the rule of Ptolemy (later Ptolemy I Soter).\textsuperscript{153} The evidence of the Persian period listed above (settlement patterns, stamped seal impressions, tax system) all demonstrate a gradual development between the Persian and the Macedonian/Ptolemaic periods, with no essential changes, which also would corroborate with the continuity of the provincial administration.\textsuperscript{154}

\subsection*{1.3.3 YHDH}

Some coins carrying the inscription YHDH (\textit{Yehudah}) present somewhat of an enigma (Fig. 14). The iconography is quite forward: a head facing front is displayed on the obverse and on the reverse an owl is depicted with the words YHD and YHDH placed to the left and to the right of it. The double reference to YHD and YHDH is problematic. The legends can be understood in several ways: as the mentioning of the province of Judah twice on the same coin, in Aramaic (YHD) and in Hebrew (YHDH), or the legends refer specifically to the province of Judah (YHD) and to the city of Jerusalem (YHDH), last but not least the inscription could refer to the province \textit{Yehud} and to a person by the name of \textit{Yehudah}.

The suggestion that the province of Judah purposefully was mentioned twice on the reverse of the same coin using two different languages is unprecedented.\textsuperscript{155} The hypothesis that both languages were used deliberately on this coin to actively demonstrate the transition from one rule (using Aramaic) to another (predominantly using the Hebrew language) is problematic, since it first of all finds no parallels in any sources and basically seems to be based on a modern knowledge of the history of the languages, secondly the

\textsuperscript{151} Sasse 2004, 97.
\textsuperscript{152} Sasse 2004, 99-100.
\textsuperscript{153} Schäfer 1995, 9-10; Kottsieper 2007, 107; The high age of Hezekiah at the time of the Battle at Gaza mentioned by Josephus, would have made the long duration of his governance possible (Contra Apionem 1.186-189).
\textsuperscript{154} Lipschits / Vanderhoof 2007, 84-85.
\textsuperscript{155} Kottsieper 2007, 108.
name YHD is frequently found on early Jewish coins of a Ptolemaic date, carrying the images of members of the royal Ptolemaic house.\textsuperscript{156} The second idea that both the province of Judah and the city of Jerusalem are referred to with the two legends is also unparalleled. However, the name יְהוּדָה (Yehudah) is apparently used as name for the city of Jerusalem in Chronicles II 25:28, which does supply some ground for this argumentation. The last suggestion that the legends refer to the province of Judah and a person of the name of Yehudah can be met with more confidence, though problems also arise here.

The interpretation of this coin as testimony of a Persian governor or Jewish high-priest (or both) in Judah not otherwise known from any sources, as suggested by Y. Meshorer,\textsuperscript{157} deserves attention. Although Meshorer states that the head on the obverse is a “clumsy copy of the Cilician prototype of the head of Arethusa” the similarities between this obverse and fashion of the obverses of the coin of YWHÎNN HKHN and the coins of YHZQYH HPHÎH are obvious. All display male heads facing front, with slight variations of the facial features and the hair. The inspiration behind the display might have derived from the Cilician Arethusa coins (Fig. 145), also known from the 4th century BCE Samarian coins (Fig. 158),\textsuperscript{158} but the idea behind the YHD coins probably had only little in common with these coins other than fashion of display. An examination of the coins minted by contemporary Persian satraps is far more revealing. On a number of Cilician silver fractional coins (tetartemorions) minted by unidentified satraps during the 4th century very similar heads are found displayed: on the obverse a Persian king or hero in kneeling-running stance to the right, holding dagger and bow, on the reverse a female head – also sometimes referred to as Apollo – with long hair facing front (e.g. Fig. 148).\textsuperscript{159} The 4th century BCE Persian governors and/or high-priests of Judah seem likewise to have preferred this specific way of official representation: placing the head on the obverse and on the reverse the owl and the inscription(s), thereby following a standard scheme used by Persian satraps, using the facing head originally conceived as female, as an official image of their own status. The fact that the representation of the youthful male head on the coins of YÎHZQYH, without the title HPHÎH, also finds its immediate comparisons in the contemporary Cilician coinage minted under the Persian sa-

\textsuperscript{156} E.g. types listed by D. Barag (Barag 1994-1999, 30) – Coin types with the images of Ptolemy I alone, Ptolemy I with Berenike I and Ptolemy II with Arsinoe II, all carry the inscription YHD.

\textsuperscript{157} Meshorer 2001, 14-15.

\textsuperscript{158} Meshorer / Qedar 1999, pl. 12 no. 82.

\textsuperscript{159} Troxell / Kagan 1989, 276 no. 2.
traps substantiates this argumentation. The images of the heads on the YHD coins should probably not be seen as actual attempts to portray the persons in question, but as the presentation of the idea of this person, or rather his official function or political position.  

Although the YHDH coin, despite the parallels found in the Cilician coinage, does not provide evidence of the dating of a historic person named Yehudah, the average weight of this coin (0.33g.) could support a date after the period of Persian authority, such a deduction should however again be viewed with caution. If the identification of the inscription as the personal name of YHDH on this coin is correct, it would mean the introduction of an otherwise unknown political figure into the late 4th century BCE Judah. This only goes to show that the material at hand is still too limited to provide enough secure evidence of many details of this period. In addition to this, the exchanging use of the inscription YHDH in the early Hellenistic period complicate the identification of this name, since it in many cases without a doubt referred to the name of the province. The Hebrew name YHDH has not been found on coins securely dated to the Persian period.

1.4 The God and the Winged Wheel? (BM TC242.5)

One much discussed coin type is the unusual silver “drachm” in the British Museum (BM TC242.5) (Fig. 156). On the obverse a male bearded head clad in a Corinthian helmet is depicted and the reverse is probably displaying a deity clad in a himation seated on what appears to be a winged wheel holding a bird (possibly a falcon) on his outstretched hand, in front facing him is a stele-like object – sometimes described as a figure of Bes or mask, but not yet securely identified. The Hebrew letters Yod and Hé are placed in the upper field on the left side, a Daleth (or Resh, or Waw) on the right side of the head of the seated figure. The inscription has traditionally been understood as the word YHD, but this is not without controversy. This coin – only dealt with briefly here – in most ways differs from YHD coins displaying the depictions of humans oth-

---

163 E.g. MESHORER 2001, 2-3, no. 1; HENDIN 2010, 126, no. 1045.
erwise known within this group of material (§1.3) and much effort has gone into identifying the seated figure and the whole representation at hand, still a definite answer to this question still remains to be found.\textsuperscript{164} The male head on the obverse has likewise received attention and has amongst others been recognised either as Bagoas, the governor of Judah under Artaxerxes II (404-359 BCE),\textsuperscript{165} as Bagoas the eunuch of Artaxerxes III (359-338 BCE),\textsuperscript{166} or as the Greek mercenary Mentor of Rhodes who was appointed a high administrative post in the 5th Persian satrapy.\textsuperscript{167} Since only one singular example of this type of coin is so far known, which does not stem from a secure archaeological context, any attempts at making conclusions regarding the true nature of this coin are greatly hampered.

The idea of it representing a syncretistic combination of Jahveh and Zeus, or a similar eastern god, is considered to be the most favourable hypothesis.\textsuperscript{168} This suggestion is based on traits observable in the Samaritan religion since the beginning of the Persian period, possibly reflected in the Samaritan coinage of the 4th century BCE.\textsuperscript{169} A brief comparison with the Persian period coins from Samaria confirms that the active involvement of the Persian government in the coinage minted in the provinces was generally kept at a minimum. The coins of the province of Samaria\textsuperscript{170} were minted under Persian authority probably in the years between c. 375-332 BCE.\textsuperscript{171} As with the YHD coinage, the Samarian coins were all minted in silver, with a few silver-plated exceptions, using the widespread denominations of the Athenian tetradrachm divided in the denominations drachm, obol, half obol and quarter obol, with the obol as the most commonly used denomination. The average weights of the denominations are all lower than the average weights of the Athenian issues based on the tetradrachm with the average weight of 16.5 g. According to the listing of coins by Y. Meshorer and S. Qedar the average

\textsuperscript{164} KINDLER 1974a, 73-74; MESHORER 2001, 2-3 – who argues for the identification of the seated figure as Jahveh based on the comparison with his identification of the depiction of the ear as a representation of Jahveh (MESHORER 2001, 13-14).

\textsuperscript{165} In his earlier publication (1982a, 27) Y. MESHORER suggests the face to belong to the governor Bagoas in office under Artaxerxes II. Later he revised this suggestion in favour of identifying the image as a common way of representing a Persian high official (MESHORER 2001, 3-4).

\textsuperscript{166} BARAG 1993, 264-265.

\textsuperscript{167} SHENKAR 2007-2008, 18.

\textsuperscript{168} KIENLE 1975, 34; SHENKAR 2007-2008, 18; de HULSTER 2007, 19 – specifies the image of the sitting figure as a solar deity.

\textsuperscript{169} As noted by GERSON 2001, 108.

\textsuperscript{170} The following is primarily based on the work of Y. MESHORER and S. QEDAR (MESHORER / QEDAR 1991; MESHORER / QEDAR 1999).

\textsuperscript{171} A discussion of the chronology in MESHORER / QEDAR 1991 (pp. 65-67) and 1999 (p. 71); GERSON 2001, 111; Alexander the Great re-founded the city after the revolt of the Samaritans in 332/331 BCE as a Macedonian military colony, KASHER 1990, 19-20.
weights of the Samarian denominations was 3.62 g. for the drachm (average of 16 coins listed) – in comparison the single Athenian drachm weighed more than 4 g., 0.67 g. for the obol (80 coins), 0.30 g. for the hemi-obol (62 coins), 0.15 g. for the quarter obol (20 coins). The fact that the Persian administration did not impose any specific prototypes or conventions on the coins minted in any areas under their authority not only explains the many differences between the provinces, but also the use and development of local types. In the case of Samaria this resulted in a wide span of types recognisingly imitating iconography from different regions or types distinct for Samaria. Athenian, Cilician and Sidonian coin types served as the most common prototypes, reflecting the commercial contacts of the province with the Phoenician coastal cities, iconographic traits from seal-impressions from amongst others Syria and Babylonia have equally been identified among the coin images. Although a distinct lack of coin finds from the other areas respectively prevail, similarities between the iconography of the Judahite YHD coinage and the Samarian coins minted during the 4th century BCE can be established, primarily caused by the common denominator of the Athenian currency. The Samarian coins, however, display an overall completely different attitude towards the use of Pagan religious iconography than found in the YHD coins. A multitude of images displaying animals, foreign gods and deities or Pagan symbols, e.g. Ahura Mazda, Heracles, Bes, the sun disc, an Egyptian ankh, and so forth (Figs. 158-161) are here used widely.

The marked differences between the iconography used in the two provinces apparent already during the 4th century, mentioned as an annotation here, may indicate that the religious separation of the two regions following during the period of Hasmonaean rule. Religious differences which in the 2nd century BCE lead to the revolt of the city of Samaria against Jerusalem and the final segregation of the temple on Mount Gerizim and the Temple in Jerusalem, with the final destruction of the Zeus-temple on Mount Gerizim under John Hyrcanus I (Josephus AJ 13.255-256). The use
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172 Average weight of each denomination according to their listing in the catalogue of MESHORER / QEDAR 1999 and overview p. 69.
175 WYSSMANN 2012, forthcoming.
177 2 Macc 6.2; Josephus AJ 12.257-264.
of the inscription Zeus on Samarian coins highlighted by Y. Meshorer, could be an early iconographic indication of this segregation, antedating the erection of the Samarian Jah-veh-temple on Mount Gerizim during the late 4th century BCE and the introduction of the Zeus cult in this temple in course of the Hellenistic reforms of Antiochus IV in 167 BCE (discussed further in §2.2).  

The final word concerning the coin still has to be spoken, but all in all it is difficult – though not impossible – to associate this coin type with the YHD coinage, particularly due to the weight of the TC242.5 coin (c. 3.39 g), which is another indication that it was not minted in the same mint as the regular YHD coins, or was not even part of the regular minted YHD coinage known so far (metrology §1.2).  

An identification of the inscription as YHD would firmly place it within the group of early Jewish coinage, but since the last letter can be read in different ways the irregularities in the reading of the letters found in the inscription leave other options open. It is furthermore noticeable that the inscription is written in the Aramaic script, and not with palaeo-Hebrew letters. The suggestion that the coin, according to all the discrepancies mentioned here, should be attributed to another mint – in this case probably resulting in a re-attribution of the coin to a Philistian context, as it has been suggested by H. Gitler and O. Tal, should so far be considered the most likely identification. 

1.5 The YHD Coins Minted under Ptolemaic Rule

The chronology of the YHD coins minted during the 3rd century can be viewed with more certainty than the preceding coins. Under Ptolemaic rule coin types were emitted, which imitated the prototypes of the gold and silver coins of the coin series issued by the government of the succeeding Ptolemaic rulers reigning in Alexandria. Only few standard coins-types were minted during this time with little variations. Their attribution
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179 Mildenberg 1998b, 68; Meshorer / Qedar 1999, 29, 46, cat. no. 40; Meshorer 2001, 3-4.  
180 Barag 1993a, 261; Ronen 2006, 29.  
181 Gerson 2001, 118 – according to him “possibly an issue by a Persian minting Authority”, without defining this closer. The mint of Jerusalem is also issuing coins for “a Persian minting authority”, since minting under their political administration. Nevertheless, the “drachm” in question does not correspond with other YHD coins neither in weight nor design.  
183 Treated in detail by Gitler / Lorber 2006, 6-19.
as early Jewish coinage is secured by their legends, either by the use of the Aramaic inscription YHD, or the Hebrew inscription YHDH. Both are simultaneously used on these early Hellenistic coins.\textsuperscript{184} Due to the greater number and uniformity of these later YHD coins die linkages between a few different types have been established by H. Gitler and C. Lorber, this especially concerns what by them has been considered the latest type (Type 16).\textsuperscript{185}

The fact that apparently the administration in Judah was allowed to continue the production of their fractional silver coins under Ptolemaic rule in keeping with the Athenian weight standard and not the new reduced Ptolemaic weight standard introduced under Ptolemaic rule, except for the reduced weight of the larger coins (hemidrachms) apparently minted under Ptolemy II,\textsuperscript{186} is noteworthy and contrasts with the coinage issued in most other places under the highly centralised Ptolemaic monetary administration and coinage monopoly.\textsuperscript{187} The strong economic position of the Jewish Temple might have been crucial for its continued existence as a financial centre, as it can also be found reflected during the Seleucid period, where – following the conflict between the pro-Ptolemaic Oniads and the pro-Seleucid Tobiads – the appointment of the Greek \textit{epistátes} Philip as the administrator of the Jewish Temple in 169 BCE by Antiochus IV (2 Macc 5:22-3) not only meant the loss of its self-government for the Jews, but also placed the administration of the temple under direct Seleucid control.\textsuperscript{188} The main reason for the continued existence of the administration of Judah was its incorporation in the Ptolemaic kingdom as a hyparchy led by the Jewish high priests directly subject to the government in Alexandria, with only a limited amount of governmental changes.\textsuperscript{189} All other hyparchies in Koile Syria, such as Samaria, Galilee, Iudumaea, and Ashdod, were in contrast led by Hyparchs instated by the Ptolemaic ruler.

The Ptolemaic YHD coins can according to their iconography be divided into the periods of reign of Ptolemy I (304-282 BCE) and Ptolemy II (284-246 BCE). Under

\textsuperscript{184} GITLER / LORBER 2006, 10.
\textsuperscript{185} GITLER / LORBER 2006, 11 Fig. 1 (Type 6 & 7), 15 Fig. 2 (Type 16), 16 (Table 1 – Types according to their chronology).
\textsuperscript{186} GITLER / LORBER 2006, 5, 12-16 (Group 8).
\textsuperscript{187} MORKHOLM 1991, 70; MILDENBERG 2000, 94; another exception to this is to be found in the coinage of Kyrene under the rule of the Macedonian king Magas between c. 276 and 250 BCE, CHAMOUX 2006, 67-70, 217-218.
\textsuperscript{188} HENGEL 1988, 486-495; Simultaneously with the appointment of Philip, the \textit{epistátes} Andronicos had been appointed to the temple in Samaria (2 Macc 5:22-23), which lends credibility to the idea that also this temple was of an equally high (financial) importance to the Seleucid government, SCHÄFER 1995, 43.
\textsuperscript{189} SASSE 2004, 103-106.
the rule of Ptolemy I Soter the obverse of the standard type, according to the number of coins of this type found, display the diademed head of Ptolemy I to the right, on the reverse the Ptolemaic eagle with spread wings facing left clutching a thunderbolt is displayed (Fig. 16), paralleling the contemporary Ptolemaic coinage (Fig. 162). The coins carry the palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHDH to the left of the eagle. Rarer variations of this type, with the inscription YHD and/or the head of Ptolemy I turned left were also issued. The resemblance with the Persian period coins is obvious (Fig. 4-5). The head of the Persian king has now been replaced by the head of the Ptolemaic ruler and the Persian falcon by the Ptolemaic eagle. Further similar types issued display a bareheaded young man on the obverse, by D. Barag suggested to be the youthful head of Ptolemy II, co-regent with Ptolemy I in the years 285/4-283/2 BCE (Fig. 17).

Under the rule of Ptolemy II Philadelphus a few rare and partly unique coin reverses bearing the head of Berenike I or II and the inscription YHD (Fig. 19), comparable with Ptolemaic period coin issues featuring Berenike I or II (Fig. 164), are minted in addition to the most common type displaying the diademed head of Ptolemy I consistently with the inscription YHDH on one side and the eagle with spread wings on the other. Following the death of Ptolemy I the jugate heads of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II on the obverse and the jugate heads of Ptolemy I and Berenike I on the reverse with the inscription YHD, an imitation of the ΘΕΩΝ-ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ coins (Fig. 163), are displayed (Fig. 20). On one single type the two Greek letters BA appear, added to the palaeo-Hebrew inscription, probably abbreviating the word Basileos (Fig. 16). The lack of use of later standard types of the Ptolemaic coinage in the YHD coins of Judah can be seen as evidence for the discontinued use of the mint in Jerusalem under Ptolemaic rule; at this point in time Judah seems to have finally been incorporated into the centralized monetary system of the Ptolemaic government.

So far only one Ptolemaic YHD coin series displays a direct link with the Persian period YHD coinage. In this coin type – of which only very few have been re-
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191 BARAG 1994-1999, 29-32; opposed by GITLER / LORBER 2006, 10 (Group 3); HENDIN 2010, 135.
194 BARAG 1994-1999, 37 – suggest the year 269 BCE as the final active year of the mint in Jerusalem; GITLER / LORBER 2006, 19, have pinpointed the closing date of the Jerusalem mint to 241/240 BCE.
corded\textsuperscript{195} – two dies representing both periods appear to have been used together. On the obverse a male head is displayed to the front, on the reverse the Ptolemaic eagle facing left with the thunderbolt and the palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD (Fig. 18). The obverse of this coin clearly belongs to the series of Yoḥanan the Priest and Yehezqiyyah the Governor. Why these two dies were combined is not clear. Following the suggestion of D. Barag, the introduction of the reverse with the Ptolemaic eagle and the palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD should be dated to a time about 285/4-283/2 BCE, leaving an inexplicable gap of about half-a-century between the uses of the two dies.\textsuperscript{196} The introduction of the use of the Ptolemaic eagle did not necessarily follow this late, as it can be seen on other coins minted, carrying the head of Ptolemy I on the obverse and the eagle on the reverse, even considering the fact that coins carrying his effigy were minted long after his death. If the actual dating of the YH\textsuperscript{1}ZQYH HPH\textsuperscript{1}H coins to the transitional period between the Persian and Ptolemaic periods as argued above is correct, the chronological gap between the use of these two dies can be reduced considerably, allowing the existence of a truly transitional coin type\textsuperscript{197} – another indication of the gradual transition taking place between the Persian and the Hellenistic periods.

1.6 YHD Coinage: Jewish or Not?

Even though the material culture from this period is meagre compared with the preceding and following periods, the evidence collected from the provincial coinage shows the individuality in terms of the public display of self-conception – especially regarding religious aspects – of the different regions very clearly.\textsuperscript{198} In the coinage of Judah especially during the 4\textsuperscript{th}, but also during the 3\textsuperscript{rd}, century BCE traits specific also for the later Jewish coinage began to take form. The material at hand and the chronology of the coins carrying personal names and titles still not only leaves room for discussion, but new finds could very well change the conclusions made so far, as it has been illustrated here. It is – on the basis of the evidence presented here – possible to argue for some

\textsuperscript{195} GITLER / LORBER 2006, 9 – recorded 4 specimens in their study.
\textsuperscript{196} BARAG 1994-1999, 32-33.
\textsuperscript{197} Also concluded by GITLER / LORBER 2006, 8-9
\textsuperscript{198} This has also been stated in detail by S. GERSON (2001, 119).
noticeable transitions, but also for continuity in the material of the 4th century coinage between the Persian and the Hellenistic period.

The names and titles used on the Persian period YHD coins reveal a political reality, where the functions of the Persian governor and the Jewish religious leaders at least in some cases – if not always, were combined in the same person; underlined by the strictly use of Hebrew personal names. The minting and use of the YHD coinage seems to have been firmly connected with the financial management and requirements of the Temple in Jerusalem, as the monetary centre of the Jewish Temple State; the strong connection between the Jewish Temple and the minting of coinage during this time is being best illustrated by the coin of YWHNN HKHN, convincingly identified with the high priest Yoḥanan II of the mid 4th century BCE. The YHD silver coins does initially seem have been introduced to comply with these requirements, as the introduction of the early Jewish coinage may be considered at least partly due to the implementation of new Persian laws in Judah at the beginning of the 4th century BCE. This does however not exclude an increasing use of these coins for everyday transactions. The restricted amount of YHD coins known of which the archaeological origin has mostly not been identified, limit the information to be drawn on the use of these coins.

It should be taken into consideration that the office of the Persian governor, the HPHH known from the coins of YHzQYH and stamped seal impressions, and the position of the Jewish high priest at least in some instances were combined in one person under the Persian administration. Nevertheless, during the 4th century in Judah apparently only few hesitations existed towards the display of images that according to Jewish law should have been considered inappropriate. Important questions towards the use of iconography in Judah during this time arise with this: did the minting authorities disregard the religious beliefs of the Jewish population of Judah at the time, even though the minting of coins was, at least in some instances, administrated by Jewish high-priests? Was the attitude towards the images on the coins so fundamentally different compared with the later periods? Did other considerations determine the choices of iconography? What were the – or perhaps rather – were there conscious political intentions behind these images?

During the period of Persian administration the governmental partaking in the coin minting was limited. The Persian king was indeed present on the earlier coins, but
not as accentuated as the images of the Ptolemaic rulers on the later YHD coins minted under their rule. The demands of the later Greek authorities seem to have been followed more closely; by placing the portrait of the living ruler and his wife on the YHD coins, thereby thoroughly disregarding any religious considerations towards the Jewish population, if this was indeed of importance for coinage during this time. Generally the diversity of the images of the 4th century YHD coins leaves the impression that no continuous rules concerning the use of specific religious, political or economic iconographic conventions or traditions of contemporaneous coins were applied. Far more, traits concerning all these aspects can be found, although apparently attempts were made to unify the iconography of the coins, i.e. the gerahs of the Athena/owl-type, the half-gerahs of the Persian king/falcon-type. Nonetheless, coin images which with confidence can be claimed to be unique for the Jewish province, i.e. the ear and the lily, 199 existed parallel to the more standardized coins following the common currencies circulating in the area. Even if religious considerations do not seem to have played a main role behind the general choices of iconography, the attitude displayed in the coinage of Judah was by no means as open towards the use of religious symbols or images as the Samarians during the same time, a fact which can also be observed in the general picture gained from the imported material found within the archaeological remains.200

That the weight standard of both the Persian and the Ptolemaic period YHD coins differed from other coins minted in Palestine at this time also indicates an intentional use of these coins within the borders of the province during both periods, 201 which also explains the original choice of denominations according to the weight of the shekel. The Persian administration enabled great liberty in the choices of images and the development of designs on these early Jewish coins, also visible in the case of the coinage of Samaria, quite contrary to the time of Jewish coinage under the Hasmonaean rulers and later.202 Still, the tension or ambiguity regarding the presentation of the Jewish religion and the own national identity present in Jewish coins minted later is not present in the YHD coinage minted neither under Persian nor Greek administration. The religious and national self-conception of the Jewish authorities minting seem to have

201 GERSON 2001, 110.
been fundamentally different during this time, compared with the presentation of later Jewish rulers.

The continued production of the YHD coins in the Ptolemaic period in Jerusalem and the continued use of the Attic weight standard – contrary to all other mints – demands attention. The political and economic considerations – based on the stability of Jerusalem in accordance with the area not being seriously affected by the wars of the Diadochi as an aid in this process – as stated by D. Barag are likely to be correct. But, as it has also been considered by Y. Ronen, this does not quite explain the fact that the mint in Jerusalem actually continued minting these very specific coins under Ptolemaic rule. The idea that these coins also held a religious importance, maybe enhanced by the palaeo-Hebrew coin legends used on them, is to be considered, especially viewed against the continued use of this scripture throughout the time of Jewish coinage, as it will be dealt with later. After a period of more than a century-and-a-half after the destruction of the First Jewish Temple in 586 BCE, where the evidence of the use of the Hebrew script is scant, the reappearance of the palaeo-Hebrew script on the 4th century BCE YHD coins must be seen as an important development.

The palaeo-Hebrew script was probably used to pronounce specific values regarding the officially demonstrated nationality and religious identity not only of the province Judah, but also of the people living here. This probably at least partly explains the continued production of these coins. Meshorer ascribes the continued minting of the coins specific for Judah under Ptolemaic rule to the special relationship existing between Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-246 BCE) and the Jews recorded by Josephus, on the grounds of this assuming that Ptolemy also granted the Jewish population the right to mint coins at this time, although this is not made evident by any ancient source. This can only be viewed as highly speculative since no evidence corroborates this hypothesis. The fact that these coins were most likely used to pay the poll tax to the Temple in Jerusalem could help to explain the continued use of the local YHD coinage well into the Ptolemaic period, without an immediate incorporation into the monetary system otherwise common practise, though in time an adjustment of the weight standard
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204 RONEN 2006, 30.
did take place. The purity of the coins, i.e. the lack of documented silver-plated coins, would support this idea further. It was furthermore more effective to take advantage of the already existing tax-system established during the Persian period, allowing the early contributions to the Temple in Jerusalem to be paid in coins acceptable here, at least for the duration of the time of their production after which they later became replaced by the Tyrian shekels (§5.2.2).

The change in the use of the two legends YHD and YHDH is noteworthy. Considering that Hebrew should not be regarded the official language at the beginning of the 3rd century BCE, except perhaps within the context of the enacting of the temple cult and certainly within religious literature, the introduction of the Hebrew word YHDH to the Ptolemaic period coins must have held a specific meaning. The previous use of the Aramaic word YHD is not surprising, considering that this was the official language of the administration at the time. The use of the palaeo-Hebrew script is noticeable, but it is difficult to judge the significance of this at the time. It should be taken into consideration that the priestly administration of the Jewish Temple was indeed the minting authority, hence also the use of Hebrew names and in part titles, since already all other monetary issues were verifiably dealt with within the temple administration.\footnote{KOTTSIEPER 2007, 109.} It is more than likely that the use of this script was determined by this connection and in extension perhaps with the actual place of their mint. The use of the palaeo-Hebrew script and the continued use of the Hebrew language would reflect its importance within the temple administration, at the same time probably mirroring a continued use of these among the literate members of the Jewish society. It does however not immediately explain the addition of YHDH in a part of the provincial coins between the two historic periods. What was or were the reasons for this change? The answer to this can only be assumed, but it must have been a deliberate choice made by the minting authorities. The minting of the early Jewish coins did probably continue within the priestly administration of the Jewish Temple between the Persian and Ptolemaic periods of rule, at least no evidence suggests any immediate changes here. The iconography of the YHD coins minted under Ptolemaic rule were close imitations of the royal Ptolemaic coinage issued and the word YHDH was in effect used to specify their place of origin and area of use. But the word did more than specify geography. The use of the Hebrew language, with
the palaeo-Hebrew script, was simultaneously a conscious religious and national statement that these coins were truly Jewish, combining land, people and religion in one, a tradition which carried into the following periods.

The most important aspect of the production of the YHD coinage was their assumable function as tax payment in relation to the Jewish cult practices. As outlined above, the high purity of the silver used for the YHD coins, for the Ptolemaic period examined by H. Gitler and C. Lorber, not only made them eligible for the payment of the annual temple-tribute of the weight of half a shekel to the Temple in Jerusalem, but conformed with the demands of high metallic purity supplied by the Achaemenid administration; the original use of the weight standard of the shekel is a further indication of this. But most of all their continued production, contradicting with the emissions of almost all other mints working under Ptolemaic rule, not only points towards their high importance within the Jewish province, but also their exceptional position in the Ptolemaic kingdom.

Sometime during the 3rd century the production of the YHD coins came to an end and for the time of approximately one century apparently no coins that with conviction could be claimed to be of Jewish origin were minted. The end of the production may have been related to the cessation of the payments of tributes to the Ptolemaic king by the at the time in Jerusalem ruling high priest Onias II (Josephus AJ 12.158-159). During the 3rd century BCE the Palestinian cities, where the main part of the settlers from the Greek-speaking world had settled down and from where the Greek culture was mediated, were used as an integrated part of the authoritative financial and military administration system of the Ptolemaic rulers. During this time the institution of the polis changed compared with the classic conception of a polis. It was no longer a free and independent city, but part of a larger centralized system laid-out to enhance the control of the newly acquired Ptolemaic territories. In this process new cities were established and existing cities were re-founded as poleis, thereby changing or re-modelling the original cultural characters of these cities, but not necessarily eliminating them. The
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209 Also noted by KOTTSIEPER 2007, 109; and GITLER / LORBER 2006, 13.
211 Listed by GITLER / LORBER 2006, Table 4, pp. 21-24.
212 GITLER / LORBER 2006, 16.
213 SASSE 2004, 128.
214 KASHER 1990, 29.
local coinage minted until the end of the 3rd century BCE by these cities,216 followed the standard of the coinage issued by the Greek rulers and imitated it in their own local coinages. It was not until the second half of the 2nd century BCE that the production of Jewish coinage was again resumed, only now under completely different circumstances.

Chapter 2

Jewish Coinage under Hasmonaean Rule (162-37 BCE)

The bronze coinage of the Hasmonaean kings, traditionally understood as the beginning of ancient Jewish coinage, found its beginning within a culturally and religiously multifaceted Pagan dominated world, which also largely shaped the appearance of the Hasmonaean coinage of which some aspects are dealt with here. The intention is not to treat the extended corpus of this material as a whole, but to focus on the question of a possible relationship between the Hasmonaean rulers and the Jewish Temple as a financial institution, as well as aspects of their identities as rulers as found expressed in their coinage. Interesting is also the apparent complete lack of Jewish coinage in the time between the minting of the YHD coins and the beginning of Hasmonaean coinage, which only to some extent can be explained or even filled.

As the following will show, the Hasmonaean rulers did all but one not use iconography with any obvious sacred connotations. This is in retrospect not surprising considering the prevailing religious orthodoxy of the Jewish society at the time of their rule, amongst others based on the history preceding resulting in the establishment of the Hasmonaean rule discussed in detail in the following.

The fact that the Jewish coins during the Hasmonaean period were minted with Hebrew, Greek as well as briefly with Aramaic legends is not only a reflection of the diversity of the cultural context in which they were issued, as well as the historic circumstances of the individual rulers under which they were minted, but also of the steadily increasing Hellenization of the Hasmonaean kingdom as such, as well as the Jewish society to a great extent,217 as it will be discussed in more detail in the following. The different languages and scripts were undoubtedly applied as means of self-representation of the ruler offering a tool to express religious and national affiliation similar already to the use of the script and languages found in the YHD coinage of the Persian and early Hellenistic periods. Furthermore, the development of Hasmonaean coinage seems equally to have rested firmly on the admin-
istrative traditions of the Jewish Temple established during the previous centuries, which is ultimately illuminated in the wording of the Hasmonaean coins legends. But before turning to the actual coins minted by the Hasmonaean rulers this is the place to take a step back and gain a brief insight into the complexity of the Hellenistic world at the time of the Hasmonaean coinage in Palestine.

2.1 Jews and Greeks in Hellenistic Palestine

Even if not allowing a chronological continuous documentation of the historic periods of Palestine the amount of information that can be drawn from the literary and epigraphic sources is – compared with other areas and cultures of the ancient Mediterranean world – outstanding. The attempt here is by no means a presentation of the complete account of these sources, but to strain aspects important for the understanding of the diverse and at times highly conflicted cultural setting of the Jewish coinage, keeping in mind that the literary documentation of the life, culture, and religion of ancient Palestine is eclectic, to great extent demonstrating the opinions or intentions of the single writers. Even so, the multitude of these sources is extraordinary compared with the sparse written information that can be gathered in other places and on other cultures of this time.\(^{218}\)

The different religious currents within the Jewish society as found in ancient Jewish literature ranged from the complete refusal of Jewish faith to the extreme opposition against anything that could be conceived as being of a Greek or Pagan origin, illustrate the complex cultural and historic situation at the time of the introduction of Jewish coinage in Palestine;\(^ {219}\) an example of this is the conflict between the Oniads and the Tobiads taking place at the beginning of the 2\(^{nd}\) century BCE dealt with shortly (§2.2). A comprehensive insight into the views of at least parts of the Jewish population in Palestine on the Pagan culture of their Greek neighbours – and vice versa – is however difficult to obtain.

\(^{218}\) GRUEN 2001, 360-361.
2.1.1 Jewish Literature

The general Jewish rejection of idolatry according to the Jewish law did by no means imply a general rejection of Greek philosophy and according to the material evidence obviously Greek kept being the official language from the Hellenistic well into the Roman Imperial period.\(^{220}\) The Jewish picture of the Hellenistic Pagan religious life found in literary sources seems generally to have been affected by stereotypes and characterisations of Pagan religious conventions, presumably to facilitate the desired distance to the world of the gentiles.\(^{221}\) Simultaneously a conscious use of palimpsest writing, which does not seem to differ widely from the mechanisms found in the acquisition of iconography in Jewish coinage, also appears in a part of the ancient Jewish literature.

On the one hand the Jews displayed themselves superior in moral and character to the Greeks, using Greek Hellenistic religious rituals to characterise barbarian behaviour. The Jewish author of the book of the *Wisdom of Solomon* (*apud* Eusebius, *Praeparation Evangelica* 12.3-5),\(^{222}\) written during the later part of the 1st century BCE, ascribes the – according to the Jewish tradition – abominable Canaanites with every kind of imaginable abhorrent religious ritual acts: orgiastic mystery rituals, human sacrifices, cannibalism, all taking place in the form of the Dionysian *Thiasos*. The precise rewriting of the Hellenistic religious rituals reveals a precise knowledge of these Greek cultic customs, but simultaneously also the systematic devaluation of these carried out here. On the other hand good qualities could be gained from the Pagan culture, especially if these were understood to derive from the Jews themselves originally.\(^{223}\)

When the Greeks are portrayed as the recipients benefiting of the Jews or Jewish culture the relationship between the two cultures is described much less hostile. In a preserved fragment of the writings in Greek of the Jewish historian Eupolemus active around the middle of the 2nd century BCE,\(^{224}\) the author describes how the Greeks received the alphabet from Moses; the Jews handed it over to the Phoenicians, who then passed it on to the Greeks (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9.26.1). The Jewish writer Artapanus of Alexandria (late 2nd or early 1st century BCE) even let Moses act as the


\(^{221}\) GRUEN 2001, 348.


\(^{224}\) The precise identification and a more precise dating of the writer Eupolemos is insecure. He presents the only Jewish author of this time writing in Greek. Eupolemos could have belonged to the followers of Judas the Maccabee, WALTER 1989, 397-398; GRUEN 2001, 354; COLLINS 2005, 45.
mentor of Orpheus and with this as the genesis of Greek poetry and the prophetic tradi-
tions (apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* Artapanus 9.27.3-4), and the Jewish Alexand-
drian writer Aristobulus in a similar way drew parallels between the assertions made by
Greek writers (such as Homer, Hesiod and Plato) and Moses. Both Artapanus and
Aristobulus did not reject the Hellenistic traditions, but implemented them as part of the
Jewish inheritance, with Moses as the source of origin for the Greek-Hellenistic cul-
ture. Many Jewish writers or intellectuals sought the origin of Greek philosophy and
poetry in the Jewish scripts, as the result of their influence and the influence of the Jew-
ish religion. The classic and the contemporary Greek texts were revised and manipu-
lated into making them conform to the Jewish traditions. Through this approach the de-
pendence of the Greek philosophical traditions on the Hebrew Bible was confirmed.

The traditional Greek view of foreign ethnic groups as *barbaroi* also applied to
the Jews. This pejorative stigma was in a similar way used by Hellenized Jewish au-
thors towards the Greeks. In doing so, the Jewish authors displayed a thorough under-
standing and knowledge of Greek historiography, very well displayed in the Second
Book of Maccabees (4:13) from the 2nd century BCE and the pejorative use of the defi-
nition of *hellenismos*. The first common use of this term as an overall designation for
the Greek culture and conventions was introduced here (2 Macc 4:13), as the opposite
to *Judaism*, when the construction of the gymnasium in Jerusalem under Antiochus
IV Epiphanes was seen as the move towards an extreme Hellenization. In the Second
Book of Maccabees this designation becomes the specific term used for the overall con-
ception of Greek culture.

---
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2.1.2 Greek Literature

The relationship with the Jews seems by the Greeks to have been scrutinized more thoroughly.\textsuperscript{235} Though as within the Jewish society, common stereotype opinions and beliefs about the Jews also seem to have been widely spread among Greek authors and only few of them display a deeper knowledge of Jewish history, literature, and religious traditions.\textsuperscript{236} Traces of mutual recognition of the characteristics showing conformity with the Jews can be found in the Greek literature, as it has been argued in the case of the Greek historian and philosopher Hecataeus of Abdera from the late 4\textsuperscript{th} century BCE,\textsuperscript{237} as he praises the accomplishments of Moses the Jew as lawgiver, agrarian reformer, and founder of a military system.\textsuperscript{238} The early Hellenistic Greek authors seem generally to have viewed the Jews as a people of philosophers, the recognition of this traceable in different Greek texts.\textsuperscript{239} The writings following the Maccabaean Revolt are far more ambiguous carrying a number of strong voices speaking against Judaism, amongst others in Alexandria, where during the first century CE the writer Apion led the Jewish opposition and the anti-Jewish propaganda.\textsuperscript{240}

The Greek authors actively sought analogies between the own gods and the gods and deities they found moving towards the East. Contrary to the distance to the Pagan world sought by the author of the Wisdom of Solomon, the later Greek historian Plutarch (late 1\textsuperscript{st}-2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE) describes Sukkoth, also known as the Feast of the Tabernacles, as a feast celebrated for the Greek god Dionysus (Plutarch, Quaestiones Conviviales 4.6). The use of branches – an often repeated image and much discussed element in Jewish coin iconography – during the festivity was connected with the Dionysian Thrysos used according to the image of Dionysus during Bacchic celebrations. In this ancient text, through the paralization of Dionysus with the Jewish god, an attempt seem to have been made to identify a feast celebrating Jahveh with a suiting Greek celebration; according to the Second Book of Maccabees (6:7) at some point in time the god Dionysus actually seems to have been worshipped in the city of Jerusalem. This connection of the two very different religions is an example of the deliberate interpretatio graeca of

\textsuperscript{235} SCHÄFER 1997, 34-50.
\textsuperscript{236} FELDMAN 1986, 15-42.
\textsuperscript{237} WALTER 1989, 402-403; SCHÄFER 1997, 15-17.
\textsuperscript{238} apud Diodorus Siculus, Bibl. Hist. 40.3.3-8; SCHÄFER 1997, 17, 22. SCHÄFER argues that Hecataeaus’ writings are biased – and not pro-Jewish – in respect to the Jews (p. 17).
\textsuperscript{239} GRUEN 2001, 360-361.
\textsuperscript{240} COHEN 2006, 37-40.
the Jewish cult or the conscious staged syncretism. More traditionally the highest Olympian Greek god was equated with the Jewish god (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.5), both in early times also accompanied by the same animal, the eagle (§3.3.2).

Contrary to the Greek and Roman authors that at least from time to time at length dealt with the religion and traditions of the Jews in literature, this rarely occurred with the Jewish authors, whose writings are mostly preserved as fragments in the writings of later authors. The attitude of the Jews primarily towards the Greeks can only be drawn from accidental remarks, implicit thoughts, and deductions made according to these observations. The time and religious-cultural setting of the Hasmonaean rule was multifaceted and due to this at times highly conflicted, which to some extent also is displayed in the coinage of this time.

2.1.3 Epigraphic Sources

The epigraphic accounts of the Hellenistic-Roman period are – true to the nature of this group of material – diverse, but not consistent. Different languages were applied at different places according to the cultural and religious background of their makers and their intensions with the inscriptions. The varying accounts can be ascribed to all periods, allowing glimpses into different levels of private, official, and religious aspects of everyday life. Contrary to the literary records, the epigraphic evidence is preserved in all languages and dialects of their time and thereby provides spontaneous insights into public as well as private practices and the – at times periodical – uses of languages, as it is also evident in the contemporary coinage.

The epigraphic evidence, however, conveys only spontaneous glimpses into the world of ancient Palestine, and these in different chronological settings and reflecting different objectives. The original context of many of the inscriptions found is not always discernible and the condition of the texts does not at all times allow their content to be understood in their full original meaning. The number of inscriptions found varies immensely from place to place, showing a non-surprising concentration around

---
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the large economic centres of the coastal cities, such as Caesarea Maritima. The majority of them have been written in Greek, even in the early Roman Imperial period where Latin in time became increasingly institutionalised as the new official language. The increasing presence of the Roman military from the time of the First Jewish War and especially after the Second Jewish War in Palestine let Latin become a noticeable more important language in the epigraphic sources found. Even so, Greek was kept parallel as a traditional official language as it can be seen in most of the coins issued in different Palestinian cities following the period discussed here.

The general use of Greek as the official language in Palestine was increasingly institutionalized through the influence of the Greek coastal cities and their administrative and financial organisation lead by Greek-speaking officials from the time of the Ptolemaic rule. In Jerusalem (Map 5) as the centre of the Hasmonaean kingdom and the minting of their coinage, Greek had established itself during the time of Ptolemaic rule and it is to be reckoned that the educated parts of the Jewish society were or increasingly became bilingual, which is also evident in the high number of Greek inscription found from the 3rd century BCE onwards. The diffusion of the Greek language was not only evidence of the changes taking part within the Jewish world, but also of the increasing Hellenization of parts of the Jewish population; amongst others visible in the increasing use of Greek personal names, which however does not seem to have spread generally among the Jewish population. This does not mean that the language itself exercised a broad cultural impact changing the existing native traditions, but evidence of the cultural reciprocity taking place over time can be found, such as the interpretatio graeca of Semitic names in bilingual inscriptions; the most prominent example of this probably the re-naming of YRŠHLY’M (Yeruskalajim) in Hierosolyma during the late 4th century BCE.

Different bilingual inscription found in- and outside the originally Phoenician territory exemplify the local interpretatio graeca of Semitic names that took place. Inscriptions not only show the equal treating of the Phoenician and the Greek gods by the

\[247\] BELAYCHE 2001, 54-55.
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\[252\] FREYNE 1998, 139-141.
\[253\] HENGEL 1996, 271-274.
Phoenicians, but that it was possible to identify oneself in society as being both Phoenician as well as Greek – or in this latter case as a Roman citizen – at the same time, apparently without presenting opposed worlds. Different private dedicatory inscriptions found in the area surrounding the city of Ptolemais attest to this fact. An example is an inscription from the 2nd century BCE dedicated by the Greek Diodotos and his wife Philista to the Syrian gods Hadad and Atargatis found near Ptolemais, or a Greek inscription on a votive altar found near Kafr Yassif, approximately 9 km northeast of Ptolemais, also mentioning the gods Hadad and Atargatis. This could again be a direct reflection of the private cult-practise common in this area, which should probably to some extent be connected with the ancient Carmel cult, another example of the acculturation taking place.

2.1.2.1 Mount Carmel: the Interpretatio Graeca of a Semitic Sanctuary

The literary and epigraphic evidence connected with the Pagan sanctuary attributed to Zeus on Mount Carmel (Map 1) perhaps illustrates the overall mechanisms of the changes taking place in religion and society throughout the different periods at its best, even though the actual sanctuary has so far not been located. The role of the mountain as a centre for cultic activities can be traced back to the middle of the 2nd millennia BCE to the time of Thutmosis III (c. 1483-1425 BCE). Which god was worshipped here at this time can only be assumed. It is reasonable to consider this ancient cult to have been at least similar to the later Baal cult established here. In early biblical sources Baal was defined as a storm and warrior deity on his own. The fact that the later use of the name Baal as a sacred epithet was geographically wide spread and at times used as a general title for a weather god (like Hadad) enhancing this possibility. The sanctuary on Carmel probably continuously functioned as a Pagan cult centre through the time of the early Israelite kings (1st Kings 18:19-20) into the late Roman Imperial period.  

---

254 Parallel to the Isis and Serapis inscription from Samaria-Sebaste, AVI-YONAH 1959, 1-12.
256 In the lists of Thutmosis III described as ṭʾōš qadôš, SIMONS 1937, 122.
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The mountain was already at a very early point in time identified as a *mountain of the god* by Greek authors. In the writings of the ancient geographer Pseudo-Scylax from the 4th century BCE the connection between Carmel and Zeus (ὁρος ἵερων Διός) had already been established (Pseudo-Skylax 66). According to Tacitus in the late 1st or early 2nd century CE the Mountain of Carmel – where the god was carrying the same name as the mountain, but was without an image and without a temple of his own – was only equipped with an altar, as the later emperor Vespasian visited the oracle here (Tacitus, *Hist*. 2.78.3). Even if no traces of the actual sanctuary have been found, the absence of a temple – as specified by Tacitus – can point towards the ritual practises of Semitic altar-gods, possibly found in the sanctuary of Tel Kedesh not far from Megiddo and most probably at Sena‘im on Mount Hermon.

The older Baal cult on Carmel was at the latest in the Roman Imperial period replaced by a cult for Jupiter Heliopolitanus. An inscription from the 2nd century CE has been found out of any archaeological secure context on Carmel, representing the only material that with certainty can be connected with the sanctuary not yet located (text Fig. I). In this the god of Carmel is connected with the city-god of Heliopolis (Baalbek), where the god during the Roman Imperial period was worshipped as Zeus Heliopolis or Jupiter Heliopolitanus. The existence of a Jupiter Heliopolitanus cult on the Carmel, where possibly an autochthonous oracle cult now no longer accounted for had originally been located as noted above, conforms with the character of the previous ancient god ruling as a weather god, oracle god, and supreme god. Parallels can be found in the Semitic god of Ba‘al Shamin, in the Syrian weather god Hadad, or in Zeus Kasios (Baal Saphon). Traits of this god can also be identified with the Phoenician god Melqart, well known from the coinage of Tyre (Fig. 189).

---
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The dedicatory inscription of *G. Iulius Eutychas colonist from Caesarea to Zeus Heliopolitanus of Carmel* consists of three lines, with letters between 12-18 mm in height. It is written on the marble fragment of the foot of a statue still remaining in situ on a low base (text Fig. I). Of the statue originally placed on the base only the front part of the right naked foot has been preserved. The original height of the statue is on the basis of the size of the foot reconstructed to have been between 3 and 3.5 m high. The reconstructed size of the original figure permits the assumption that the object in question was a cultic statue, perhaps even the actual cult-statue representing Zeus Heliopolites.

On the basis of the form of the letters the inscription has tentatively been dated in the late 2nd or 3rd century CE. Since it is accentuated by Tacitus that no statue was part of the sanctuary at the time when Vespasian as general visited it, this could be viewed as evidence for a \textit{terminus post quem} for the erection of a cultic statue not until after the writing of his \textit{Historiae} at the beginning of the 2nd century CE, which would agree with the dating of the inscription in the 2nd century CE or later. His praenomen \textit{Gaius} and nomen gentile \textit{Iulius} refer to the Roman citizenship of his family which probably accordingly should be dated to the rule of the Julio-Claudian emperors.

The case of the sanctuary of Mount Carmel clearly illustrates that not only the Jewish world became subject to changes under the influence of foreign cultures and religions during this time, holding an intrinsic importance for the use of iconography on the Palestinian coins on a larger scale, but also for the iconography developing in the Jewish coinage.

\begin{footnotes}
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2.2 The Seleucid Rule of the Jews and the Hellenistic Reform of Jerusalem

No conscious attempts on larger cultural or religious reforms seem to have marked the rule of Palestine during the time of the Ptolemaic kings. A general respect or acceptance between the local religions and cults appear to have characterized all of Palestine during the period of their rule. This to a great extent explains the at the time relative peaceful coexistence of amongst others the native Phoenician and Jewish population-groups and the Greek population residing here, as well as the continuity traceable in the transition from the Persian to the Hellenistic period. It must however be said that the 3rd century BCE is probably the least well-known time of the history of Palestine.

The Ptolemaic rule of Palestine ended with the victory of the Seleucid king Antiochus III (242-187 BCE) over the Ptolemaic general Scopas in the battle of Paneas c. 200 BCE (Josephus AJ 12.131-133), after which the Seleucid rule of the region began (Polybius, Hist. 28.1.2-3). The history of Judaea and Jerusalem during this time will here not be treated in great detail, but summarized to the extent necessary for an understanding of the developments taking place, especially in regard to the increasing Hellenization of the Jewish society.

A general respect or at least acceptance of local religions and cults – including the Jewish cult – within the Seleucid Empire seems also to have marked the beginning of the Seleucid rule. This is amongst others evidenced by coin emissions from a number of cities in which local autochthonous gods and deities are found, amongst others Athena Magarsia on coins from Mallus in Cilicia under Demetrios I or the old war and fertility god Sandan on coins from Tarsus featured for the first time under Antiochus IV, and others. A specific interest of Seleucid rulers in local sanctuaries, such as possibly during the late period of coin minting under priestly authority in Bambyce (Hierapolis) in northern Syria – from where the cults of Hadad and Atargatis spread throughout the Hellenistic and the Roman Imperial periods – and perhaps in the local coinage of Istakhr (§1.3.1), as well as in Elymais were the minting of coins from the mid second
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century BCE was closely related with the administration of a local temple; was also present (further below). This does not appear to have been any different to the situation found in Judaea during the early 2nd century BCE.

Judging by his course of action Antiochus III seems to have maintained and supported the administrative structures present in the Jewish province after his conquest of Palestine. He amongst others showed his goodwill towards the Jews of Jerusalem by issuing a decree which stated that he would aid the rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem and the Jewish Temple. He exempted the building materials from taxation and granted the Jews an allowance for their sacrifices, thereby encouraging the continuation of the Jewish temple cult. As it was already the case during the late Persian period the persons working within the temple cult were exempted from paying any taxes, but now the members of the Jewish council or synedrion were also exempted from paying any taxes. In addition tax-exemption was promised the residents dwelling in Jerusalem, or those who would return to the city within a certain period of time, for the period of three years (Josephus AJ 12.142-144). One important aspect of the decree was the specific mentioning that the Jews were allowed to live according to the laws of their fathers, i.e. the Torah, thereby implying the official recognition of this law and establishing the necessary balance between religion and politics in Jerusalem. Furthermore, Antiochus III decreed that only Jews or those acting according to Jewish law were allowed to enter the temple and ritually unclean animals were not allowed in Jerusalem (AJ 12.145-146). All in all, the Seleucid ruler acknowledged and supported the continued existence of an independent Jewish self-government.

Internal differences were however a major cause of tension within the ruling upper classes of the Jewish society as Antiochus III took possession of Jerusalem. The longstanding conflict between the priestly family of the predominantly pro-Seleucid Tobiads and the high priestly pro-Ptolemaic Oniad family during the late 3rd and early part of the 2nd century BCE is most illustrative – even if a simplification – of these circumstances. The core of this inner-Jewish conflict was primarily the increasing power struggle surrounding the seat of the high priest between the Tobiad family on the
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one hand and the Oniads on the other hand, lasting through the reigns of both Antiochus III and his successor Seleucus IV (187-175 BCE), only to culminate under the rule of Antiochus IV. The decrees issued by Antiochus III seem alternately to have been directed at the financial interests of both parties, probably in an attempt to keep the strained political situation under control.

Adding to this conflict was the increasing Hellenization of the Jewish society in general, which has often specifically been attributed to the so-called Hellenistic Reform of Antiochus IV. The idea that Antiochus IV implemented specific religious policies within his empire in an attempt to deliberately Hellenise his subjects is much disputed and is in all likelihood not conform with the actual intention of his politics, but in effect a result of them.

At the beginning of his reign Antiochus IV appointed the Oniad Jason to the office of the high priest, who – with the support of the pro-Seleucid fractions – led the Jewish Hellenizers towards the transformation of Jerusalem into an institutional Greek polis. Specific structural alterations took place in Jerusalem during this time, which supported the physical transformation of the city in the approach of the idea of a Greek polis, however without the official founding of the city as such. The introduction of the Greek athletic institutions (the ephebeum and the gymnasion) by Jason may have been an attempt at becoming recognized equals of their Greek neighbours, as the participation in these institutions presumed the bestowal of the Greek citizenship. This process possibly actively involved the Pagan citizens of Jerusalem and seems to a great extent to have been related to the objective of living as Greek citizens by the parts of the Hellenized Jewish elite now led by Jason, rather than caused by official royal Seleucid policies. Greek ways of life were to a great extent desirable by parts of the Jewish society, as long as the Jewish cult was not directly affected.
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The seat of the high priest Jason was after only three years usurped by the To-biad Menelaus, a – in political respect – much more extreme Hellenizer than Jason and the first high priest from a non-Zadokite, i.e. a non-high priestly, family to take this position and forcing Jason to flee from Jerusalem. The overt misuse of the temple treasury by Menelaus to pay the increased tributes he had promised Antiochus IV against being appointed high priest caused an open uprising against him in Jerusalem. Menelaus who at the time resided at the king’s court in Antioch in Syria managed to fend himself against all attempts to put an end to his reign and misuse of the position of the high priest, and to keep the support of the Seleucid king.\textsuperscript{292}

The exiled high priest Jason, who in the mean time had turned to seek support with the more conservative pro-Ptolemaic parties, mistakenly believed a rumour that said Antiochus had died during his invasion of Egypt in 170 BCE during the 6\textsuperscript{th} Syrian War. He attacked Jerusalem with an armed force, forcing Menelaus to seek refuge in the Seleucid citadel (the \textit{Acra}), presumably situated in the area directly south of the Temple Mount (Map 5),\textsuperscript{293} and forced the followers of the Seleucid king from the city. This did however cause Antiochus to retaliate with military force led by Apollonius and perhaps as early as in 169 BCE the city was recaptured and – with the assistance of Menelaus – the citizens of Jerusalem punished. As a consequence of these actions the city and the temple lost its self-government as well as its religious freedom, as all the real power was transferred from Jewish hands into the hands of the Greek official (\textit{epistátes}) Philip appointed by Antiochus IV (2 Macc 5:22-23). Menelaus still remained in the office of the high priest, but now derived of all real political power.\textsuperscript{294}

After the end of the troubles with Jason, Antiochus’ IV is said to have decreed a ‘religious edict’, a highly disputed subject, which may have followed in 167 BCE.\textsuperscript{295} The exact details and course of action by the Seleucid ruler are in the literary sources inconsistent, but has been seen as the last attempt to finalize the \textit{Hellenization} of Jerusalem. Antiochus IV is amongst others said to have issued decrees against the free enactment of the Jewish religion (1 Macc 1:44-50) and to have consecrated the Temple in Jerusalem to the Olympic Zeus on the 6\textsuperscript{th} of December 167 BCE (2 Macc 5:62). The
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precise historic succession of the religious persecution of the Jews by Antiochus IV is not completely clear and it is disputed which actions did in fact take place or which actions described were in fact the result of the polemics of the authors of the individual literary sources.\footnote{Amongst others treated in detail by P. SCHÄFER (1995, 41-44) and P.F. MITTAG (2006, 256-268).} Especially the consecration of the Jewish Temple to Zeus has traditionally been seen as the final action leading to the spontaneous outbreak of the Maccabean revolt against the Seleucid rule and the beginning of the establishment of the Hasmonaean kingdom.\footnote{1 Macc 1:54-57; 2 Macc 6:1-5.} The process towards the outbreak of this revolt may in fact have commenced more gradually.\footnote{MITTAG 2006, 268, 281.}

That the revolt against the Greek king was – at least initially – centred on Jerusalem and the Jewish Temple here is underlined by a letter to Antiochus IV from the year 166 BCE written by the Sidonians dwelling in Shechem.\footnote{The inhabitants of the city of Maresha also called themselves Sidonians. It is possible that the wish to be disassociated from the religious founded uprising in Jerusalem came from a group of Hellenized citizens and should not be attributed to the Samarian inhabitants as a whole, COLLINS 2005, 48.} In this letter they disassociated themselves strictly from the protests against the king’s religious reforms taking place in Jerusalem and fully intended to accept the cult of Zeus in their sanctuary on Mount Gerizim in Samaria.\footnote{2 Macc 6:2; Josephus AJ 12.257-264; MORKHOLM 1989, 286-287.} The cult of Mount Gerizim is one of the more pronounced examples of a conscious syncretism of a local Semitic and a foreign cult taking place in Palestine. The erection of the Hellenistic temple probably occurred shortly after the Macedonian conquest of Samaria in 332 or 331 BCE and cultic continuity between the Persian and the Hellenistic period has been established during the excavations of the sacred precinct.\footnote{2 Macc 6:1-5; Josephus AJ 12.257-264; MØRKHOLM 1989, 286-287.} According to Josephus it was dissident priests from the Temple in Jerusalem that was involved in this undertaking (AJ 11.306-312). The final separation of this sanctuary and the Temple in Jerusalem had however not occurred until now.

The reasons for the insurgence of the city of Samaria with its cult-centre on Mount Gerizim (see Map 1) towards the Jewish cult in Jerusalem and the apparent willingly acceptance of the Pagan religion can perhaps be linked with a shift in the composition of the population, which took place during the very early Hellenistic period, as a Macedonian colony was settled here.\footnote{ARGENT 1979, 160; HENGEL 1996, 271; KASHER 1990, 19-20.} Archaeological finds from the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE have shown that in the case of Samaria the residents primarily comprised of

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotemark[1]
\footnotemark[2]
\footnotemark[3]
\footnotemark[4]
\footnotemark[5]
\footnotemark[6]
\footnotemark[7]
\footnotemark[8]
\end{flushleft}
Hellenized Pagan population. This would at least to some extent explain why the intercessors from Samaria were so eager to disassociate themselves from the Jews in their letter to Antiochus IV (Josephus AJ 12.257-264), although the religious differences between the two cities did probably go back even further, as the brief survey of the iconography of the coins of Samaria and Judah during the late Persian period has already shown (§1.1.2).

Simultaneously with the appointment of the epistátes Philip by Antiochus IV to the Temple in Jerusalem (2 Macc 5:22-3), the epistátes Andronicus had been appointed to the temple in Samaria, which lends credibility to the idea that also this temple was of a high (financial) importance to the Seleucid government (2 Macc 5:22-23). This approach is also visible in his re-organization of the main temple Esagil in Babylon in 169 BCE, where a zazakku was appointed, who may have supported the official functions of the temple official, the šatammu, presumably in an attempt to gain the financial control of the temple. In Samaria the open disassociation by the Sidonians from the insurgents in Jerusalem was the final development that created the permanent religious fissure between Samaria and Jerusalem. The Hellenistic temple of the Samarians was finally destroyed by John Hyrcanus in 108 BCE (Josephus AJ 13.255-256) and the city of Samaria was occupied and destroyed one year later.

The history of the Maccabaean revolt against the Greek rule has been accounted for in great detail in a number of ancient – first and foremost – Jewish sources. Stated in short, the Maccabaean revolt – initiated by the priest Mattathias from Modein and continued by his sons Judas, Jonathan, Simon, John and Eleazar – fell into two stages. During the first part the rebellion was directed against the rule of the Seleucid sovereign and persisted until the prohibition of the enactment of the Jewish religion was officially terminated in 163 BCE. The second part, which was caused by the continued inner-Jewish problems between the Hellenisers led by the high priest Alkimos, instated by the Seleucid ruler after the demise of Menelaus, and the orthodox Maccabaean party contin-

---

303 BARAG 1993b, 4.
305 SCHÄFER 1995, 39, 43.
308 FREYNE 1998, 42.
309 MITTAG 2006, 225-228.
ued after this time and forced Demetrius I to actively intervene in the affairs of the Jews again. The problems continued until 158 BCE until the Hellenisers lost the support of the Seleucid rule favouring a stable Jewish province. 311 With this insurgence the fundament for the developing Hasmonaean dynasty was laid and the setting for the development of what is traditionally understood as the actual Hellenistic Jewish coinage was established.

2.3 Evidence of a Seleucid Mint in Jerusalem?

The fact that apparently the administration in Judah was allowed to continue the production of their fractional silver coins under Ptolemaic rule is noteworthy, contrasting with the coinage issued in most other places under the highly centralised Ptolemaic monetary administration and coinage monopoly, 312 where only few exceptions to this rule can be found; among these the coinage of Kyrene (Map 2) minted under the rule of the Macedonian king Magas (e.g. Fig. 164 & 165), the half-brother of Ptolemy II (Pausanias I 6,8), who made himself king here in c. 276 BCE and whose kingdom after his death in 250 BCE once again became part of the Ptolemaic empire. 313 No coinage can, however, be attributed to the Jewish Temple or be identified as Jewish of some sorts for the duration of approximately one century after the end of the production of the YHD coinage around the mid 3rd century BCE.

The strong economic position of the Jewish Temple might have been all-important for its continued existence as a financial centre, as it can be found reflected during the Seleucid period, where – following the conflict between the pro-Ptolemaic Oniads and the pro-Seleucid Tobiads – the appointment of the Greek epistates Philip as the administrator of the Jewish Temple in 169 BCE by Antiochus IV not only meant the loss of its self-government for the Jews, but also placed the administration of the temple under direct Seleucid control. 314

The attribution of a bronze coin type by D. Barag as possibly issued by Antiochus IV in a Seleucid mint in Jerusalem – before the official bestowal of any minting

311 EHLING 2008, 117, 130-139.
312 MORKHOLM 1991, 70; MILDENBERG 2000, 94.
314 HENGEL 1988, 486-95.
rights to the Jews and the beginning of Hasmonaean coinage – would be consistent with this development (Fig. 167). The radiate head of Antiochus IV is displayed on the obverse, and on the reverse a sitting female deity clad in a chiton and with a polos as headdress. A small winged Nike is standing on her outstretched right hand and a small bird at her feet. The inscription on the reverse reads ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ. The many die-variations found especially in the reverses point towards a large issue of coins with the use of many dies. The attribution to a mint in Jerusalem has however been contested in favour of an attribution of this coin type to another Seleucid mint under Antiochus IV, namely in Samaria, or that the mint was possible even situated in Nysa-Scythopolis or even Ptolemais. The issue is paralleled by bronze coin series of the same type with slight variations attributed to Antiochus IV issued in Seleucia-on-Tigris (Fig. 168) and in Susa. Common for these images is that they probably represented the personifications of these Hellenistic cities. The specific bronze coin type referred to here, would – if correctly attributed to Antiochus’ IV mint in Jerusalem – have communicated a picture of the city successfully transformed into a Hellenistic polis, in line with the actual physical transformation of the city taking place. This can however not be stated for sure. Nonetheless, it was in the context of this Hellenized environment that Hasmonaean coinage was initiated.

A further coin type can with more certainty be attributed to a Seleucid mint in Jerusalem working under Antiochus VII Sidetes (138-129 BCE) (Fig. 174). It has been suggested that the coin type displaying the images of the lily and the anchor, two motifs with long traditions in Palestinian coinage, was either minted by or in the name of Antiochus VII in the year 181 and 182 of the Seleucid era (131/130 and 130/129 BCE). This would place the coin type as one of the latest Seleucid coin series minted in Jerusalem, or that these coins belonged to the first coin series issued in the mint established in Jerusalem under John Hyrcanus I, which could have served as the prototype for the

---

316 HOOVER, however, marks on a lack of convincing evidence from a previous Seleucid mint in Jerusalem, HOOVER 2003, 30.
317 HOUGHTON II, 61, nos. 364-367; SC II.1, 94-95.
318 SC II, nos. 1513-1515 (Seleucia), no. 1533 (Susa).
320 BARAG 2000-2002, 75-76.
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later Hasmonaean coins.\textsuperscript{323} This coin series would according to this have functioned as a transitional coin between the Seleucids and the Hasmonaean periods of rule and marked the beginning of Hasmonaean coin minting,\textsuperscript{324} or may rather have been issued on a specific occasion (cf. §2.4). No later Seleucid-style coinage can be attributed to Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{325} The exact starting point of the production of Hasmonaean coins can on the basis of this material however not be determined with any certainty.

It can be surmised that preceding the emergence of Hasmonaean coinage Seleucid coins may have been issued both under the rule of Antiochus IV and Antiochus VII in Jerusalem. It should in all likelihood be given some more consideration if (Greek) coinage was minted in Jerusalem respectively if further coins can be attributed to a mint situated here in the time between the YHD coinage and the coins mentioned here. This discussion will however not be pursued further here.

\textbf{2.4 The Bestowal of the Right to Mint Coins upon the Jews: the Literary Evidence}

It is well-known that according to the First Book of Maccabees (15:6) the third of the Maccabaean brothers Simon (142-135 BCE) was bestowed the right to mint coins by Antiochus VII Sidetes (138-129 BCE) in his function as hieros megas and ethnarchos (according to 1 Macc 15:1-2), as an addition to the concessions of amnesty, tax exemptions, and the recognition of the Jewish de facto sovereignty of Judaea (1 Macc 15:5-8), reconfirming the rights and privileges previously bestowed on the Jews under the rule of respectively Demetrius I and the first period of rule of Demetrius II.\textsuperscript{326} Also in the case of the city of Arados, which likewise had aided Antiochus' VII fight against Tryphon on his way to the throne, it is known that the right to mint tetradrachms was given by the new Seleucid ruler in 138/137 BCE.\textsuperscript{327}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{323} KINDLER 1968, 190 Pl. 20B no. 7-9; MESHORER 1982, 39 Fig. 1; JACOBSON 2000, 74-76; MESHORER 2001, 30; HÜBNER 2005, 181; a monogram is rendered on two series of tetradrachms minted by Antiochus VII, which has been suggested to refer to the name Hyrcanus (\textit{yrkan[ou]}), FISCHER 1975, 194.

\textsuperscript{324} MESHORER 2001, 31; HENDIN 2007-2008, 83-84; HENDIN 2010a, 181.

\textsuperscript{325} SC II/1, 392.

\textsuperscript{326} SCHÜRER 1973, 182-183, 189-191; SCHÄFER 1995, 54, 56, 58; these rights were possibly reconfirmed in the later alliance between Antiochus VII and John Hyrcanus I, HOOVER 2003, 31-34.

\end{flushright}
It is traditionally assumed that the right to mint coins was bestowed on the person of Simon as the Jewish ruler considering his historic role in the establishment and fortification of the Hasmonaean kingdom. Bearing in mind that in the Greek text no clear distinction is made in the wording of Simon’s political role, it has to be considered whether the minting rights were given to Simon as ruler (*ethnarchos* and *strategos*) or if all the rights were bestowed on Simon as high priest (*hieros megas*). It is of course clear that during this time religion and politics were not separable entities, hence Simon was not functioning either as the secular ruler or the high priest, but a closer look on the ancient use and understanding of these termini in the Biblical texts might cast some additional light on this situation.

Of the designations used in connection with Simon primarily the title of *hieros megas* and secondarily the title of *ethnarchos* is emphasised in ancient literature. His role as *strategos* is only emphasised in connection with his appointment as the official Jewish leader by the Jewish *synedrion* and people (1 Macc 14:42-47), which was also subsequently recognised by the Roman Senate (1 Macc 15:15-24). During the early Roman period the Jewish title *ethnarchos* was assigned as an official ruler title to both the high priest John Hyrcanus II as well as to the Herodian tetrarch Archelaus by the Romans, not only with the deliberate intention to avoid the use of the title of king introduced by Aristobulus I, but also – in the case of Hyrcanus II – politically degrading the official position of the Hasmonaean ruler, although principally the same rights as provincial rulers/governors were involved, and according to Josephus formally still recognising his status as high priest. The question is if it is valid to assume the similar use of this title to the period and reign of Simon.

It is no longer possible to determine the exact Semitic title(s) probably originally given to Simon. During his time the title of *ethnarchos* does appear to have been consistent with the Hebrew title NŠY’ (*nasi*), and a direct translation of NŠY’ into *eth-

---

328 The term *synedrion*, i.e. the Jewish council, is here understood to have preceded the Sanhedrin, an expression confined to literary sources of the Roman Imperial period, see ABD 5, 977 s.v. Sanhedrin (A.J. Saldarini); Grabe 2008, 13-15; Other Greek termini were also applied to this institution: *gerusia* (council of elders), *boulé* (advisory council), inter alia summarised by Grabbe 2008, 3-13, 17.


330 Also Sharon 2010, 479.


332 Sharon 2010, 474-478, 489-490, argues that the title *ethnarchos* was erroneously attributed to Simon (caused by the translator of the original text into Greek) and in extension to John Hyrcanus I and that the title in fact “was probably an invention of the early Roman period” (p. 490).

333 Alon 1984, 622-624; Samuels 2000b, 87-88.
narchos in the Greek text should probably be considered correct.\textsuperscript{334} The term NŚ́Y’ was throughout time applied with many variations\textsuperscript{335} and apparently underwent some changes. It ranged between being the honorary title of a primus inter pares, military leader, judge to that of a king until it finally became the title of the head of the Rabbinic Sanhedrin.\textsuperscript{336} Already before the time of Simon’s rule this title seems to have established itself as a designation for the heads of the Jewish politeumata in Ptolemaic Egypt, a tradition upheld well into the Roman Imperial period.\textsuperscript{337} When exactly the title actually came to refer to the head of the Jewish synedrion – and later the Sanhedrin – in Jerusalem is however disputed.\textsuperscript{338} It has been suggested that this term was in fact already applied as a honorary title to the leader of the office of the high priest during the Persian period, which carried through the Ptolemaic and Seleucid periods as well, during which the high priest acted as the highest Jewish ruler under the different foreign authorities until the establishment of the Hasmonaean rule.\textsuperscript{339} It is possible that with the changes taking place at the time of the emergence of the Hasmonaean kingdom the title of NŚ́Y’ – i.e. the Greek ethnarchos – was transferred to the religious authority or head of the Jewish synedrion,\textsuperscript{340} thereby predetermining its use as the title of the primary religious authority of the Jewish council, although the exact time of the introduction of the use of the designation NŚ́Y’ known from Rabbinic sources for the head of the Sanhedrin is not clear.\textsuperscript{341} It does seem necessary to draw a clear line between the understanding of the title of NŚ́Y’ during the Hellenistic and earlier periods and the later much more exclusive use of the title NŚ́Y’ as the head of the Sanhedrin, possibly already applicable at the

\textsuperscript{334} EncJud 14., 784 s.v. NASI (G. Y. BLIDSTEIN); Contrary to ALON 1984, 622, Y. MESHORER is of the opinion that the Greek title ethnarchos was not the translation of NŚ́Y’, but the translation of the title of the head of the Jewish council, MESHORER 2001, 141 – the one does although not exclude the other.

\textsuperscript{335} see especially BOTTERWECK / RINGGREN / FABRY 1986, 647-657 s.v. נשי (H. Niehr), for a comprehensive survey of the use of the title NŚ́Y.

\textsuperscript{336} Gesenius, s.v. נשי; KOEHLER / BAUMGARTNER, s.v. נשי; EncJud 14., 784-785 s.v. NASI (G. Y. BLIDSTEIN); BOTTERWECK / RINGGREN / FABRY 1986, 647-657 s.v. נשי (H. Niehr).

\textsuperscript{337} This was verifiably the case in Alexandria and possibly also in Leontopolis (Tell Yahuuda) and Herakleopolis; DNP 4 (1998) 166; COWEY / MARESCH 2001, 4-9. The position of the NŚ́Y within the politeumata in Egypt might have been similar to that of the politarchos, e.g. Herakleopolis: P.Heid.Inv. G 4927 (c. 135 BCE), P.Heid.Inv. G 4877 (c. 135 BCE), COWEY / MARESCH 2001, 10-11, 35-45, Pl. I-II. On the general use of politarch, see ABD 5, 384-389 s.v. Politarchs (G. H. R. HORSLY); IDRIS BELL 1957, 25-49; N. SHARON argues against a use of the title of ethnarchos in Egypt previous to the early Roman period on the basis of the textual evidence alone (SHARON 2010, 486-487).

\textsuperscript{338} EncJud 14., 784 s.v. NASI (G. Y. BLIDSTEIN).

\textsuperscript{339} ZEITLIN 1957, 3-4; ALON 1984, 623-624; GRABBE 1998, 5-7. This is although not without controversy, BICKERMAN 1988, 142-143.

\textsuperscript{340} ZEITLIN 1957, 4-5.

\textsuperscript{341} EncJud 14., 784 s.v. NASI (G. Y. BLIDSTEIN).
time of the Bar Kokhba war,\textsuperscript{342} as well as between the use of the title {	extit{ethnarchos}} applied by the Romans to provincial rulers and earlier uses. The use of the title of {	extit{ethnarchos}} during the time of Simon seems more strongly connected with the dignity of the high priest based on an older honorary tradition, in conformity with a later non-territorial use of the title of {	extit{ethnarchos}},\textsuperscript{343} enhancing his connection with the Jewish Temple and its immediate administration – whose responsibility according to 1 Macc 14:42 was explicitly to remain in the hands of Simon. It is theoretically possible that the legal rights mentioned in the First Book of Maccabees were in fact bestowed equally on the Jewish Temple under the administration of Simon the high priest and also covered his role as leader of the Jewish {	extit{synedrion}} – regardless of the actual constitution of the council at that time.\textsuperscript{344}

The heritability of the dignities bestowed on Simon and therewith the foundation of the high priestly ruler dynasty of the Hasmonaeans\textsuperscript{345} is featured strongly in the legends of the following Hasmonaean coinage – here not overlooking the fact that neither of the honorary titles {	extit{ethnarchos}} nor NSY’ were put to use as part of the Hebrew legends of the Hasmonaean coins. Far more, the actual official Hebrew titles or designations HKHN HGDWL (ha-kohen ha-gadol – the high priest), R’S (reš – head) or HMLK (ha-mælek – the king) were used and in addition the Greek title {	extit{basileus}}, reflecting the official positions and functions of the Hasmonaean rulers. The title of the high priest and the institution of the ḤBR HYHWDM (hever ha-yehudim), i.e. the {	extit{synedrion}}, are the only constants in the palaeo-Hebrew legends, which fits the picture gained from the use of titles in connection with Simon. John Hyrcanus I (135-104 BCE), who was the first to implement the titles or designations inherited from Simon, is even titled as the R’S ḤBR HYHWDM, i.e. the head of the Jewish council, on coins displaying double parallel cornucopiae, contrary to the traditional display of the facing cornucopiae, on the obverse and a crested helmet on the reverse (Fig. 21), both motifs uncommon – belonging to one of the rarest Hasmonaean coin series,\textsuperscript{346} and on two other coin types displaying a wreath and the inscription on the obverse and the double cornucopiae and

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{342} Gesenius, s.v. קַנְוֹד; Koehler / Baumgartner, s.v. קַנְוֹד; EncJud 14., 784-785 s.v. NASI (G. Y. Blijstein); see Botterweck / Ringgren / Fabry 1986, 647-657 s.v. קָנְוֹד (H. Niehr).
\bibitem{343} A non-territorial aspect of the title of {	extit{ethnarchos}}, defined according to ethnic criteria, was applicable to John Hyrcanus II at a time were Antipater was probably the effective authority administrating the Jewish territory. In the case of Herod Archelaus the title seems equally to have alluded to his specific territory (Sharon 2010, 482-484).
\bibitem{344} ABD 5, 975 s.v. Sanhedrin (A. J. Saldarini); Grabbe 1998, 3-9, 15-19.
\bibitem{345} Schürer 1973, 193-194.
\bibitem{346} Meshorer 2001, 207 Group H; Hendin 2010a, 187-188, no. 1136.
\end{thebibliography}
the pomegranate on the reverse, as well as on a type displaying a palm branch on the obverse and a rose on the reverse.\textsuperscript{347} It has been argued that the coins carrying the image of the helmet should be attributed to Hyrcanus II, as the image would have functioned as a sign of the authority of the \textit{ethnarch} bestowed on this Hasmonaean king by Caesar in 47 BCE.\textsuperscript{348} A combination of the designation R’Š and the depiction of the helmet is not repeated in other Hasmonaean coins. The image is however not uncommon finding parallels in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century YHD coinage (Fig. 10),\textsuperscript{349} as well as different depictions of helmets in the Seleucid coinage (dealt with in more detail in §3.2.1.3.).\textsuperscript{350}

The possibility of a continuous consistent administration of the Jewish Temple established during the Persian period seems to some extent be reflected indirectly in the use of these titles, providing details concerning the context of the establishment of Hasmonaean coinage. Even if the right to mint coins was not actually converted into practice during Simon’s brief rule under Antiochus VII, it is not to say that the process, though no longer discernible, was not initiated within the framework of the existing temple administration. After having defeated his opponent, the former general Tryphon, Antiochus apparently did not see a necessity in keeping the support of the Jews and his alliance with them and demanded the return of the areas now under Jewish control, the taxes of the areas under Jewish rule outside of Judaea or a compensatory payment of 1000 silver talents (1 Macc 15:27-35).\textsuperscript{351} Simon, however, did not submit to any of the demands made by Antiochus and inflicted a crushing defeat upon Antiochus’ general Cendebaeus during the following battle.\textsuperscript{352}

In 135 BCE Simon was insidiously killed by his son-in-law Ptolemy in the fortress of Dok/Dagon near Jericho (1 Macc 16:11-16; Josephus AJ 13.228). Subsequently a power-struggle broke out between his son John Hyrcanus and Ptolemy, which gave Antiochus VII the opportunity to actively involve himself in the ongoing problems in Judaea leading to his successful siege of Jerusalem in 135/134 BCE, which was not terminated until a peaceful agreement was reached between him and John Hyrcanus.\textsuperscript{353} It is impossi-

\textsuperscript{347} \textsc{Hendin} 2010, nos. 1137-1138.
\textsuperscript{348} \textsc{Hübner} 2005, 181; an earlier bestowal of the title under Pompey in 63 BCE has also been argued, on this \textsc{Sharon} 2010, 479-481.
\textsuperscript{349} \textsc{Gerson} 2001, 112 no. Y-2-C.
\textsuperscript{350} E.g. \textsc{Houghton} II, nos. 127-128 (Antiochus I Soter), 553 (Antiochus VI Dionysus), 563-565 (Tryphon).
\textsuperscript{352} \textsc{Schäfer} 1995, 58; \textsc{Ehling} 2008, 192-195.
\textsuperscript{353} \textsc{Ehling} 2008, 194-199.
ble to tell if perhaps the coin type mentioned above featuring the lily and the anchor (cf. §2.3) was indeed a reflection of this development, minted at a time where the relationship respectively the agreement of 134 BCE between the rulers needed reinforcement. A possible occasion to be taken into consideration would be John Hyrcanus’ participation in Antiochus’ VII campaign against the Parthians in 131 BCE (Josephus AJ 13.250).\(^{354}\)

An archaeological indication of an administrative continuity, preceding the minting of the Hasmonaean coins, can be found in the group of the late YHD stamp impressions, which seem to have directly preceded Hasmonaean coinage.\(^{355}\) It should be taken into consideration that the old administrative tool of the YHD stamp impressions continuously in use during the previous centuries was also employed during the early part of the Hasmonaean period, as a manifestation and expression of the rising national sovereignty, but ceased to exist with the expansion of the Hasmonaean kingdom and the emergence of the coinage carrying the same palaeo-Hebrew script.\(^{356}\) It should not be readily dismissed that Hasmonaean coinage was in fact established within the already existing administrative body of the temple, where the Hasmonaean ruler came to act as both the secular and religious leader, hence the equal treatment of the political and religious unities in the legends of the coins – at least until the reign of Alexander Jannaeus.

So far, the literary reference found in the First Book of Maccabees (1 Macc 15:5-8), is the only evidence of the actual official bestowal of minting rights on the Jews. Other than the mentioning of this right, in addition to the decree of amnesty, tax-exemptions, and recognition of the Jewish de facto sovereignty of Judaea,\(^{357}\) no details on any kind concerning the actual coining of or appearance of the coins are to be found here. Any further deductions made on the basis of the meagre evidence towards the coins possibly minted during this brief period, can therefore only be viewed as tentative and hypothetical. Important is nonetheless the fact that the Jews were apparently officially given the right to mint their own coins to use within their own land, which constitutes the beginning of Jewish coinage proper.

\(^{357}\) SCHÄFER 1995, 56.
2.5 The Hasmonaean Coinage

The chronology of the coinage of the Hasmonaean rulers has long been considered problematic, and many details in their mint succession have not yet been clarified.\(^{358}\) They on the one hand do generally not carry any dates, though the few coin series minted by Alexander Jannaeus carrying Aramaic legends are the exceptions to this rule,\(^{359}\) and the attribution of some coin series to specific rulers has on the other hand, despite the use of personal names, at times proven to be difficult. This is primarily caused by the repetitive use of names among the Hasmonaean rulers (see text Table I),\(^{360}\) and the very close resemblance of the coin types. In the case of the coins ascribed to Judas Aristobulus I by D. Hendin (Fig. 29), the only dissimilarity between his coins and the coins issued by his father John Hyrcanus I is to be found in the legends.\(^{361}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hasmonaean Rulers and/or High Priests with no verifiable Coinage:</th>
<th>Attribution of Minting Insecure:</th>
<th>Hasmonaean Rulers and High Priests with Coinage:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eleazar (163 BCE)*</td>
<td>John Hyrcanus I (Yehohanan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judas the Maccabee (Yehudah) (165-160 BCE)**</td>
<td>(135-104 BCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John (Yehoḥanan) (161 BCE)</td>
<td>Alexander Jannaeus (Yehonathan or Yonatan) (103-76 BCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan (Yehonathan) (160-143 BCE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon (Shimeon) (143-135 BCE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Salome Alexandra (76-67 BCE)                                 | Judas Aristobulus II (Yehudah?) (67-63 BCE) |
|                                                            | John Hyrcanus II (Yonatan?) (63-40 BCE)     |
|                                                            | Mattathias Antigonus (Mattataya) (40-37 BCE) |

| Aristobulus III (35 BCE)                                     |                                 |
|                                                             |                                 |

(* single date: year of death)                                 |
(** double date: period of rule)                                |

Text Table I. Chronological list of the primary members of the Hasmonaean family.\(^{362}\)

---

\(^{358}\) e.g. HENDIN 2010a, 162-163; HENDIN 2010b, 34-38.

\(^{359}\) MESHORER 2001, 39.


\(^{361}\) HENDIN 2010a, 190, nos. 1142-1143.

The minting of the Hasmonaean coins commenced with the rule of John Hyrcanus I (134-104 BCE), perhaps towards the end of his reign, and presumably continued until the end of the period of Hasmonaean rule with Mattathias Antigonus’ death in 37 BCE. Within this period only in the case of Alexandra Salome (76-67 BCE) no coins have been attributed to her person, although it is possible that she did mint coins in the name of her deceased husband Alexander Jannaeus or her son John Hyrcanus II (Fig. 30-31). All Hasmonaean coins were presumably minted in Jerusalem, with no specification of the nominal value, except for the last coin series minted by Mattathias Antigonus, where the distinction between the regular perutah and the half-perutah was displayed respectively through the use of two cornucopiae and one cornucopia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hasmonaean Rulers/High Priests</th>
<th>Coin Images:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Hyrcanus I (135-104 BCE)</td>
<td>Double cornucopiae with pomegranate, wreath, rose, helmet, double parallel cornucopiae, palm leaf, rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judas Aristobulus I (104-103 BCE) (?)</td>
<td>Double cornucopiae with pomegranate, wreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE)</td>
<td>Double cornucopiae with pomegranate, wreath, palm leaf, lily, rose anchor, diadem, star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judas Aristobulus II (67-63 BCE) (?)</td>
<td>Double cornucopiae with pomegranate, wreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hyrcanus II (63-40 BCE) (?)</td>
<td>Double cornucopiae with pomegranate, wreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattathias Antigonus (40-37 BCE)</td>
<td>Double cornucopiae with pomegranate/grain ear, double cornucopiae, single cornucopia, wreath, menorah, showbread table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Text Table II.** Overview of images used in the Hasmonaean coin iconography.

Common for all Hasmonaean coinage was the use of religiously inoffensive iconography, such as the double or single cornucopia with a pomegranate, lilies, roses, the anchor, the diadem, the wreath, and further similar depictions (overview text Table II),

---

363 RAPPAPORT 1976, 176-177; BARAG / QEDAR 1980, 8-21, pl. 3-9; OSTERMANN 2005, 13-20, 28; HENDIN 2007-2008, 77; at an earlier point MESHORER argued that Alexander Jannaeus was the first Hasmonaean to issue coins (MESHORER 1967 and 1982); furthermore, Y. RONEN has argued that Aristobulos I (104-103 BCE) was the first Hasmonaean king to issue coins (RONEN 1987, 105-107).


365 HENDIN 2007-2008, 82.


367 Also noted by HÜBNER 2005, 173.

368 The established use of the Rabbinic term perutah (prutah) will also be used here, as no knowledge of the actual ancient names of the Jewish coin denominations during their time of use has been preserved, on this MEYSHAN 1968b, 49-53; HENDIN 2009, 106.

369 On this MESHORER 2001, 69.

which did not cause any conflict with the Jewish aniconism found in the Second Commandment (Exodus 20:4). This corresponds to a similar development found in Jewish art and iconography in general during this time. Some of the images used, such as the anchor and the diadem, are clearly imitations of contemporary Greek coin iconography.

**The Lily/Rose**

Clear parallels between the iconographic repertoires of the Hasmonaean coins and the corpus of the stamped handles of the contemporaneously used imported Greek amphorae found in Jerusalem can be established; here especially depictions of the rose and the star belong to the most frequently used representations. An identification of the flower-images found in Hasmonaean coinage as the representation both of the lily (Fig. 24) as well as a rose (Fig. 22 & 25), is not generally recognized, far more all flowers have been identified as different representations of a lily. The use of the rose in the Hasmonaean coinage could however very well have derived from the contemporary Greek coinage of the island of Rhodes (Fig. 157), where similar types were widely used, and – as already noted – the image of the rose was widely used in the stamped amphora handles found in Jerusalem. The image is furthermore found represented both in the earlier and contemporaneous Macedonian coinage, and in Seleucid coinage, as in a coin series from Antioch-on-the-Orontes minted by Antiochus VIII Grypus (109-97/96 BCE) (Fig. 175). The image of the rose was evidently used widely and with some frequency in Greek coin iconography.

If indeed two different flowers were presented in Hasmonaean coinage the question remains to how they should be identified. The image of the lily is almost self-explanatory as it by now had become a well-known representation in Jewish coin iconography, which without hesitation can be linked with the city of Jerusalem through its prev-

---

371 KUHNEN 1990, 291; D. HENDIN (2007-2008, 78), who lists a number of researchers who have dealt with this question.
374 MESHORER generally identifies the flowers as lilies, e.g. Group N and group O, both attributed to Alexander Jannaeus (MESHORER 2001, 221); HENDIN 2010, 161 – recognizes the differences of the rendering of the flowers as different styles of the lily.
375 SNG Finland (Keckman I) 693-700 var.
376 4th century BCE: e.g. SNG ANS 8 (Macedonia II: Alexander I-Philip II), nos. 346-347 (type), 495 (type); 2nd century BCE: SNG Finland (Keckman I), nos. 793-795 (Magistrate Hermias) – it is noticeable that the coins quoted from the Keckman collection were acquired in Jerusalem in the mid 1970ies.
377 HOUGHTON II, no. 741.
ous presence in the YHD coins (discussed in §1.3.3 and §2.5.1) (e.g. Fig. 3 & 7). The image of the rose is another question. This motif evidently had a palpably presence within the contemporary Jewish world. If the rose did in fact derive from the similar types found in the stamped handles or Rhodian coinage it should in all likelihood be interpreted as a sign of wealth and prosperity, probably in relation to trade. The imitation of the Hellenistic Greek iconography in the developing Jewish iconography is in any case unmistakable. A comparison between the rose of the Rhodian coinage and the Hasmonaean coins also clearly shows the increasing stylization of the image on the Hasmonaean coins, a tendency also noticeable in other representations.

The Cornucopia with the Pomegranate

The cornucopia was a common Pagan sign of prosperity and abundance regularly found in contemporary Greek coin iconography in a number of different pictorial combinations and as a stand-alone image in the form of the single cornucopia or the double parallel cornucopiae, the latter a Ptolemaic conception first found in the coinage of Ptolemy II. The image had by the time of the Hasmonaean rule disengaged itself from any connection to any specific goddess to become a standalone image. The double facing cornucopiae is the most frequent motif found in Hasmonaean coinage and appears in the coinages of all the Hasmonaean rulers (text Table II above) (e.g. Fig. 23 & 26). Only in the coinage of Mattathias Antigonus does the single cornucopia also make an appearance (Fig. 35). The pomegranate – itself also a sign of fertility and abundance – inserted between the double cornucopiae has in the context of the Hasmonaean coinage tentatively been seen as a reference either to the high priest or the Temple in Jerusalem.

A number of references to the use of the pomegranate in connection with both the high priest and the Jerusalem Temple can be found in the Hebrew Bible, where it is used as an adornment of the temple or the robe of the high priest Aaron, dealt with in more detail in connection with the First Jewish War (§5.3.4). This is however difficult to substantiate here. In the coinage of Mattathias Antigonus a small detail calls for atten-

378 On this MEYER 2007, 183-202, especially 199-201.
380 KINDLER 2000, 318.
381 ROMANOFF 1944a, 307-310.
tions, as here the inserted pomegranate in some cases has been replaced by a grain ear (Fig. 34), yet another sign of plenty, which appears in a number of variations in Jewish coinage. This might serve to substantiate a connection between the image of the pomegranate and the high priesthood, as in these few coins Mattathias is only mentioning by his Hebrew name and not with any title, contrary to the coins displaying the pomegranate between the horns, where he is mentioned with title. Later, in the coinage of the Herod the Great the inserted pomegranate was to be replaced by the caduceus (§3.3.3). A similar motif with double facing cornucopiae with the horns crossed and an inserted pomegranate can only be found in the coinage of the Nabataeans towards the end of the 1st century BCE under the rule of the Nabataean kings Aretas IV (9 BCE-40 CE), clearly dating after the Hasmonaean coins and are probably imitations of these (Fig. 194). Otherwise a similar form of the motif as used by the Hasmonaeans is not found elsewhere in ancient coinage in a related context.

The reduction of the Greek weight standard under Alexander Balas (150-145 BCE) also applied to the coinage of the Hasmonaeans, whereby the Hasmonaean perutah became the approximate equivalent of the Seleucid chalkous respectively Greek dilepton and the half-perutah the equivalent of the Greek lepton, thereby following the development of the neighbouring kingdoms. This distinction is in Jewish coinage however rather a definition of coin denomination than weight as insofar the weights of the coin types respectively groups show great variety. The metallurgical analysis of the coin metal has enabled a tentative arrangement of coins into groups attributable to different Hasmonaean kings, which has disclosed a noticeable continuous reduction of the percentage of bronze in favour of an increasing amount of the lead in the Hasmonaean coins from the time of John Hyrcanus I until the rule of Mattathias Antigonus, which could point towards the increasing financial difficulties of these rulers.

384 MESHORER 1975, no. 118.
385 SC II/2, 3-4; HENDIN 2009, 106, 109.
386 MESHORER 2001, 54; HÜBNER 2005, 173; a similar adjustment of the weight standard is observable in the coinage of Tyre during this time, KINDLER 2000, 316-317.
387 KINDLER 2000, 317.
388 HENDIN 2009, 107-108 – this not only concerns the Hasmonaean coins, but all Jewish coins issued.
389 KRUPP 2007-2008, 57-71. This analysis has however been subject to critique, see HENDIN 2009, 113-114.
2.5.1 Interaction between Jewish and Seleucid Coinage

Many of the images used in Hasmonaean coinage find parallels in the coinage of the Seleucids, but this was by no means a one way phenomenon. The obverse-reverse combination of the lily and the anchor, together with the Greek inscription Basileos Antiochou Euergetou, on a Seleucid coin series minted either by or in the name of Antiochus VII Sidetes (138-129 BCE) in the years 131/130 and 130/129 BCE, discussed previously (§§2.3 & 2.4), clearly display the interaction taking place between Jewish and Seleucid coinage. The meaning of the motif of the lily as a sign for Judaea respectively Jerusalem, and/or the Jewish Temple, was imitated on these locally minted Seleucid coins, and the anchor was used in recognition of the royal Seleucid coin iconography (Fig. 174).

The image of the lily used on Hasmonaean coins evidently originated in the Persian period YHD coinage, where it had already played an important role as it became the sign of Judaea or Jerusalem. Already on early Persian period imitations of the Athenian coins, displaying Athena on the obverse and the owl with an olive branch on the reverse, the image of the lily was used as a replacement of the olive branch and with it the mark of the mint of Jerusalem was introduced into the coins minted here (§1.3.3). Next to the use of the palaeo-Hebrew script of the YHD inscription the lily accentuated the intended geographic circulation area and with this the cultural-religious context of these coins. On the later YHD coins the lily developed from a secondary element to a central image and as such remained an important element within Jewish coin iconography until the 1st century CE. Thus the image is one of the oldest Jewish coin images to be found.

The image of the anchor held several functions within ancient coinage. The image was used as a royal mark from the start of the royal Seleucid coinage, beginning with Seleucus I Nicator (311-281 BCE). The anchor seems to have functioned widely as an iconographic mean of monetary authorisation within the Seleucid Empire, judging

392 Also HOOVER 2003, 32-3.
395 The image of the lily was first introduced in connection with the Solomonic temple (1. Kings 7:19), and is known in form of different capitals from 9th and 8th century BCE buildings in Jerusalem (ROMANOFF 1944a, 301-307; HENDIN 1987, 35; GERSHON 2001, 109, 116; MESHORER 2001, 8-10).
from its appearance as a countermark on foreign coins of the appropriate metal and of a
weight suitable with the uniformity of the Seleucid monetary weight system, as well as
on Seleucid coins;396 where through the use of the anchor as countermark the coins were
legitimised. It is also found as a reverse type in different locally minted minor Seleucid
coin series attributed to different eastern mints,397 functioning as an iconographic rec-
ognition of the Seleucid sovereignty.

In Hasmonaean coinage the image of the anchor was only used by Alexander
Jannaeus (103-76 BCE) (text Table II) (Fig. 25, 27 & 28). Otherwise only the one coin
series issued at the time of John Hyrcanus I mentioned here carries a similar anchor.398
The explanation for the evident transfer of this dynastic image – parallel to the use of
the star (§3.2.1.3) – into the coinage of Alexander Jannaeus could have been his wish to
demonstrate royal rank and to legitimate his rule towards the non-Jewish parts of the
population – which constituted a non-negligible part of the subjects of the Hasmonaean
rulers399 – through the use of the contemporary well-known Seleucid pictorial lan-
guage.400 As it will become evident in the following chapters, the image was used by a
number of the Herodian rulers either as a sign of their own dynastic position or that of
members of their families (§4.5.2 and §4.6.1.2), and it cannot be dismissed that the im-
age was implemented by Alexander Jannaeus according to this function, i.e. primarily
as a sign of his inherited dynastic position.401

Through the continued use of Seleucid iconography and Greek legends in the
own coinage the local autonomous states rising in the wake of the increasing disintegra-
tion of the Seleucid Empire display a tendency to follow the example of the Seleucid
coinage.402 This development is also very much noticeable in the Hasmonaean coinage.

396 ZAHLE 1996, 127; HOUGHTON II, nos. 110-111 (Antiochus I/Antioch), no. 172 (Seleucus II/Sardes),
830 (2nd century BCE/Phaselis), nos. 831-832 (2nd century BCE/Aspendus), no. 833 (2nd century
BCE/Side); SC I, no. 1184 (Antiochus III, Uncertain mint).
397 HOUGHTON II, no. 97 (Seleucus I/unattributed Eastern mint), no. 116 (Antiochus I/uncertain Eastern
mint), no. 139 (Antiochus II/Cabyle or uncertain mint in Western Asia Minor), no. 705 (Alexander II Zabi-
nas/Antioch); numerous examples are listed in SC I and SC II, e.g. no. 26 (Seleucus I/Antioch), nos. 283-289
(Seleucus I/Ai Khanoum), no. 364 (Antiochus I/Europus (Dura)), no. 2230 (Alexander Zabinas/Antioch),
miscellaneous types are unattributed or of uncertain mints.
398 KINDLER 1968, 190, pl. 20B nos. 7-9; MESHORER 1982, 39, pl. 1; JACOBSON 2000, 74-76;
400 KINDLER 2000, 320; JACOBSON 2000, 77-79.
401 Also HOOVER 2003, 32-35.
402 JACOBSON 2000, 77.
The depiction of the anchor illustrates this well, as it in Judaea and other places was used continuously well into the late Herodian coinage, long after the termination of the Seleucid rule and the regular distribution and use of the Seleucid coinage. The continuous use of the image does indicate, that not only were the Seleucid coins themselves imitated, but that the actual significance of the image as an old royal insignia dating back to the beginning of the royal Seleucid coinage was of importance, thereby entailing an fundamental meaning as a conscious legitimating connection with a older royal rule.\textsuperscript{403} The conscious tie to the Seleucid background did apparently serve as an aid in the construction of the own Hellenistic-Jewish royal identity at the time of the Hasmonaean rule.\textsuperscript{404}

2.5.2 The Use of Languages and Scripts in Hasmonaean Coinage

Already the use of the ancient palaeo-Hebrew script on the early Jewish coins more than a century-and-a-half after the destruction of the 1\textsuperscript{st} Jewish Temple in 586 BCE, during a period where the findings of the use of this script are very rare, must be seen as an important development. On the Hasmonaean coins the script was probably re-introduced out of similar nationalistic and religious considerations. The script was undoubtedly used to pronounce specific values related to the national awareness and the religious identity of the people living in the Jewish province.\textsuperscript{405} This religious-nationalistic re-awakening taking place in the Jewish coinage during this time is amongst others paralleled by incised inscriptions written in the palaeo-Hebrew script.\textsuperscript{406} However, the additional use of Greek – and to a very limited extent Aramaic – legends cast a whole other light on the coins issued during the time of the Hasmonaean rule (overview in text Table III).

\textsuperscript{403} JACOBSON 2000, 79-80.
\textsuperscript{404} HOWGEGO 2007, 7; a similar thought is behind the development of the image during the Roman republican period, MEADOWS / WILLIAMS 2001, 27-49.
\textsuperscript{405} BARAG 1986-1987, 18; GERSON 2001, 118.
\textsuperscript{406} MAZAR 1976, 32.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hasmonaean Rulers / High Priests</th>
<th>Main Coin Legends <em>(transcribed)</em>: (Hebrew / Greek / Aramaic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Hyrcanus I <em>(Yehohanan)</em></td>
<td>YHWḤḤNN HKHN HGDWL RʾŠ ḤḤBR HYHWDYM <em>(Yehohanan the High Priest and Head of the Council of the Jews)</em>&lt;br&gt;YHWḤḤNN HKHN HGDWL WḤḤR HYHWDYM <em>(Yehohanan the High Priest and the Council of the Jews)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judas Aristobulus I <em>(Yehudah)</em> (?)*</td>
<td>YHDḤ HKHN HGDWL WḤḤR HYHWDYM <em>(Yehudah the High Priest and the Council of the Jews)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Jannaeus <em>(Yehonathan or Yonatan)</em></td>
<td>YHWNTN HKHN HGDWL WḤḤR HYHWDYM <em>(Yehonathan the High Priest and the Council of the Jews)</em>&lt;br&gt;YHWNTN HMLK <em>(Yehonathan the King)</em>&lt;br&gt;ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ (L KE) <em>(of King Alexander)</em> <em>(Year 25)</em>&lt;br&gt;MLK’ ‘LKSNDRWS (SHNT K’) <em>(King Alexander)</em> <em>(Year 25)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judas Aristobulus II <em>(Yehudah?)</em> (?)</td>
<td>YHDḤ HKHN GDWL WḤḤR HYHWDYM <em>(Yehudah High Priest and the Council of the Jews)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hyrcanus II <em>(Yonatan?)</em> (?)</td>
<td>YWNTN HKHN GDWL HḤḤR YHWDMY <em>(Yonatan the High Priest and Council of Jews)</em>&lt;br&gt;HḤḤR YHWDMY <em>(Council of Jews)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattathias Antigonus <em>(Mattataya)</em></td>
<td>MTṬYḤ HKHN GDWL WḤḤR HYHWDYM <em>(Mattataya High Priest and the Council of the Jews)</em>&lt;br&gt;MTṬYḤ HKHN (GDWL) <em>(High Priest Mattataya)</em>&lt;br&gt;MTṬYḤ <em>(Mattataya)</em>&lt;br&gt;.consume_tweets: text_table_3: Text Table III. Overview of the legends used in the Hasmonaean coinage.407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.5.2.1 The Palaeo-Hebrew Script

Contrary to the Greek and Aramaic legends, the palaeo-Hebrew script used from the beginning of the Hasmonaean period stated that the coins on which they were used were truly Jewish, combining land, people and religion in one (on the use of the Hebrew language and script §1.1.1). It was equally used to accentuate the Jewish religion, as a political statement, as well as simultaneously functioning as an ethnic and geographic marker. According to the altering political contexts of the coins under the rule of the different Hasmonaean rulers, their legends would vary, but essentially the use of the script was based on a traditional understanding of it, very likely holding specific nationalistic connotations, hence also its use on the pre-Hasmonaean stamped seals. The answer to why this script was put to use at certain times and not at others, in light of the larger scheme of ancient Jewish coinage, should be sought in the identity of the minting

---

authorities and their relation to the administration of the Jewish Temple and therewith with the identification of the actual mint(s) of these coins.

Through the use of the script both the addressing authorities and the primary addressees or users were characterised as Jews, thereby firmly establishing their cultural-religious identity and context. Since – as it has been noted time and again – the script itself was no longer widely used except for some of the Qumran texts and occasionally in funerary inscriptions, such as the tomb inscription from Giv‘at Hamivtar, it is not to be considered self-evident that many of the general public could read and understand these extended legends, by the beginning of the 1st century BCE. The immediate reason for the use of the script can be explained with the placing of the actual mint of the Hasmonaean coins in the hands of the administration of the Jewish Temple, where the ancient script was still in use, amongst others based on the considerations listed previously (§1.1 and §2.4). A fact presenting itself again in the minting of the coins of the First Jewish War, which – at least during the early years of the war – were possibly minted within the high priestly administration of the temple (§5.4). In addition, it is probable that the script itself in time came to hold a sacred meaning, based on its history of use and particularly in the context of the temple, which made it more than a political tool.

A certain degree of epigraphic change in the palaeo-Hebrew script on the coins of the Hasmonaeans occurred during the course of that dynasty, which does offer some basis for comparisons and analysis. Not only do the letters vary in form and style, which can help to arrive at a classification into different groups, also the accuracy – through the omission of certain letters – and the quality of the extended palaeo-Hebrew legends is variable. The differences accounted for in the script and the completion of the legends can reasonably be explained by the varying skills of the individual die-engravers and their understanding – or lack of understanding – of the old script. Accordingly, it does seem sensible to refrain from attempting to establish a relative chronology of the Hasmonaean coinage or groups based on script typology, since different styles of letters

---

411 Also HENDIN 2010b, 34-36
413 HENDIN 2010b, 34-36.
416 As done by KINDLER 1954, pl. 14.
can be found together and over a longer period of time,\textsuperscript{417} which may be ascribed to the work of specific die-engravers.\textsuperscript{418}

A stylistic comparison between the Greek and Semitic letters used on the Hasmonaean coins furthermore shows that two different techniques apparently were put to use simultaneously (e.g. Figs. 53-54). In contrast to the Semitic letters, the Greek letters were executed as points connected through straight lines, a technique familiar from the Seleucid coinage (e.g. Fig. 172). Evidently, a well-known technique was imitated in the Greek legends on the Hasmonaean coins or Greek die-cutters were here at work, in any case two different palaeographic traditions were deliberately used simultaneously.\textsuperscript{419}

\textbf{2.5.2.2 The Greek Legends}

The additional parallel use of Greek, and partly Aramaic, legends on the Hasmonaean coins was more consistent with the actual everyday linguistic requirements, where the coins were put to use also by non-Jews.\textsuperscript{420} It is noticeable that only Alexander Jannaeus and later Mattathias Antigonus made use of Greek legends – in addition to the standardised palaeo-Hebrew legends – designating themselves as kings and in the case of Antigonus as both king and high priest, and that only Alexander Jannaeus also made use of the Aramaic script, on his coins (text Table II). In both cases the explanations for the varying use of languages and scripts should most likely be sought in their individual political aspirations and the historic circumstances affecting the rule of both rulers and the political statements they were making accordingly.

Not only does the iconography on the coins of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE) show how implicitly he conceived himself as part of the Greek Hellenistic ruler tradition, according to which he portrayed himself or rather his own position.\textsuperscript{421} The imitation of the Hellenistic traditions was not limited to coinage. The Hellenized Jewish elite also found other public ways of expressions, as found in the late Second Temple period monumental rock-cut tombs for the most part situated in Jerusalem, such as Jason’s Tomb surmounted by a pyramidal structure, the Tomb of Bene Ḥezir, or the Tomb

\textsuperscript{417} MESHORER 2001, 49.
\textsuperscript{418} HENDIN 2010b, 36.
\textsuperscript{419} KINDLER 1968, 190; Idem 2000, 323; LICHTENBERGER 2012, forthcoming.
\textsuperscript{420} HÜBNER 2005, 178-179.
\textsuperscript{421} BERGMANN 1998, 13-15, 58-66; HÜBNER 2005, 181; OSTERMANN 2005, 27 Fig. 10; LYKKE 2011, 124-125.
of Queen Helene of Adiabene. Such Hellenized rock-cut family tombs remained a characteristic burial form of the elite during the periods of autonomous Jewish rule in the late Second Temple period.\textsuperscript{422} According to the literary sources Simon the Maccabean early on build a memorial monument in Modeïn – the home town of the Maccabaean family – commemorating their victory, which functioned as a family tomb where the remains of his brothers and parents were interred.\textsuperscript{423} The monument consisted of a high podium, with a central part surrounded by columns and was surmounted by a roof consisting of seven pyramids, one for each of the family members. The prototype for this monument, and others, has been suggested to be the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus.\textsuperscript{424}

The simultaneous use of the Hebrew and Greek legends – the latter introduced for the first time on his coins – presented Alexander Jannaeus both as high priest and as king, a title which had not been used earlier on the Hasmonaean coins. He clearly chose to follow iconographic traditions used in the coinage of the Greek Hellenistic kings, as it is evident from a comparison with the Seleucid coins evidently minted in Jerusalem before and around the time of the emergence of Hasmonaean coinage mentioned previously. Traditions which at the time were well-established in Jerusalem also within other groups of material, as it amongst others can be seen in the rock-cut tombs of this time.

Alexander Jannaeus followed the traditions of the royal Hellenistic predecessors and adhered to his positions in the Jewish society as high priest and presumably his role in the \textit{synedrion}, judging by his continued use of the inscription YHWNTN HKHN HGDWL WHBR HYHWDYM (Yehonatan the high Priest and the Council of the Jews) (Fig. 26). The implicitness, with which he initially displayed and consolidated himself as a Hellenistic ruler, highlighted through the addition of his name and title written in Greek (Fig. 27), seems to have changed during the later part of his reign. The diadem, which initially framed the star, disappears on the later coins minted from 79/78 BCE and was replaced by a dotted circle. The palaeo-Hebrew inscription was detached from the rows of the star and replaced by an Aramaic inscription positioned around the new dotted circle (Fig. 28). Through this the direct connection between the ruler and the star (and the diadem of the ruler) was eliminated.\textsuperscript{425} This could very well have been a reac-

\textsuperscript{422} \textit{Berlin} 2002, 138-148; \textit{Magness} 2011, 147-150.
\textsuperscript{425} \textit{Meshorer} 2001, 41, 47.
tion to the ongoing internal political problems with the Pharisees culminating during his period of rule, which, according to Josephus (AJ 13.403-4) allegedly upon the advice of Alexander Jannaeus, were reconciled during the time of rule of Salome Alexandra (76-67 BCE), who also otherwise had proven to be an astute politician. The dating of this coin type has been suggested by S. Pfann to be equivalent with a sabbatical year (one year out of every seven years), of which some have been precisely documented. The argument that greater religious neutrality was required from the coin iconography during these years may carry some weight in connection with this specific coin emission issued during the 25th year of Jannaeus’ reign considering the internal political problems with the Pharisees during this time, who amongst others strongly opposed Jannaeus’ claim to the high priesthood. It is however not at all sure that this also applies to the coins issued by Herod the Great and the Herodian rulers to follow and during the two Jewish wars.

Fig. II. An engraving of the menorah and right a part of the showbread table, from the Jewish Quarter in Jerusalem (BAHAT 1996, 52).

427 SASSE 2004, 220-221.
428 Leviticus 25; Deuteronomy 15.
430 PFANN 2006, 103.
431 As suggested by PFANN 2006, 103-108.
Despite his additional use of the Greek title *Basileus Antigonos*, Mattathias Antigonus (40-37 BCE) basically remained faithful to the Hasmonaean coin legends developed and used previously through his use of the inscription MTTYH KHN GDWL WḤBR ḤYḤWDYM (Mattataya high Priest and the Council of the Jews) (Fig. 32).\(^{432}\) It is noticeable that he, as the only Hasmonaean ruler, used the Greek title of king and the Hebrew words for high priest on the same coins. He was furthermore the first and only Jewish minting authority to use depictions of the seven-branched menorah and the showbread table on ancient Jewish coins (Fig. 33),\(^ {433}\) motifs which at this time had not yet developed into the common sacred motifs connected with Jewish decorative arts.\(^ {434}\) The earliest depiction of both to follow the display of these objects on Mattathias’ coins stem from the Jewish Quarter in Jerusalem (text Fig. II) and the Arch of Titus in Rome (text Fig. II), the latter if which is discussed later (§5.3.1).

Through the bold use of both legends and depictions he was as ruler able to refer directly to the Temple in Jerusalem and the temple cult and with this to his own old inherited and legal dignity as high priest, very much contrary to his political opponent the half-Jew Herod – who as the direct descendant of an Idumaean family and with a Nabataean mother would never be able to occupy the position of the high priest due to this deficiency in his genealogy.\(^ {435}\) Mattathias probably resorted to the use of these iconographic elements in combination with the acclaimed legends as a last mean to appeal to the Jewish population to gain the necessary support as both the true religious as well as secular leader of the Jewish people,\(^ {436}\) contrary to the will of Rome expressed in the Greek legends used on the coins of Herod the Great (40-4 BCE) explicitly stating Herod as basileus, according to the position bestowed on him by Rome.

### 2.5.3 Sacred Iconography in Hasmonaean Coinage

Did the Hellenistic Jewish kings use sacred iconography? Even a brief overview of the Hasmonaean coins shows that – perhaps surprisingly – no images of a distinct sacred nature were put to use, except for the images found in the last coins issued by Mat-
tathias Antigonus. The use of the pomegranate briefly mentioned above could perhaps entail a reference to the Jewish high priest, since almost all of the Hasmonaean rulers were holding this position, but this is hard to prove. A seemingly eternal question seems to be the possible sacred nature often attributed to the depiction of the palm branch. The image is visible in Seleucid coinage as a secondary element, but never standing alone.\textsuperscript{437} It is a common sign of victory and as such regularly displayed in connection with the goddess Nike. In the Hebrew Bible the references found to palm branches are used both as signs of prosperity\textsuperscript{438} and in connection with sacred rites and ritual festivals.\textsuperscript{439} The coins themselves do not convey which interpretation is the one closest to the original meaning. The observation made by A. Kindler that the vertical positioning of the inscription on both sides of the image is typical of Seleucid coinage point in the direction of a Greek origin of the use of the image, which perhaps would imply a more universal understanding of the image of the palm branch as a sign of victory and peace.\textsuperscript{440} This does however not exclude an interpretation of the image in its functions within the Jewish cult, as a possible distinction in the understanding of the image could have been made by the viewer of the image individually.

Other images may have held a sacred component, such as perhaps the lily, with its implicit connection to the Temple in Jerusalem, or the pomegranate as a reference to the high priest or the temple, but this can pretty much only be assumed. The images of the Hasmonaean coins increasingly placed the emphasis on the position of the kings, their own prosperity and to some extent the prosperity of their kingdom. A sacred content could however very well have been a deciding factor in connection with the use of the palaeo-Hebrew script, which is connected with the hypothetical discussion aiding in the identification of the Hasmonaean mint. Hypothetical, since no information or material has been found concerning this question.

The use of different languages and scripts in Jewish coinage was used to pronounce specific conscious statements. The choice to use the ancient and very specific palaeo-Hebrew script must have been made according to deliberate considerations, since it was never applied randomly. The use of this script was most likely determined

\textsuperscript{437} KINDLER 2000, 320.
\textsuperscript{438} Job 15:32.
\textsuperscript{439} Leviticus 23:40; Nehemia 8:15; Revelations 7:9.
\textsuperscript{440} KINDLER 2000, 320.
by factors outside the medium of coinage, first of all probably through its traditional affiliation with the monetary administration of the Jewish Temple and with the minting authorities. The origin of this development should probably be sought before the beginning of Hasmonaean coinage, in the YHD coinage minted from the time of the Achaemenid administration under the authority of the Jewish Temple.

2.6 Concluding Remarks

The iconographic repertoire displayed on the Hasmonaean coins was simple and consistently kept inoffensive in relation to the Jewish religious law concerning the display of living beings throughout the time of the existence of Hasmonaean coinage. This was in every way conform with the strong nationalistic aspect of the Hasmonaean rule, adhering to a rigid religious orthodoxy expressed in their choice of iconographic language. The uniformity for the most part found in the Hasmonaean coin types issued by the different rulers could suggest that the coinage was predominantly issued to meet with financial demands and only in few cases was the coin iconography used to broadcast messages, such as John Hyrcanus I at the beginning of his reign or Mattathias Antigonus at the end of the Hasmonaean period. The iconography of the Hasmonaean coins was nonetheless from the beginning designed and developed according to the iconographic language of the coinage of the Hellenistic world within which they were issued, though at no times did blatant contradictions with the Jewish religious law occur, except in case of the latest coins issued by Mattathias Antigonus.

As accounted for, the Hasmonaean coins were minted primarily with Hebrew, but also periodically with Aramaic and Greek legends. The different languages and scripts were applied as a mean of self-expression of the individual ruler offering a tool to express statements about ethnicity and religion, but also hierarchical positions within society and cultural affiliation – or perhaps more precisely – the cultural-religious context in which they were minted. It is noticeable that in the coins of the Hasmonaean rulers – disregarding any details known of the political ambitions of the individual rulers determining this use in the coinage – specific intentions where expressed solely by the use of languages, such as the connection of the king (written in Greek or Hebrew) with
the position of high priest (only ever written in Hebrew); one example of the specific use of different languages in regard to the different positions or roles of the ruler is one element that deserves attention, since it is unlikely to have been a coincidence.

Contrary to the Greek legends, the palaeo-Hebrew script used since the beginning of the Hasmonaean period stated that the coins on which they were used were truly Jewish, combining land, people and religion in one; a reason why the periodical use of the script continued throughout the history of Jewish coinage – that is, whenever it was deemed necessary by the minting authorities. It was equally used to accentuate the Jewish religion, as well as simultaneously functioning as an ethnic and geographic marker. According to the altering contexts of the coins, their legends would vary, but essentially the use of the script was based on a traditional understanding of it, very likely holding the specific nationalistic connotations, but most likely also holding a strong sacred component, judging from the contemporary use of script and languages. The answer to why this script was put to use at certain times and not at others, in light of the larger scheme of ancient Jewish coinage, should be sought in the identity of the minting authorities and their relation to the monetary administration of the Jewish Temple and the identification of the actual mint(s) of these coins.

But, to return to the question whether the Hasmonaean kings used sacred iconography, the answer must on the whole be negated – apart from one exception: the coinage of Mattathias Antigonus. Only relative few coins minted by Mattathias have been found. This fact should probably be attributed the short duration of his rule and perhaps to a withdrawal of his coins from circulation at the beginning of the sole reign of Herod the Great in 37 BCE. Mattathias basically remained faithful to the till then developed and used royal Hasmonaean iconographic coin traditions, as it is also reflected in the use of the palaeo-Hebrew and Greek legends. It is nevertheless noticeable that Mattathias Antigonus was the first and only Hasmonaean ruler that deliberately used sacred iconography in his coinage, but he probably resorted to the use of these images as a last desperate attempt to appeal to the Jewish population in a situation of severe political crisis. The same mechanism becomes visible again in the coins of the First Jewish War, when at a time of utmost distress originally Jewish sacred images were to be introduced again as an answer to a crisis situation.

442 BIJOVSKY 2004, 75-76.
The struggle for power between the last Hasmonaean king Mattathias Antigonus and Herod the Great in the years 40-37 BCE is to some extent mirrored in the coinage of both rulers, although most specifically in the coinage of Mattathias. The coins of respectively Mattathias and Herod, in which both simultaneously stressed their right to rule, was in the three years of their struggle for power compared with their earlier and later coins of a notably larger size and qualitative design. The importance of coinage both as a medium supporting authoritative and propagandistic declaration, as well as a medium of self-representation, is highlighted in the situation where the identity and legitimacy of the ruler is questioned, as the case of the last Hasmonaean king Mattathias Antigonus clearly shows. 

---
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Part 2

THE ROMAN PERIOD
(40 BCE – c. 100 CE)
Chapter 3

The Coinage of Herod the Great (40-4 BCE)

The turbulent reign of Herod the Great as king of Judaea, which stretched over a period of 36 years, left him with the most renowned legacy of all Jewish rulers. He was especially characterized by his supreme political abilities, his extensive building program reaching far beyond the borders of Palestine and his handling of family affairs, mostly resulting in the violent deaths of its members, here however not to be treated in any detail, since this has aptly been done by others.444

Herod was appointed king by the Roman senate in 40 BCE and ruled as a Rex Sociusque et Amicus of Rome as the sole ruler of Judaea after the defeat of the last Hasmonaean ruler Mattathias Antigonus in 37 BCE until his own death in 4 BCE.445 Through the ancient literature the vita of Herod is known in great detail, but no information on his coinage or the iconography he preferred to use is to be found here. Like other rulers of this time he apparently wrote his own memoirs, although they no longer seem to have been available at the time of Flavius Josephus, born Joseph ben Mattitjahu c. 38 CE, who came to be the main source to our knowledge of Herod’s life.446 In his primary work the Antiquitates Judaica and the Bellum Judaicum written in Rome after the end of the First Jewish war, Jewish history in the period from the Biblical times until the First Jewish War is covered in detail. One of the key authorities to Josephus writings on the great Jewish king was Nicolaus of Damascus, a non-Jew and probably Herod’s closest counsellor, whose writings have been preserved in fragments and excerpts and through its extensive use in the works of Josephus.447

Similarly to the Hasmonaean rulers Herod the Great minted bronze coins to satisfy the monetary needs of the areas under his direct control, which meant that they

444 This has been done in a number of recent publications i.e. ROLLER 1998, KOKKINOS 1998, LICHTENBERGER 1999, JAPP 2000, NETZER 2006, ROCCA 2008, and others. Earlier publications are summarized in ROLLER, Preface pp. ix-xii, and KOKKINOS, Introduction, pp. 23-26.
446 SCHÜRER 1973, 26-27.
were circulating an area accordingly limited. The actual political propagandistic value of this medium to Herod and within his contemporary world and Herod’s involvement in the employment of the iconography is difficult to grasp. A number of the coin images found in the coinage of Herod the Great have received the label ambiguous, as the nature of these images apparently not correspond with the image of a Jewish king paying toll to the Jewish religious traditions.

The fact that Herod in his coinage may have attempted to cater both to the Jews and Pagans inhabiting his dominion, the apparent contradictions found in the coinage of a Jewish king have been conceived as intentionally having been created ambiguous, but this may in fact first and foremost be caused by modern perspectives and a modern understanding of Herod and his way of thinking and using images. It is true that Herod almost consistently avoided the depiction of living beings, with the pronounced exception of the theriomorphic display of the eagle, but nonetheless implemented images, which have been interpreted to hold a specific meaning both in Pagan as well as in Jewish contexts, but the reconstruction of the religious context of these elements as either Jewish or Pagan is at times difficult to authenticate. This on the whole contrasts starkly with the coinage of Herod’s Hasmonaean predecessors, even though many iconographic similarities can be found. This chapter may on the whole not bring much new understanding of the images used by Herod in his coinage, discussed in great detail by others dealt with in the course of this chapter. But the context and the overall picture communicated by the sacred images used and the generally accepted ambiguity of parts of Herod’s coin iconography will be given some more consideration.

A surprising fact concerning the coinage of Herod is his overall limited use of coin types and images in general – to put it in the words of others “Herod’s numismatic legacy is disappointing, to say the least”, particularly viewed against the length of his reign and the possibilities he actually would have had to exploit this medium. It has to be questioned how much importance Herod did indeed attach to his own coinage, espe-
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cially compared with the efforts of his building programme, and how much importance we accordingly are allowed to place on the testimony found in it. Because of the immense interest in the person of Herod equally much has been written on all aspects of him, including his coinage,\textsuperscript{454} which probably tends to somewhat distort the picture of the importance of this part of his legacy.\textsuperscript{455}

3.1 The Games of a Jewish King and Roman Ruler

One of the most prominent aspects of Greek Hellenism acting very visibly in the Jewish society from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE onwards, characterizing the extension of the Hellenization of parts of the Jewish world already before the rule of Herod the Great and the material culture during his reign, including his coinage, was the introduction of sports, games and plays, concepts foreign to the Jewish culture. As both a Jewish king and Roman client king Herod the Great is often viewed as moving between the worlds, which – as the following chapter will show – can only be confirmed on a superficial level, mainly relying on a certain amount of regard for Jewish religious sensitivity detectable primarily in situations which could have escalated, causing Herod internal problems. Herod the Great used the Pagan institutions in connection with the imperial ruler cult dealt with in the next chapter (§4.1) with intention, to establish himself as ruler in accordance with Roman expectations.

With the introduction of the gymnasium during the Hellenistic Reform of Jerusalem under the rule of Antiochus IV and the political changes following in its wake accounted for earlier (§2.2), the increasing Hellenization of the Jewish society had been given a public face. The Hellenistic traditions introduced at that time were revived by Herod the Great as a part of his public program paying adherence to his Roman sovereign and characterise the fundamental changes taking place in and around the Jewish world during the rule of Herod the Great, at the same time illustrating the completely different cultural context of the coinage issued by him in contrast to his predecessors, the Hasmonaeans.

\textsuperscript{454} Ariel 2002, 99.
\textsuperscript{455} Also Ariel 2009, 113-114.
The first games accounted for by Josephus, were initiated by Herod after he returned from his visit with Octavian in Rhodes in 30 BCE (AJ 15.268-273). These games were presumably performed for the first time in Jerusalem in 28/27 BCE to pay honours to the future emperor, a tradition which was later upheld by Herodian rulers following, such as Herod Antipas (§4.3) and Herod Agrippa I (§4.5). According to Josephus a theatre and an amphitheatre (AJ 15.268) were erected on this occasion. Both structures have so far archaeologically not been verified. The 11 stone theatre seats found in secondary use excavated at the southeast corner of the Temple Mount in Jerusalem could perhaps derive from the Herodian theatre, but since they are without a precise dating and location, they could just as well have come from a later theatre or Odeon not yet identified. As a further possible original use of these seats it has been suggested that they should be attributed to the Herodian hippodrome or a later Roman circus from the time of the Aelia Capitolina. Beside the unparalleled reference made by Josephus concerning the Herodian theatre, only one further theatre is recorded in literature. In the much later source of the Chronicon Paschale (1.474) from the 7th century CE a Roman theatre is mentioned in the list of buildings erected by Hadrian in the city of Aelia Capitolina. According to this brief reference it can however not be established if it refers to a new structure or the re-use of an older Herodian building.

The much discussed identification of the Herodian theatre as a temporary wooden construction is plausible, hence the perhaps chance absence of any archaeological imprint of it. This would comply with the contemporary developments of the Roman theatres at the centre of the developing Roman Empire, where according to Vitruvius De architectura (5.5.7) wooden constructions were predominantly used. Moreover, the complete silence in literature regarding any further use of the theatre could tentatively

456 Schürer 1973, 290; Herod could have found his inspiration for his games in different contexts. It has been suggested that the Herodian games were either held in the tradition of the so-called Actic games as celebrated by Octavian after his victory at Actium in Rome in 29 BCE, or Herod was inspired by the Penteteric games in the Ptolemaic dynastic tradition, the ptolemaia, presumably held by Ptolemy II Philadelphus for the first time in 282 BCE in Alexandria after the death of Ptolemy I Soter; Lämm 1973, 206-207; DNP 1 (1996), 415-416; Ruggendorfer 1998, 115; Roller 1998, 93-94, 116-118; Licht 1999, 75; DNP 10 (2001), 526-527; Bennett 2007a, 52-53, 56-57. Another possible source is the Phoenician games (e.g. Boutros 1981).
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be seen as a suggestion of the structure never coming into use again. The games could afterwards have been moved from the Jewish religious stronghold to one of the cities re-founded by Herod, e.g. to Samaria-Sebaste established in 27 BCE or to Caesarea Maritimea were imperial games were held every five years and where the refusal of these Pagan traditions was not given, due to the predominantly Pagan character of these cities.462

The amphitheatre that Herod, according to Josephus, built ‘on the plain’ should probably be equalled with the ‘hippodrome south of the temple’ also mentioned by him,463 as generally the form of the amphitheatres build by Herod seems to have come closer to the elongated form of the hippodrome.464 The earliest Roman amphitheatres were, as the theatres, temporary wooden structures. This was in Jerusalem probably also the case.465 The discussion concerning the identification of these structures as having been permanent stone structures or temporary wooden structures can only find hypothetical answers on account of the archaeological evidence. Also no further records give evidence to these buildings having had any permanent effect on the Jewish society in Jerusalem or the outline of the city, contrary to in other places, such as Caesarea Maritima.466

It is doubtful whether the Herodian games held in Jerusalem in honour of Octavian possessed the same outspoken sacred character as the traditional Pagan games held in other places. Cultic worship of gods and religious rituals had been an integral part of games taking place at the great Greek games since the 6th century BCE, such as the Pan-Hellenic games held at the sanctuaries of Olympia, Delphi, Nemea and Corinth, and in a number of cases during the Roman Imperial period the games held in Palestine were verifiably dedicated to the cult of the emperors (e.g. §4.5). The sanctification of the games to a specific Pagan god would however – given the claim of the Jewish god as the sole true god – have been impossible to carry through in Jerusalem.467 Pagan cultic activities connected with these games can only have been pursued very inconspicu-

463 Josephus AJ 17.255; BJ 2.44.
465 Perhaps build on a stone foundation, BIEBERSTEIN / BLOEDHORN 1994, 400.
466 A. LICHTENBERGER suggests the most likely conclusion that this can be seen as evidence for the temporary construction of the theatre (1999, 79).
467 BERNETT 2007a, 59.
ously, if at all. The public protests and uncertainty among the pious Jews towards the theatre and concerning the *tropaia* arrayed in it, suspicious of them being ἀνθρώπων εἰκόνες or even Pagan ἀγάλματα (*AJ* 15.276-281), would probably have fallen out much stronger if these suspicions had proven to be true;⁴⁶⁸ especially in view of how violent later reactions against even minor threats of the centre of Jewish religion fell out, as the incident where the emperor Caligula decreed that his statue should be placed in the Jewish Temple show (§4.5.2). Based on Josephus’ account of this time and the reactions that the games caused among the Jewish citizens of Jerusalem towards them the lasting impact of these institutions on Jewish society in the Jewish capital seem to have been very limited. The performance of games has however been attested in a number of cases, which took on different forms. One example is found in the city of Tiberias, which was founded by Herod Antipas during the late second decennium CE. He apparently likewise introduced games entailing no cultic elements and where the Jewish population took part, although they – as the games held by Herod the Great in Jerusalem – probably also were held in honour of the Roman emperor.⁴⁶⁹

The negative response towards the quadrennial games at the time of their introduction in 28/27 BCE accounted for by Josephus (*AJ* 15.280-290) seems to represent his polemic against the disastrous development of parts of the Jewish society at this time leading towards the destruction of the Second Jewish Temple in 70 CE. In his description (*AJ* 15.268-298), the process of how the ruler was acting as the initiator or aid in the development of new traditions adverse to the Torah – first and foremost the increasing presence of the imperial ruler cult – play an important role.⁴⁷⁰ It is clear that Josephus descriptions of the games in Jerusalem are based on his knowledge of the later development and cultic staging of the cult of the emperor in the predominantly Pagan cities of Samaria-Sebaste, Caesarea Maritima and Caesarea Philippi, even though no cultic elements have been attested in connection with the – according to the name alone – offensive *Kaisareia* in Jerusalem.⁴⁷¹ The erection and use of the theatre and the amphitheatre was seen by Josephus as systematic political actions directed against the Jews aiming at cultural-religious changes of the Jewish society.⁴⁷²
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Many of Herod’s actions and his coinage have equally been viewed in this light. In reality, Herod was most likely first and foremost acting within the political frame of his rule and responding to his Roman superior in a language clearly understandable. Any respect towards the religious sensitivity of the Jewish population came second, although Herod did apparently try to limit his offences towards the pious parts of the Jewish population by banning Pagan cultic rituals from his games and reducing the presence of offensive images, such as the tropaia mentioned, therewith avoiding eventual political problems emerging from a lack of religious consideration, an approach which seems to repeat itself only to some extent in his coinage. Herod seems to have attempted a conscious balance between the two worlds in an effort to avoid internal problems, however not denying his personal demonstration of affiliation both in regard to politics and religion mirrored in his coinage.

3.2 The Coinage of Herod the Great

Herod the Great exclusively minted bronze coins with Greek legends, which can be divided into the two main groups of dated and undated coin series, the execution of which are in most cases of a relative low artistic value. Of these the dated coins have received the most attention. A general agreement has yet to be established as to the understanding of the overall intentions of the pictorial language used in both the dated and the undated coins and questions still remain concerning their exact chronology. Attempts have been made at correlating Herod’s coinage with historic events taking place during his reign, resulting in a possible placement of the dated coins under the jurisdiction of Mark Anthony and the undated coins after Actium under the rule of Augustus. The place of the mint of Herod the Great has equally been given much consideration and the differences in style, weight and quality of execution between the undated and the dated coin series has ultimately been ascribed to the work of two different mints
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producing these coins.\textsuperscript{476} Due to the large number of dated coins unearthed in Samaria during excavations an attribution of these coins to a Samarian mint has generally been accepted. Also the number of undated coins found in Jerusalem points towards the city being the place of the mint of these coins.\textsuperscript{477} A question which one has to ask and which is dealt with below is if it is valid to presume direct links between the coin iconography and places of the mint in the coinage of Herod based on the evidence at hand.

Typological connections can to some extent be established between the coins preceding and following the coinage of Herod. Parallels can amongst others be found between Herod’s coin types and the coins of Alexander Jannaeus, through the implementation of iconographic traditions well-known in the Hasmonaean coinage, such as the image of the anchor as a reference to the position of the ruler (§2.5.1) in the coinage of Herod. In a similar fashion Herod’s immediate successor in Jerusalem, Herod Archelaus, issued coin types similar to the anchor/double cornucopiae type minted by Herod, leaving the coins mainly to be distinguished through their legends (compare Figs. 44 and 51),\textsuperscript{478} though a direct continuation of the minting has been disputed by D. Jacobson on the basis of stylistic comparisons.\textsuperscript{479} Herod Archelaus does however in other cases use the same declination of the title ethnarch applied by him.

The view that Herod was deliberately ambiguous in his coin iconography is long standing.\textsuperscript{480} The question is, if this is actually true, or if this to some extent was not simply the result of obliging to the religious sensitivity of the pious Jews regarding graven images,\textsuperscript{481} and simultaneously using a pictorial language which expressed his own political and religious affiliation and ambitions in a language also clear to the Roman sovereign. Many questions pose themselves when dealing with the coin iconography of Herod the Great, but one main question concerns our approach to the interpretation of Herodian coinage: why would Herod intentionally apply ambiguity or “double meaning”\textsuperscript{482} to some images – primarily those we apparently not readily understand – and not to other or all of his depictions? As it will become evident, this seems mainly to

\textsuperscript{476} Ariel 2002, 103.
\textsuperscript{478} Ariel 2002, 108-109, 119.
\textsuperscript{479} Jacobson 2012, forthcoming.
\textsuperscript{480} Kanael 1963, 149; Barag 1993b, 16.
\textsuperscript{481} Fontanille / Ariel 2006, 74.
\textsuperscript{482} Barag 1993b, 16.
be the result of how the coinage of Herod has been perceived and is not necessarily based on facts.

3.2.1 The Dated Coin Types

The ambivalent understanding of some of the images used by Herod in his coinage corresponds with the diverse interpretations and understanding of Herod in modern research. The largest of Herod’s “Year 3” dated coin types (overview in text Table IV) (Fig. 36), displaying the tripod on the obverse and a much debated image on the reverse, is here showcased to exemplify the problems.483

The dated coins, which were executed more skilfully than the undated coins, 484 belong to a series of four types issued in four different denominations varying in weight between 1.5 g to 7 g, all carrying the same inscription, date and ligature (text Table IV).485 The dated coins display four obverse/reverse types: the tripod/helmet or pilos (or apex) (Fig. 36), the helmet/Macedonian shield (Fig. 37), the winged caduceus/pomegranate or poppy (Fig. 38), the aphlaston/palm branch with a fillet (Fig. 39).486 Where some images seem to hold sacred meaning, other again hold specifically military or victorious connotations, yet other depictions are not without controversy as their interpretation is still debated. The actual date of the “Year 3” has equally been subject to extensive discussion. A recent die-study of the dated coin series carried out by J.-P. Fontanille and D. Ariel has shown that the “Year 3” coin types, which were minted in several sub-series, possibly extended past the actual “Year 3” of Herod’s reign.487 The images found on two of the dated coin types, the tripod/helmet or pilos and the pomegranate or poppy have been closely related to and identified on the basis of the history and archaeology of the city of Samaria. To be able to judge the validity of this it is necessary to take a closer look at the information available.

484 HÜBNER 2012, forthcoming.
485 MESHORER 2001, 221, no. 44-47b; FONTANILLE / ARIEL 2006, 73.
486 MESHORER 2001, Pl. 44 no. 44-47b; ARIEL 2009, 114.
3.2.1.1 Samaria, Kore and the Poppy

The city of Samaria, to which the dated coins of Herod have been attributed, had come under Greek sovereignty already at the earliest point possible, as it was among the few cities of which it is known to have resisted Alexander the Great’s conquest of Palestine on his way through to Egypt. After the Samaritan revolt against him in 332/31 BCE Alexander re-founded the city as a Macedonian military colony. According to Josephus, the Hellenistic city was completely destroyed by John Hyrcanus I towards the end of the 2nd century BCE around 108/107 BCE (§2.2). Extant settlement remains found on the western slope of the Acropolis erected on a Hellenistic destruction level could point towards a repopulation of the city after its latest destruction, possibly connected with the re-foundation and incorporation of the city in the Province of Syria by Pompey in 63 BCE, or more likely with the rebuilding of the city under the Roman governor Gabinius (57-55 BCE) (text Fig. III). In choosing Samaria Herod the Great not only attached himself to an old dynastic interest in the place, which in literary sources can be traced to the re-founding of the city by king Omri (878-871 BCE) as the main city of the northern Kingdom of Israel in the 9th century BCE, the city also served as his capital during the war against Mattathias Antigonus.
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Fig. III. Roman Period Samaria-Sebaste (CROWFOOT et al. 1966, Pl. 1).
Only few Jews appear to have been among the citizens re-settled here first by Gabinius and later by Herod. According to Josephus Herod let 6,000 veterans and additional followers settle in and around the city, who all were befitted with special privileges (AJ 15.296; BJ 1.403), tax advantages were probably part of these privileges, as it is known from other places. Josephus explicitly stresses the safety-value aspect of the settlement of the faithful veterans to Herod (Josephus AJ 15.291-297). After Herod was presented with Samaria-Sebaste and other cities and areas by Octavian in 30 BCE Samaria became the first city re-named after Augustus in Sebaste in 27 BCE, where he within a precinct on the Acropolis built his first Augustus-temple at the centre of the city (§4.1) (text Fig. III).

Several cultic finds testify to the Pagan character of Samaria preceding the time of Herod. Within the precinct of the Kore-temple erected during the early 3rd century CE in the area northeast of the Acropolis a black limestone block with a dedicatory inscription to Isis and Serapis (Ἡγήσανδρος, ξεναρχις και τα παιδία Σαράπι, Ίσι) dating to the Ptolemaic period has been found (text Fig. IV). This inscription has been associated with the possible existence of a temple or smaller cultic edifice devoted to these two
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497 BERNETT 2007a, 70.
Egyptian gods in Samaria existing during the 3rd century BCE. The earliest Hellenistic coins found here have been attributed to Ptolemy III (246-221 BCE). Among the fewer cultic finds dating back to the Israelite period found in the cult area are fragments of Astarte figurines, animal figurines and the head of an Egyptian Ushabti, which perhaps are to be associated with an even older Pagan sanctuary or at least with the long-standing Pagan traditions prevailing in Samaria.

The location of the inscription within the precinct of the later Kore-temple suggests an equation of this area with the preceding Hellenistic cult-area (text Fig. V). In the vicinity fragments of two rosettes executed in the same stone as the inscription were found, although nothing specific can be stated regarding a connection between these finds and a specific cult-edifice. Architectural fragments and older foundation walls stemming from one or two buildings, one of these possibly to be identified as the Hellenistic cult edifice from the 3rd century BCE devoted to Isis, have been found in the filling of the foundations of the Kore-temple built above it at the beginning of the 3rd century CE. The termination of the Isis-temple is generally connected with the destruction of Samaria by John Hyrcanus in 108/107 BCE, although no archaeological evidence testify to the violent destruction of the temple at this time. All but nothing of the original superstructure of this cult edifice has been preserved. Rough hewn blocks found reused in the western part of the foundation of the Kore-temple display the pronounced centre and surrounding flat chiselled edge typical for Herodian stone structures, which can be found in many places, where Herod was active as builder, such as in ‘The Tower of David’ in Jerusalem. According to this, a part of the stones reused in the foundations of the later Kore-temple apparently came from a building erected during the time of Herod the Great.

499 S. Lake, in Crowfoot et al. 1957, 4, 37 no. 13; SEG VIII No. 95.
500 Crowfoot et al. 1966, 65, specifies a total number of 10 Ptolemaic coins; it is not possible to draw further information from the listing of Samarian coin finds in Crowfoot et al. 1957, 45-46.
502 Crowfoot et al. 1957, 4; Crowfoot et al. 1966, 62-66; NEAEHL IV 1993, 1308; Barag 1993b, 4; presumably to be identified with the area in which the veneration of the two took place, Bernet 2007a, 93.
504 Crowfoot et al. 1966, 66; Bernet 2007a, 95.
505 Crowfoot et al. 1966, 34; Magness 2001, 159; it can be disputed if the stones in question actually stem from the abandoned Augusteum, as the concentration of stones in this area is relatively large, Bernet 2007a, 95.
Fig. V. The Kore-Temple (CROWFOOT et al. 1966, 63, Fig. 29).
An indication of the later presence of an Isis cult in Samaria during the 1st century BCE – with or without the continued existence of a temple – is found in the decoration of the ESA-pottery from this time, which was decorated with stamped decoration displaying attributes to be connected with Isis, such as her typical crown. The use of the Isis-iconography seems to have ceased with the beginning of the Augustan period, after which no further evidence of this has been found.506 A simple explanation for this development may be found in the traditional association of Cleopatra and Anthony with Isis and Serapis, a continuation of which would have been unthinkable after Actium in 31 BCE and therefore dismissed by Herod and the population in general, explaining the following avoidance of this iconography.507 The presence of the Isis-iconography in the ESA-pottery previous to the Augustan period does however indeed point towards the active presence of this cult until a very late point in time, which would mean the Kore cult did probably not predate the introduction of the Principate and Herod’s official acquisition and re-founding of Samaria after 30 BCE – if the Kore cult did indeed replace the cult of Isis, as suggested and argued “in a somewhat roundabout way”508 by J. Magness.

Magness’ suggestion is that Herod chose to introduce the cult of Kore (and in extension her mother Demeter) to Samaria, as the result of the assimilation of Isis and Demeter509 and their similarities, replacing the cult of Isis.510 Evidence of this cult has been seen in the coin image of the poppy on one of the dated coin series of Herod (Fig. 38).511 The image of the poppy would indeed be conspicuous, as it is difficult to relate it to anything but the Kore/Demeter cult,512 especially considering the later pronounced presence of this cult in Samaria, but the identification of the image is not without discussion, as this image has equally been identified as a pomegranate,513 which held a much longer tradition in Jewish coinage and in Jewish religious history altogether (further in §5.3.4).514 Any iconographic distinction between the identification of two fruits is how-
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508 JACOBSON 2001, 102.  
509 Connections visible in votive reliefs, e.g. LIMC IV 1, 904 nos. 170-171 s.v. Ceres (S. de ANGELI)  
511 RPC I (1992), no. 4903.  
512 JACOBSON 2001, 102.  
513 MESHORER 1982b, 20-22; MESHORER 2001, 64; The pomegranate can in the Pagan iconography be found in connection with a number of goddesses, amongst others Astarte, as a sign of fertility, DNP 4 (1998), 1203.  
514 As also noted by RICHARDSON 1999, 213-214.
ever very difficult to argue, which makes the discussion somewhat random and primarily based on an individual interpretation of the image.

The suggestion that the Hellenistic cult edifice devoted to the Isis and Serapis cult was intentionally replaced by a cult edifice devoted to the cult of Kore by Herod already in the 1st century BCE and that this was mirrored in the Herodian coinage of Samaria-Sebaste in form of the poppy-head, is – as stated above – difficult since no further contemporary evidence of the early existence of a Kore cult in Samaria exists. The earliest comprehensible archaeological evidence for the existence of a Kore cult, with which the image of the poppy can securely be related, dates to the 2nd century CE and the actual Kore-temple was not erected until the early 3rd century CE. Furthermore, depictions of Demeter and Kore are also not found on the coins of Samaria until the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE. It is entirely possible that the cult was actively pursued in Samaria before this time but if so it does not seem to have played any major role based on the lack of material, even if no evidence of an earlier cult building would have been caused by later encroachments. Since the identification of an earlier presence of the Kore cult is primarily based on the identification of the image of another dated coin type of Herod the Great as a poppy-head and not a pomegranate, which consequently has been seen to symbolise the city of Samaria and its Kore cult caution is called for.

3.2.1.2 The Tripod of Whose Apollo?

The original meaning of the tripod placed on the largest of Herod’s dated coins is difficult to grasp. One thing which does seem to be the case is however that the tripod as found depicted here could hardly have rested in a Jewish tradition, since no direct references to a device of this kind can be found in connection with any description of the Jewish temple cult. Such an interpretation has been attempted, but must due to lack of comparable evidence for now remain purely hypothetical. Nevertheless, a Pagan origin

517 Poppy heads are regularly depicted together with corn ears in connection with Demeter and similar fertility goddesses, DNP 8 (2000), 338-339; MARSHAK 2006, 228.
519 MESHORER 2001, 64.
of the image has notably been ignored or dismissed by some researchers, although detailed parallels can be found with Pagan images, as will be displayed here.

On the reverse of the largest denomination belonging to the dated coin series a tripod with a lebes is depicted, the dating of ΛΓ (“Year 3”) is placed in the left field (Fig. 36). An uncommon ligature of the Greek letters T P is placed in the right field (text Table V), which has been suggested to be the monogram for tetrarches, but since this title did not apply to Herod during his time as king – the only time where he could have issued his own coins – and no counting of years from his appointment as tetrarch brings any reasonable year to which the inscription “Year 3” could be attached, this seems to be a highly unlikely solution. Several different more or less consistent attempts have been made to understand this ligature, all requiring lengthy and detailed explanations of which none can be seen to be beyond question. Surveying the general use of monograms on coins, the most likely explanation for its presence is it being the mint-mark of the city or the mark of the mint master himself or magistrate in charge. In the case of the latter, the Greek initials T P would be referring to a yet unknown mint master, or – as the so far most convincing suggestion – the monogram was a ligation of the Greek letters H and P as a reference to the name Herod, known since 112/111 BCE on coins from Ascalon. But another solution to the problem of the nature of this ligature may still be found. The image is consistently framed by the usual Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ (of King Herod) applied by Herod, which only once display a light variation in ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥ ΗΡΩΔ (Fig. 46), discussed further below.

Also the date on these coins has been the cause for much discussion. Depending on the calendar used to calculate Herod’s years of reign it is equally possible to place the coin series in Samaria as well as in Jerusalem. Y. Meshorer has argued for an
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522 On this also JACOBSON 1986, forthcoming.
525 A summary of these can be found in MARSHAK 2006, 217-225.
526 MARSHAK 2006, 221.
527 MARSHAK 2006, 221, 235.
528 KOKKINOS 1998, 129-139, specifies the connection between earlier members of the Herodian family and the minting of coinage in Ascalon, see especially pp. 129-132 concerning the identification and development of the monogram; SPAER 1984, no. 20; SPAER 1984, 234 nos. 30-38, 235 no. 50, pl. 36.
529 KOKKINOS 1998, 129-139, specifies the connection between earlier members of the Herodian family and the minting of coinage in Ascalon, see especially pp. 129-132 concerning the identification and development of the monogram; SPAER 1984, no. 20; SPAER 1984, 234 nos. 30-38, 235 no. 50, pl. 36.
530 HÜBNER 2012, forthcoming.
532 on this KUSHNIR-STEIN 2007a, 55-56; S. PFANN furthermore suggests the date ΛΓ to be the sabbatical year 37/36 BCE (PFANN 2006, 103-104).
early dating of the “Year 3” coin series stemming from the Samarian mint to the year 40 BCE, since according to his reasoning the undated coins carrying the same images could not have been minted in Jerusalem until after 37 BCE. The “Year 3” date is here favoured to be equalled with the year 37 BCE, the year of Herod’s defeat of Mattathias Antigonus and him conquering Jerusalem after which he emerged as the de facto sole ruler of the Jewish kingdom, and not with the 3rd year after his reconfirmation as king of Judaea by Augustus in 30 BCE, i.e. 27 BCE – the same year the city of Samaria was re-founded as Sebaste.\(^{534}\)

Parallels for the images of Herod’s coinage have been sought both within the contemporary Roman Republican coinage,\(^{535}\) as well as in Augustan imagery, but should in fact be viewed in a much wider context. Arguments can be made in favour of Herod’s coin images imitating both traditions, although it can be argued that a closer connection may have existed between the Herodian and Augustan imagery.\(^{536}\) But the prototypes preceding Herod’s images find their beginning much earlier and are clearly independent of earlier and contemporary Roman traditions. Parallels from the Seleucid coinage can be found and proposed for a number of Herod’s coin images, such as the anchor (compare Fig. 44-45 & 169), the galley or the prow of a galley,\(^{537}\) and the Macedonian shield.\(^{538}\) Herod’s use of maritime images should according to their longstanding history also not necessarily be equalled with a specific naval content caused by any of Herod’s accomplishments or as a response to specific historic incidents, such as the founding of Caesarea Maritima or Herod’s naval support for Marcus Agrippa’s expedition against Pontus or any similar actions.\(^{539}\) Notable is that these coin images belong to
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\(^{533}\) MESHORER 2001, 61-63, as also KANAEL 1951-1952, 263-264; against the early dating presuming that Herod could not have minted coins before 39 BCE, RICHARDSON 1999, 212; MARSHAK 2006, 221-225; U. HÜBNER dismisses the late dating of the “Year 3” coins on the basis of the interpretation of the ligature as tetrarches, since a use of this title more than a decade after its bestowal would have been illogical (HÜBNER 2012, forthcoming).

\(^{534}\) MARSHAK 2006, 233-236.

\(^{535}\) JACOBSON 2007, 97.

\(^{536}\) ARIEL 2009, 119-120.

\(^{537}\) HOUGHTON II, no. 355 (Antiochus IV), nos. 474-5 (Alexander Balas); SC II, nos. 1814, 1833 (Alexander I), nos. 1453, 1466-67 (Antiochus IV), nos. 2104, 2112-14 (Antiochus VII), nos. 1666, 1673-75 (Demetrius I), nos. 1957, 1969, 2198-99 (Demetrius II 1st and 2nd reign), et al.; HÜBNER summarises a number of the attempted interpretations of this image (HÜBNER 2012, forthcoming).

\(^{538}\) HOUGHTON II, no. 249 (Alexander III Megas); SC I, nos. 339.2-342 (Antiochus I).

\(^{539}\) On this see MEYSHAN 1959, 118, RICHARDSON 1999, 213; a number of these possibilities are summarized by HÜBNER 2012, forthcoming.
the least used ones. Especially the presence of the anchor in Herod’s coins illustrates the long survival of a Seleucid prototype, as it has been mentioned earlier, this image had been widely used in Seleucid coinage until the 1st century BCE and also found its way into the Hasmonaean coinage (§2.4). Despite the suggestions made that specific historic associations should be considered in regard to the naval images applied by Herod, it is more likely that Herod used the image of the anchor to verify his own position as ruler, as already found in the coinage of Alexander Jannaeus, hence falling back on the Seleucid tradition – which was also later repeated in the coinage of the following Herodian rulers – in a demonstration of rights of succession. Alone the absence of this image in the Roman Republican or later coinage speaks decidedly against a premature attribution of images to a Roman iconographic tradition, since here evidently the reasons for its use rested on the Hellenistic Seleucid tradition. The coin series carrying the image of the anchor on the reverse and the inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥϹ ΗΡΩΔΗϹ (Fig. 46) – as noted the only inscription deviating from the usual ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩϹ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ otherwise applied by Herod (Fig. 45) – and no image on the obverse underlines this interpretation. It may well be that this coin type was in fact issued by Herod Archelaus in honour of his father, and not by his father, hence applying a iconographic tradition where the anchor had come to be a personal sign to proclaim dynastic inheritance and succession rights (also §4.2.1 and §4.5.2).

Similar images can to some extent be found in the Roman Republican coinage of the 2nd century BCE, with the marked exception of the anchor already mentioned. But this mainly testifies to the widespread use of similar iconography, which is based on the iconographic traditions found in Hellenistic coinages, originating in a shared cultural-religious background. In the case of the image of the Apolline tripod a long traditional use, similar to that of the anchor, can be verified. Depictions of Apollo sitting on the omphalos, Apollo standing leaning on the tripod, the tripod alone or other images related to the Apollo cult are frequently found in Seleucid coinage throughout its time of existence.
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541 Also JACOBSON 2012, forthcoming.
542 HENDIN 2010, no. 1173.
544 E.g. the Macedonian shield and the galley, RRC e.g. nos. 263/1a, 290/1, 307/1a-b.
Based on these few observations alone, it is obvious that at least some of the images applied by Herod were used over a long period of time, some of which also visible in the coinage of his Hasmonaean predecessors, and that they had circulated widely and for a long period of time in the Hellenistic world. This does however not automatically imply Herod imitating the Seleucid coinage, or necessarily exclude the Late Republican or Augustan images in use contemporarily as the primary iconographic source of inspiration, since they to a great extent relied on the same iconographic traditions in their imagery due to the shared cultural background. It seems far more to be the case that images which can be affiliated with both traditions were applied.

As it according to Josephus is known that Herod himself in some form venerated Apollo, amongst others honouring the god by building him a temple at Rhodes, it is more than tempting to see Herod expressing a personal affiliation with Apollo through his use of the tripod, thereby placing himself in the political tradition of public personal veneration at the time also becoming very much present in the contemporary Roman political iconography. Also in this case a similar phenomenon is well-known from Hellenistic coinage, one of the most prominent examples of this the association of the deified Alexander the Great with Zeus Ammon in the coinage of Lysimachus, one of Alexander’s successors who ruled as king over Thrace, Asia Minor and Macedon, but also the widespread obverse/reverse combinations of the portraits of different Seleucid kings and representations of Apollo. The political use not only of divine origin for dynastic lineage, but also of claiming a personal closeness to specific gods, therewith creating a political identity and identification within the frame of the myth, was generally well-known already in the Hellenistic world and also became widely implemented in the contemporary Roman world of the late 1st century BCE as well, as amongst others the cases of the triumviri Sextus Pompeius courting Neptune, Mark Anthony claiming an unknown son of Heracles named Anton as the ancestral origin of his family and Dionysus
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545 Tripod: E.g. SNG Israel 1, nos. 15-17 (Seleucus I/Antioch), nos. 179-182, 200-205 (Antiochus I/Antioch), nos. 343-346 (Antiochus II/Tarsus), nos. 351-364 (Antiochus II/Sardes), nos. 410-412 (Seleucus II/Antioch), nos. 624-627 (Antiochus III/Uncertain mint associated with Antioch), nos. 792-793 (Antiochus III/Ecbatana), nos. 1291-1294 (Demetrius I/Antioch), nos. 1622-1629 (Demetrius II – first reign/Antioch), nos. 1738-1743 (Demetrius II – first reign/Gaza), nos. 2188-2194 (Demetrius II – 2nd reign/Antioch), nos. 2534-2536 (Antiochus VIII/Antioch), nos. 2563-2567 (Antiochus VIII/possibly Antioch). Apollo and tripod: E.g. SNG Israel 1, nos. 416-417 (Seleucus II/Uncertain mint associated with Antioch), nos. 440-441 (Seleucus II/Sardes), nos. 845-885 (Seleucus IV/Antioch).


547 Also JACOBSON 2012, forthcoming.

548 Visible in his coinage, RRC no. 511/1-4d; SEAR 1998, 201-202, no. 333.
as his own personal divinity, and as not least Octavian’s use of amongst others the proclaimed family myth of Aeneas and his personal veneration and use of the god Apollo clearly show.

In the case of Herod and his family the cult of Apollo/Qos appears to have played a certain role for some time. The earliest references to the god Qos are preserved in Neo-Assyrian annals and Edomite epigraphic text from the 8th-7th century BCE. The veneration of this god appears to have been upheld in Edom/Idumaea, the native area of Herod the Great and his family during the Hellenistic Period, where the cult of Qos apparently in time became equated with the cult of Apollo. The earliest known members of the Herodian family were verifiably involved in the temple of Apollo at Ascalon and Apollo respectively Qos may to some extent still have played a role as an ancestral god, even after the family had converted to Judaism at the time of the forced conversion of Idumaea in the late 2nd century BCE during the reign of John Hyrcanus I (Josephus AJ 13.319).

The argument that the tripod must be seen as a reference to Apollo as the god closest to Augustus, hence a placement of the dated coin type of the “Year 3” at a time where the importance of the Augustan Apolline iconography increased would be necessary, specifically concerning the time from the beginning of the Principate after 31 BCE, must be viewed with caution. Not only does the knowledge of the connection between the Herodian family and the worship of Apollo, but also the long and extensive use of Apolline iconography in coinage in general underline this. Even if a punctual connection between Herod’s and Augustan imagery can be argued, this can consider-

549 RE 1 (1894), 2566, s.v. Anton (Hoefer.); RE 1 (1894), 2575, s.v. Antonius (Klebs.); RRC p. 743, n. 4.
552 KOKKINOS 1998, 121-122.
553 In a Haurantic inscription from al-Mushannaf dedicated to Agrippa I Apollo seems to be referred to as the ancestral god of the Herodians, KOKKINOS 1998, 121-122; Antipas I (c. 148-? BCE), son of Herod of Ascalon (c. 178-? BCE), was a priest at the temple of Apollo at Ascalon around 140 BCE when the temple was attacked by Idumeans. The boy Antipas was abducted and held for ransom in Idumaea, where he later became a strategos under the rule of Alexander Jannaeus, KOKKINOS 1998, 109-111; the cult of Qos was still actively upheld by a smaller group of Idumeans in the days of Herod the Great, on this KASHER 1988, 62-63. According to Josephus (AJ 15.255-257), Qostobarus I – the second husband of Herod’s sister Salome – whose name reveal the continued presence of the old cult of Qos, led a major revolt in attempting to restore the old Hellenistic order under the reign of Herod around 38 BCE, before he was executed in 27 BCE, SCHÜERER 1973, 303-304; KASHER 1988, 74; KOKKINOS 1998, 93, 179-182.
555 ARIEL 2009, 119-120.
556 ARIEL 2009, 120-121.
ing the evidence at hand not automatically be assumed for the tripod of the large denomination of the “Year 3” coin series. The display of the undoubtedly Pagan image of the tripod – since no equivalent item can be found in the Jewish tradition other than a somewhat random attribution as temple equipment – can equally be attributed to a display of a personal affinity of Herod to Apollo by showing the tripod as his unmistakable sign – maybe under the pretence of accommodating to the sensitivity of the Jewish population concerning the use of graven images, as well as a simultaneous use of a pictorial language close to Rome as the sovereign of Herod.

The identification of the tripod as an image belonging in the Augustan iconographic tradition has been conceived to cause a problem if the “Year 3” coin series were correctly dated to 38/37 BCE, since this would mean that apparently Augustan imagery was imitated at the earliest possible stage of Herod’s coinage, where he was still immediate subject to Octavian’s adversary Mark Anthony. This has forced different possible explanatory scenarios. Most illustrative of this problem is the suggestion offered by D. T. Ariel. He has put forward the suggestion that the date of “Year 3” does not refer to the third year of Herod’s rule, i.e. to 38/37 BCE, but to the 3rd year after 30 BCE, i.e. the actual beginning of an Octavianic era and the year of the reconfirmation of Herod’s reign of Judaea by Octavian at Rhodes, where Herod later built his temple to Apollo. The appointment of Octavian to Imperator Caesar Augustus in 27 BCE, which shortly afterwards was commemorated by Herod through the founding of Samaria as Sebaste, would in this case be equivalent with the 3rd year and the coins would have been issued specifically as a congiarium or donativa distributed on this occasion. But – as Ariel himself points out – no other evidence of such a chronology has been preserved anywhere that could substantiate this theory. Furthermore, the possible continuation of the production of these coins speaks against them having been intended as such a one-time issue. This suggestion would of course solve the problem of interpreting the iconography of the tripod as a reference to the Apollo cult as venerated by Augustus, but the main problem is that a definite connection of the tripod shown on the coin of Herod with the Augustan

557 KOKKINOS 1998, 134.
559 ARIEL 2009, 121-123.
560 Made clear by the close proximity and connection of the House of Augustus and the Apollo temple on the Palatine Hill in Rome consecrated in 28 BCE, CARETTONI 1983, 7-17. A similar connection probably existed in Samaria-Sebaste, where apparently the Augusteum and a large residential house were interconnected, BERNETT 2007a, 87-89.
Apollo cult is presupposed. As the evidence shows, the tripod does not necessarily have to be connected with an Augustan Apollo cult, since both Seleucid iconographic traditions were still in use and Herod himself was in some way affiliated with the Apollo cult.

Even if a personal connection between this image and the imagery of the later Roman emperor is valid, the political objectives of Octavian and his implementation of the cult of Apollo was not limited to the time after the victorious outcome of the battle of Actium against Mark Anthony in 31 BCE. Augustus had already in 36 BCE pledged to build Apollo a temple on the Palatine Hill in Rome if he was to come out victorious of the battle against Sextus Pompey at Naulochoi. But even before his time the Apollo cult had increasingly begun to establish itself as a political important factor in the Roman republican coinage, and was in fact visible in the Roman coin iconography from its very beginning. The establishment or recognition of an Octavianic era from 30 BCE is not necessary to explain the presence of the image of the tripod even if used as an imitation of an image also used in a Roman context related to the later Augustus, regardless if the coin series “Year 3” are of an earlier or later date. Octavian himself issued coins with the image of the tripod as early as after the renewal of the Triumvirate in the summer of 37 BCE, marking the beginning of his personal public association with this god.

Since the cult of Apollo was verifiable actively pursued within the Herodian family during the 2nd century BCE it should not to be eliminated that the cult was still of importance to Herod the Great, who himself amongst others erected a temple to this god at Rhodes. The use of the specific coin image of the tripod does not have to be explained by special personal affinities to either Alexander the Great or Augustus on the part of Herod, although both were undoubtedly to some extent true, but with the implementation of a long established and well-known tradition of the Apollo cult, as found in Herod’s homeland of Idumaea and enacted within his own family. Regardless of the dating of the “Year 3” coins with the depiction of the tripod to 37 BCE or later, the most logical explanation for the appearance of the tripod would be as an expression of the personal Apolline cult affinity of Herod the Great. We do not have to seek the explanation for the Pagan image of the tripod outside of the immediate world of Herod and as
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561 E.g. RRC nos. 385/5, 411/1, 500/1, 502/1, 502/4.
562 E.g. RRC nos. 6/1, 10/1; ZANKER 2003, 57-59.
563 SEAR 1998, 191 nos. 311-312; RRC no. 537/2.
564 ARIEL 2009, 119-120, n. 1.
for the further discussion of the use of imagery in his coinage, one does not have to look far to counter other Pagan aspects in Herod’s genealogy and in his vita.

A. K. Marshak argues for the same dating of the dated coin series as D. Ariel, however not based on the iconographic consideration, which he makes dependent on their connection with the city of Samaria and its concurring importance to Herod. He argues that the dated coins were minted on a special occasion, which was steered by the two important events of first of all, Herod’s reappointment as king in 30 BCE, and secondly, the rebuilding of Samaria in 27 BCE three years after his reappointment. The coins were minted to commemorate this 3rd year of his new era as king. This suggestion is just as sound as the idea of the coins dating to the year 37 BCE, the actual 3rd year of Herod’s reign as king after his initial appointment as king of Judaea. The iconography does not hold any solid indications as to which year is the appropriate one, since it cannot be pinpointed to any specific occasion.

3.2.1.3 The Pilos of the Dioscurids or the Helmet of Herod?
The identification of the motif on the reverse of the largest “Year 3” coins – displaying the tripod on the obverse discussed above – has proven even more complicated (Fig. 36). The image consists of a semicircular object placed on a horizontal line or surface with upwards coiled ends, below this line another line is shown, which has the ends bent downwards. Two straps are hanging down behind the lower line. A star-like element or sign is depicted above the central composition, which is connected to the semicircular object through a straight line. Two palm branches are placed to the left and to the right of the central element. The depiction is framed by a dotted circle. This unusual motif has so far found no immediate parallels and different explanations have been suggested to solve the question of its identification. Here two possible identifications will be given some more thought.
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566 The older identification of the depiction as a thymiaterion of some kind, will here out of lack of any comprehensible parallels be neglected, KINDLER 1974, 29; HENDIN 1987, 61 no. 39; JACOBSON 2007, 93-94. Also the suggestion that the image was the depiction of an apex, the cap of a roman priest, will here be discarded, MESHORER 2001, 63; JENSEN 2007, 286-287; as noted both by U. HUBNER (2012, forthcoming) and D. JACOBSON (2012, forthcoming); Meshorer uses the term apex somewhat inconsistently.
The motif has been identified by D. Jacobson as the image of a single Dioscurid pilos resting on a couch. Although this identification has received much recognition, it does present us with several difficulties. The most basic argument to be made against this identification is that a pilos is normally not depicted alone. It is true that you can find depictions showing only the head of one of the Dioscurids wearing a pilos and even the odd depiction of a single pilos, or the depiction of a pilos as an iconographic sub-element in detailed coin compositions, but as a rule both the Dioscurids and the piloi appear in pairs as numerous examples show or in a context where they are clearly to be identified as such. Furthermore, the form of the piloi found on the Herodian coin type deviates markedly from other known parallels, as the usual cylindrical form of the pilos is here spherical. It is indeed true that the wreath-like decoration adorning it is, as noted by Jacobson, consistent with other depictions of piloi, but this can also be said for the decoration of other kind of helmets found (below). Therefore, the considerations expressed here concerning the iconography of the pilos commend that caution rule towards such an identification of this image is eminent.

The identification of the image to be consisting of an upper and a lower part seems correct. Further considerations concerning the lower part of the motif being some kind of couch must in this context equally be viewed with caution. Jacobson’s suggestion that here a theoxenia, a feast in honour of gods, honouring Herod is being displayed is however hypothetical. If a couch is being displayed here it does not fit well with other depictions of couches found, including the curule seat. Contrary to the depiction here the fulcrum or fulcra of both the kline and the lectus found in all parts of the Roman Empire are turned outward and not inward as shown here. It would perhaps be more appropriate to apply a more neutral expression to describe the
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569 As noted by D. JACOBSON (1986, 153); e.g. RRC no. 18/5 (275-270 BCE); also JACOBSON 2001, 100.
570 JACOBSON 2001, 100.
571 E.g. SNG Israel 1, nos. 226-229 (Antiochus I/Tarsus), no. 348 (Antiochus II/Tarsus), no. 415 (Seleucus II/Nicopolis), nos. 460-464 (Seleucus II/Nisibis), nos. 1068-1069 (Antiochus IV/Antioch), nos. 1389 (Demetrius I/Ecbatana), nos. 1898-1979 (Antiochus VII/Antioch), no. 347 (Alexander II/Antioch), nos. 2792-2795 (Antiochus X/Antioch); HUGHTON II, pl. XLVIII no. 793 (Antiochus X Eusebes/Antioch).
572 Amongst others comparable with the bronze coins from Amisos (Pontos) from the late 2nd/early 1st century BCE (e.g. SNG British Museum no 1129), BRENNER 2001, 212-213; also HÜBNER 2012, forthcoming, n. 50.
573 Also MARSHAK 2006, 214 n. 4.
574 RE 5 (1934), 2256-2257, s.v. Theoxenia (F. PFISTER).
575 RICHTER 1966, 105-110.
lower part, such as rack or just support until a more secure identification can be expressed. What is perhaps more important concerning the identification as suggested by Jacobson is that it implies the motif to have been made as a highly abstract design, in regard to both the size of the couch and the pilos, an iconographic approach not immediately visible in any other images used by Herod, although not foreign to ancient coinage. Jacobson’s identification would however imply that this coin type in every way would distinguish itself from other coin images used by Herod the Great.

The archaeological remains from Samaria-Sebaste have played an important role in this identification. Two approximately 0.5 m high limestone reliefs with depictions of the piloi of the Dioscurids adorned with wreaths and above stars found within the precinct of Isis and Serapis north of the acropolis in Samaria-Sebaste, described above (§3.2.1.1). They have on the basis of their style been dated both to the Ptolemaic period, during which the presumed Isis- and Serapis cult was also actively pursued, as well as to the 1st century BCE. The two stone reliefs with the dioscurid piloi have been seen by D. Jacobson as support of the identification of the coin motif described here (text Fig. VI).  

---

Fig. VI. Samaria. Limestone panels with the caps of the Dioscurii (Jacobson 2001, 101 © Palestine Exploration Fund).
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577 CROWFOOT et al. 1957, 4, 37 no. 13; SEG VIII, no. 95.
A cultic relationship between or iconographic representations of Kore (and Demeter) and the Dioscurids – which in an additional step has been used as reasoning for the introduction of a Herodian Kore cult by J. Magness (above)\textsuperscript{580} – has not been confirmed through on-site findings and cannot in any way be substantiated leaving the evidence of a link between the two weak to say the least.\textsuperscript{581} A link between the Dioscurids and other goddesses can on occasion be found, such as Artemis, Astarte and Isis, with emphasis on the astral or celestial context of these.\textsuperscript{582} In the case of Samaria the reliefs of the Dioscurids should most likely not be separated from the cult of Isis and the suggested 3rd century BCE date, to which also the dedicatory inscription to Serapis and Isis found in Samaria date.

A further suggestion for an identification of the image is that a helmet is being depicted here.\textsuperscript{583} In Jewish coin iconography the use of the image of the helmet can be traced back until the 4th century BCE, where it first appears as an obverse image on the YHD coins, with the falcon on the reverse together with the palaeo-Hebrew inscription (Fig. 10).\textsuperscript{584} In the Hasmonaean coin iconography the image was used either by John Hyrcanus I or John Hyrcanus II (§2.4) (Fig. 21) and on the coins minted by Herod the image of the crested helmet is also to be found (Fig. 37).\textsuperscript{585} Herod probably used the helmet equivalently as an authoritative ruler sign following previous examples.

The use of helmet depictions can be placed in a very long iconographic tradition, which geographically spread very widely.\textsuperscript{586} In the royal Seleucid coin iconography varied examples of helm-depictions are found displayed,\textsuperscript{587} originating in the coins minted by or for Alexander the Great.\textsuperscript{588} The display of helmets or different types of

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{580} MAGNESS 2001, 167-168.
\textsuperscript{581} RE 19.1 (1937), 944-972, s.v. Persephone (F. BRÄUNINGER); LIMC IV 1, 844-892 s.v. Demeter (L. BESCHI); LIMC III 1, 567-593 s.v. Dioskouroi (A. HERMARY); LIMC III 1, 593-597 s.v. Dioskuroi (in peripheria orientali) (Chr. AUGÉ / P.L. de BELLEFONDS); JACOBSON 2001, 102; MARSHAK 2006, n. 40.
\textsuperscript{582} LIMC III 1, 593 s.v. Dioskouroi (A. HERMARY).
\textsuperscript{583} HENDIN 1987, 62 no. 40; BRENNER 2001, 213-214; FONTANILLE / ARIEL 2006, 74.
\textsuperscript{584} GERSON 2001, 112 no. Y-2-C.
\textsuperscript{585} MESHORER 2001, nos. 45-45c; HENDIN 2010a, no. 1170.
\textsuperscript{586} For an overview of the numerous Greek helmet types, see DINTSIS 1981. A discussion of the terminology is found on the pp. 17-26.
\textsuperscript{587} E.g. HOUGHTON II, nos. 127-128 (Antiochus I Soter/Ai Khanoun-Bactra), no. 553 (Antiochus VI Dionysus/Antioch), nos. 563-565 (Tryphon/Antioch), no. 566 (Tryphon/Antioch – imitation), no. 567 (Tryphon/uncertain mint, northern Syria); SNG 1 Israel, nos. 1816-1819 (Antiochus IV/Antioch), nos. 1822-1840 (Tryphon/Antioch), nos. 2095-2100 (Antiochus VII/Ascalon); SC II, nos. 2034-36, 2039-40 (Tryphon/Antioch), no. 2122 (Antiochus VII/Southern Coele Syria).
\textsuperscript{588} According to JACOBSON 1986, 160 and IDEM 2012, forthcoming, the prototype is to be found in a coin type issued by Philip V of Macedon.
\end{flushleft}
headdress was imitated and used in the coinage issued by local rulers within smaller Hellenistic kingdoms.\textsuperscript{589} Most interesting is the use of personalised styles of helmets or specific helmet types or types of headdress, such as the Macedonian \textit{kausia} or \textit{kausia diademophoros},\textsuperscript{590} used by local Hellenistic rulers throughout their coinage. The most striking example of this is probably to be found in the coinage of the Greco-Bactrian kings, especially of Eucratides I (c. 170-145 BCE), who was regularly shown wearing a headdress or helmet which came to be his specific mark (Fig. 166).\textsuperscript{591} Also the former general and usurper Tryphon (142-138/7 BCE) adopted the ruler sign of the Macedonian helmet, frequently displaying it with only one large goat horn attached to it as his personal helmet (Fig. 170).\textsuperscript{592} Also local coin issues with depictions of single helmets can be found. Examples, which are geographically closer to Herod, can be found in coins from the Hellenistic mint of Ascalon. On coins issued by Antiochus VII (138-129 BCE) a crested helmet is displayed on the obverse of the coins and an aphlaston on the reverse of the coins (Fig. 173).\textsuperscript{593} An interesting parallel may be found in the bronze coinage of the city of Marisa (Tell Sandakhanna), situated 38 km south-west of Jerusalem (Map 1), issued by the Roman governor Aulus Gabinius in the years 58-55 BCE during the time of the Roman restoration of Palestine initiated by Pompey in 63 BCE.\textsuperscript{594}

On the Marisa coins a somewhat stylized head wearing a crested helmet has tentatively been identified by S. Qedar as Gabinius himself being displayed on the obverse and on the reverse is either an eagle standing on a thunderbolt with a palm branch at its shoulder or a palm branch with an entwined serpent depicted (Fig. 185).\textsuperscript{595} A second type displays the head of Tyche on the obverse and an eagle standing on a thunderbolt with a palm branch at its shoulder on the reverse (Fig. 186), which parallels other depictions of Tyche amongst others found in Demetrias-by-the-Sea (Fig. 179). The complete coin inscription probably reads MAPICH[no]N (of the people of Marisa), the date LI (Year 3), and the abbreviations have been reconstructed either as \textit{GA}binia and

\textsuperscript{589} Amongst others visible in the depiction of the Bashlik on coins from Bosporus, e.g. SNG BM no. 972, 978, and 980.

\textsuperscript{590} DINTSIS 1981, 265-283; KINGSLEY 1984, 66-68; JANSSEN 2007, 220-221, 244-245.

\textsuperscript{591} DINTSIS 1981, 13; BOPEARACHCHI 1991, \textit{passim}; Imitated by the former Seleucid governor and usurper Timarchos (c. 163-160 BCE) in his coinage issued in Babylon, JANSSEN 2007, 55.

\textsuperscript{592} HOUGHTON II, nos. 563-565 (Antioch), no. 566 (Antioch – imitation), no. 567 (uncertain mint, northern Coele Syria); SC II, nos. 2029-40 (Antioch).

\textsuperscript{593} BRETT 1950, 48 no. 10; SNG Israel I, nos. 2095-2100 (Antiochus VII/Ascalon); SC II, no. 2122 (Antiochus VII/Southern Coele Syria), here noted as Boeotian helmet.

\textsuperscript{594} NEAEHL 3 (1993), 948-951; GITLER / KUSHNIR-STEIN 2004, 92-94.

MA[rise],\textsuperscript{596} or ΓΑ[beinieon] and MA[risenon].\textsuperscript{597} If the identification of the head as Gabinius is correct, it may be that also in this case the Hellenistic ruler tradition of displaying a helmet as a personal sign had been applied, in a fashion very similar to the helmeted head of the ruler on the coins of the Greco-Bactrian king Eucratides I. This is however not secured. The helmeted portrait on the Marisa coin type has also been identified as the helmeted head of the goddess Athena.\textsuperscript{598} An argument for the identification of the head as Athena are amongst others the similarities found between the Marisa coins and depictions of Athena in Seleucid bronze coinage minted by Antiochus III and Alexander Balas (Fig. 171).\textsuperscript{599} Furthermore, on earlier Hellenistic coins attributed to a local mint in Marisa under the rule of Antiochus VII, the diademed head of Antiochus displayed on the obverse and double splayed cornucopia on the reverse display no similarities with the coins of the time of Gabinius.\textsuperscript{600} However, similar depictions displaying a male(?) head with a helmet can be found on bronze coins issued by Alexander Balas (152-145 BCE), displaying the Seleucid ruler in a very similar way (Fig. 172).\textsuperscript{601} In the case of the helmeted head on the Marisa coinage issued under Aulus Gabinius it can be argued both ways.

The tradition of displaying a helmet or persons dressed in specific helmet type can also be found in the Roman Republican coinage. On contemporary coins issued at the time of the Roman imperators during the third quarter of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE, more specifically on coins issued under the dictator Caesar in Rome, the crested Corinthian helmets appear as a single obverse image.\textsuperscript{602} But already previous to this the Macedonian helmet had made an impact in the Roman Republican coinage, as it can be seen in coins from the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE minted in Rome, depicting Philip V of Macedon.\textsuperscript{603}

In the case of the large “Year 3” coins it may well be that Herod adopted and adapted the specific Hellenistic ruler tradition and depicted his personalised helmet or headdress on his largest dated coins. One indication which strongly suggests this is the

\textsuperscript{597} RPC Suppl. 1 (1998), 46.
\textsuperscript{598} RPC Suppl. 1 (1998), 46-47 (s.v. Marisa); GITLER / KUSHNIR-STEIN 2004, 87. e.g. SC I, nos. 1095.1-6 (Antiochus III).
\textsuperscript{599} e.g. SC I, nos. 1095.1-6 (Antiochus III/uncertain mint, southern Coele Syria); SC II, no. 2133 (Antiochus III/Susa).
\textsuperscript{600} SC II, 1, 392-393, no. 2125.
\textsuperscript{601} SC II, no. 1790; e.g. HOUGHTON II, no. 115 (Antiochus I/Uncertain mint), no. 119 (Antiochus I/Susa).
\textsuperscript{602} RRC no. 463/2; SEAR 1998, nos. 64, 68.
\textsuperscript{603} RRC no. 293/1; HOUGHTON II, 97, no. 553.
fact that what at first appear to be cheek pieces hanging down, more likely are to be identified as the ends of a diadem or a taenia hanging down from behind the rack upon which the helmet or headdress is placed;\textsuperscript{604} a comparison between this element and the fillet of the dated coin type of the aphlaston/palm branch with a fillet reveals a striking resemblance between the two (Fig. e.g. Fig. 39, though better recognised in other depiction).\textsuperscript{605} On very fine examples of this coin type it is furthermore possible to see the traces of what seems to be a wreath adorning the helmet. Neither this, nor the two palm branches – if this identification is correct\textsuperscript{606} – or the star-like element next to and above the headdress contradict this identification. The Hellenistic helmets found on coins are in some cases adorned with wreath-like ornaments,\textsuperscript{607} and the use of palm branches is a distinct part not only of other coins of Herod the Great,\textsuperscript{608} probably used as references to victory perhaps associated with Athena Nike,\textsuperscript{609} but was also common in the Jewish coin iconography, amongst others through its association with the enactment of the temple cult.\textsuperscript{610} It is however probably not valid to recognise the image as an allegorical representation of Herod the King,\textsuperscript{611} even if the image was meant as a representation of his power.

The star or star-like element crowning the central part is a further element well-known from the Hellenistic-Greek iconographic repertoire, which was imitated in the Jewish coin iconography already by the Hasmonaeans, which however does not automatically equate an adoption of the Hellenistic use of this element. The star, as found in the Seleucid iconography, was used with different intentions depending on the respective context in which they were applied. It could be used as the star of the Dioscurids,\textsuperscript{612}

\textsuperscript{604} BERGMANN 1998, 115-116.
\textsuperscript{605} The iconographic association of the palm tree and \textit{taeniae} (the use of which possibly implying a sacred context) as a token of victory in Greek iconographic displays date back to the 6\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, MILLER 1979, 38-39.
\textsuperscript{606} HÜBNER 2012, forthcoming.
\textsuperscript{607} E.g. HOUGHTON II, no. 564; the helmet of Tryphon, SC II, nos. 2034-2036, 2039-2040.
\textsuperscript{608} JACOBSON 2012, forthcoming – on the crossed palm branches as an emblem of Herod the Great. This image is also later found in the coinage of the procurator Antoninus Felix (MESHORE 2001, no. 342; HENDIN 2010, no. 1347).
\textsuperscript{609} JACOBSON 2007, 98; the use of the palm frond as a supplementary sign of victory – with specific Apolline associations – can in ancient Greek iconography be traced back to the 6\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, MILLER 1979, 35-36.
\textsuperscript{610} E.g. HÜBNER 2012, forthcoming.
\textsuperscript{611} JACOBSON 2007, 99.
\textsuperscript{612} Very often found in the iconography of the Dioscurids in the classical Greek world, LIMC III 1, 567-593 s.v. Dioskouroi (A. HERMARY); JACOBSON 2007, 94.
the star denoting the ruler or saviour, as a godly sign, or as a sign of the sun.\textsuperscript{613} Also in the Jewish coinage the star or star-like signs were depicted in different contexts, although generally referring to the ruler or military leader. Viewed against the background of the political situation at the time of their minting the star-like sign on these coins should probably be recognised as a sign of the ruler as saviour or his quality of saviour.

The most likely identification of the obverse image of the “Year 3” coin series is that it is indeed to be recognised as a personalised helmet or headdress resting on some kind of support and should most likely be understood as the personal authoritative ruler motif of Herod – perhaps specifically executed for Samaria, especially since it differs markedly from other renderings of helmets found in his coinage. The identification of the image is not dependent on a specific dating of the coins to either 37 BCE or 27 BCE. If the star crowning the helmet and the palm leafs are intended to mark him as the true victorious saviour, it would probably fit well with the time of 37 BCE and the beginning of Herod’s sole rule as king. If the consideration that the composition is a personalised ruler image with no further connotations the date 27 BCE is just as appropriate.

3.3 The Undated Coin Types

The understanding of Herod’s coin iconography as either Pagan, Jewish or both has varied greatly.\textsuperscript{614} Contrary to his Hasmonaean predecessors Herod did indeed use iconography in his coinage, which with confidence can be said to be deriving from sacred contexts, but their interpretations have varied greatly, largely depending on the basic understanding of Herod as a Jewish ruler. The nature of many of his coin images has proven difficult to pinpoint, as they can be interpreted as relying both on Jewish and Pagan origins respectively being understandable in both contexts. None of these images have however been subject to a similar extensive discussion as the helmet/tripod images on the “Year 3” coin type dealt with above.

\textsuperscript{613} BERGMANN 1998, 64-66.
\textsuperscript{614} ARIEL 2002, 103-106.
The prevailing images used in Herod’s undated coins (varying in weight between 0.8 g to 4.0 g) overall lighter than the dated coins⁶¹⁶ are according to the numbers registered: the diadem with an X or chi/the three-legged table (Fig. 40-41) and the anchor/double cornucopiae (Fig. 44). Among the rarer images are palm branch(es), the galley, the vine branch and the eagle, all found with minor variations (text Table V).⁶¹⁷ Also the inscription alone containing Herod’s name and title could be used in combination with the reverses displaying the anchor or the table. The establishment of a relative chronology of the undated coins has been attempted, largely depending on the political history and the relationship between Herod and Augustus.⁶¹⁸

### 3.3.1 The Three-legged Table

An example of the possible duality discussed in regard to the iconography of Herod the Great is the image of the three-legged table found on the undated coins with alternating images on the reverse, most prominent among these the royal diadem with or without an inserted X (Fig. 40-41) or two crossed palm branches and the inscription ΗΕΡΩΔΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ (Fig. 43) on either the obverse or reverse. The surface of the table is flat.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Monogram</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Av. weight (g.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Closed diadem surrounding X</td>
<td>Table / 2 palm branches</td>
<td>2.5-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open diadem surrounding X or X below</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>2 crossed palm branches</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Palm branch in circle / diadem</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Vine</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>Double cornucopiae w. caduceus</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inscription of King Herod</td>
<td>Anchor in circle or wreath</td>
<td>0.8-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>Galley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornucopia</td>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text Table V. Herod’s undated coin types.⁶¹⁵

The upper part of the legs and the feet are curved outward and mostly standing on a straight line. An object of some sorts, here tentatively identified as a bowl, is on a number of coins placed on the top of the table. Palm branches are on some coins depicted on each side of the table. The image is surrounded by a dotted circle.619

The table has generally been considered to be the representation of a cult object, but the opinions diverge concerning its identification as either Jewish or Pagan, or as a result of this an intentionally ambiguous representation.620 There seems to be little doubt that the three-legged table could not have been intended as the representation of the showbread table, as this depiction was not only prohibited, but the table was also to be fashioned according to the very detailed specifications found in Exodus 25:23-28 differing considerably from the table displayed on the coins of Herod: 27You shall make a table of acacia wood, two cubits long and one cubit wide and one and a half cubits high. 24You shall overlay it with pure gold and make a gold border around it. 25You shall make for it a rim of a handbreadth around it; and you shall make a gold border for the rim around it. 26You shall make four gold rings for it and put rings on the four corners which are on its four feet. 27The rings shall be close to the rim as holders for the poles to carry the table. 28You shall make the poles of acacia wood and overlay them with gold, so that with them the table may be carried.621 If the table was indeed part of the cult equipment of the Jewish Temple, which is a definite possibility, it is also in this case very difficult to give it a precise name connected with anything specific.

As a Jewish image it has generally been understood as the display of a table belonging within the Jewish Temple or used as part of the enacting of the temple cult.622 If it can be identified as an image belonging in a Jewish tradition it should perhaps be connected with Herod’s reconstruction of the Jewish Temple, as suggested by Y. Meshorer, where sacrifices were carried out on tables as part of the daily offerings (Mishnah, Shekalim 15b),623 thereby intending the table to represent these offerings and Herod’s involvement in the ongoing temple cult.624 The two palm branches flanking the table have been seen to substantiate this identification, as these were also used within

---

620 KANAEI 1963, 49; ARIEL 2002, 104.
621 Quotation from NAU 1995.
the enactment of the Jewish cult; as already shown the flanking branches were also used in other Herodian coin motifs, such as found on the largest “Year 3” coins flanking the helmet and appear in many variations in Jewish coinage as will be shown later. The interpretation of the table as a contemporary Jewish cult object is used during the erection of the new temple, is – though convincing – a hypothetical suggestion finding no iconographic parallels and in need of further substantiation to be validated.

The most common reverse side of this coin type carrying the diadem with an X or crossing palm branches inside has been used to enlighten the context of the table as an image used in a Jewish tradition. It is most likely that Herod with the diadem wanted to display himself as king – an interpretation valid of both the Jewish and the Pagan traditions where it was used identically. The X or Greek chi has been identified as a reference to the high priest of the temple based on a reference found in the BT (K’rithoth 5b): Our rabbis have taught: In anointing kings one draws the figure of a crown [diadem, or in Hebrew nezer] and with the priest in the shape of the letter chi. R. Menashiah said: like a Greek chi. Though Herod as a half-Jew could not take the position of high priest himself, he could control the office through the appointment of loyal high priests. The chi on the coins would have signalled his control as king of the high priest. This interpretation could be valid, but is based on the BT edited centuries later, which does call for some caution. A very rare reverse type used in connection with the obverse type of the table (with an unidentified object on top) is the image of a vine leaf (Fig. 42), which might imply a reference to the Jewish Temple or simply be a reference to the wealth of the land (discussed further in §4.2.1 and §5.3.3).

A number of further interpretations have been suggested in connection with the motif of the X, of which only one is briefly mentioned here. The element has been viewed as a representation of the first letter of Herod’s name, hence as his authoritative signature possibly as substitute for the rendering of his portrait. The image on the reverse has in conjunction with this been identified as a tripod executed by a die-cutter unfamiliar with the appearance of an Apolline tripod, placing it in a context similar to

---

625 ROMANOFF 1943a, 435-438; IDEM 1944b, 426-429; HENDIN 2010a, 231.
626 Quotation from HENDIN 2010a, 231.
627 HENDIN 2010a, 231-232.
629 Summarised by HÜBNER 2012, forthcoming.
the “Year 3” coin type displaying the so-called pilos and couch honouring Herod with the tripod of Apollo on the reverse. If the interpretations of both the X as a Greek chi and the crossed palm branches as Herod’s signature are correct (Fig. 43), Herod would simultaneously have presented both the office of the high priest and referred to himself. However, in some variations the obverse of the coins displaying the table on the reverse only displays a diadem with no X or palm branches.

The varying appearances of the table, both shown with as well as without a vessel or an object of some kind placed on it needs further explanation, which does not seem to rest on the possible unfamiliarity of the die-cutter with the appearance of an Apolline tripod, as suggested by D. Jacobson. A Jewish artist may never have had personal contact with a Pagan tripod, but this does not exclude the knowledge of its general appearance, especially since both earlier and contemporary coins in great numbers evidently did display this image. Furthermore, the table as it appears on the coins was well known in Jerusalem at the time.

An interesting comparison to the coin image is the well-known reconstructed stone table found in the Herodian quarter in Jerusalem (text Fig. VII), but this may say more about the private customs in decorating the upper class houses according to Hellenistic-Roman customs during this time, whose occupants most likely included the aristocratic

---

priestly families, than cast any light on the use of the image by Herod on his coins. The type of table displayed on the undated coin of Herod was a very common type of table in the contemporary Roman world. Rectangular leafed tables with three legs were already common in the archaic and classical Greek periods and the form itself may originally have derived from Egypt. The Greek tables were known as *trapeza*, identified as *tripous* or *tetrpaous,* and appeared in Roman copies of Greek paintings, i.e. in a fresco from Herculaneum and on a mosaic signed by Dioskurides both now in Naples, as well as in wall-paintings from the Villa Farnesina now in the Terme Museum. The Roman *mensa* with a round leaf and three animal-shaped legs became very popular in Roman times. In the Roman table with animal legs animal heads are typically introduced above the legs, which was not the case here. Representations of such three-legged tables can be found in reliefs from all parts of the Roman Empire, and the finds of single legs attest to the popularity of this type of table. Its appearance in domestic, funerary, as well as sacred contexts makes any attempts towards identification difficult. Also the geographic wide and chronologic long use of such tables, such as a much later coin issued under the rule of Septimius Severus in Troizen, where on the reverse a small tripod-table very similar to the one depicted on Herod’s coins is displayed next to the figure of Tyche holding two cornucopiae. The use of the flanking palm branches and the placement of a “bowl” on the top of the table may be the only things bringing further knowledge. Although possible, both these features do not necessarily have to be considered items belonging in neither a specific Jewish nor a Pagan sacred context.

An interesting – even if much later – phenomenon found in the Roman imperial coinage may allow further speculation concerning the nature of this table and therewith cast a different light on the image of the table as used by Herod the Great. In 60 CE Nero (54-68 CE) founded his own games, named the *Neronia* after himself, which were to be held every five years. Coins were issued on the occasion of these games in 64/65 CE, showing a four-legged table on the reverse with a vessel and a wreath on the top and beneath it a disc or shield leaning against one of the animal footed legs (Fig.

---

634 ANDRIANOU 2009, 50.
636 RICHTER 1966, 110-112, Fig. 568-572.
637 Apparently unpublished specimen recorded at the LHS Numismatik AG, Auction 96 (08.05.2006), lot 1343.
638 WEEBER 1994, 77-79.
This seems to be the first appearance of the agonistic table in the Roman imperial coin iconography. After the death of Nero the Neronias fell into oblivion. Many later examples of this phenomenon can be found, but they do not appear until the 2nd century CE after which they become fairly common. The types of tables displayed in this connection vary between 3 and 4-legged of which some are fairly similar to the table shown in the coins of Herod the Great.

Herod initiated his games in honour of Octavian in Jerusalem in 28/27 BCE, approximately at the same time as the founding of Samaria-Sebaste, coinciding with the suggested possible “third year” after his reappointment as king by Octavian. Compared with other suggestions made in connection with the identification of the Herodian coin images, it does not appear beside the point to juggle with the idea that Herod used the image of the table as a commemoration of the games initiated by him; the diadem on the obverse enhancing his newly re-appointed status as king. If this was the case it would place the beginning date of this undated coin type around 27 BCE, most likely issued in his mint in Jerusalem – were the games were held – as the other undated coin types. D. Ariel has attempted a dating of the coins carrying the image of the table to the middle of Herod’s reign (c. 30-20 BCE), which would only coincide peripherally with the time of the beginning of the re-erection of the temple by Herod the Great in 20/19 BCE, also suggested as the context of which the image should be identified, as discussed above. If the image is to be placed in the tradition of the agonistic table, as it can later be found first in the coinage of Nero and repeatedly in the imperial Roman coinage from the 2nd century CE and later, it would mean that it was first introduced by Herod the Great.

These last hypothetical considerations are an example of the possibilities in the interpretation of the Herodian imagery. The fact that the table is both shown with and without a vessel or object of some kind placed on it and with or without flanking palm branches, would demand further explanation, which however is difficult to find without overstressing the manifold possibilities of hypothesising. Also the varied representations of the reverse of the table coins displaying either a diadem with an X, or crossing palm branches, or even alone should either in each case be interpreted on their own or
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639 RIC I, no. 92 (Nero).
640 WEISSER 2007, 141.
641 E.g. RIC Hunter Coin Cabinet II (1971), no. 396, 398 (Trajan), no. 458 (Hadrian).
they are all variations of one coin type and belong in the same category. Here the finer details still seems to elude us due to a lack of comparative material and care should be taken in making one-dimensional interpretations. One last parallel mentioned here are the contemporary depictions of altars in the coinage of Alexandria with the figure K written on them, of which a number are likewise displayed with flanking palm leaves or trees (Fig. 210, without palm leaves). The table of the coins of Herod the Great should perhaps also be interpreted as tripod-altars – independent of their religious context.

3.3.2 The Eagle

The depiction of the eagle is the only rendering of a living being on a coin type issued by Herod the Great and is therewith also in his coinage an exception compared with the coinage of his Hasmonaean predecessors.644 On coins carrying this image a single cornucopia is displayed on the obverse together with the inscription king Herod (Fig. 48).645 The image of the eagle in the coins of Herod is very often linked with the famous episode of the golden eagle taking place in Jerusalem shortly before his death in 4 BCE (§5.1).646 According to Josephus, Herod placed a golden eagle above a gate leading into the temple precinct, which was then immediately torn down by pious Jewish citizens after the premature announcement of his death.647 The connection between the golden eagle placed at the temple and the image on the coins of Herod is a hypothetical possibility. Based on the results of the excavations of Building 721 in Area E in the Jewish Quarter in Jerusalem and the dating of the rebuilding of the temple, D. Ariel tentatively places the coins of the eagle/diadem type after 15 BCE, correlating it with coin finds from Antipatris and Caesarea Maritima.648

The image of the eagle was widely used in ancient coin iconography. In Pagan iconography the animal is usually presented as the companion of the Olympian god Zeus, also visualised through the use of his other prominent attribute, the thunderbolt.649 The eagle is featured on a number of Greek Hellenistic coins of Alexander the Great
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646 SCHÜRER 1973, 313; ARIEL 2002, 105-106.
648 ARIEL 2002, 111-118.
649 JACOBSON 1986, 164-165.
and his successors,\textsuperscript{650} but is also prominently placed in Palestine amongst others through its use in the coinage of Tyre (Fig. 189) and other Palestinian cities. Furthermore, the image is also used continuously in the Nabataean coinage probably holding a specific sacred importance in the Nabataean religion (Fig. 190-191),\textsuperscript{651} possibly imitating the image on the Tyrian shekels as the principal currency circulating at the time.\textsuperscript{652} It is furthermore displayed in the coinage of Marisa probably issued by Gabinius in connection with his rebuilding of this city in 57-55 BCE (Fig. 186), as well as other cities of which Samaria has already been mentioned.\textsuperscript{653} And last but not least, the eagle seems to have been viewed as holy within the written Jewish tradition,\textsuperscript{654} where it at an early point in time was attributed to Jahveh in a similar way as the eagle to Zeus.\textsuperscript{655} In later Jewish synagogue and funeral art the eagle became an established image.\textsuperscript{656} It is not an easy task to decide with what intentions Herod used the image of the eagle or to decide if it held any specific sacred meaning in his case.

3.3.3 The Caduceus / the Facing Cornucopiae with Caduceus

The image of the winged caduceus standing alone or the caduceus inserted between the double cornucopiae (§2.6) cannot be mistaken for anything else than exactly what it is: a caduceus (Fig. 44). Similarly to the image of the cornucopia the image of the caduceus in time disengaged itself from a specific sacred connection to become a standalone image and sign of peace.\textsuperscript{657} The original connection with the god Hermes/Mercury was most likely reduced to a secondary position.\textsuperscript{658}

\textsuperscript{650}The eagle is amongst others known on coins issued by Antiochus IV Epiphanes from Hierapolis-on-the-Pyramus (Castabala) (HOUGHTON II, nos. 321-327) and Antioch (SNG Israel 1, nos. 981-989); further SC II, e.g. nos. 2171 (Demetrius II/Antioch), 1412-1415 (Antiochus IV/Antioch), 2300, 2308-2309 (Antiochus VIII/Antioch).

\textsuperscript{651}Especially in the coins issued by Obodas II (62-60 BCE), Malichus I (62-30 BCE), Obodas III (28-9 BCE) and Aretas IV (9 BCE-40 CE), i.e. from the beginning of the Roman rule of Palestine in 63 BCE. Simultaneously the use of Nabataean legends was introduced on the Nabataean coins, replacing the hitherto used Greek legends, MESHORER 1975, 17-20.

\textsuperscript{652}MESHORER 1975, 17-18, 24-25, 29.


\textsuperscript{654}Exodus 19:4; Deuteronomy 32:11; Ezekiel 1:10, 17:7.

\textsuperscript{655}JENSEN 2007, 288; HÜBNER 2012, forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{656}HACHLILI 1988, 332-334; HACHLILI 1998, 386-387; e.g. the door lintel in the synagogue in Gush Ḥalav, MEYERS et al. 1990, 83-84, 89 fig. 25; S.H. WERLIN on the eagle as decoration in ancient synagogues, WERLIN 2006, passim.

\textsuperscript{657}RE 3 (1899), 1170-1171, s.v. caduceus (SAMTER)

\textsuperscript{658}Also U. HÜBNER (2012, forthcoming); contrary to D. JACOBSON (2012, forthcoming), who prefers a stronger connection with Augustus, Rome and the promotion of the cult of Mercury here.
The caduceus was used in the coinage of Demetrius II Nicator,⁶⁵⁹ in coins minted by Antiochus VII possibly from Gaza,⁶⁶⁰ and was a recurring image in other city coins like on undated bronze coins from the late 1st century BCE from Ascalon,⁶⁶¹ in the quasi-autonomous city coins of Gadara from the beginning of the time of the Decapolis (Fig. 183) and later,⁶⁶² and in the Hellenistic coinage of the city of Dor.⁶⁶³ In all cases expressing the existing respectively desire for Homonoia, i.e. harmony and peace. In Roman Republican coinage contemporary parallels can be found in the coins of both Mark Anthony and Octavian during the time of the triumvirate (Fig. 208) and earlier (Fig. 204), where the winged caduceus or the caduceus often displayed between the clasped hands came to be an expression of the Latin equivalent: Concordia.⁶⁶⁴ Also the Roman goddess Felicitas was as the bearer of happiness, wealth and copiousness most often displayed with the caduceus (Fig. 205) and from the Flavian period additionally with the cornucopia as her main attributes (Fig. 228),⁶⁶⁵ and the images of the cornucopia and the caduceus were most likely used in this spirit in the coins of Herod the Great. D. Jacobson argues for the image to be a direct reference to the Roman goddess Fortuna Felicitas,⁶⁶⁶ but it seems more likely that in this case the motif was meant as an overall reference to the virtues and the state of happiness represented by the goddess Felicitas,⁶⁶⁷ i.e. here represented through the use of her attributes, and not a literal reference to the goddess per se. Similarly, the alone standing image of the caduceus – which by Jacobson likewise has been considered a direct reference to the Roman cult of Mercury⁶⁶⁸ – should first and foremost be viewed as a more general reference to peace and happiness.

In the coins of Herod the caduceus replaced the pomegranate inserted between the double cornucopiae found in the Hasmonaean coinage (Figs. 47-49), where it might additionally have functioned as a reference to the high priest, since the pomegranate
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⁶⁵⁹ HOUGHTON II, nos. 535-536, 688-689; SNG Israel 1, nos. 2272-2274 (Demetrius II 2nd reign/Uncertain southern mint).
⁶⁶⁰ YASHIN 2007, no. 290.
⁶⁶¹ YASHIN 2007, nos. 51-53.
⁶⁶² E.g. SPIJKERMAN 1978, 128-129, pl. 26 no. 3.
⁶⁶⁴ RRC p. 743, nos. 529/2c, 529/3; SEAR 1998, nos. 256, 302-303; DNP 3 (1997), 116-117.
⁶⁶⁶ JACOBSON 2012, forthcoming.
⁶⁶⁷ DNP 4 (1998), 463; the unreliability connected with the fortune bestowed by the goddess Fortuna does not correspond with the objective of the coin Motif, see DNP 4 (1998), 598-602.
⁶⁶⁸ JACOBSON 2012, forthcoming.
through literary sources was firmly connected with this image (§2.5).\textsuperscript{669} Compared with the motif of the double cornucopiae with the inserted pomegranate used during rule of the Hasmonaeans, the image of the caduceus inserted between the double cornucopiae should however be understood as a general enhancement of the expression of the felicitas and beneficium (the Greek euergesia) of Herod’s rule.\textsuperscript{670} Any reference to either the temple or the high priest would have been eliminated through this replacement. The function of the object inserted between the facing cornucopiae remained the same in both Hasmonaean and Herodian coinage, but the elements changed as a response to the changed political circumstances and accordingly the iconographic language applied. A similar use of both the pomegranate and the caduceus can be found in the coinage of the Nabataean king Aretas IV (briefly dealt with in §4.2.1) (Fig. 192).\textsuperscript{671} Fontanille and Ariel have argued that in the case of his dated coins Herod makes a conscious attempt to innovate and not to borrow from or imitate Hasmonaean coin iconography.\textsuperscript{672} In this case this seems to hold some truth and does not have to be judged as an example of a “double-sided nature of Herod”,\textsuperscript{673} but rather of a conscious change of tradition – which in itself does not validate any ambiguity. It is however true that Herod did not emphasize his connection with the Roman rulers through the use of their names and images,\textsuperscript{674} but apparently showed reluctance to go this far, which has left room for the interpretation that the iconography applied by him was to some extent ambiguous in its conception.

### 3.4 Concluding Remarks

When looking at the different images it seems quite clear that mainly if not only images of a Pagan origin were put to use by Herod and that his intention with the iconography was to express himself as a ruler in line both with his Roman contemporaries and in the tradition of a Hellenistic ruler, the use of the anchor a strong indication of the latter since this image is not to be found in the contemporary Roman coinage. Nothing imme-
diately points in the direction of Herod minting coins as a Jewish ruler with any regard to the Jewish cult, although through the possible varied interpretations of some images, such as the three-legged table, alternative ways of viewing the images could have taken place. The tripod of the “Year 3” coins, the winged caduceus and the element of the caduceus inserted between the double cornucopiae derivate from Pagan iconography and do not appear to have been regarded or used in any other way by Herod, at least none of the ambiguity often discussed is here immediately recognisable. In all cases dealt with here a Pagan origin – sacred or not – of the images used in the Herodian coin iconography can be argued much more convincingly than any connection with the Jewish cult, as considered in connection with the image of the three-legged table.

The lack of openly offending iconography to be said about most of Herod’s coin motifs may be judged as a reluctance to use offensive iconography resulting in the ambiguity often discussed in regard to the understanding of the images, but the extent of Pagan iconography used speaks just as clearly against such an assumption. What we to some degree judge as ambiguity is just as much caused by a modern understanding of the tightrope walk between Pagan and Jewish iconographic traditions supposedly taking place here. But again, this is first and foremost caused by modern interpretations of the images as either belonging in one or the other tradition and the understanding of Herod as a Jewish king. The transitions between these traditions at the time of their use were possible not viewed as distinct if at all, since Jewish coin iconography was in effect primarily based on the Pagan iconographic traditions, hence the use of similar images within both cultural traditions was a given reality. The images may have evoked different associations among the users of the coins according to their different cultural-religious origins as found in Herod’s kingdom.

Herod may have displayed common sense by for instance toning down actions which could be seen as offensive in connection with the games held by him in Jerusalem in 27 BCE and otherwise limiting actions which could have been seen as threatening the Jewish cult by also reducing offences in his iconography, but as his vast building program and his open endorsement of the Roman imperial cult in Palestine illustrate (in the following §4.1), not to speak of his actions outside of the Jewish world, this was a procedure reserved for the religious centre of the Jewish world, similarly to what can be
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676 E.g. briefly summarized in JACOBSON 2012, forthcoming.
found in the coinage of his successor Herod Archelaus (§4.2). The use of the theriomorphic representation of the eagle, independently if this image in any way is to be considered a reflection of the temple-incident or not, stresses the lack of religious sensitivity on the part of Herod and serves to stress that Herod was not in any way primarily acting as a Jewish king, but as king in his own rights. The image of the eagle may well find parallels in earlier Jewish written traditions in which a connection between this image and Jahveh can be established as noted here similarly to a connection between Zeus and the eagle, but at the time of Herod this was not yet the norm in iconography, contrary to what can be found in the later art of the Jewish synagogues in Palestine.

The differences between the dated and the undated coin series can convincingly be attributed to the work of the two different mints in Samaria and Jerusalem. The coins from the Samarian mint were more obvious in their Pagan iconographic language, whereas in the mint in Jerusalem coin images far less conspicuous were issued, to some extent still following the traditions established under the rule of the Hasmonaeans, although with modifications as shown by the double cornucopiae with the inserted caduceus. The dating of especially the dated “Year 3” coins from Samaria is however still not completely settled. Convincing arguments can be brought forth supporting both the date of 37 BCE and of 27 BCE. The iconography alone does not give the deciding cues in support of either of the two and the historical facts can be used to validate both.

The general discussion of the Herodian coin iconography is at times forced, tending to press the material beyond any reasonable comprehension in search of answers, which is especially illustrated by the pilos-helmet-apex discussion. This is on the one hand caused by the limitations of the material available, but to some extent also by what the preconceived ideas about the understanding of the context and declarations made with the iconography at hand are. As always Herod the Great tends to polarise and definite answers and identifications are still open, but it is safe to say that Herod might have been a Jewish king, but the iconography introduced by him into the Jewish coinage was in effect anything but, at least judged against his Hasmonaean predecessors.
The Coinage of the Later Herodian Rulers (4 BCE-100 CE)

Three generations of Herodian rulers reigned after the death of Herod the Great. As the legitimate local Jewish sovereigns appointed by Rome – either as ethnarchs, tetrarchs or as kings – all of them issued their own bronze coins within which different iconographic strategies and to some extent different iconographic traditions were displayed. The first generation – the three sons of Herod who were instated as rulers immediately after his death in 4 BCE – all issued their own coinages, but contrary to coins issued by earlier Jewish heads of state, each of these differentiated themselves markedly in their use of iconography. Especially the coinage of Herod Philip (4 BCE-34 CE) distinguished itself from the coinages of his father and the contemporary coinages of his brothers Herod Archelaus (4 BCE-6 CE) and Herod Antipas (4 BCE-39 CE). The coin iconography applied by the two following Herodian ruler generations – Agrippa I (37-44 CE) and his son Agrippa II (c. 50-100 CE) – had removed itself almost completely from any iconographic traditions which can be associated with the previous practices of the Jewish world.

The three sons of Herod the Great to succeed him, Herod Archelaus, Herod Antipas and Herod Philip, were born in Palestine in the years between 27 and 25 BCE. At the relative young age of c. 12-13 years they were all simultaneously sent to Rome to be educated at the imperial court, as already the older sons of Herod Alexander I and Aristobolus I had been previously (according to Josephus AJ 15.342-343). Archelaus, Antipas and Philip remained in Rome in the years between c. 14 and 7/6 BCE and did not return to Palestine until after the execution of their older brothers by their father in 8 BCE. The two following generations of Herodians to rule Palestine, Herod Agrippa I and later his son Herod Agrippa II, were raised under similar circumstances. Agrippa I
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677 Vollmer 1991, 438-441, 448.
678 Dahmen 2010, 100.
679 According to Josephus (BJ 2:98) Herods Sister Salome received coastal cities Jamnia and Azotus and later also the palace of Herod in Ascalon, as well as Phasaelis, see Kasher 1990, 217.
spent large parts of his life as a youth and adult in Rome until he finally returned to Palestine as king in 38 CE and Agrippa II was even born and largely raised in Rome, spending only few of his childhood years in Palestine.\(^682\) Already the knowledge of the differences in raising and educational background of the Herodian rulers of the 1\(^{st}\) century CE serves as an aid in understanding some of the immediate reasons for the radical changes found in the Jewish coinage of Palestine during this time compared to earlier periods.

As this chapter will demonstrate, the coinages of the Herodian rulers succeeding Herod the Great in this respect had only little in common with previous ancient Jewish coins issued. It has been argued that at least in some coin series issued by some of these rulers regard towards Jewish religious sensibility played a role during the early 1\(^{st}\) century, this specifically pertains to coin types issued by Herod Archelaus, Herod Antipas and later by Herod Agrippa I, in the case of Herod Archelaus this was to a great extent determined by him upholding the already established coin traditions.

If at all noticeable, the adherence to the prohibition against the use of images of living beings found very different ways of expression and did not correspond with the far more strict use of iconography as especially found in the coinage of the Hasmonaean and to a great extent Herod the Great, aside from his choice to include the display of the eagle (§3.3.2), and whose coin iconography to a great extent was imitated by his successor Herod Archelaus.\(^683\) The overall picture gained from the coin iconography is that of the three generations of Herodian rulers following Herod the Great being throughout Hellenized secular Jews acting as such in their coin iconography. Especially the coin iconography used by the two latest kings, Agrippa I and Agrippa II, was to a great extent adjusted to the Roman imperial coinage.

Nonetheless, did all of the rulers display strong individual traits in their choices of iconography, use of wording of the legends and reasons for coin issues,\(^684\) hence the political statements made by each of them varied greatly, and their Hellenistic background never completely ceased to find expression. Alone the exclusive use of the
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\(^{682}\) Kokkinos 1998, 277, 318-319.

\(^{683}\) Jensen 2007, 280 – the statement made by Jensen that the textual and archaeological evidence from the 1\(^{st}\) century BCE and 1\(^{st}\) century CE display a distinct lack of prohibited images (both of living beings and sacred objects) must be relativised, he himself marks on the use of the menorah on oil lamps and ossuaries during this time (p. 285). The imagery and sacred iconography used during the Rabbinic period did not suddenly appear after the Second Jewish War, but was the result of a gradual development within the Jewish society.

\(^{684}\) Lykke 2011, 132-6.
Greek language in the coin legends in the individual coinages of the Herodian rulers simultaneously reflect the official political courses chosen by them in relation to Rome and the Hellenistic customs already established in Palestine. Compared to the rule of the Jewish priests-kings and kings during the preceding centuries a fundamentally different and continuously developing official representation of the Jewish world surfaces here, relying on completely different political concepts and ideals and a different understanding of the place and use of (the Jewish) religion within this than previously encountered.  

4.1 The Roman Imperial Ruler Cult in Palestine

“In no public arena were relations of power more clearly visualized and symbolized than in the imperial cult”, 686 a device very visible both in the political and the religious landscape of Palestine and in the coinage of the Herodian rulers succeeding each other during the 1st century CE. The modern classification of the buoyant categories of politics and religion in relation to the reality of the ancient world has caused a number of difficulties in the understanding and placement of the Roman imperial ruler cult. 687 The apparent modern dichotomy between the two is however verifiably caused by a later Jewish-Christian understanding of these as separate entities. 688

The introduction of the imperial ruler cult in Palestine initiated by Herod the Great is not likely to have been associated with a specific personal devoutness towards the Roman ruler viewed as a god on his part. Rather, Herod pursued the line of public cultic reverence designed to honour the sovereign as the highest power previously approved by Augustus during the very early years of the Principate, resting on an older Hellenistic tradition. 689 This in time developed into a “communication system among citizens, subjects, cities, principalities and provinces in the Roman empire”, 690 within which the emphasis in regard to the appearance of the imperial ruler cult in Jewish coinage being placed on the term communication. Hence, an honouring of the controlling power was
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686 BERNETT 2007b, 338.
690 BERNETT 2007b, 341.
being expressed in a language defined according to the traditional system of Pagan worship in regard to the recognition of higher entities, within which divinity itself was not the deciding factor, but a relative concept used to define the status of the honoured individual, in this case the Roman emperor as previously the Hellenistic ruler, without implying a separation of this in terms of religion or politics.\textsuperscript{691} It is entirely questionable whether the imperial cult was in any way implemented by Herod as an instrument to consciously either “Hellenize” or “Romanize” the Jewish world on a larger scale.\textsuperscript{692}

The development of the official Roman imperial ruler cult in the eastern part of the Roman Empire at the time of Augustus was probably initiated with his official accession to power in Egypt after Actium and the defeat of Cleopatra and Mark Anthony. The aspect of the private worship of or municipal cults devoted to the living ruler evidenced by a great number of inscriptions and the archaeological evidence from Rome and Italy abundant during the time of Augustus will not be discussed further here.\textsuperscript{693} In Egypt Octavian was, according to the traditional Egyptian beliefs, from the beginning introduced as *synnaos theos* (as “having the same temple” or “temple-sharing god”) in the temples of the Egyptian gods and was thus honoured as the immediate successor to the Ptolemaic dynasty – whose rulers in time and to some extent also their wives had been incorporated in many of the Egyptian temples as *synnaoi theoi*.\textsuperscript{694} In the case of Memphis this is already documented for the year 30 BCE.\textsuperscript{695} The same might have been the case in Karnak,\textsuperscript{696} as well as in the case of the temple for Mark Anthony under construction in Alexandria in the year 30 BCE, when the temple probably in some form was rededicated to the liberator Octavian.\textsuperscript{697}

Already in 30/29 BCE Octavian authorized the first establishments of his own cult in the eastern part of his empire. Ambassadors from the provinces of Asia and Bithynia had asked his permission to erect temples dedicated to the goddess Roma and him in the cities of Pergamon and Nicomedia (Cass. Dio 51.20.6-9).\textsuperscript{698} These temples have not been verified through archaeological remains, but the appearance of the tem-

\textsuperscript{692} BERNETT 2007b, 340-341.
\textsuperscript{693} GRADEL 2002, 73-108.
\textsuperscript{695} HÄNLEIN-SCHÄFER 1985, 208-210, 215; BERNETT 2007a, 57.
\textsuperscript{696} HÄNLEIN-SCHÄFER 1985, 208 n. 17; STROCKA 1980, 180.
\textsuperscript{697} FRASER 1972, 24-25; HÄNLEIN-SCHÄFER 1985, 209-211; BERNETT 2007a, 57.
\textsuperscript{698} PRICE 1996, 54-56.
ples has been deduced from the coinage of each city respectively. On cistophoroi issued in Pergamon in 19/18 BCE on the occasion of the decennial of the permission to build the temple it is displayed as a hexastyle temple in the Corinthian order placed on a five-stepped foundation. The silver and bronze coins from Nicomedia issued between 128 and 138 CE on the occasion of a visit by Hadrian display an octastyle temple-façade in the Corinthian order placed on a three-stepped crepis. The establishment of the Roma and Augustus cult in these cities seems to have been the starting point for the further independent development of the Roman imperial ruler cult in the Roman East rapidly replacing the older Hellenistic ruler cult.

The introduction of the Roman ruler cult during the reign of Herod the Great came to play an important role in the coin iconography of the Herodian rulers succeeding Herod the Great, especially pertaining to the rulers ruling over areas largely inhabited by a non-Jewish population, more specifically to Herod Philip, Herod Agrippa I and Herod Agrippa II. Astonishing is that the introduction of the cult, despite its apparent importance visible in the effort Herod the Great placed on its architectural appearance in Palestine, did not have any verifiable – or at least recognisable – impact on the coin iconography used by Herod the Great himself.

In the years 25 to 10 BCE Herod erected three temples dedicated to the emperor Augustus, all situated outside the religiously conservative Jewish territory of Judaea. The cities within which they were situated were mostly re-named after the Roman ruler: Caesarea Maritima with its harbour Sebastos, Samaria-Sebaste, and Paneas, later re-named after Herod Philip in Caesarea Philippi. The endorsement and implementation of the Roman imperial ruler cult – and accompanying games – was in each of these cities not only a manifestation of the acceptance of and obeisance to the political sovereign on the part of these cities, in a first step towards Herod and secondly towards the
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699 RIC II, no. 461a-c (Hadrian).
701 BERNETT 2007a, 58.
702 The main work on the introduction and establishment of the imperial cult in Palestine is to be found in the work of M. BERNETT (primarily BERNETT 2007a).
703 WILSON 2004, 12; in the western part of the Roman Empire only few cult sites existed, where the Roman imperial cult came to play a role during the time of Augustus: the Ara Romae et Augusti (also Ara Trium Galliarum) in Lyon inaugurated on the 1st of August 12 BCE and the Ara Ubiorum near Cologne inaugurated 9 BCE (Tac. Ann. I.57,2), on this FISHWICK 1987-2005, passim; ECK 2004, 86-87. In the western parts of the Roman Empire the actual worship of the imperial ruler cult did not follow until the time of the emperors Claudius and especially Vespasian, DNP 6 (1999) 143-144.
704 E.g. in Caesarea Maritima, BERNETT 2007a, 116-121.
Roman sovereign, but simultaneously a conscious embedment within the political structure and hierarchy of this world.\textsuperscript{705} It also meant a strategic political and economic development of the cities in question and the areas in which they were situated.\textsuperscript{706}

All three of Herod’s imperial cult sites appear to have been dedicated to the goddess Roma and the living emperor, at least during the time of Augustus,\textsuperscript{707} according to a decree issued by Augustus stating that a cult could not be dedicated to him alone, but must always be dedicated to the goddess Roma as well (Suetonius, \textit{Div. Aug.} 52), whereas the Roma cult as such was a common phenomenon.\textsuperscript{708} The duality of Roma and Augustus is by Josephus stressed in connection with Herod’s temple in Caesarea Maritima (AJ 15.339; BJ 1.414), but it should be assumed that in all cases where an Augustus temple is mentioned in ancient literature the temple in question was devoted to both Roma and Augustus, i.e. also applying to Samaria-Sebaste and Paneas, respectively Caesarea Philippi, where in the latter amongst others a helmeted marble head found within the sanctuary of Paneas has tentatively been identified as the head of a Roma statue.\textsuperscript{709}

M. Bernett argues for a greater liberty in the constitution of the Palestinian imperial cult in the case of Herod, compared with other eastern Roman provinces, such as Bithynia and Asia within which the cult was originally officially introduced. According to her, this would amongst others have allowed Herod the inclusion of Livia, in the case of Caesarea Maritima in the guise of the goddess Roma-Hera, in the imperial cult and the accompanying games.\textsuperscript{710} The Roman imperial ruler cult should at no point be viewed as a static institution once introduced, but was indeed subject to continuous developments and changes according to the rising circumstances.\textsuperscript{711} The question if Livia already from the beginning was included in the cultic honouring of Augustus is however difficult. The representation of amongst others Livia will be discussed further below in connection with other displays of female members of the ruling houses in the coins of the later Herodian rulers (§4.4.2 and 4.5.1).

Of the three temples mentioned the temple in Samaria-Sebaste is probably the one best verified through archaeological research, but interestingly enough the only one not

\textsuperscript{705} Also BERNETT 2007b, 340.
\textsuperscript{706} WILSON 2004, 11, 68.
\textsuperscript{707} DNP 6 (1999), 144.
\textsuperscript{708} PRICE 1996, 40-47; DNP 6 (1999), 143.
\textsuperscript{709} FRIEDLAND 1997, Cat. 1, pp. 114-117, Fig. 6-9; WILSON 2004, 11.
\textsuperscript{710} BERNETT 2007a, 114-117.
\textsuperscript{711} PRICE 1996, 61-62.
found represented in the coin iconography of any of the Herodian rulers. Contrary to the temples situated in Caesarea Maritima\textsuperscript{712} and Caesarea Philippi, dealt with below, both known from the coinage of these cities respectively, the remains of the monumental Augustus temple situated on the Acropolis in Samaria-Sebaste is known fairly well through the archaeological excavations (text Fig. VIII), even if only the foundations of the Herodian temple have been preserved,\textsuperscript{713} not allowing a detailed reconstruction of the inner division of the temple.\textsuperscript{714} The temple was erected on a high platform on the highest point on the western side of the Acropolis. Massive substructures were erected to accommodate the new supporting walls and older buildings in the area were levelled out. The temple and its precinct were symmetrically adjusted along a central axis and probably surrounded by a portico on the three sides opposing the temple.\textsuperscript{715} An altar was placed on the central axis in front of the temple. The temple displays the classic proportions of 2:3 in width and length (23.95 m by 34.9 m), proportions also found in the Roma and Augustus temples of Ephesus, Ancyra and Leptis Magna.\textsuperscript{716}

Viewed as a whole the placing, the monumentality and the overall conception of the temple complex point towards the distinct wish to make a clear visual statement with the display of the structure and therewith also the venerated god, i.e. the Roman emperor being honoured here.\textsuperscript{717} Interesting is the placing of a large private house at the south-western corner of the Acropolis, which has been identified as a part of a Herodian period palace complex.\textsuperscript{718} It could very well be that the phenomenon of the ruler seeking the personal closeness of the power venerated is to be found here, probably best paralleled by the temple of Apollo and the House of Augustus on the Palatine Hill in Rome (briefly mentioned in §3.2.1.2).\textsuperscript{719}

\textsuperscript{712}KAHN 1996, 130-145; Moderate information concerning the temple in Caesarea Maritima has increasingly been brought to light during the since 1989 ongoing excavations of the platform where it was situated, HOLUM 2004, 184-191; KAHN 1998, 123-141; BERNETT 2007a, 106-112.

\textsuperscript{713}HAMILTON 1936, 46-47; CROWFOOT et al. 1957 & 1966; NETZER 1987; BARAG 1993b, 3-8.

\textsuperscript{714}Different reconstructions of the inner division of the temple have been suggested, e.g. NETZER 1987, 102 fig. 4; BERNETT 2007a, 78.

\textsuperscript{715}BERNETT 2007a, 76-77.

\textsuperscript{716}HÄNLEIN-SCHÄFER 1985, cat. nos. A 27, A 42, A53; BERNETT 2007a, 78.

\textsuperscript{717}BERNETT 2007a, 83.

\textsuperscript{718}BARAG 1993b, 3-18.

\textsuperscript{719}BERNETT 2007a, 87-89.
In the temple precinct east of the altar the torso of a larger than life marble armoured statue has been found (text Figs. IX-X). According to stylistic criteria the statue has been placed in the Augustan period, but the height of the statue – which has been reconstructed to approximately 3 m – is compared with other contemporary armoured statues extraordinary large for this time.\footnote{Fittschen 2002, 11 n. 9, 14-15; Bernett 2007a, 80-82.} The identification of the statue is not quite certain. It could be an early representation of Augustus or a statue of Marcus Agrippa erected on the occasion of his visit to the city of Samaria-Sebaste in 15 BCE (Josephus AJ 16.13).\footnote{Fittschen 2002, 16-17.}
Fig. IX-X. The armoured statue from Samaria-Sebaste (H. 2.40m) (FITTSCHEN 2002, 10-11, Fig. 1-2).

4.2 Herod Archelaus (4 BCE-6 CE)

Archelaus was the eldest son of Herod the Great and his fourth wife Malthaca the Samaritan (Josephus AJ 17.20, BJ 1.562) and the seventh of Herod’s children to be born.722 As his brothers he was required to return to Palestine after having completed his education in Rome in 7 or 6 BCE, during a time were the Herodian family and court was in upheaval due to the internal intrigues and the fatal repercussions enforced by Herod the Great upon members of his family lasting until few days before his own death.723 Herod’s three youngest sons survived the turmoil unscathed, but immediately after the death of their father the internal power struggle began from which Archelaus emerged as the most powerful.

Archelaus only issued a limited number of coin types (appendix Table 2): the helmet/vine type (Fig. 49-50) and the anchor/double cornucopiae with an inserted caduceus type (Fig. 51), the anchor/inscription in wreath (Fig. 52), the double parallel cornuco-
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722 KOKKINOS 1998, 225, overview of the Herodian family tree to be found on pp. 244-245.
piae/galley (Fig. 53), the prow of a galley/inscription in wreath (Fig. 54).\textsuperscript{724} All of these coins were minted in Jerusalem, probably continuing the use of the mint of his father,\textsuperscript{725} and continued to produce coins in denominational system partially comparable with that of Herod the Great with prutot and double-prutot, but apparently no half-prutot,\textsuperscript{726} which primarily circulated within the borders of his territory.\textsuperscript{727}

Archelaus was never mentioned by birth name in his coin legends, but had adopted the dynastic name Herod at the beginning of his reign and applied the words ΗΡΩΔΟΥ (or ΗΡΩΔΗ) and ΕΘΝΑΡΧΟΥ (or ΕΘΝΑΡΧΗ) dispersed on both sides of his coins, contrary to the inscription ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ used by his father.\textsuperscript{728} Through the mentioning of the title of ethnarchos bestowed on him by Augustus (Josephus AJ 17.317), he was able to position himself especially towards his older brother Antipas. Both brothers had successively been named as heirs to the kingdom of their father in the different testaments drawn up by him during his last years after their return to Palestine.\textsuperscript{729} This had caused both Archelaus and Antipas to travel to Rome to argue their case before Augustus immediately after the death of Herod the Great.\textsuperscript{730} Augustus chose to allot the higher ranking title of ethnarch to Archelaus and with it a territory consisting of Judaea, Samaria and Idumaea including all the most important cities of the old Herodian kingdom (Josephus AJ 17.317-318) (Map 1).\textsuperscript{731} The image of the helmet used by Archelaus in his coins should be understood – analogue to the use of the helmet by John Hyrcanus I (or II) and by Herod the Great (discussed §2.4 and §3.2.1.2) – as a representation of his superior status of ethnarch, contrary to the other tetrarchs (Figs. 49-50).\textsuperscript{732} One should, however, not jump to the conclusion that the use of the title ethnarchos at the time of Archelaus can uncritically be parallelized with an earlier use of this title at different points in time (see discussion of the use of the title ethnarch

\textsuperscript{724} RPC I (1992), nos. 4912-4917; MESHORER 2001, no. 67-74; HENDIN 2010a, 1192-1197.
\textsuperscript{725} MESHORER 2001, 78.
\textsuperscript{726} HENDIN 2010, 243.
\textsuperscript{727} SYON 2004, 48.
\textsuperscript{728} MESHORER 2001, 78-79; HENDIN 2010, nos. 1192-1197.
\textsuperscript{729} Josephus AJ 17.146, 17.188-190, BJ 1.646; KOKKINOS 1998, 229
\textsuperscript{731} SCHÄFER 1995, 104-105; HENDIN 2006, 56.
\textsuperscript{732} RPC I (1992), no. 4917; MESHORER 2001, 80-81, no. 73-74.
in §2.4). The small caduceus placed below the helmet probably referring to a harmonious rule and the benefaction of the ruler (discussed §3.3.3).

4.2.1 The Depiction of the Grapes: the Image of the Golden Vine?

The image of the vine was widespread in Jewish art, especially in later funerary and synagogal contexts, and seems mainly to have been used as a decorative element, which is likely to have entailed a reference to natural wealth. On Archelaus’ coins the image of the vine (Fig. 49-50) – consisting of a bunch of grapes, a smaller vine leaf and a tendril – is displayed on the obverse of the coins with the depiction of the helmet on the reverse. It has by Meshorer in his case been interpreted as the representation of the golden vine decorating the Temple in Jerusalem described by Josephus (AJ 15.394-395), which Meshorer sees as the main source of inspiration for the increasing use of the image in Jewish art during the 1st century CE and alter. According to Josephus the golden vine was evidently considered an important part of the decoration of the Temple and has as a result even been seen to represent Israel or even Judaism. An identification of Archelaus’ coin image of the vine as a reference to the golden vine would place the coin iconography in a very specific Jewish context (discussed further in §5.3.3), which has lead to the interpretation that Archelaus here “displayed his sovereignty over and protection of Jerusalem and its temple”. This does however first and foremost rely on a similar identification of the image found in the coinage of Herod the Great and the following use of the image during the Jewish wars.

The image of the bundle of grapes in coin iconography had already before this time long been established as a traditional motif used in ancient Greek coinage, both as a main motif as well as a secondary element. In that context the image should first and foremost be interpreted as an actual reference to wine and was most often displayed in connection with the god Dionysus and could as such functioned as a reference to this
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733 Translation of the Hebrew inscription as used by Y. MESHORER (2001, 80), and consequently M.H. JENSEN (2007, 290).
734 HACHLILI 1988, 80, 318; HACHLILI 1998, 380.
735 MESHORER 79-80.
736 KADMAN 1960, 90; MESHORER 2001, 121.
737 ROMANOFF 1944a, 299-301.
god on its own, or to the opulence connected with him. In Jewish art of the Second Temple period and later various combinations of the vine are found, in many cases as a filling motif where hardly more than a content as a sign of fruitfulness can be claimed.\textsuperscript{740} An often sited and very elaborate parallel is found on a sarcophagus from the Tomb of the Nazirite in Jerusalem dating to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE (text Fig. XI).\textsuperscript{741} The question is however in what way the image should be identified in the coinage of Archelaus and if it is at all possible to establish if this image was actually meant as a reference to the aforementioned golden vine of the Temple in Jerusalem or if was meant as a more general reference to fertility in the coinage of Archelaus.

![Fig. XI. The Nazirite Sarcophagus (HACHLILI 1988, Pl. 8).](image)

An interesting slightly later parallel can be found in two coin types, which according to their date L Δ, was issued by the Roman procurator of Judaea Valerius Gratus (15-26 CE) in the “Year 4” (17 CE). On the obverse of the first coin type a vine branch with a large leaf, tendrils and a small bunch of grapes was displayed together with the inscription TIBEPIOY and on the reverse a vessel traditionally designated as a kantharos, but rather comparable with a crater, the date placed left and right in the field and the inscription KAIKAPOC (Fig. 199).\textsuperscript{742} On the second type the obverse displaying a vine branch with a large leaf, tendrils and a small bunch of grapes and the inscription IOYAIA is accompanied by the reverse image of a lidded narrow-necked amphora (Fig. 200).\textsuperscript{743}

\textsuperscript{740} HACHLILI 1988, 318.
\textsuperscript{741} AVIGAD 1976, 67; HACHLILI 1988, pl. 8; MESHORER 2001, 150.
\textsuperscript{742} RPC I (1992), no. 4962; MESHORER 2001, pl. 74 nos. 325-325a.
\textsuperscript{743} RPC I (1992), no. 4963; MESHORER 2001, pl. 74 nos. 326-326a.
In both cases the vessels displayed cannot be identified on the basis of comparisons with specific known objects and it is not immediately clear whether the images displayed should be associated with either a Jewish or a Pagan context, or if a specific sacred context is to be assumed at all. Both the obverse and the reverse images find possible parallels or suitable contexts respectively cult connoted objects in the Greco-Roman as well as within the Jewish culture with which they can be associated. The obverse motif of the vine was undoubtedly used with a specific intention in mind, but it is difficult to pinpoint this precisely, which may have been the intention with – or unintended result of – the use of the image, due to a possible diverse understanding of images according to the different contexts of their users.

The vine alone can here again indeed be understood either as an image associated with a general reference to fertility/abundance, eventually connected with a Pagan (Dionysian) context, or as an image referring to a Jewish cultural context, in this case perhaps to be associated with the golden vine of the Temple in Jerusalem. The combination with the long-necked amphora on the reverse of Valerius Gratus coins may have been intentional, viewed against a similar display of these images in the coinage of the First Jewish War (e.g. Fig. 112). This could suggest that a specific vessel was in fact depicted here, which may have held an actual function within the Jewish cult (§5.3.3 and §6.4).

Still, it is difficult to actually determine if Valerius Gratus issued these coin images with a specific context in mind. Only the inscription could lend a specification, since here not only the name of the emperor is mentioned, but also the name Ioulia – the name of Livia attributed to Livia after the death of Augustus (below) – appear together with the image of the vine (Fig. 200). Valerius Gratus was as Roman procurator bound to issue coins in the name of his sovereign, in this case also honouring the mother of the sovereign. The use of the likewise unspecified crater-like vessel on other coins does not provide a solution to this problem. Also in this case, a specific identification is not possible allowing a placement of the image in both a Pagan and a Jewish context. What is certain is that the images of the vine (as well as the helmet and at least the narrow-necked amphora) repeatedly appear in Jewish coinage at different points in time.
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744 Meshorer 2001, 169.
745 Hendin 2010, nos. 1336-1337.
Valerius Gratus recognition of the Jewish world is evident in the use of the old Jewish coin motif of the lily in another of his coin series (Fig. 198), and he may also have used the vessels and the vine described here similarly. The vine could actually have been meant as a reference both to the Jewish Temple, as well as to a more general tradition of displaying the fertility of the land. Any specific sacred content of the image of the vine is however impossible to pinpoint in regard to either, which is exactly the same case in the coinage of Archelaus. None of these considerations help to verify a specific connection of the vine found on the obverse of the helmet coin type issued by Archelaus with the great vine of the Jewish Temple, or of a more general meaning was the intention. It is not possible to deduce if the use of an image which could be understood both in a Greco-Roman as well as a Jewish context was intended to be ambiguous. Rather, the vine may by some viewers primarily have been a sign of opulence or wealth, also found in Jewish art at this time, in combination with the sign of power in form of the helmet on the reverse, whereas others may well have read a reference to the vine of the Jewish Temple.

4.2.2 Concluding Remarks

In his coin iconography Herod Archelaus appears basically to have remained faithful towards the already established iconographic traditions of the preceding Hellenistic-Jewish rulers, probably relying on the recognisability of these traditions. He demonstrated an overall restraint in regard to Jewish religious sensitivity in the choice and use of coin iconography and issued coin types very similar to those issued by his father to the extent that typological connections have been established between coin types issued by both of them. Archelaus produced exact copies of the anchor/double cornucopiae with an inserted caduceus type minted by Herod, leaving the coins only to be distinguished by the titles used in their legends (Fig. 41 & 51); this could be a chronological indicator pointing towards the issuing of this coin type towards the end of Herod’s reign, at which time the motif of the cornucopiae with the inserted caduceus was also

---

746 HENDIN 2010, nos. 1335-1335a.
747 E.g. AVIGAD 1976, 67.
applied in Nabataean coinage by king Aretas IV (9 BCE-40 CE). This speaks for a deliberate use of established traditions used by an heir respectively successor. Archelaus may even have issued a coin type with the anchor on the reverse as a reference to his father Herod the Great (discussed in §3.2.1.2). The images with naval connotations have – as in the case of the use of these images by Herod the Great – often been connected with a specific importance of the coastal cities under his rule and the international connections stemming from this (Figs. 53-54). It should not be overlooked that similar images were widespread in Seleucid coinage and also featured prominently in the Phoenician coinages of Tyre and Sidon until the end of the 1st century BCE. It is more likely that these images were used as general references to political strength and superiority (§3.2.1.2).

The coin iconography of Herod Archelaus does not hold any images of a securely discernible sacred nature. The image of the double cornucopiae with the inserted caduceus (Fig. 51) does not appear to have taken a meaning different from the image as found used in the coins of Herod the Great (Fig. 44). The original sacred context of the caduceus as an attribute of Hermes/Mercury is here again only secondary it having assumed the overall meaning of peace and felicity as a reference to the benefaction of the ruler (§3.3.3). The interpretation of the bunch of grapes on the obverse of the helmet coins as belonging in a sacred context is mainly determined by assumptions made about the content of Herod the Great’s coin iconography. As shown previously, no specific iconographic elements found in Herod’s coinage can however with certainty be said to belong in a Jewish context, let alone a sacred Jewish context. Maybe the very rare use of the vine leaf found here is the one exception. The later use of the image could point in this direction, but it is not without problems to deduct solid information from coins issued later and under completely different circumstances.

The strategy of upholding the established traditions with only few alterations, choosing not to introduce new images can be explained by the fact that Archelaus ruled over the Jewish core areas Judaea, Samaria and Idumaea, where at least a certain amount of restraint was necessary in the use of iconography. This does however not

---

750 MESHORER 1975, 99-100, nos.75-76.
751 E.g. SYON 2004, 36 fig. 8, 70 -71.
752 JENSEN 2007, 289 – who generalize the use of these images.
753 In later Roman coins the image of the clasped hands and the caduceus can be found with the addition of two ears of grain and two poppy heads underlining the aspect of abundance, e.g. RIC I, no. 16 (Civil Wars).
754 A very rare example of the image of a vine leaf, on the obverse the three-legged table with an unidentified object on top, MESHORER 2001, 69-70, pl.45 no. 58; HENDIN 2010a, 241, no. 1187.
match the historical tradition portraying the brutal reign of a despot, ruthlessly crushing the opposition upon his return to Palestine as ethnarch (Josephus 17.284, BJ 2.64), ultimately ruling less than ten years before he was removed by Augustus himself and banished to Vienna in Gaul (Josephus AJ 17.344, BJ 2.111), after which Judaea was converted into a Roman province. The clear discrepancy between the use of coin iconography and the historical record of Archelaus reign far more suggests that Archelaus only placed little value on the use of coin iconography as a political medium and therefore mainly implemented the already established iconographic traditions with few alterations.

4.3 Herod Antipas (4 BCE-39 CE)

After the dispute with his younger older brother Archelaus concerning the succession to their father’s kingdom Antipas was by Augustus made tetrarch of Pereaea and Galilee (Josephus AJ 17.318), an area much smaller than he originally had sought to gain (Map 1). Also in his case the difference between the religious neutrality of the iconography used and the historic tradition, where he by Josephus is described as a true Herodian tyrant in line with his father, is apparently marked, but the reality was rather that Antipas’ rule was both unremarkable and relatively uneventful. His reign is especially marked by the founding of first Sepphoris and later his new capital Tiberias, which was erected on Jewish burial ground (Josephus AJ 18.36-38), hence his image problems. The few chronologically widespread coin series minted by him in the years “24” (20/21 CE), “33” (29/30 CE), “34” (30/31 CE), “37” (33/34 CE) and “43” (39/40 CE) of his more than four decades as tetrarch seem mainly to have been issued on different specific occasions, rather than used as an official political medium to position and display him as ruler at all times. In the years when they were issued, they were always divided into four different denominations primarily determined by their weight, as their iconography remained the same. The majority of Antipas’ coinage seems only to have moved within his own territory, but due
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755 SCHÄFER 1995, 104-105; KOKKINOS 1998, 228-229 – according to KOKKINOS Archelaus may later have returned to Palestine where he then died; RPC II (1999), 301.
756 SCHÄFER 1995, 103.
759 RPC I (1992), 680.
to the favorable position of the city of Tiberias at one of the major routes a larger number of Antipas’ coins have also been found in the southern part of Herod Philips tetrarchy.\textsuperscript{760}

A distinct lack of images which could offend Jewish religious sensitivity in any way is noticeable in Antipas’ coin iconography, which displays a very limited corpus of images consisting of reeds (Fig. 56), palm branches (Figs. 57-59, 61 & 63), palm trees (Fig. 60) and legends placed within wreaths on almost all coin reverses (Fig. 56-63) (Appendix Table 3).\textsuperscript{761} All his coins have been attributed to the mint of Tiberias. A single coin carrying the date “4” has recently been identified by D. Hendin as a coin issued by Antipas in the 4\textsuperscript{th} year of his reign, possibly minted in Sepphoris (Fig. 55).\textsuperscript{762}

No images or iconographic elements which can be associated with a sacred content can be determined with certainty in his coinage. The image of the reed is most likely to be associated with the foundation of Tiberias and might have been meant as a reference to the vegetation found at the lake where Antipas’ city was situated.\textsuperscript{763} The reference found in Matthew 11:7 and Luke 7:24 to “a reed shaken by the wind” in the wilderness has been discussed as a possible reference to this, translated into an image representing the city.\textsuperscript{764} Judged by the fact that the reed is maintained in coin types issued in the mint of Tiberias by Agrippa II (Fig. 95) and was even sustained as a pictorial element in the much later coins issued by the emperor Trajan here, displayed on reverse types between two cornucopiae (Fig. 187), the connection and association with the city of Tiberias does seem to have been strong. This can also be found in the coinage of many other cities, where specific images had come to represent different cities; such as Heracles-Melqart and the eagle on the coins of Tyre, the Semitic god Doros on the coins of Dor/Dora (Fig. 180-181),\textsuperscript{765} or the dove on the coins of Ascalon, and others.

The palm branch is often associated with the Jewish cult as a \textit{lulav} (a closed palm frond part of the four species),\textsuperscript{766} discussed further in connection with the coin iconography of the two Jewish wars (§5.3.5), but in the case of Antipas’ coinage nothing points in this direction.\textsuperscript{767} The palm branch has furthermore also been connected with the prosper-

\textsuperscript{760} SYON 2004, 112.
\textsuperscript{761} RPC I (1992), nos. 4918-4937; MESHORER 2001, pl. 49 no. 75-94; JENSEN 2006, 234-236.
\textsuperscript{762} HENDIN 2006, 56-61; JENSEN 2007, 295-296.
\textsuperscript{763} MESHORER 2001, 82; JENSEN 2007, 298.
\textsuperscript{764} THEIßEN 1985, 43-55; OSTERMANN 2007, 10, 12; JENSEN 2007, 298.
\textsuperscript{765} MESHORER 1986-1987.
\textsuperscript{766} ROMANOFF 1943b, 436-438.
\textsuperscript{767} Also JENSEN 2007, 300.
ity of Tiberias as an established city.⁷⁶⁸ And finally, the palm branch has been associated with a representation of victory – hence understood as a reference to the goddess Nike;⁷⁶⁹ the games held by Antipas in Tiberias might have had an effect on the decision to use this image, but this is pure speculation. The non-cultic and aniconic character of these games does however equal the religious neutrality found in Antipas’ coinage.⁷⁷⁰ None of these interpretations do however seem completely satisfactory. Despite this evident lack of obvious sacred images in the coin iconography used by Antipas it has been argued that “the coins issued by Herod Antipas gave symbolic expression to his own political ambitions and messianic dreams”,⁷⁷¹ but this is completely unfounded.⁷⁷²

Antipas did stress his own role as tetrarch in the coin legends and after his position had been re-confirmed by Augustus, following the ban of Archelaus in 6 CE and Judaea’s transformation into a Roman province (Josephus BJ 2.167), he possibly also adopted the dynastic name of Herod visible in his coin legends: HPWΔΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΟΥ, but this is not without controversy.⁷⁷³ The coin legends applied by Antipas are primarily used to stress the founding of his new capital Tiberias in the 24th year of his reign (probably founded between 18 and 20 CE),⁷⁷⁴ or refer to the city as such – at the same time honoring the eponymous emperor Tiberius, or testify to Antipas’ unsuccessful attempt of establishing a good relation to the Roman emperor Caligula and gaining the emperors favor (Fig. 60-63), before he was banished by Caligula to Lugdunum in 39 CE (Josephus AJ 18.240-252).⁷⁷⁵

4.4 Herod Philip (4 BCE-34 CE)

After the death of his father Herod Philip – born in the year between his two half brothers and contemporary regents Archelaus and Antipas and the second son of Herod and his seventh wife Cleopatra⁷⁷⁶ – came to be the tetrarch of the most northern part of the Jewish

⁷⁶⁸ MESHORER 2001, 82.
⁷⁶⁹ WIRGIN 1968, 248.
⁷⁷⁰ BERNETT 2007b, 344.
⁷⁷¹ HORSLEY / SILBERMAN 1997, 22; JENSEN 2007, 278.
⁷⁷² JENSEN 2007, 313.
⁷⁷⁶ KOKKINOS 1998, 236, overview pp. 244-245.
territory (Map 1), which he ruled for 37 years. His capital city Paneas, also known as Caesarea Philippi, was situated at the foot of the southwestern spur of Mount Hermon, where the Sanctuary of Pan was located to which the old city name referred (text Fig. XII below).\footnote{The Roman city Caesarea Philippi is first and foremost known by its modern (Arab) name Banias. In ancient sources the name of the old sanctuary and the city and the surrounding area is also known as Panias, Paneas, or Paneas, NEAEHL 1 (1993) 136.}

During his rather uneventful reign Herod Philip ruled over a region which already for a long time had primarily been inhabited by a Pagan population despite previous periods of Jewish rulership. Especially during the 1st century BCE the territory surrounding Paneas was part of the hard-fought border area between the Hasmonaeans in the south and the Ituraeans in the north in the increasing power vacuum left by the failing Seleucid Empire.\footnote{WILSON 2004, 6-7.} According to Josephus the Hasmonaeans had even earlier forced a part of the Ituraean population settled here to convert to Judaism (AJ 13.318-319) and close connections between the royal houses seem to have developed through intermarriage.\footnote{FREYNE 2005, 190.} Not only the presence of an Ituraean sanctuary situated on a rocky spur of the Mount Sena’im approximately 4 kilometres north of Paneas does however indicate that the Ituraean hold on this territory was continuously stronger than that of the Jewish rulers.\footnote{D AR / MINTZKER 1984; DAR 1988, 34-36; DAR / KOKKINOS 1992, 9-23; DAR 1993, 28-92; NEAEHL 4 (1993) 1322-1324; WILSON 2004, 7-8.} Also the general impression of the sculptures and sculptural decoration dating between the 1st century BCE and the late 4th or early 5th century CE found in Paneas testifies to the Pagan character of the city.\footnote{FRIEDLAND 1999, 7-22.}

During his almost four decades as tetrarch Herod Philip only issued a limited number of coin series of which eight carry dates – “Year 5” (1/2 CE) being the earliest – and one is undated.\footnote{RPC I (1992), 680-682.} In the majority of his coinage Philip from the beginning of his tetrarchy followed Greco-Roman coin traditions by displaying the portraits of the Roman emperors Augustus and Tiberius on the obverse and the temple on the reverse, but also Livia respectively Julia Augusta, as well as his own portrait found place on the coins (Fig. 64).\footnote{RPC I (1992), nos. 4938-4953; MESHORER 2001, 85, pl. 50 no. 95-111.} Only in his smaller coins a few variations of this scheme are found. In doing so Herod Philip chose to follow iconographic coin traditions much closer to the
Greco-Roman than to those of his Jewish predecessors, including his father, and to a
great extent his fellow Jewish rulers, who all ruled over areas with much larger Jewish
population groups than it was the case within Philip’s territory.\textsuperscript{784}

The limited number of coin types issued (appendix Table 4), suggests that Herod
Philip, as his brother Antipas, was using his coinage primarily as a political medium to
make specific statements called for at specific times. In his coinage Herod Philip to
some extent probably continued the example set by the Ituraeans, who had ruled over
parts of the same area until 20 BCE, when the territory was finally given to Herod the
Great by Augustus. The Ituraean rulers, Ptolemy (son of Mennaios), his son Lysanias
and grandson Zenodorus issued bronze coins in the years 73 to 25 BCE, dated according
to the Seleucid era, in which they referred to themselves as tetrarchs and high priests
and exhibited purely Hellenistic-Roman iconographic traditions.\textsuperscript{785} In the years 31/30 to
26/25 BCE the last Ituraean ruler Zenodorus issued a coin type, which displayed the
portrait of Octavian/Augustus on the obverse and a portrait of himself on the reverse,\textsuperscript{786}
the same type that Philip chose to apply to his first coins issued (Fig. 64).

\textbf{Fig. XII.} Plan of the Sanctuary of Paneas. A) Herodian Augusteum, B) Court of Pan and
the Nymphs, C) Temple of Zeus, D) Court of Nemesis, E) Tripartite Building, F) Apsidal Hall.
\textit{(Berlin 1999, 29, Fig. 2).}

\textsuperscript{784} Also Strickert 1995, 166-167.

\textsuperscript{785} RPC I (1992), 4768-4776.

\textsuperscript{786} RPC I (1992), 4774-4775; Kindler 1971, 162; Kindler 1993, 283-285; An interesting fact is that
the Ituraean rulers bear the title of \textit{αρχιερεως} (high priest) on their coins, which could attest to them holding
a function within the Ituraean cult, probably also the cultic origin of the sanctuary in Heliopolis,
Herman 2002, 87-91.
4.4.1 The Temple of Roma and Augustus

The most frequently used image on the coinage of Herod Philip was the temple façade, which suggests that it must have held a specific meaning to him explaining why the image was important for his self-representation as a ruler. This is most likely to have been connected with the presence of the imperial cult in Philip’s capital Caesarea Philippi.

The façade of a tetra-style temple placed on a podium with a flight of stairs leading up to it is displayed on most of Philip’s coin types, with the varying portraits of the emperors displayed on the obverse (Fig. 66 & 69).\(^787\) The depictions show few decorative variations, which suggests that the images all referred to the same structure. Only the decoration of the pediment shows some distinctions, especially in the earlier coins of this reverse type, such as a floral decoration, branches, but most often a pellet is placed at the centre. F. Strickert may be correct in his identification of the floral decoration placed in the pediment of the façade of the temple in the earliest series as a lily (Fig. 65), comparable with the decoration found in other contexts, such as an ossuary from Jerusalem (text Fig. XXVI). It is however not likely to be correct that this would support an identification of the temple as the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem and not the Augusteum if Philip was to be approached and criticised for his choice of iconography, as suggested by Strickert.\(^788\) It is more than doubtful if Philip would have “argued” anything concerning his choice of iconography, especially within his own kingdom.

No representation of a cult statue is found between the columns, as it is known from other Palestinian coin images in line with contemporary Roman coinage. On almost all coins the spaces between the columns is occupied by the letters of the date.\(^789\) Only in the single undated type a shield-like object is placed between the central columns of the temple (Fig. 68). This coin type displays the jugate heads of Augustus or Tiberius and Livia on the obverse.\(^790\) An explanation for the shield-like object has been sought in a hypothetical association with the incident of the votive shields accounted for by Philo.\(^791\) Through his attempt to place the votive shields in Herod’s palace Pontius Pilate came close to causing a riot in Jerusalem, before he could be encouraged to remove them by Herod’s
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\(^790\) RPC I (1992), no. 4951; MESHORER 2001, nos. 100-100a.

\(^791\) De Legatione ad Gaium 38, 299-305.
sons and the citizens of Jerusalem and instead to place them in the Augustus temple in Caesarea Maritima. The date of this coin type is not quite certain. It has been argued to belong either in the year 14 CE respectively shortly afterwards based on the use of the inscription Sebaste, which Livia did not receive until after the death of Augustus, or due to the use of the word ΕΠΙ with Philip’s name on the reverse to after 26 CE after which time all his coins carried this addition to the inscription. F. Strickert suggest a placement of this coin type in the year 30/31 CE as part of a series of 4 coin types possibly issued by Philip that year (below).

The façade displayed has unanimously been identified as the Roma and Augustus temple erected by Herod the Great. According to Josephus Herod erected a “white marble” temple in honour of Augustus near the sanctuary of the old sanctuary Paneion in Paneas after he acquired the area in 20 BCE. Despite thorough attempts during the excavations it has not been possible to determine were exactly in Paneas the temple was situated according to the description offered by Josephus. According to the excavator of the Paneion the Augustus temple should be identified with the architectonic remains in excavation area A in front of the Pan grotto, consisting of two north-south parallel proceeding walls and a number of different architectural finds (text Fig. XII). These remains can however also be identified as a monumental entrance or passage to the Pan grotto situated directly behind them. As a further suggestion for the identification E. Netzer has argued that the Augusteum should be identified with the remains of an opus reticulatum structure situated on an elevated terrace west of the Pan grotto. It has in recent years also repeatedly been suggested that the Roman period tetra-style podium temple in nearby Omrit is the temple which in fact should be identi-

---

797 TZAFERIS 1992, 190, 196-198; WILSON 2004, 10-11; also in his other temples (Samaria-Sebaste and Caesarea Maritima) did Herod used other materials than marble, WILSON 2004, 185 n. 75.
798 Josephus AJ 15.363; BJ 1.404.
799 MA'OH 2005, 531-539.
802 NETZER 2003, 25.
fied with the Augusteum described by Josephus. Independent of the actual identification of the Roma and Augustus temple with remains in Paneas or the temple in Omrit, the introduction of the temple façade was one of the remarkable renewals in the corpus of iconography to be found in Jewish coinage and there can be no doubt that this image was meant as a reference to a Pagan cult, as there were no other to be found here. Besides this, the depiction of the Augustus and Roma temple displays a general resemblance with the Roman Republican temples found on coins during the 1st century, such as the first Jupiter Capitolinus temple on coins issued by M. Volteius 78 or 74 BCE (Fig. 203) or the representation of the Templum Divi Iuli, displaying the sidus iulium in the pediment, on coins issued by Octavian c. 36 BCE (Fig. 209).

The establishment of the Roman imperial ruler cult by Herod the Great in (or near) Paneas did not only mean the introduction of a new cult to this area, but ensured a new focus on the city, which was decisive for the further development of the city and the surrounding area, as also the increasing number of settlements here dating to the early Roman Imperial period has shown. From this point on in time Paneas developed from being a rural sanctuary into a proper city, although the exact extent of this city at this time is not known due to the extensive settlement of later periods. The political importance of the new cult supports the idea that Paneas from this time onwards also functioned as an administrative regional centre, which after the death of Herod the Great became the centre of Philip’s realm; re-established as a polis in the year 3 BCE and re-named after the Roman sovereign and Philip himself in Caesarea Philippi (Josephus AJ 18.28; BJ 2.168). Under Philip’s rule Paneas developed into the capital of a small kingdom encompassing the areas of Gaulanitis, Batanaea (Ulatha?), Trachonitis, and northern Auranitis, (Josephus AJ 17.189, 319; BJ 2.95).

The reason for the marked difference in the use of iconography between Philip’s coins and other previous and contemporary Jewish coinages lies in the obvious predominant Pagan nature of the inhabitants of his dominion. Neither the use of the por-

---


804 RRC no. 540/1-2 (Templum Divi Iuli); HILL 1989, 21-24; compare with MESHORER 2001, nos. 96-106.


806 WILSON 2004, 17, 19-20 – the date of Philip’s reestablishment of the city as a polis is based on the dates found on the city coins (pp. 19-20).


trait of the emperor, nor the display of a Pagan temple was here considered foreign or digressive iconographic traditions.\textsuperscript{809} Although Philip’s readiness to display the emperor’s portrait, as well as his own, on his coins already at the beginning of his regency, contrary to all previous Hellenistic Jewish iconographic traditions and the Jewish religious law, not only suggests that an adjustment of the iconography in accordance with the one used in this specific area previously was necessary at the beginning of his reign, but could very well also be an allusion to the – at least officially displayed – secularity of him as a Jew.

In the course of the following three decades Philip did not issue any further coins carrying his own portrait. Instead primarily the façade of the Roma and Augustus temple was displayed on the reverse of his coins and the image of the Roman emperors Augustus or Tiberius (Fig. 69), Livia/Julia Augusta, and exclusively on the undated coin type the jugate heads of the laureate Augustus or Tiberius and Livia on the obverse (Fig. 68).\textsuperscript{810} The latter a type familiar from the royal Hellenistic iconography, such as the sardonyx gem in Vienna – the so-called “Ptolemäerkameo” – displaying the jugate heads of Ptolemy II and his wife Arsinoe II dating to around 278 BCE (text Fig. XIII),\textsuperscript{811} compare also with Fig. 163, a tradition maintained in the Roman period (text Fig. XIV), and well known from locally issued bronze coins issued during the early Roman Imperial period in Asia Minor (e.g. in Ephesus, Smyrna, or Magnesia-ad-Sipylum) by local magistrates displaying the jugate heads of Augustus and Livia,\textsuperscript{812} as well as Nabataean coinage (Fig. 193). Not only is the up-keeping of a distinct Greek Hellenistic iconographic tradition here visible,\textsuperscript{813} but also the connection of it with the Roman tradition of displaying architecture in coinage. The undated coin type discussed above is an excellent example of the different iconographic traditions merging here.

\textsuperscript{809}Meshorer 2001, 85-86.

\textsuperscript{810}The latter type also familiar from cameos displaying the jugate heads of both Augustus and Livia, as well as Tiberius and Livia, e.g. a sardonyx cameo now in Florence (Museo Archaeologico inv. no. 177) displaying Tiberius and Livia, a carneol intaglio also in Florence (Museo Archaeologico, inv. no. 14920) with Augustus and Livia (Winkes 1995, 103-104 no. 28-29), or a cameo in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna displaying the heads of Augustus and Livia (Zwierlein-Diehl II 1979, no. 1034).

\textsuperscript{811}Zwierlein-Diehl 2008, no. 1, 56-73, figs. 1-6.

\textsuperscript{812}Gross 1962, 24-25, 28; RPC I (1992), e.g. nos. 2591, 2593-6, 2599-2603, 2608-2612 (Ephesus), nos. 2464, 2466 (Smyrna), no. 2449 (Magnesia-ad-Sipylum).

\textsuperscript{813}Also visible further to the north, e.g. the coinage of the Thracian king Rhoemetalces, displaying the jugate heads of Augustus and Livia on the obverse and the jugate heads of himself and his wife Pythodoris on the reverse, RPC I (1992), no. 1708-1712.
It was not until 30/31 CE that Philip again had his own portrait depicted (Fig. 71).\textsuperscript{814} It is noteworthy that Philip, contrary to his successor Agrippa I, never portrayed himself wearing a diadem or wreath.\textsuperscript{815} Rather he defined his official position and therewith himself through the Greek legends continually as tetrarch and in 30 CE additionally also as founder (ΚΤΙΣΤΗΣ). The latter has been seen either to refer to Philip’s re-founding of Paneas as a polis,\textsuperscript{816} or as a reference to the founding of the city of Bethsaida as Julias most likely in 30 CE in honour of Livia,\textsuperscript{817} who upon the death of Augustus had been adopted into the gens Iulia and re-named Julia Augusta – respectively Ioulia Sebaste in Greek – according to his testament (Tacitus, Ann. 1.8.1).\textsuperscript{818}

\textsuperscript{814} RPC I (1992), no. 4950; MESHORER 2001, 86-89, pl. 51 no. 108, 111.
\textsuperscript{815} MESHORER 2001, 86.
\textsuperscript{816} WILSON 2004, 19 – the title is used in several instances in Palestinian coinage in cases of rulers acting as founders, or in connection with re-founding or reorganisation of cities dating to the Roman period, e.g. on more occasions in Caesarea Maritima. Imperial Roman founder coins are known from Ptolemais-Akko under Nero, and Jerusalem under the rule of Hadrian.
\textsuperscript{818} HAHN 1994, 35; STRICKERT 2002, 73-74.
4.4.2 Livia, Julia Augusta and Demeter Karpophoros

Herod Philip continuously displayed his connection with and adherence to the Roman emperors, going as far as to present Livia – respectively Julia Augusta – in three coin series, of which one was issued in 26/27 CE (Fig. 67),\(^819\) and one the year after her death in 29 CE (Fig. 70) according to the dates found on these coins, and one in 33/34 CE.\(^820\) On the obverse the draped bust of Livia and the Greek inscription ΙΟΥΛΙΑ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ displayed and on the reverse three ears of grain held together by a hand and the inscription ΚΑΡΠΟΦΟΡΟΣ (fruit-bearing).\(^821\) The reverse image of this coin type should most likely be identified as a reference to a specific personification or goddess of fertility or similar quality, such as Abundantia or Ceres/Demeter. The identification of the figure as Abundantia, first suggested – but later revised – by Strickert,\(^822\) is however the least likely, since the Roman personification of abundance – even if this figure was closely connected with the cult of the emperor – is normally displayed holding a cornucopia from which she is spilling the fruits and often also a patera.\(^823\) Rather an identification of the reverse motif as being associated with Demeter respectively Ceres, who is regularly displayed holding ears of grain and associated with the agrarian epithet karpophoros, is the correct one.\(^824\) The display is therewith stressing the specific connection between Demeter and the Julia Augusta.\(^825\) It is noticeable that the epithet karpophoros was here not applied to a female member of a ruling house for the first time. Already the Ptolemaic queen Arsinoe II is known to have carried this divine cult title, according to a papyrus dating to c. 190 BCE.\(^826\)

Both the obverse and the reverse sides find parallels in the Roman coinage of Asia Minor and especially Egyptian Alexandria, a city which held an exceptional position in the context of the Roman imperial coinage. In the mint of Alexandria a coin ico-
nography with strong dynastic associations applying to Augustus was expressed both earlier and to a much greater extent than in the contemporary coinage of the imperial mint in Rome. The avoidance of the iconography of Livia noticeable in the Augustan coinage in Rome is opposed by the early and continuous presence of Livia in the bronze coinage of Alexandria not documented to this extent elsewhere, although different local coin issues from Asia Minor do carry her portrait.\footnote{GROSS 1962, 22-42.} Also without the inscription of the coins issued by Herod Philip the identification of the characteristic portrait of Livia (text Fig. XV) on the coins of Herod Philip with her signature hairstyle of the *nodus* is made evident by a direct comparison with the Alexandrian coins featuring the portrait of Livia (e.g. Fig. 212). One example is an almost contemporary bronze coin type issued under Tiberius in 17/18 CE (Fig. 213). On the obverse of the Alexandrian coin type a very similar bust of Julia Augusta is displayed and on the reverse a bundle consisting of two grain ears and two poppy heads and the date “Year 4”, although here no hand is holding the bundle.\footnote{RPC I (1992), no. 5079.}

![Fig. XV. Portrait of Livia. Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen (ALEXANDRIDS 2004, 122, cat. no. 17, Pl. 3.1).](image)

A bound bundle of grain ears displayed alone is a common reverse type found in the contemporary and later Roman imperial coinage from Asia Minor and Alexandria (e.g. Fig. 211, 214 & 215). The image is typically displayed with a reference to the ruler in form of names or titles, such as ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ or ΑΥΤΩΚΡΑΤΟΣ and evidently used as a
reference to the surplus respectively wealth of their reign. The handheld bundle of grain (and poppies) is found in much fewer numbers and with a few variations, amongst others in the coinage of Alexandria (Fig. 216). The type as found on the reverse of Herod Philip’s coin series displaying the handheld bundle of three grain ears does however seem to be confined to these coins.

F. Strickert has pinpointed the Salus coin type emitted by Tiberius in 22 CE upon the recovery of Julia Augusta after a severe illness to be the prototype of Philip’s coin type (Fig. 218). As the evidence shows also earlier similar coin types displaying the portrait of Livia exist, testifying to a widespread use of her portrait in coinage in the eastern part of the Roman Empire. Due to the inferior preservation of Philip’s coins it is difficult to say anything specific about details in hairstyle etc. which could clarify a date more precisely according to the development taking place in the portrait of the Augusta.

No distinct sacred elements are visible in the representation of either Julia Augusta or the hand holding the ears of grain on the reverse in Herod Philip’s coins. The combination of the bundle of grain and the epithet karpophoros does however place the coin type in a sacred context connected with the goddess Demeter. The question is however, what can within reason possibly deduced from this coin type. Can it be assumed that Livia, as the Augusta, was here presented in her role of priestess of the Divus Augustus, a position appointed to her upon the death of Augustus in 14 CE (Cassius Dio 56.46.1), or was the coin type meant specifically to honour her person in her association with the Demeter or even in some form her cult, as known from other parts of the Roman empire where Livia has also been found associated with the goddesses Hera and Iuno, or is it even possible to deduce anything further concerning the importance of this specific composition in the context of the religious life of the city of Caesarea Philippi?

---

829 E.g. RPC I (1992), nos. 2209 and 2212 (Pergamum[?] under Augustus), no. 2214 (Augustus/Ephesus), no. 4061 (Claudius/Anazarbus-Caesarea), nos. 5026 and 5028 (Augustus/Alexandria), no. 5123 and 5127 (Claudius/Alexandria), etc.; RPC II (1999), no. 874 (Domitian/Asia); RIC II, nos. 120, 221, 464b, 518.
830 E.g. RPC I (1992), no. 2448 (Magnesia-ad-Sipylum, late first century BCE, issued by the magistrate Theodorus after 30 BCE); or the type of the clasped hands holding two grain ears or grain ears and poppies and a caduceus introduced by the Flavian emperors, e.g. RIC II, nos. 55, 155, 244, 444, 528, etc.
831 RPC I (1992), nos. 5177, 5184 (emitted under the rule of Claudius).
No specific type of statue or portrait of Livia was apparently created in her honour and associated with the new status and title given to her upon Augustus death in 14 CE,\textsuperscript{836} rather sacerdotal attributes were added to her existing iconography.\textsuperscript{837} But the portrait of Livia alone displayed in the two coin series shows no iconographic elements which can immediately be associated with her role as priestess for the Divus Augustus or any other specific context. The image of the three grain ears held by a hand on the reverse of the coin type and the inscription, which should be associated with Demeter according to numerous representations of her holding a bundle of grain or connected with the title \textit{fruit-bearing},\textsuperscript{838} points towards a representation of Julia Augusta according to her association with the fertility goddess especially found in the eastern part of the Roman Empire,\textsuperscript{839} but also increasingly present in imperial Rome.\textsuperscript{840} A similar posthumous commemoration is visible in the coinage of Pontius Pilate, who in the year 29/30 CE apparently upon the death of the Augusta issued a coin type with a bundle of grain and the inscription IOYAIA KAIACAPOC on the reverse, and on the obverse a simpulum and the inscription TIBEPIOY KAIACAPOC (Fig. 201).\textsuperscript{841} These representations did not oppose Tiberius’ decision not to deify his mother upon her death in 29 CE, nor his rejection of any form of official worship of both himself and his mother previously.\textsuperscript{842} Rather these displays were used to honour the Roman ruler.

When verifiable the worship of Julia Augusta seems generally to have taken on indirect forms, to some extent comparable with the concept of the Roma and Augustus cult, always implying cult-sharing. A divine veneration of the living individual alone did not take place. One example of this can be found in the city of Ephesus, where different members of the Roman imperial family, amongst them Livia as Julia Augusta, received cultic honours by high standing members of the Ephesian society as an integrated part of the local Demeter cult during the time of Tiberius. In one inscription one

\textsuperscript{836} GROSS 1962, 42.
\textsuperscript{837} BARTMAN 1999, 103.
\textsuperscript{838} In the much earlier coinage of Leontini (Sicily), the obverse type displays the head of Demeter and the reverse a bundle of grain ears, e.g. SNG ANS 4 (Sicily II: Galaria-Styella), no. 274; Also later within the Decapolis a similar representation is noticeable in the coinage of Titus issued in Philadelphia, SPIJKERMAN 1978, 244, pl. 54 no. 1-1d.
\textsuperscript{839} Also AMANDRY 1988, 58; repeated by HAHN 1994, 47 – the city of Caesarea Philippi has by her however been confused with Caesarea Maritima; BERNETT 2007a, 203-204.
\textsuperscript{840} STRICKERT 2002, 78-85.
\textsuperscript{841} RPC I (1992), no. 4967; BERNETT 2007a, 202-203.
\textsuperscript{842} GROSS 1962, 12; HAHN 1994, 35-37.
of the Demetriasts, a woman named Servilia Secunda, is mentioned as priestess of *Sebaste Demeter Karpophoros*, a clear reference not only to Julia Augusta, who as already noted was named *Ioulia Sebaste* in Greek, but specifically the cultic connection between the Augusta and Demeter Karpophoros. The correlation not only between the Augusta respectively Ioulia Sebaste and the goddess as Demeter/Ceres is evidenced by a number of inscriptions found dedicated to her person, but is also later repeated in a number of inscriptions dedicated to succeeding female members of the Roman imperial house. The same phenomenon seems here to make itself visible in the coinage of Herod Philip both before and after the death of Julia Augusta.

The commemoration of Livia in the contemporary coinage of Pontius Pilate upon her death only enhances her importance. F. Strickert, however, goes too far in describing the drooping outer ears of the bundle on the reverse of Pilate’s coin type as an iconographic element visualising the mourning at the death of the Augusta. This interpretation is primarily based on the *maybe* receding lower stalk of grain on a sardonyx gem in Vienna displaying the seated, diadem and veiled Livia as priestess holding a bust of Augustus in her right hand and bundle with three grain ears, a leaf and two poppy heads in her left hand in a display of mourning the death of the emperor, hence dating sometime in the years between 14 and 29 CE (text Fig. XVI below). First of all, the lower grain ear is not purposefully receding, but answers to the nature of gravity by bending slightly down. Secondly, based on this to read an imperial trinity (Augustus-Tiberius-Livia) into the grain ears – thereby ignoring the presence of the poppies and the leaf – on Pilate’s coin type, the drooping ears representing the deceased Augustus and Livia, is unprecedented and in need of further substantiation. Several features in the display of Livia in this cameo can be attributed to different goddesses, which were connected with her identity as priestess of the Divus Augustus: the naked left shoulder associated her with Venus, the *tymanon* and headdress with Cybele, the bundle of

---

843 Reflecting the importance of a relationship between the dominating elite of the city partaking in the enactment of this cult as an expression of superiority towards other parts of the municipal society, BERNETT 2007b, 338.
844 SEG IV 515; BARTMAN 1999, 206 cat. no. 45; HARLAND 2003, 90-91; also noted by STRICKERT 2002, 76.
845 STRICKERT 2002, 77, listed according to SPAETH 1996; ALEXANDRIDIS 2004, 290, Tab. 3.
847 ZWIERLEIN-DIEHL 2008, no. 8, 126-133, figs. 76-81.
848 STRICKERT 2002, 84-86.
849 Compare e.g. with ZWIERLEIN-DIEHL 2008, no. 22, 200-203, figs. 154-155; ALEXANDRIDIS 2008, 89-90, no. 55.2.
grain ears and poppies are here used to illustrate the plenty respectively the *fecunditas* (fertility) connected with Demeter/Ceres as a goddess of fertility. Furthermore, since Philip already in 26/27 CE had issued a coin series displaying Julia Augusta (*karpo-phoros*), the rivalry argued by Strickert to have existed between Pontius Pilate and Philip supposedly expressed in the coin series presented by both upon the death of the Augusta can also not be substantiated through the iconography at hand. Another interesting fact concerning the further use of this coin type is that almost the exact same type was later imitated in the coinage of Philip’s successor Agrippa I (§4.5.1), and in a varied form to be found in the coinage of Agrippa II (§4.6.1.2).

It is in the case of this coin type safe to assume that Livia was presented in her association with the goddess Demeter, i.e. also relating to her role as priestess of the Divus Augustus, a

---

850 LIMC VIII 1, 583-585 s.v. *Fecunditas* (T. GANSCHOW); SCHMIDT-DICK 2002, 44; ZWIERLEIN-DIEHL 2008, 133.
851 According to the date on the specimen recorded by HENDIN 2010a, 260, no. 1227.
852 STRICKERT 1995, 168 – he also argues for a correlation of Philip’s dated coins with the dates of the procurators, seemingly issuing most of his earlier coin series as statements stressing his official authority upon the arrival of new procurators (p. 169-170); agreed upon by JENSEN 2006, 199.
tradition widely spread both in the western and eastern provinces of the Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{853} This tradition also came to play an important role in the Roman imperial iconography, amongst others visible in the statue of Ceres Borghese in the Louvre (text Fig. XVII),\textsuperscript{854} though the severe restorations carried out on this sculpture may have changed its original appearance,\textsuperscript{855} and a number of other statues displaying similar features.\textsuperscript{856} Although Livia was being honoured, any specific correlation with the time of the death of Livia is however undermined by the identification of an earlier issue of this coin type dating to 26/27 CE.

![The Statue of Ceres Borghese. Louvre, Paris](ALEXANDRIDIS 2004, 126, cat. no. 28, Pl. 9.1)

The question is, if this in any way was directly related to the imperial cult. F. Strickert suggests that an offspring of the imperial cult may be found in the city of Beth-

\textsuperscript{853} ALEXANDRIDIS 2004, 83.
\textsuperscript{854} BARTMAN 1999, 45, fig. 45 (cat. no. 3); STRICKERT 2002, 82-83; ALEXANDRIDIS 2004, 126, cat. no. 28, Pl. 9.1.
\textsuperscript{855} GIROIRE / ROGER 2007, 69-70, cat. no. 15.
\textsuperscript{856} ALEXANDRIDIS lists other known statuary images of Livia portrayed as or similar to Demeter/Ceres (e.g. ALEXANDRIDIS 2004, cat. nos. 10-19).
saida/Julias. Here a building has been unearthed, which by the excavators has been identified as a Roman temple dating to the first century CE and which should be identified as a temple dedicated to the empress Livia, possible dedicated at the time of the city’s dedication to Livia. However, both the identification as an imperial cult edifice and the proposed date has been seriously questioned, not allowing a solid foundation for any further discussion in this direction at this point in time. It may, nonetheless, hypothetically be argued that the coin type used by Philip should be associated with the Roman imperial ruler cult existing in Paneas at the time.

4.4.3 Concluding Remarks

All iconographic elements found in the coinage of Herod Philip have in common that absolutely no traces of his Jewish descent or any integration in a Jewish realm can be detected. The relative limited frequency of his emittance of coinage and reduced number of coin types suggests that Herod Philip mainly used his coinage to sustain his own political propaganda. The iconography finds immediate parallels in the contemporary Roman coin iconography, foremost in the coinage issued in the eastern parts of the Roman Empire, i.e. Alexandria and to some extent the cities of Asia Minor. This has been seen to explain why none of his coins have been found in or near Jerusalem or even in Judaea, but the coins of the tetrarchs seem generally to have maintained limited areas of circulation only in a restricted degree moving beyond the borders of their individual dominions, in the case of Philip only four coins have been recorded outside his area. The iconography may have played a role in the distribution of the coins, but it seems more likely to have been depending on the control of the use of currencies during this time.

---

858 Most recently C. SAVAGE (2011, 145-156), who argues for a Seleucid date of the structure, which may well originally have been conceived as a cultic building.
859 As also mentioned by F. STRICKERT (1995, 167).
860 MESHORER 2001, 90.
861 SYON 2004, 135, 246.
4.5 Agrippa I (37-44 CE)

After the death of Herod Philip in 34 CE his dominion was placed in the hands of Agrippa I, the grandson of Herod the Great and son of Aristoboulos I who had been executed in 8 BCE (Josephus BJ 1.551). Agrippa only reigned for a few years before he suddenly died in Caesarea Maritima in 44 CE. As the first Herodian ruler after Herod the Great he was rewarded with the title of king by his friend Caligula (37-41 CE) as he came into power in 37 CE after the death of Tiberius. During Agrippa’s reign the area ruled by him was continuously expanded (Map 1). As the immediate successor to Herod Philip he was appointed king of Philip’s old territory consisting of the capital city Caesarea Philippi, and the territories of Golan, Trachonitis, Hauran, and Batanea. When Herod Antipas was sent into exile in 39 CE Agrippa I also received his territory, and with the death of Caligula in 41 CE Agrippa I was by Claudius additionally rewarded with the areas of Judaea, Idumaea and Samaria, as part of the process of reappointing the loyal client kings previously appointed by Caligula, but probably also due to his support of the new emperors rise to power after the death of Caligula. In all, the dominion under the rule of Agrippa I came to encompass an area even larger than the old kingdom of Herod the Great.

Agrippa I issued bronze coins in the cities of Caesarea Philippi, Caesarea Maritima, Jerusalem and possibly in Tiberias (overview appendix Table 5), in the case of the latter the attributions to this mint are tentative. Of all coin types issued only the coins issued in Jerusalem are aniconic. A canopy and the inscription ΒΑCΙΑΕWС ΑΓΡΙΠΑ is displayed on the obverse of these coins and on the reverse three ears of grain and the date Λ ζ (“Year 6” – 41/42 CE) (Fig. 80), whereas the remainder of his coin series carry the images of the Roman ruler, Agrippa himself and members of both the imperial and his own family, testifying not only to his own secularity as a Jew, but also explicitly demonstrate his political position in regard to Rome, amongst others by making use of the sacred pictorial language found in the Roman imperial coin iconography.

---

863 The main publication on the life of Herod Agrippa I is by D.R. SCHWARTZ (1990).
867 MESHORER 2001, 231, pl. 52 nos. 120-120m.
868 BERNETT 2007b, 347.
According to his active support of Pagan institutions outside of the Jewish territory recorded by Josephus (AJ 19.335-337), his apparent piety towards Judaism – praised in the ancient literary sources (e.g. Josephus AJ 19.331) – was evidently restricted to Judaea and seems purely to be an expression of his internal political strategy. In his coinage the aniconic coin series from Jerusalem are the only admission to this to be found. These coins may have been conceived in a form as to pay respect to the Jewish religious sensitivity by not displaying any offending images, but Agrippa nonetheless managed to present himself as the true ruler through the obverse image of the canopy in connection with the inscription ΑΓΡΙΠΑ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ.\(^{869}\)

The tradition of displaying a canopy in royal iconography is found in the iconography of the Assyrian kings since the 9th century BCE, still remnant amongst others also in the coinage of the Kushan Empire as late as the late 1st-early 2nd century CE.\(^{870}\) These kings were regularly displayed accompanied by an attendant carrying an umbrella-like sometimes fringed canopy above their heads, thereby accentuating the ruler in relation to the surrounding or surrounding figures.\(^{871}\) It is possible that in the coins issued by Agrippa in the Jewish core area of Judaea the old royal motif was reduced to the display of the canopy alone, which in this context probably served as the lone representation of the ruler or of his ruling power.\(^{872}\) The unusual motif does not seem to find any immediate parallels anywhere else.

The reverse image of the coins carry three ears of grain are here neither held by a hand nor bound together, but seemingly spring from two stylized leaves, thereby distinguishing themselves markedly from all other displays of grain ears in the coinage of the Herodian rulers. The display of the grain ears has been identified more specifically as barley and as such as “one of the seven kinds of produce with which our country is blessed” (according to Deut 8:8).\(^{873}\) In all there can be little doubt that the image of the grain ears principally referred to agricultural fertility and abundance based on a Biblical tradition or not.\(^{874}\)

---


\(^{870}\) WEBER 1990, 88-93; on contemporary coins, e.g. BOPEARACHCHI 1991, Série VII, 10-11: rare example of dinar of Vima Kadphises (Kushan, c. 100-127/8 CE), on the obverse the diademed and crowned figure of Vima Kadphises, standing in a chariot under a canopy holding a mace-sceptre, with driver, drawn by two horses. On the reverse Siva standing facing, head left, holding a composite trident/axe.

\(^{871}\) WEBER 1990, 85-86.

\(^{872}\) WEBER 1990, 96-98; MESHORER 2001, 96.

\(^{873}\) MEYSHAN 1968c, 121.

\(^{874}\) As MESHORER 2001, 96-97; JENSEN 2007, 293-294.
The sensitivity apparently present in the coins issued by Agrippa in Jerusalem towards the Jewish religious traditions is contrasted by the coin issues closely imitating Roman imperial coin types. Among the earliest coins issued by him in Paneas dating to the second year (38 CE) of his reign one type display the laureate head of Caligula on the obverse and the emperors three sisters Julia, Drusilla and Agrippina mentioned by name in the guise of different goddesses on the reverse (Fig. 72). This coin type evidently imitates or even copies a coin type emitted almost contemporarily in Rome in the year 37/38 CE (Fig. 219). The presentation of the three sisters of Caligula in the guise of different female goddesses used to express their virtues, an approach well known especially from many female portraits of the Roman Imperial period, clearly marks the uninhibited use of imagery originating in a Pagan sacred context and expresses Agrippa’s loyalty to the Roman sovereign in his own language, but reveals nothing about Agrippa’s personal adherence to the sacral context constituting the origin of the display.

4.5.1 Sacred Images

Only few of Agrippa’s coin types contain images which can be determined to be of a sacred nature or can be placed in a sacred context. Among these are the façade of two temples or temple-like structures displayed on the reverse of coins from Paneas/Caesarea Philippi and Caesarea Maritima.

The first temple depiction discussed here is displayed on coins from Paneas, with the date L B “Year 2” (38 CE) inserted between the columns (Fig. 74). The similarity to the temple façade on the coins of his predecessor Herod Philip displaying the Roma and Augustus temple is noticeable and there can be only little doubt that the image should be identified as a representation of the same temple. On the obverse a wreath with the inscription ΓΑ ΒΑΣ is displayed, to be read Agrippa Basileus since the letters ΓΑ are probably written retrograde. The intention with the temple image was undoubtedly to stress the continued importance of the imperial ruler cult and with it Agrippa’s adherence to the emperor at an early point in time of his reign, simultaneously displaying his own authority as king.

875 RPC I (1992), no. 4973; MESHORER 2001, no. 112.
876 RIC I, no. 33.
878 RPC I (1992), no. 4980; MESHORER 2001, 92-93, pl. 52 no. 115
A similar use of an already existing image also dating to the very early part of Agrippa’s reign is found in the coin type featuring Agrippa’s wife Kypros from the mint of Paneas discussed above.\textsuperscript{879} On the obverse the bust of a woman is shown, with the inscription KYΠΙΡΟC to the right and the date “Year 2”, and on the reverse a hand holding two grain ears and a vine leaf and the Greek inscription ΓΑΙΩ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ (\textit{to Gaius Caesar}) (Fig. 75). This type clearly imitates the coin type featuring Livia respectively Julia Augusta issued by Herod Philip in the same mint, displaying the draped bust of Julia Augusta on the obverse and three grain ears held together by a hand on the reverse (§4.4.2) (Fig. 67 & 70).\textsuperscript{880} Agrippa’s wife Kypros, who was also of a Herodian lineage and had possibly likewise spent a part of her youth in Rome,\textsuperscript{881} was here consciously presented in a way comparable to Julia Augusta during the reign of Herod Philip. The biggest difference between the two issues being that the inscription \textit{karpophoros} on the reverse was now replaced by the inscription \textit{to Gaius Caesar}. As in the case of the first coin type issued with the portrait of Julia Augusta, neither the image of Kypros on the obverse, nor the ears of grain and the vine leaf held by a hand displayed on the reverse of these coins show any obvious distinction as sacred elements, but a closer look at the history of use of similar images disclose a specific sacred connection.

In Roman imperial iconography the display of the bundle of grain ears underwent a gradual development in the course of the first century CE. It was primarily an attribute of Demeter/Ceres, but could also be associated with other goddesses or used as a stand-alone display of \textit{fecunditas}.\textsuperscript{882} During the early Roman Imperial period it was solely displayed as an attribute of female members of the imperial house, whereas it later during the Flavian period became a universal sign of virtue applicable to images of common Roman matrons.\textsuperscript{883} The intention with the composition found in the Agrippa’s coinage was probably to make the statement of prosperity, i.e. the \textit{fecunditas}, on the part of Kypros similar to the presentation of the imperial women in the Roman ruler cult through an association with Demeter/Ceres common in Roman imperial iconography at this time.

\textsuperscript{879} RPC I (1992), no. 4975; RPC Suppl. 2 (2006), no. S-4975; HENDIN 2010, no. 1238.  
\textsuperscript{880} MESHORER 2001, 92.  
\textsuperscript{881} KOKKINOS 1998, 276, 286.  
\textsuperscript{882} On the display of the deity Fecunditas in Roman coinage, where she is not portrayed carry grain ears, see SCHMIDT-DICK 2002, 44-46.  
\textsuperscript{883} ALEXANDRIDIS 2004, 56-57.
As in the case of the earlier presentation of the Julia Augusta and her association with Demeter, the display of Kypros on this coin type may have been issued as a comparable similar tribute to the Jewish queen personally and her position. The conscious repetition of the very similar obverse-reverse display suggests this to have been the case. The handheld bundle on the reverse implies a continued association between the wife of the ruler and the riches of the gifts associated with Demeter – if not with Demeter herself, now connected with the portrait of the Jewish queen, suggesting her to be the acting part. The changed inscription does however now imply a direct association with the Roman emperor and not Demeter as previously, the primary intention with the coin type being an honoration of the Roman emperor.

A similar phenomenon may be observed in the posthumous display of Antonia Minor as Demeter/Ceres wearing a wreath of grain ears and poppies on an imperial sardonyx cameo dating to the time of the rule of her son Claudius (text Fig. XVIII). Antonia (text Fig. XIX) had by Caligula at the time of his accession to power in 37 CE been made the new priestess of the cult of the Divus Augustus and the display found on the cameo may be a reference to this role.884

---

Ambivalence in the use of the grain wreath either as an insignia of Demeter/Ceres or it being a sign of the virtue constantia (steadfastness)\textsuperscript{885} is to some extent indisputable,\textsuperscript{886} and the use of this feature in connection with both can be found in Roman coinage, at least from the time of Claudius. The displays of Livia and later female members of the Iulio-Claudian imperial house enhance the connection of the women with Ceres,\textsuperscript{887} whereas the representation of Constantia is a slightly later development dating to the time of Claudius.\textsuperscript{888}

Another coin type attributed either to the mint of Tiberias or Paneas displaying the standing Kypros holding a long lance and a wreath does in fact substantiate this (Fig. 78).\textsuperscript{889} Kypros is here displayed very similarly to the so-called CONSTANTIA-series emitted by the emperor Claudius, in which the he presents his mother Antonia Minor as the CONSTANTIAE AUGUSTI (Fig. 223),\textsuperscript{890} which has been interpreted as Antonia Minor in her role as priestess of the Divus Augustus.\textsuperscript{891} Amongst others A. Alexandridis here sees a stronger connection with the virtue of Constantia than a connection with the goddess Ceres attributable to the emperors mother.\textsuperscript{892} In the case of the display of Kypros, Agrippa in his coinage evidently imitated contemporary representational forms at home in Rome, relegating to depictions of respectively roles adopted by Antonia Minor, maybe both as priestess of the emperor, in this case according to the inscription the living emperor (Caligula), and only little later as Constantia, according to the tradition introduced by Claudius.

It can only be theorised that with the representation of the coin type of Kypros and the bundle of grain ears from “Year 2” reflections of a local development within the imperial ruler cult in Paneas surface, within which the wife of the ruler played the leading part in the honouring of the Roman emperor. Even if no detailed information on the ruler cult in Paneas of this time has been preserved, the references to the cult found in the coinage of Agrippa I at the beginning of his reign may suggest that the imperial ruler cult was rededicated to Caligula at this time. Another suggestion offered by M. Bernett is

\textsuperscript{885} LIMC III 1 (1986), 300-301 s.v. Constantia (T. Hölscher).
\textsuperscript{886} ALEXANDRIDIS 2004, 48.
\textsuperscript{887} ALEXANDRIDIS 2004, 48-49.
\textsuperscript{888} SCHMIDT-DICK 2002, 39.
\textsuperscript{889} RPC I (1992), no. 4978; HENDIN 2010, 270, no. 1242.
\textsuperscript{890} LIMC III 1 (1986), 301, s.v. Constantia (T. Hölscher).
\textsuperscript{891} SCHMIDT-DICK 2002, 39 (Constantia ΠΒ,Ο/1).
\textsuperscript{892} ALEXANDRIDIS 2004, 48.
that the motif was meant as a reference to a cult for the imperial women at Paneas, which would then equally pertain to the use of the similar iconography found in the coinage of Herod Philip and Agrippa II. 893 This suggestion does however need more evidence to be convincing. It is more likely that the repeated issue of similar coin series under the successive rulers displaying the temple suggests that the imperial ruler cult in Paneas received additional emphasis early on in Agrippa’s reign – possibly in connection with a rededication of the cult, or that at least the honoration of the emperor was given more emphasis at this time.

The second coin type carrying the image of a temple is found on coins attributed to the mint of Caesarea Maritima. This coin type displays a distyle structure, within which two figures are standing facing each other, the right figure veiled, holding round objects (patera?) in their outstretched hands above an altar (Fig. 81). The upper body of a third standing probably veiled figure holding a so far unidentified object is visible in the background to the right behind their outstretched arms, and a fourth figure is kneeling on the ground to the left at the feet of the right standing figure. The date L Z (“Year 7”) is placed in the pediment of the temple. The laureate bust of the emperor Claudius is displayed on the obverse. 894

There can be no doubt that an allegorical scene was displayed here and that the composition held a very specific meaning. It has however proven very difficult to name this and many different interpretations of this motif have been offered. 895 According to the dates found on this coin type the coins were issued in the 7th year (42/43 CE) and 8th year (43/44 CE) of Agrippa’s reign, which would suggest a connection with an event taking place shortly before this time, but according to the use of the laureate bust of Claudius on the obverse not before the beginning of the reign of the emperor in 41 CE. The legends on the coins of both years are the same, on the obverse ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΓΕΡ, and on the reverse ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΕΓΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑΣ ΦΙΛΟ(ΚΑΙΣΑΡ). 896 The suggestion put forward by A. Burnett that the scene is depicting the consecration of the alliance between Claudius and Agrippa I in 41 CE in the Jupiter Capitolinus temple in Rome seems so far to be the most convincing. 897 Although

893 BERNETT 2007b, 353.
894 RPC I (1992), no. 4983; MESHORER 2001, pl. 53 no. 121-121b, 125-125a.
896 BURNETT 1987, 35-36.
897 BURNETT 1987, 36.
according to Josephus the alliance was confirmed ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγορᾶς μέσης ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων πόλει (AJ 19.275). 898

Similar scenes taking place in front of the Jupiter Capitolinus temple are displayed on a number of coin series issued by later Roman emperors. Especially one type issued in several series by the emperor Domitian on the occasion of the secular games taking place in 88 CE shows close similarities to the coin reverse applied by Agrippa I (Fig. 230). On the reverse of Domitian’s *Ludi Saeculares* coins – the second held since Augustus arranged the first secular games in 17 BCE 899 – variations of a sacrificial scene are displayed taking place in front of a hexastyle temple, probably the Jupiter Capitolinus temple. 900 Common for all the issues are the larger figure of the emperor shown standing to the right of an altar in the middle of the act of sacrificing and the two smaller figures, a harpist and a flute player, standing to the left of the altar, which corresponds with the coin type issued by Agrippa I, only in his coins two figures – probably Agrippa I to the left and the emperor to the right – are shown in the act of sacrificing on the altar. The third possibly veiled figure standing in the background should, similarly to the figure of the flute player found in Domitian’s *Ludi Saeculares* coins, most likely be identified as a flute player. In some variations of Domitian’s coins a *victimarius* is displayed slaying an sacrificial animal held by a fifth figure kneeling in the front, 901 in other the river Tiber is reclining on the ground on the left side. 902 The kneeling figure in Agrippa’s coins should probably accordingly be identified as a victimarius and therewith an explanation for the fourth figure in Agrippa’s coin type is found. If Burnett’s identification of the scene is correct, evidently the scene is placed in the religious context of the act of consecration, but this does not make the iconography displayed here sacred. First and foremost the loyalty and the strong relationship with the Roman emperor are here being expressed. 903 It is nonetheless tempting also to see a similarity in regard to content and not only in appearance between the coins issued by Agrippa and Domitian, although several problems arise through such a comparison. First of all, the long period of time between these issues covering almost four

898 SCHWARTZ 1990, 149.
899 E.g. RIC I, nos. 340, 343, 355.
901 RIC II, no. 381.
902 RIC II, no. 383.
903 DAHMEN 2010, 108.
decades must be explained, secondly and most importantly, is it likely that Agrippa issued his coins on a similar occasion? The last suggestion will here be treated first.

As part of his loyalty towards the imperial house Agrippa verifiably continued the imperial games held in Caesarea Maritima since the days of Herod the Great, during which he also died very suddenly in 44 CE; his death said to be the punishment for him staging himself as god-like on this occasion. Since Agrippa issued his coin type displaying the sacrificial scene in the temple in the years 43 and 44 CE in Caesarea Maritima these are neither chronologically nor geographically far from the time and place of Agrippa’s games, therewith the possibility that Agrippa did in fact issue these coins to announce his forthcoming games does seem arguable. Since he died during the games, these coins could not have been issued afterwards as a commemoration of these. The long time-span between the coin issues of Agrippa and Domitian does nonetheless require a convincing explanation, especially if in regard to content a similar scene was in fact displayed.

Sacrificial scenes taking place in front of a temple including a number of persons can be found on several occasions. The emperor Caligula issued a coin type in the years 37, 39 and 40 CE with the goddess Pietas sitting holding a patera on the obverse and on the reverse a sacrificial scene taking place in front of a garlanded hexastyle temple (Fig. 222). In this scene the emperor is only accompanied by two attendants, one leading a bull to the altar on the left side and on the other side one standing next to the emperor holding a patera. No further figures are here attending. This display was however according to the coin inscription a commemoration of the dedication of the temple of the Divus Augustus. Similar sacrificial scenes do however not appear to have been issued in the coinages of Claudius, Nero, Vespasian, nor Titus. Not until the reign of Domitian does the type discussed above appear. In the Roman imperial coinages preceding the time of Agrippa I similar motifs apparently does not exist. If Agrippa was in fact announcing his own games with these sacrificial scenes there seem to be no immediate comparisons at hand from which he could have drawn his inspiration, other than the coinage of Caligula. In his coins there can however be no doubt that the dedication of

---

904 Josephus AJ 19.343.
907 RIC I, nos. 36, 44; HILL 1989, 20.
the temple of Divus Augustus was intended. Since the dates on the coins of Agrippa place them after the death of Caligula and since two persons are depicted in the middle of the act of sacrificing the suggestion made by A. Burnett that the scene is commemorating the consecration of the alliance between Claudius and Agrippa I in 41 CE in the Jupiter Capitolinus temple in Rome still seems to be the most valid, even if not without question.

The close relationship between the Roman emperor and the Jewish king also found other ways of expression. On coins also attributed to Agrippa’s mint in Caesarea Maritima two figures are on the obverse shown in the act of crowning a third central veiled figure clad in a toga, the inscription reading ΒΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑΣ ΣΕΒ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΒΑΣ ΗΡΩΔΗΣ and below it the date L H “Year 8” (43/44 CE) (Fig. 84).909 The display of two clasped hands on the reverse of the coin type presents a common motif in the Roman republican (Fig. 206-207) and imperial coinage used as a reference to the concordia (discussed §3.3.3),910 here placed in a wreath accompanied by the Greek inscription celebrating the friendship and alliance between them on the reverse underlines the intended harmony and unity of the display in the obverse of this coin type.911 The figures have, according to the coin inscription, by A. Burnett been identified as Agrippa I and his brother Herod of Chalcis in the act of crowning the emperor Claudius with a wreath.912

Traditionally in Roman imperial coin iconography it is the emperor who crowns a subject king or he himself is being crowned by a goddess such as Victory. Apparently only few exceptions imitating the traditional imperial displays can be found, which makes the suggested interpretation of Agrippa’s coin motif unique. Among the exceptions is a bronze coin type from Pergamon issued during the reign of Augustus (Fig. 217a). On the obverse of this coin type a tetrastyle temple with a standing facing figure, identified as Augustus, holding a sceptre is displayed and on the reverse a standing toga figure holding a phiale is being crowned by a standing figure in a military outfit, the Demos of Pergamon. The amicus principis M. Plautius Silvanus was proconsul of Asia in 4/5 CE and the reverse of the coin type has tentatively been identified as the Demos of Pergamon honouring the proconsul through crowning by the magistrate De-

909 RPC I (1992), no. 4982.
910 RRC p. 743, no. 529/2c, 529/3.
912 Treated in detail by A. BURNETT (1987, 31-35 pl. 4 no. 8 (B a-C)), with further comments by KUSHNIR-STEIN 2007a, 57-58; MESHORER 2001, 101, 232, pl. 53 no. 124.
mophon.\textsuperscript{913} Despite some insecurity in the identification of the Pergamene coin type it may be that a similar phenomenon is encountered here, namely the subject – here represented in singular – honouring the sovereign and not vice versa, similarly to the honouring of the emperor by Agrippa I and his brother Herod of Chalcis. Since the obverse of Agrippa’s coin type finds a close parallel in a bronze coin type issued by his brother Herod of Chalcis (41-48 CE) during the third year of his reign (Fig. 85),\textsuperscript{914} the political statement made by these coin issues went beyond a local audience towards making a collective statement of loyalty by the two kings together towards the emperor,\textsuperscript{915} thereby simultaneously positioning themselves towards their own subjects.

\textbf{4.5.2 Iconographic Traditions}

Both the Hellenistic Greek and the Roman imperial coin traditions found place in the coinage of Agrippa I. Here, the accumulation of traditions respectively traditions in development found will be illustrated with the help of three examples.

Apparently only few iconographic elements known from Hellenistic Greek coinage found a place in Agrippa’s coinage. At least a reminiscence of older Hellenistic traditions can be credited to a coin type featuring an anchor and the date “Year 7” (42/43 CE) on its reverse and on the obverse the portrait of the young Agrippa II, the son and successor of Agrippa I, with the inscription ΑΓΡΙΠΠΟΥ ΥΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ (Fig. 82).\textsuperscript{916} The image of the anchor on this coin type seems to have upheld its original meaning as a mark of the sovereign originating in the coinage of the Seleucid rulers (discussed in §2.5.1), which was also imitated in the Roman imperial coinage minted and issued in Palestine during this time, as shown by coins of a secure provenance issued by Claudius in Caesarea Maritima displaying an anchor on the reverse.\textsuperscript{917} In his coins Agrippa I officially presented his successor in form of a portrait of the still very young Agrippa II, who would have been 15/16 years old at the time, and legitimated his future inheritance of the throne through the use of the anchor appearing as a sign of succession. The previous year Agrippa I had already presented his young son in a coin se-
ries carrying the more neutral display of the double crossed cornucopiae on the reverse (Fig. 79).

Another coin type features the laureate portrait of Caligula on the obverse, the inscription reading: ΓΑΙΩ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ ΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΩ, and on the reverse a figure holding a sceptre standing in a quadriga decorated with the figure of Nike, the inscription reading: ΝΟΜΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ, and the date LE (“year 5”), i.e. from the year 40/41 CE (Fig. 76). The latter figure has regularly been identified as *Nero Claudius Germanicus*, the father of Caligula, standing in the quadriga in imitation of parallels found in a type issued by Caligula in Roma at this time, carrying the inscription GERMANICVS CAESAR (Fig. 221). In this case Agrippa I is not generally imitating Roman iconographic traditions, but intentionally copying and displaying specific images. Despite the close parallel to the coin type as found issued by Caligula at this time, it is possible to argue for a different identification of the reverse type as found issued by Agrippa I.

The reverse inscription ΝΟΜΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ has undoubtedly moved its original focus from Germanicus to Agrippa, seemingly independent of the motif displayed, which does seem to imply that Agrippa I was meant as the part acting here. The question is, if the person in the quadriga should still be identified as Germanicus. Meshorer speaks decidedly against an identification of the figure as Agrippa himself on the grounds that this would not have been the intention of Agrippa, the figure is not diademed as other depictions of Agrippa, and the eagle tipped sceptre held by the figure is Roman. Apart from the coin images already discussed of which a number can directly be related with the Roman coin iconography, an interesting archaeological parallel found in the periphery of Agrippa’s kingdom shows that Agrippa most likely did not place himself far from the representational ways of the Roman emperor also outside of his coinage.

---

920 MESHORER 2001, 94.
Fig. XX. Sketch of the reconstructed Sahr al-Ledja sanctuary (from southeast) (FÄHNDRICH / WEBER 2001, 604, Fig. 1).

Fig. XXI. Draft of the reconstruction of the east side of the equestrian monument at the Sahr al-Ledja sanctuary (FÄHNDRICH / WEBER 2001, 605, Fig. 2)
In the sanctuary of Sahr al-Ledja in the northern part of the Trachonitis an equestrian monument has been reconstructed to have been placed on a square podium in the front court of this sanctuary (text Fig. XX-XXI).\textsuperscript{921} The area of Ledja mainly functioned as a buffer zone between the Jewish kingdom and the surrounding areas dominated by Arab tribes. It had since the late 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE been controlled by the \textit{Zamiris}, Babylonian equestrian archers originally settled here as guards by Herod the Great. According to the excavators the remains of the equestrian figures – both mounted and drawn by teams of animals – were placed on this monument, which – on account of a reference found in Josephus (\textit{AJ} 17.29-31) – should probably be identified with Agrippa I or his son Agrippa II and the leaders of the Zamiris, Jakimos or his son Philippus. This would correlate with the dating of the pottery found in the sanctuary to the second half of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE. The reconstruction of the monument of Sahr is however only tentative as the fragments of a large number of figures found in the sanctuary still have to be reconstructed correctly. A great number of similar statuary monuments have however been found in this area, evidenced by sculptured fragments found in Menara Henu, Sha’arah and Mesmiye, and in other places in the connecting areas suggesting these imperial representational ways well-known from Roman imperial monuments to have been firmly established here.\textsuperscript{922}

Agrippa’s use of coin iconography similar to that found in the contemporary coinage of the Roman emperor was according to this not an accidental imitation, but part of a deliberate application of a specific part of the Roman imperial representational language, which during this time was in the process of being established firmly in the immediate periphery of the Jewish world. The argument that this was not according to the intentions of Agrippa, or that the sceptre was Roman, does in view of this bear no validation. One might consider the point of Agrippa not being portrayed wearing a diadem, but this does also not withstand closer scrutiny as the closely imitated original coin image was evidently not changed in any way, not even the figure of Nike on the side of the quadriga. Only the original inscription had been adapted to fit the new context of use. To underline his close relationship with the Roman emperor Agrippa in some coin legends professed himself to be \textit{ΦΙΛΟΚΑΙΣΑΡ} and used partly otherwise unknown images of the imperial family; such as the example of Caesonia the wife of emperor Caligula displayed on the

\textsuperscript{921} The following account is based on the publications by \textit{FÄHNDRICH / WEBER} 2002, 608-612; \textit{WEBER} 2003, 257-275.
\textsuperscript{922} \textit{FÄHNDRICH / WEBER} 2002, 608-612, Fig. 7-10; \textit{WEBER} 2003, 265-266.
obverse and the young Drusilla the sister of the emperor on the reverse of a coin type issued in Paneas in his 5th year as king (Fig. 77), or the imitation of the imperial coin type displaying Caligula and his three sisters on the “year 2” coin type from Paneas mentioned above (Fig. 72). At the same time Agrippa I also applied Roman iconographic conventions to display members of his own family. It is difficult to determine if Agrippa did in fact consciously display Germanicus, the father of his close friend Caligula, who would indeed not have been portrayed with a royal diadem, or if his intention was in fact to display himself. Viewed against the number of Caligula’s family members found in Agrippa’s I coinage it does however seem more likely that Agrippa I was indeed presenting Germanicus and not himself with this coin types.

A similar fashion of representation can be found in another coin type of Agrippa I presenting the mounted Agrippa II as a youth in the Roman imperial tradition of displaying heirs as *principes iuventutis* (Fig. 73), a tradition first established by Augustus in his display of his originally designated successors *Gaius* and *Lucius Caesar*, later imitated in the coinage of following emperors, such as the young Nero in a contemporary coin series (Fig. 220). Also here Agrippa I consciously applies a distinct part of the contemporary Roman imperial iconographic language. There can be no other way to understand this display of iconographic traditions.

The last iconographic element only briefly discussed here is the display of the so-called Tyche of Caesarea Maritima on coins issued by Agrippa I (Fig. 83), probably one of the best examples of the display and interaction of different iconographic traditions towards the establishment of a specific iconographic type. On the obverse of these coins the diademed and draped bust of Agrippa I is displayed with the inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥϹ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΚΑΙΡΟΧΑΙ[CAP] reminiscent of the inscriptions found on Hellenistic Greek coinage (e.g. Fig. 166) in combination with the Roman sobriquet *filokaisar*. On the reverse the elaborate inscription ΚΑΙΡΟΧΑΙ ΠΡΟΤΟ ΚΑΙΡΟΧΑΙ (Caesarea with its nearby harbour Sebastos) surrounding a female figure standing to the left clad in a chiton and cloak holding a rudder in her right hand.

---

923 Kokkinos 1998, 286; Kushnir-Stein 2007a, 57; Burnett 1987, 29-30; Meshorer 2001, 94-95, Pl. 52 no. 117 – here attributed to the mint of Tiberias; Caesonia is otherwise only known from a coin type from Spain; Sear 1970, 99, no. 524; RPC I (1992), no. 4977.
924 RPC I (1992), no. 4974; Zanker 2003, 220-221.
925 E.g. the Greco-Bactrian ruler Eucratides I (c. 170-145 BCE), SNG ANS (Greco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek Coins), no. 526; or the Parthian kings, e.g. Mithradates I (c. 123-88 BCE), BMC Parthia, p. 26, no. 12.
hand and a palm leaf in her left hand. The cloak is draped around her hips and over her right arm and is hanging down on her right side. The date L Z (“Year 7”) is placed in the right field. \(^{926}\) Only in one variation of this type does she clearly appear to be tur- reted. Any further details are not distinguishable. The inconsistent use of the mural crown in connection with the female figure on Agrippa’s coins could suggest that the representation should not be understood as Tyche per se, but far more as the personification of the city and its harbour Sebastos, as which she was probably also actively honoured, in line with the shortly later emerging representation of the Kaisareia.\(^{927}\)

As accounted for by M. Meyer, the traditional displays of Tyche – a conventional designation used for figures whose individualised appearances show that they were meant to represent the respective cities in the context of which they were displayed – in the Roman coin iconography is dominated by two types retraceable to two statuary types: the statue of Tyche of Antioch and the statue of Tyche of Caesarea Maritima, which both have not been preserved in original.\(^{928}\) According to this the statuary type of the so-called Tyche of Caesarea Maritima first appears on the city coins from 68 CE after which it was further developed and repeated on coins of later dates,\(^{929}\) and widely imitated in the city coinages of central Palestine.\(^{930}\) On the earliest coins a standing tur- reted female figure is displayed clad in a short knee-length chiton and a cloak covering her back. The right breast is left free. The figure is placing her right foot on the prow of a ship. A male bust is placed on her right outstretched hand and she is holding the standard of a ship (a stylis) in her left hand. A shortsword is bound diagonally across her left shoulder.\(^{931}\) The two female types described here do not display many parallels, but the use of the same inscription ΚΑΙΚΑΡΙΑ Η ΠΡΟΣ ΤΩ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ ΛΙΜΗΝΙ[Λ]I] clearly specifies both as the representation of the city Caesarea Maritima with its harbour Sebastos.\(^{932}\) Obviously the different representations of the city’s personification depicted here were conceived according to two different iconographic traditions. The first type found on the coins of Agrippa I was based on the Hellenistic Greek tradition of displaying the Levantine representatives of the different cities clad in a long chiton and


\(^{927}\) MEYER 2011, 180.

\(^{928}\) On the iconography of the Tyche of Caesarea Maritima, MEYER 2011, 161-163.

\(^{929}\) RPC I (1992), no. 4862; SNG ANS 6 (Israel), nos. 753-756.

\(^{930}\) MEYER 2011, 175-180.

\(^{931}\) MEYER 2011, 162-163.

\(^{932}\) MEYER 2011, 165-167, 180.
equipped with different attributes significant of the individual cities, whereas the later type relied on the Roman representation of Virtus respectively Roma and a combination of iconographic elements from both the Hellenistic and the Roman traditions.933

4.5.3 Concluding Remarks

Overall, there can be no doubt that the traditions displayed in the coinage of Agrippa I for the most part relied on Hellenistic and Roman imperial coin traditions and that the representations found no parallels in the Jewish world. The coinage of Agrippa I was primarily held in line with the Roman imperial coinage, evidenced by the close typological parallels found between Roman imperial iconography and the coin types applied by Agrippa I.934 Only few iconographic elements can be directly associated with the traditions found in Hellenistic Greek coin iconography, whereas no elements can be associated with any specific Jewish traditions or contexts, even if the coins issued in Jerusalem did heed the religious sensitivity regarding iconographic displays present there, this was a strictly local phenomenon. The apparent piety on the part of Agrippa I towards Judaism amongst others praised by Josephus (AJ 19.331) was clearly restricted to the Jewish dominated areas of Palestine and his coinage shows that also here the religious restrictions were limited to the absolute Jewish core area of Judaea, thereby keeping these restrictions at an absolute minimum. The written tradition in which Agrippa’s piety is highly approved, above all due to his intervention as Caligula attempted to transfer a statue of himself from Ptolemais in Syria to the Temple in Jerusalem thereby additionally trying to enforce the imperial cult,935 is in every way contradicted by the king’s coin iconography, in which he displays himself as a Hellenized and in effect truly Romanized Jewish ruler,936 who relied heavily on Roman iconographic traditions as a reference to the Roman sovereign and the imperial ruler cult, but also placed himself and his family firmly within these. Agrippa displayed a number of members of the imperial house in his coinage, especially those close to Caligula, to publicly stress his personal relationship with this emperor, to a large extent probably due to his competition
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934 Other types also discussed by BURNETT 1987, 27-31; KOKKINOS 1998, 286.
935 GOODMAN 2007c, 47-48; BERNETT 2007b, 348-350; BILDE 2011, 9-48. Petronius, the governor of Syria, was despite the intervention of his troops not able to demonstrate his loyalty towards the emperor by placing the portrait of Caligula in the Temple in Jerusalem (Josephus AJ 18.261-269; BJ 2.184-203).
with Herod Antipas. His honoration of Claudius, on the other hand, took on a far more formal form, as shown by the example of the coin type displaying the consecration of the alliance with Claudius in 41 CE.

4.6 Agrippa II (c. 53-100 CE)937

At the time of the sudden death of his father in Caesarea Maritima in 44 CE Agrippa II – then only 16 or 17 years old – was considered too young to immediately succeed his father and was kept at the imperial court in Rome, where he was living at the time. After the death of his uncle Herod of Chalcis in 48/49 CE Agrippa II was made successor to the kingdom of Chalcis and given the authority as overseer and appointer of high priests in the Temple in Jerusalem, which until then had been under his uncles control (Josephus AJ 20.15-16). Agrippa II apparently remained in Rome until Claudius in 53/54 CE dispossessed him of Chalcis instead granting him the larger territory of the old Ituraean kingdom earlier partly ruled by Herod Philip (Josephus BJ 3.57-58), upon which he returned to Palestine at the age of 26.938

Agrippa II ruled over a territory inhabited by a population of mixed ethnicities and cultures which had all long been thoroughly Hellenized. It extended beyond the territory of the old tetrarchy of Herod Philip and came to encompass the additional areas of Ulatha, Hermon, the Abilene (the Anti-Lebanon), some parts of Galilee and Peraeae – with the major cities of Tiberias and Julias – were added to his kingdom by Nero, and finally the territory of Arca in Syria was added by Vespasian (Map 1).939 The circulation of Agrippa’s coins was limited to the areas placed under his rule.940 Large parts of Agrippa’s capital Paneas have been excavated disclosing a city whose layout was determined by the existing topographic conditions present here. During the Roman period the centre of the city was dominated by two different districts, one largely laid out in a grid containing the public buildings divided in sections by the Cardo Maximus and the

937 Concerning the date of Agrippa’s II death, see discussion outlined by KOKKINOS 1998, 396-399 (Appendix 10).
Decumanus, and the sacred area containing a number of temene over time devoted to different gods and goddesses, the areas being separated by a large artificial pool. A large number of houses and villas have been excavated east, south and west of the city centre, among these the so-called “Palace of Agrippa” (text Fig. XXII).  

Fig. XXII.
The so-called Palace of Agrippa with connected Bathhouse in Paneas (WILSON 2004, Fig. 18).

Under the reign of Nero Agrippa’s power over Palestine had continuously increased until the outbreak of the First Jewish War in Jerusalem in 66 CE. The outbreak of the war was in part caused by Agrippa’s inability to handle the increasing social and religious problems among the Jewish population of Jerusalem, but the situation escalated radically with the arrival of the new Roman procurator Gessius Florus to Palestine in 64 CE (§5.1).  

Agrippa II himself witnessed the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish Temple in 70 CE and was in 75 CE rewarded with the title of praetor and the territory of Arca by Vespasian for his continuous support and loyalty towards Rome (Josephus BJ 3.57, 7.97).

4.6.1 The Coinage of Agrippa II

Generally, the Jewish bronze coins issued after the First Jewish War in Palestine did in fabric and dimensions distinguish themselves from the smaller and thinner Jewish prutot produced by the Hasmonaeans, Herod the Great and the first generation of Herodian successors during the previous centuries. The bronze coins produced by Agrippa II were

---

941 WILSON 2004, 51-54.
similar to the ones found in the Greek cities and Rome. Besides his coins, the administra-
istration of the cities of Gaza, Ascalon, Neapolis, Sebaste, Caesarea Maritima and Gaba
provided the Palestinian population with provincial bronze coinage minted under the
Flavian rulers, whereas the most widespread common coinage (silver and bronze) circu-
lating in all of Palestine during this time came from Antioch-on-the-Orontes.943

Compared with his predecessors Agrippa II irregularly issued a large number of
different coin types during his long reign. His coin production evidently came to a halt
for the duration of the First Jewish War and not until the early seventies CE that it was
resumed again, afterwards intermittently continuing it until the year 95/96 CE.944 The
main part of Agrippa’s II coin production took place after the Jewish War. The images
on the coins seem to have some extent to have been connected with specific denominations,
e.g.: coins of a weight of 15-17g/diameter 26-30mm were associated with the image of
Tyche (e.g. Fig. 91 & 106), coins with an average weight of 11-12g/diameter 22-26
were associated with an advancing Nike (e.g. Fig. 93), and coins weighing 5-
7g/diameter 19-22mm were associated with a standing Nike inscribing a shield (e.g.
Fig. 94 & 97). The actual value of these has proven difficult to determine and a number
of exceptions to this are found.945

4.6.1.1 Problems concerning the Dates and Mints of Agrippa’s Coinage

Several problems have presented themselves in connection with his coinage. First of all,
the coins carry a number of different dates, partly double dates, paired with the effigies
of the varying emperors ranging from Nero to Domitian (appendix Table 6). Agrippa
applied the dates on his coins according to two different eras. One era was determined
by the year of his succession to king, i.e. 49 CE, the second era probably commenced in
60/61 CE, where Agrippa’s kingdom was enlarged by Nero and further areas were
placed under his rule.946 The problems concerning the different dates and eras can here
not be dealt with in detail.

943 RPC II.1 (1999), 302-303.
945 RPC II.1 (1999), 309, Table p. 310.
STEIN’s view on the dates of Agrippa’s coin eras have been accepted by the authors of the RPC II.1 (1999),
The second problem with the coinage of Agrippa II is the attribution of coins to specific mints. Agrippa’s main mint must have been situated in Paneas being the capital city of his kingdom. A few other coin types have been attributed to other mints as well, though the evidence from these mints is very scant. One coin type has been securely attributed to a mint in Tiberias according to the inscription TIBE PIAC placed in a wreath in the reverse. The inscription on the obverse BA ΑΓ[ΠΙ] ΝΙΚ CEB identifies the coin type as belonging to Agrippa II and the palm branch on the obverse is in complete accordance with the previously under Herod Antipas established traditions of the city coinage found here underlining the validity of this attribution (Fig. 95).

According to Y. Meshorer Agrippa’s earliest coins issued should be attributed to the mint of Sepphoris during the reign of Nero. Judging by the use of the inscription ΣΕΠΦΩ or ΣΕΠΠΦΩΡ this seems to be correct at least for some of these coins. Yet further coins carry double references to both Neronias and Sepphoris, which likewise by Meshorer have been attributed to the same mint. The double references to both Claudius and Vespasian in the 14th year of the reign of Nero found on two coin types, one carrying a wreath and the date on the obverse and the double cornucopiae with a caduceus at the centre and the second an S C surrounded by the inscription on the reverse, place these coins securely in the year 67/68 CE (Fig. 87-88). Considering that Vespasian was not yet emperor at this time the use of his name was unusual, but – if Sepphoris was indeed the place of the issue – not surprising as the city sided with the Roman general during the First Jewish War (Josephus BJ 3.30-34). It is however entirely questionable if this coin types should be attributed to Agrippa as done by Meshorer.

The mentioning of the people of Neronias is only slightly troubling, as – parallel to Caesarea Philippi (below) – the city of Sepphoris was probably re-named after Nero in Neronias. This would not be the first case where the renaming of a city has only been recorded in the coinage of a city, and the fact that the damnatio memoriae was
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947 RPC II.1 (1999), 309.
948 RPC II (1999), no. 2242; Meshorer 2001, Pl. 54, no. 134.
950 MESHORER 2001, nos. 127-128.
951 NEAEHL 4 (1993), 1324.
953 Through the Hellenistic municipal coins of the 2nd century BCE information concerning the Seleucid names and titles of the cities has been preserved, which has not been found elsewhere, such as Seleukia for Gaza, Antiochia for Ptolemais, on this KUSHNIR-STEIN 2007b, 157.
placed upon Nero shortly after his death would not have allowed for a long use of his name (the attribution of these two coin types will be discussed further below).  

The attribution of the coins to specific mints must in most cases be done according to the iconography and legends used, although the name of the city is only mentioned on few coins, such as the name ΝΕΡΩΝΙΕ or ΝΕΡΩΝΙΕΑ as a reference to either Sepphoris or Paneas. The capital of the old northern tetrarchy, Caesarea Philippi, remained Agrippa’s capital in the north and was according to Josephus (AJ 20.211) re-founded by him as Neronias in 61 CE, at a point in time when the Augustan imperial cult was probably also rededicated to the Roman emperor Nero (Fig. 90). As discussed above a rededication of the imperial cult to Caligula had probably taken place at the beginning of the reign of Agrippa I, which was possibly reflected in the coin type displaying the former king’s wife Kypros as a partaker of this cult (Fig. 75). Other coins yet have been attributed to the different mints on the basis of their iconography, such as the coins belonging in a series of types of which one is depicting the god Pan (Fig. 102-103), sometimes compared with the display of the figure of Pan in the Lysippan tradition (text Fig. XXIII). These coins should in most likelihood be attributed to the mint of Paneas. Some of the problems caused by this will be dealt with in the following. There may even have been more active mints next to the three mentioned here during the rule of Agrippa II, but too little is known to serve as base for any further assumptions.
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954 Also MESHORER 2001, 104.
956 RIDGWAY 2001, 101, no. 11; WILSON 2004, 61, Fig. 27.
Thirdly, it can be argued that under the Roman provincial administration of Palestine – i.e. the Roman prefects and procurators controlling the province of Palestine before the outbreak of the First Jewish War and the city magistrates subject to the Roman emperor after 70 CE – upheld a continuous production of coins parallel to Agrippa’s and that the attribution of coin types to either in some cases can prove difficult. Several coin types from this time display imperial women in the guise of different goddesses or represented as *diva* in Palestinian coinage, especially the women related to Nero are well-represented: Agrippina II (mother), Octavia (1st wife), Poppaea (2nd wife), Claudia (daughter).  

959 These are representations of women or – in the case of Claudia, Nero’s daughter who died as an infant – a child presented according to their position within the Roman imperial house, as demonstrated by the coin type featuring the *Diva Poppaea Augusta* in a distyle temple on the obverse, with the inscription DIVA POPPAEA AVG, and *Diva Claudia* in a round temple on the reverse, with the inscription DIVA CLAVD NER F (Fig. 225).  

960 This coin type has, among others, been tentatively attributed to the

---

960 RPC I (1992), 669-670, no. 4846; MESHORER 2001, no. 354; BERNETT 2007a, no. 54g.
mint of Caesarea Philippi respectively Neronias, according to M. Bernett mainly due to a closer association of the coin types issued here and those of the Roman administration in Antioch, such as the use of Latin legends;⁹⁶¹ the last point is however disputable since both the contemporary Neronian tetradrachms (Fig. 217) and coins issued later evidently carried Greek legends.⁹⁶² These coins do however not in any way allude to either the person of Agrippa or his position as king, to a specific mint, or carry a specific date attributable to Agrippa, but are exclusively referring to members of Roman imperial house and in this case its deceased members and the cults established in their honour,⁹⁶³ and should in fact be attributed to Caesarea Maritima as the seat of the Roman administration. Likewise, the first coin types attributed to Agrippa by Meshorer mentioned above, carrying the double references to Claudius and Vespasian dating to the 14th year of the reign of Nero, should in fact not be attributed to the Jewish king, but rather to the Roman city administration acting under the authority of Vespasian in Sephoris at the beginning of the First Jewish War.⁹⁶⁴ Also in the case of these coins absolutely no references to Agrippa whatsoever can be detected. It is more probable that also here Agrippa did not play any role in the emission of these coins.

According to Y. Meshorer a number of later coin types should indeed be attributed to the Roman administration striking coins in Caesarea Maritima during the reign of Domitian,⁹⁶⁵ but this does in fact seem to have been the case from the beginning of Agrippa’s reign. Evidently great care should be taken in the attribution of coin types to him. During the reign of the previous Jewish rulers the distinction between the coins issued by the Jewish and the Roman authorities was much more clearly defined, both in physical appearance and use of iconography. Now the differences between the Jewish, in this case, Agrippa’s II coinage and the other coinages produced in Palestine at the time had all but disappeared. If this is correct, the use of iconography should in the case of each of these coin types indeed be viewed in a different light than coins through their legends verifiably issued by Agrippa II as the main authority.

⁹⁶² e.g. the coins minted in Paneas from the reign of Marc Aurelius until Elagabal all carrying the official name KAIC(areia) CEB(aste) IER(a) KAI ACU(los) UP(o) PANEI(ou), SNG ANS 6 (Israel), no. 862; NEAEHL 1 (1993), 136.
⁹⁶³ MESHORER 2001, nos. 354, p. 178; BERNETT 2007a, no. 54g, p. 320-321.
4.6.1.2 Gods, Deities and Pagan Iconography

In his coinage Agrippa II exclusively made use of Greco-Roman iconographic traditions, partly the traditions found in the Roman imperial coinage, partly traditions specific for and common in Palestine, such as the motifs most likely imitated from the Palestinian Judaea Capta coins probably issued during the years 71-73 CE.\(^\text{966}\) A long row of Greco-Roman gods and deities were displayed on his coins, among these Tyche respectively a figure often referred to as Tyche-Demeter due to her attributes (e.g. Fig. 91, 96, 98), Nike/Victoria (e.g. Fig. 92 & 94), Moneta (Fig. 101),\(^\text{967}\) Tyche/Fortuna (Fig. 104),\(^\text{968}\) Pan (Fig. 102 & 103), and he also made use of sacred iconography in form of architectural representations, such as the altar (Fig. 100). Only a small part of Agrippa’s coinage will be treated here.

During the Flavian period following the First Jewish War Agrippa’s coin types were close imitations or even copies of Roman imperial coin types, to some extent struck with dies used in the imperial mint in Rome carrying the original Latin legends.\(^\text{969}\) In his ‘Year 25’ and ‘Year 26’ series Agrippa’s name (ΕΠΙ ΒΑ ΑΓΡ) had been added secondarily in Greek letters to the Roman imperial die used on the reverse (e.g. Fig. 100 & 101).\(^\text{970}\) The obverse of the ‘Year 25’ coin type displays the head of Domitian, the reverse the Ara Pacis Augustae. Except for the inscription this is a precise copy of a type issued by Domitian in his 12\(^\text{th}\) year of consulship, i.e. the year 85/86 CE (Fig. 229).\(^\text{971}\) It is difficult to determine if Agrippa II repetitively followed the directions of the imperial mint of Rome in his use of coin iconography or if his iconography was determined according to his own preferences. The use of an only slightly adapted dies and recently introduced displays such as that of Moneta, which was introduced during the rule of Galba (68-69 CE),\(^\text{972}\) may suggest the deliberate use of distributed imperial dies, but since we only possess a few examples of this, this must remain hypothetical. On the other hand does the coin iconography used by Agrippa display a number of highly individual

\(^{966}\) RPC II 1 (1999), 317.
\(^{967}\) MESHORER 1971, 164-165.
\(^{968}\) SCHMIDT-DICK 2002, 55.
\(^{969}\) It has been suggested that part of his coins were minted in the imperial mint in Rome (RPC II (1999), 309-310; MESHORER 2001, 111), but it seems more likely that dies were imported and used in Palestine, KUSHNIR-STEIN 2002, 130; DAHMEN 2010, 109.
\(^{971}\) HILL 1989, 63.
\(^{972}\) SCHMIDT-DICK 2002, 15, 78-79
traits in the choice of motifs, which specifically belong in his local context, such as the depiction of Pan in reference to the Pan-cult of Paneas or some of his minor coin types.

All of Agrippa’s larger denominations carry the portraits of the Roman emperors, whereas some of the smallest denominations show some variations, such as the display of the veiled turreted head of Tyche (Fig. 105), which finds earlier parallels in Palestine in the coinage of Demetrias by the Sea (Strato’s Tower) (Fig. 179) and in Augustus’ coinage of the same city under the name of Caesarea Maritima (Fig. 171). Interesting is the repetition of a few motifs used earlier, which show that a partaking in the coinage of Agrippa on the part of the Romans must have been very limited and that the choice for the use of the iconography was made by Agrippa II himself, who for the most part remained faithful to the Roman iconographic traditions.

In the coinage of Agrippa II images are found repeated in a fashion very similar to images used in coins issued in Paneas by his predecessors Herod Philip and Agrippa I: the hand clasping three ears of grain (Fig. 89) and the veiled head of a woman accompanied by the inscription CEBACTH (Fig. 99). The identification of this figure has been subject to varied interpretations, such as to be the representation of Livia respectively Julia Augusta, or Titus’ daughter Julia according to the date of the series to 78/79 CE, the same year Titus became emperor. It is however more fruitful to toy with the idea of another interpretation of the female figure being presented here. Considering that an anchor is displayed on the reverse of this coin type a dynastic claim or at least a verification of a dynastic succession seems to be presented here, to judge by the preceding use of this maritime image in Jewish coinage since the days of the Seleucid rule – at the latest by Agrippa I in his effort to present his son and successor Agrippa II dealt with above (§4.5.2). The use of this image would not be inappropriate neither in connection with the former empress Livia nor Titus’ daughter Julia, but not a usual motif in Roman imperial coinage. Agrippa did undoubtedly cultivate a close relationship with the Roman emperors; hence the presentation of a member of the Roman imperial family is – as encountered in the coinage of Agrippa I – not a foreign concept. Livia appeared already in the coinage of Herod Philip and was not an unknown quantity in the
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973 MESHORER 2001, no. 132.
974 HOOVER 2007, 77-88, pl. 14 nos. 3-5.
975 MESHORER 2001, nos. 133-133b, 149.
976 MESHORER 2001, 236 no. 149.
later coinage found in Paneas. Titus’ daughter Julie would according to this also be an entirely appropriate figure to display. Only, how would this fit with the current context? The use of the anchor on the reverse of the coin type would in fact not have been necessary if either of these two imperial women was the one portrayed on the obverse of this coin type, as both did not need any proof of their position, and the anchor was furthermore – as already mentioned – not an image commonly associated with Roman imperial coinage, but was verifiably an old Hellenistic dynastic emblem.

Agrippa I had his wife Kypros depicted on his coins and this could suggest that Agrippa II would have chosen to do the same; there is however no evidence of a wife in connection with Agrippa II. Much more important was his sister Berenice, who in all aspects seems to have taken the position of a queen next to him.\footnote{KOKKINOS 1998, 321-328.} A Latin inscription from Berytus from 61/62 CE even gives evidence to the reconstruction of a building, originally erected by Herod the Great, by King Agrippa and Queen Berenice.\footnote{KOKKINOS 1998, 324; BERNETT 2007a, 323.} The term queen used in connection with Berenice may still have been upheld after the termination of her second marriage to king Herod of Chalcis (Fig. 86), but seems independently to have stayed with her throughout her life.\footnote{WILSON 2004, 27.} The most logical interpretation of the female portrait on the coins of Agrippa II would according to this in fact be that Berenice was portrayed here (Fig. 99).\footnote{First suggested by J. MALTEIL-GERSTENFELD (1980, 25-26); also agreed upon by WILSON 2004, 35; HENDIN 2010, 290-291.} Berenice was at the time of Titus’ accession to the throne in the middle of an infamous affair with the new emperor and was living in his palace until 79 CE after which Titus was forced to remove her to avoid political complications.\footnote{KOKKINOS 1998, 329-330; Wilson 2004, 34-35.} The anchor does not refer to a sea-journey done by Agrippa II. The anchor was as a familiar royal emblem here used by Agrippa to officially establish and present the position of Berenice at a time where she was at the zenith of her political importance (e.g. §4.5.2).

Previously the images of the female portrait and the hand clasping the three grain ears had been displayed in obverse-reverse combinations with each other. Contrary to the use of the images in the coins of his predecessors, where the images were always de-
picted in combination with each other, they have now been separated. In the coin iconography of Agrippa II the hand clasping the three ears of grain is displayed in one coin type together with the inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΑΡΚΟΥ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΟΥ (of King Marcus Agrippa), on the reverse a diadem enclosing the date ΕΤΟΥC ΑΙ ΤΟΥ with the sign for 6 at the centre (“Year 11 also 6”) (Fig. 89), which according to the dating suggested by A. Kushnir-Stein would be equivalent with 60/61, whereas Meshorer dates the coin type to 67/68 CE.

Already in the coinage of Agrippa I the original combination of the hand with grains and the inscription karpophoros firmly associated with the goddess Demeter had been severed in favour of the use of the name of the Roman emperor Caligula together with the image, herewith suggesting a closer association of a worship of the Roman emperor than the Demeter cult. Similarly in the coin type issued by Agrippa II the original association between the hand clasping the grain and Demeter was equally abandoned in favour of a written reference referring to the ruler ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΑΡΚΟΥ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΟΥ, this time however referring to Agrippa II himself and this through the use of a part of his name as a Roman citizen and scion of the Julian house going by the name of Marcus Julius Agrippa. The use of his Latin name could perhaps suggest that – through the closer association with the Roman traditions – Agrippa was in fact part of the imperial traditions referred to here, linking himself personally with the cultic practises reflected here either as the acting or as the receiving part. The diadem displayed on the reverse was used to further stress his royal position.

It has been suggested by M. Bernett that the image of the hand clasping the three grain ears should be understood on the basis of its association with another motif. In a different coin type issued by Agrippa II in Paneas a standing Tyche is depicted on the obverse holding grain ears, in this case however Tyche is only holding two grain ears (e.g. Fig. 91, 96, 106). The reference to fruitfulness implied in the element of the grain ears might be similar, but the context is not quite the same. Tyche with the grain
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983 RPC I (1992), no. 4992.
985 MESHORER 2001, 233 nos. 133-133b – contrary to MESHORER’s identification, the circle seems in all cases to be the representation of a diadem.
987 RPC II (1999), nos. 2243, 2252, 2254, 2273-2275, 2283, 2288-2289; MESHORER 2001, nos. 158-159; BERNETT 2007b, 353; for example in Cilician coinage the deceased Augusta is displayed on the obverse, the reverse features the sitting turreted Tyche holding two grain ears, e.g. RPC I (1992), nos. 4009 var., 4014.
ears was displayed as representing the prosperous city of Paneas and is commonly referred to as Tyche-Demeter, whereas the single hand holding the grain ears can be linked closer with a honoration of the imperial power cult through the original association of Julia Augusta and the cult of the goddess Demeter and its continued association with first the name of the emperor and secondly with Agrippa II.

The deduction made by Bernett is similar to what is proposed above, namely that the motif – in combination with the similar previous appearance of the motif in the coins issued by Herod Philip and Agrippa I – was meant as a reference to the imperial cult and the prosperity brought on by this, only Bernett focuses this to have been intended for the imperial women at Paneas. In the case of the image of the hand holding the grain ears several points rather speak in favour of a – hypothetical – association with the Roman imperial ruler cult in Paneas. Queen Kypros may have been part of an active cult for the imperial women, of which however only the Augusta is mentioned by name, but the reverse of the coin type with the clasping hand presenting her on the obverse is unquestionably referring to the Roman emperor as stated by the inscription. Furthermore, she is evidently more than once paralleled with the contemporary presentation of Antonia Minor in Rome, both in her role as priestess of the cult of the Divus Augustus and also with the same qualities. Equally, the coin type of Agrippa II displaying the hands clasping the grain ears together with the inscription naming the king Marcus Agrippa does also imply an association of the motif of the hand and grain ears with an honoration of the imperial power (Fig. 89), maybe through the imperial ruler cult, as in the case of the coin type issued by Herod Philip honouring Livia in her role as priestess of the cult of the Divus Augustus (Fig. 67).

4.6.2 Concluding Remarks

Agrippa II was without doubt the Herodian ruler who in his iconographic language came closest to Rome. Through his use not only of images imitating Roman imperial coin iconography, but dies actually stemming from the imperial mint, he displayed a closeness to the Roman sovereign unseen before this time. A few elements found in his coin iconography display his Hellenistic heritage, but no traces of his Jewish decent are
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988 BERNETT 2007b, 353.
to be found in his iconographic language at all and that in all cases the sacred content and context of the images rely exclusively on Pagan Greco-Roman traditions cannot be questioned.

The use of imported dies, or possibly even coins minted in Rome to be distributed in his kingdom, do leave the question open if the images were imported intentionally this way and were applied as such or if they were subject to a certain amount of randomness. The display most likely representing Agrippa’s sister Berenice does however underline at the extent of the consideration with which the images were applied. When the use of a specific local iconography can be established the Hellenistic origin of the images used becomes pronounced, otherwise Agrippa II primarily imitated or copied Roman coin types with few variations. The honoration of the emperor played an important role, which might even have been connected or increased due to the presence of the imperial ruler cult in Paneas.

During his time as ruler both his realm of power and the actual territory in his possession was in a continuous flux, until it as the second to last next to the Nabataean kingdom was finally incorporated into the province of Syria – herewith marking the end of the existence of the ancient Jewish rulers – upon his death in 100 CE. Jewish coinage was only once briefly revived after his death during the Bar Kokhba War, but here the conscious use of older traditions was sought, which barely compares with the coinage of the last Herodian ruler.

989 Daumen 2010, 110.
Part 3

THE JEWISH WARS
AGAINST ROME
Chapter 5

The Coins of the Bellum Judaicum (66-70 CE)

Vast amounts of research dealing with the reasons for the outbreak of the First Jewish War, the war itself, and the impact of the war on history have been carried out on the basis of the archaeological, literary and numismatic evidence at hand.\(^991\) The purpose here is by no means to attempt to recapitulate this research and in this context to offer yet another summarized account of the collected numismatic material in question here,\(^992\) but again primarily to focus on the sacred images found on the coins issued during the First Jewish War and their political context and use.

The numismatic evidence provides the most substantial source of material regarding the Jewish perspective – at least to be found true for parts of the Jewish society – during the time of the war and has proven to be a highly profitable source of information on its own and even more so in the larger context of the entire archaeological and literary material at hand; as also true in the case of the revolutionary coins of the Second Jewish War (132-135 CE) dealt with later, where the archaeological and literary evidence is even more scant. Large amounts of the war coins have been found in various hoards and as individual finds. The circumstances of some hoard finds bear testimony to massive destruction, which evidently took place as the Romans conquered Jerusalem.\(^993\)

As it was written on the coins, the longing after freedom and national liberation was the main declaration made at the time, and as Y. Meshorer has phrased it “with this goal in mind, one should examine these coins, comprehend the inscriptions on them, and explain the significance of the symbols adorning them”.\(^994\)

The coins minted and issued during the First Jewish War represent a completely new development in the history of Jewish coinage. These coins were minted and issued by Jews for Jews, in a much narrower sense than Jewish coins produced previously. The
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\(^{991}\) The most important of these are listed by GOLDSTEIN / FONTANILLE 2006, 29, endnote 1; a recent overview is also to be found in GOODMAN 2007a, 403-442.

\(^{992}\) The primary literature on this is still MILDENBERG 1984.

\(^{993}\) In reference to the hoards e.g. BIJOVSKY 2009, 73-81, who list other hoard finds as well.

\(^{994}\) MESHORER 2001, 115.
target group moved within the very small geographic area frequented by the insurgents centred on the immediate area of Jerusalem,\textsuperscript{995} which at an early point in time was largely cut off from the surrounding land by the Roman army. As a further limitation they were not kept in circulation after the end of the war, even though individual coins did travel wide distances as far as Athens, Cyprus, Dura Europos, or the Roman city of Carnuntum in Austria.\textsuperscript{996} This puts very strict geographic and chronological limits on these coins allowing a – so to say – numismatic snapshot of one of the most traumatic times in Jewish history. This changes some of the fundamental rules generally applying to the medium of coinage, necessitating a more differentiated understanding of these coins, in this case relying heavily on their religious context. The images and legends of the coins were meant for Jewish users within a narrowly defined area and could probably to some extent only understood by these people. This approach not only helps to explain some of the differences found in these coins compared with earlier Jewish coinage. At the same time it renders any comparisons to previous coins other than the later coins of the Second Jewish War respectively the Bar Kokhba-War issued under similar complicated political circumstances difficult, since the preconditions for their development and use were fundamentally different. Nonetheless, a few parallels to Pagan iconography can be established, the question is how the iconography in these cases should be interpreted.

5.1 The Chronology of the First Jewish War

The cornerstone dates of the war are the beginning of it in the year 66 CE and its ending with the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE.\textsuperscript{997} The primary ancient literary source dealing with the Jewish insurgence against the Roman rule of Judaea is undisputedly the contemporary accounts of Flavius Josephus in his work \textit{Bellum Judaicum}, hence also the name of the war. The more sparse archaeological material from this time very much contrasts with the detailed – even if historical eclectic – account given by Josephus, the stronghold of Masada remaining as the main standing monument of this war.

\textsuperscript{995} SHIVTIEL / ZISSU / ESHEL 2010, 81-85.
\textsuperscript{996} KROLL / WALKER 1922, nos. 1000a-1000d; COX 1959, 26 no. 2000; BELLINGER 1949, no. 180; MESHORER 2001, 134; REICH 2010, 88-90.
\textsuperscript{997} Josephus BJ 6.236-266.
mous event of the resistance of the Zealots holding Masada until its fall in 74 CE has due to Josephus writings been lifted to somewhat inappropriate heights viewed against the whole extent and historic implications of the war.\footnote{GOODMAN 2007a, 435} This momentous incident does not hold any importance for the evaluation of the Jewish coinage of this time.

It was probably an accumulation of many reasons and the social tension increasing in Jewish society throughout the years preceding, as well as incidents taking place during the same year that finally lead to the outbreak of the resurrection against the Roman rule in the autumn of the year 66 CE. All attempts made by the failing Roman procurator Gessius Florus (64-66 CE), who in his actions and exploitations had proven to be the worst procurator of all,\footnote{Josephus BJ 2.277.} and Agrippa II during the spring and the summer of 66 CE towards regaining the slipping control of Jerusalem failed facing the rebellious parties. Among the immediate actions and consequences of these causing the violent outbreak of the Jewish resistance against the Roman rule were the brutal retaliations ordered by the procurator Florus on the citizens of Jerusalem, as they refused to hand over a group of youths who had insulted him by staging a mock collection of pennies for the apparently destitute procurator in such dire need of money that he had to plunder the temple treasury.\footnote{Josephus BJ 2.293-304.} The following raid and killing of the people in Jerusalem, also killing Jews holding the Roman citizenship in the process,\footnote{Josephus BJ 2.305-308, 2.315.} backfired severely and Florus was forced to leave Jerusalem and return to his residency in Caesarea Maritima.\footnote{Josephus BJ 2.329-332.} As a result of the offhanded uprising against Florus the suspension of the sacrifices made daily in the temple on behalf of the Roman emperor to the Jewish God was initiated by the young priest Eleazar, son of the high priest Ananias and segan (Captain/Governor) of the temple.\footnote{Josephus BJ 2.409-410; another son of his named ‘Aqavia, otherwise unknown in the literary sources, may have been among the Zealots seeking refuge in Masada, YADIN / NAVEH / MESHORER 1989, 37-38; MAGNESS 2011, 19-20.}

Some years earlier in 40 CE the governor of Syria, Publius Petronius, had attempted to set up a statue of Caligula in the temple on behalf of the emperor,\footnote{Josephus AJ 18.261-272; BJ 2.184-203.} which immediately had been prevented by the Jewish population and an intervention by Agrippa I (§4.5.2). The rigorous rejection of religious depictions in the centre of the
Jewish cult is clearly illustrated by this encounter and the even earlier incident of the golden eagle during the rule of Herod the Great earlier (§3.3.2). These events demonstrate that acts that were considered to threaten the most holy of the Jewish cult were regarded as direct aggressions towards the centre of Jewish religion, even if no direct contact with or influence on the central cult of the temple was actually the primary intention; contrary to the actions that had lead to the outbreak of the Maccabean Revolt in the 2nd century BCE (§2.2). The violent reactions by the pious Jews to these aggressions became the immediate responses to these threats. Only the death of the emperor Caligula shortly after the episode taking place in 41 CE probably prevented the Roman retaliations that were to be expected as the result of the rejection of this standard implementation of common political practises carried out elsewhere in the Roman Empire. Since no further actions were taken on the part of the Roman authorities as an answer to this, it seems that the Romans on their part accepted the rigid Jewish religious customs concerning the placement of a statue in the sacrosanct Temple in Jerusalem and what by the pious Jews could only be conceived as an act considered threatening towards the most holy of the Jewish cult, even if this was not the intention. It is likely that the increasing presence and importance of the imperial ruler cult, reflected by the incident in 40 CE, was a contributing cause in the rebellion brewing against the Roman rule.

Fact was that the discontinuation of the sacrifices to the Jewish god made on behalf of the Roman emperor in 66 CE, after the successful resurrection against Gessius Florus, could not go without a reaction, since this action was equivalent to the exclusion of the highest Roman authority from the Jewish Temple. The discontinuation of the sacrifices could therefore by the Romans only be viewed as the official rejection of their superior rule by the Jewish religious authorities and thereby as a declaration of war, which forced the Romans to react.

The outcome of the Jewish rebellion against the Romans could however already be foreseen at an early stage. Jerusalem was already caught up in an increasing class struggle caused by the growing social frustration within the Jewish population towards its rich and religiously dominating elite before the outbreak of the war. The internal political instability of the Jewish society resulted in the outbreak of the civil war in Je-
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1007 SAMUELS 2000a, 63.
Jerusalem in 66 CE, coinciding with the war against Rome, rearing up time and again throughout the following years.  

The internal political power struggle in Jerusalem took place foremost between the pro-Roman peace party on the one side consisting of the Jewish aristocracy of the high priestly families, the Pharisees and the supporters of Herod Agrippa I, with his military support, and the rebellious party on the other side consisting of the lower classes gathered around the more radical Zealots supported by the priest Eleazar and lead by Menahem, son of Judas the Galilean and before the rebellion the leader of the ultra radical segment of the Zealots, also known as the Sicarii. The internal struggle at first left the party of the Zealots with the upper hand. Although, shortly afterwards the Zealot-party cracked due to internal strife between the Zealots and the Sicarii. The Zealots following the priest Eleazar b. Ananias killed the secular leader Menahem who had instigated the murder of Ananias, Eleazar’s father and former high priest of the temple, as well as one of the leaders of the pro-Roman peace-party. The remaining supporters of Menahem fled to the stronghold of Masada, remaining there until the end of the war, enduring the Roman siege until their storied deaths in 73 CE. Due to this internal fighting the Zealot party was not able to secure their leading position in Jerusalem, which remained in the hands of the moderate peace-party still consisting primarily of the old Jerusalemite religious nobility.

Simultaneously, the problems between the Jewish and Pagan population of Caesarea Maritima escalated into open fighting also spreading into other areas causing Jews and Pagans to massacre each other. It had at this point in time become impossible for the procurator Gessius Florus to regain any control of the province. The belated attempt made by the Syrian governor Cestius Gallus and his army to restore order in the city of Jerusalem in the late summer and fall of 66 CE was met by the spontaneous rise of Jewish forces that despite the ongoing internal power struggle caused the Roman forces a thorough and humiliating defeat. This finally forced the imperial administration in Rome to react deliberately with military force to the rising problems in Judaea. The proper war against the Roman legions lead by the general Vespasian – until his
proclamation as emperor in 69 CE in Caesarea – and his son Titus began with their arrival in Palestine during the spring of 67 CE. By fall the same year the Roman forces had regained the control of the northern part of the area previously under the control of the rebels, i.e. the area of Galilee under the military supervision of the Jewish general Josephus b. Matthias (later better known as Flavius Josephus). No advances were made on the part of the Romans towards ceasing Jerusalem during the next couple of years, probably in recognition of the advantageous situation brought on by the ongoing internal power struggle among the Jewish parties increasingly weakening the cause of the rebels. The city was left in the hands of the Jews, who from the 4th year where largely cut off from the surrounding land, until it was conquered by Titus during the spring of the 5th year of the war, in 70 CE. Even though the position of the rebels towards the Romans was severely weakened by the internal conflicts taking place, the final siege and conquest of Jerusalem and the temple in 70 CE took 5 months and caused the Romans several setbacks and serious losses.

5.2 The Coinage of the First Jewish War

The coins of the First Jewish War were minted during five consecutive years corresponding with the years of the Jewish calendar extending from April (the month of Nisan) to March (the month of Adar), shortening the production time of the coins of the 1st and the 5th year respectively to a few months. The coins were minted in both bronze and high-refined silver (c. 99% silver content) in the denominations shekel (silver) weighing approx. 14 g., with the minor denominations half-shekel and quarter-shekel, and the prutah (bronze), with the lower denominations half-prutah, quarter-prutah, and one eighth prutah being issued from the time of the 4th year. The high quality of the mass of coins issued was ensured through the use of a high quantity of dies and the careful execution of these coins, especially the shekel, has lead them to be distinguished
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from all other Jewish coins as the qualitative eminence of ancient Jewish coinage. 1016 One surprising fact is that during the succession of the coins minted through the first three years no reverse dies were used successively even though the content of all the dies remained the same. The majority of the reverse dies were apparently discarded at the end of the year, whatever state of their use. 1017 The reasons for this have so far found no satisfying explanation.

The very precise organisation of the coins issued during especially the first three years of the war testifies to an astonishing monetary administration on the part of the minting authorities considering the circumstances under which they minted. This organisation effectively carried into the coinage of the 3rd year, during which time the political power structures in Jerusalem underwent radical changes caused by the ongoing civil war breaking out again during the winter 67/68 CE. This probably also brought changes to the minting authorities coming under Zealot administration, at this point lead by John of Gischala, 1018 which could prove to be the explanation for some of the changes apparent in the coins between the 3rd and 4th year, although the overall picture of the coins remains consistent still articulating the prevalent desire for freedom and independence. 1019

Next to the majority of the coins, which stem from Jerusalem and the immediate surrounding, Jewish coins were also minted in the city of Gamla on the western slopes of the Golan Heights. Only 9 coins, 7 of these found during the excavation of the city, have so far been identified (Fig. 117 & 118). They are the only Jewish coins minted outside of Jerusalem during the war and the only Jewish coins ever to have been issued by an independent local Jewish authority. 1020 All are of the same crude type, probably displaying the image of the cup or chalice (further in §5.3.1) together with an inscription consisting of a mix of palaeo-Hebrew and Hebrew square script, suggested by Y. Farhi to be read as BGMLH (in Gamala) or GMLH B (Gamala Year 2), on the obverse. 1021 The form and random positioning of the letters suggest very unskilled die-
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1016 GOLDSTEIN / FONTANILLE 2006, 14, 16, 21, 28.
1018 Josephus BJ 4.353-357.
1021 FARHI 2006, 72-74; also HENDIN 2010, 364, who lists a third possible reading “Year one to the freedom of the Jewish people”, suggested by SAHURI 2010 (missing in the bibliography).
 engravers to have been at work here.\textsuperscript{1022} No image is found on the reverse and the inscription used here is still not securely identified, but it may be part of the reference “for the redemption of Jerusalem holy”.\textsuperscript{1023} So far, no other Jewish war coins have been found during the excavations of Gamla.\textsuperscript{1024}

5.2.1 The Dates and the Script

All legends on the coins were without exception written in the palaeo-Hebrew script, thereby reverting to older traditions found earlier on the Hasmonaean and before them on the YHD coinage. The years were numbered with the first letters of the alphabet: Year One with \textit{aleph} alone, the following years the numbering letters were prefixed with a \textit{shin} in place of \textit{sh’nat} (year) and then followed by the letters \textit{beth} (two), \textit{gimel} (three), \textit{dalet} (four) and \textit{heh} (five). Unusually compared with the other coins of this time, the denominations were written on all shekel and on some prutot, using the phrases: \textit{Shekel Yisrael, Chatzi} (half) \textit{Shekel, Chetzi} (half prutah) and \textit{Revia} (quarter).\textsuperscript{1025} One of the noticeable changes occurring in the 4\textsuperscript{th} year of the war was the radical decrease in the number of silver shekels minted, probably being replaced by bronze coins carrying the same denominations: a \textit{half} (Chatzi) and a \textit{quarter} (Revia). The smallest bronze coin issued at this time, but not carrying the equivalent written denomination, is assumed to be a replacement of an eight of a shekel. Plausible reasons can be found offering different explanations for this development, basically deriving from a shortage of or a limited or no access to the silver necessary for minting.\textsuperscript{1026}

The additional denominations \textit{chetzi} (half) and \textit{revia} (quarter) introduced simultaneously on minor bronze coins minted from the fourth year constitute a noteworthy development and the cause for some discussion. The reason for this development can only be sought and found in the development of the war and increasingly bad situation of the Jews at this time, which necessitated the introduction of ‘emergency’ money.\textsuperscript{1027}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1022} SYON 2004, 56-57; FARHI 2006, 73.
\textsuperscript{1023} MESHORER 2001, 130-131; SYON 2004, 54; FARHI 2006, 74-75.
\textsuperscript{1024} SYON 2004, 54; FARHI 2006, 72.
\textsuperscript{1025} MESHORER 2001, 116; GOLDSTEIN / FONTANILLE 2006, 19 Tab. 5.
\textsuperscript{1027} KADMAN 1960, 79; The deviating minting of ‘Money of Danger’ was allowed according to the Jerusalemer Talmud (JT \textit{Ma’aser Sheni} 52.4), MESHORER 2001, 130.
\end{flushleft}
due to an increasing lack of silver. The emergency bronze money was introduced to cover the everyday financial needs, the written denominations most probably replacing the silver half-shekel and quarter-shekel. The continued minting of silver shekels was however required to attempt to provide the necessary amount of coins eligible for the payment of the annual tribute to the temple, even if this could only be upheld on a much smaller scale, as the limited amount of these coins found contrary to the previously minted shekels demonstrate.

It can by no means be seen as self-evident that the legends written in the ancient palaeo-Hebrew script could be read and understood by the general population at this time, as it had already been the case during the Hasmonaean period, since it by now had been out of common use for centuries long replaced by the use of the Aramaic square script (§1.1.1 and §2.5.1.1). The general impression gained from the coins is however that the minting authorities must have understood this script perfectly well and used it in the legends with intent. The most likely explanation for this is that palaeo-Hebrew had continuously been upheld as the language and script of the temple administration and/or temple cult. If this assumption is valid its long use would have lent it a distinct recognisable symbolic value, even if the actual written words were not generally understood. The monetary functions of the temple administration as tax-collector, bank and mint did apparently not completely cease at any point throughout the previous centuries – although the importance of the temple as an institution of monetary importance probably underwent considerable changes, especially during the time of the rule of Herod the Great and the Herodian tetrarchs as a considerable number of other mints were developed and used alongside it. It was not until after the war with the destruction of the Temple and the introduction of the Fiscus Iudaicus, which basically constituted a redirection of the annual temple-tribute of half a shekel paid by all adult Jewish males to the Temple in Jerusalem – now also including tax payments for all observing Jewish women, children and slaves – to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome, that these func-
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1028 MESHORER 2001, 129-130. As stated by MESHORER, a similar phenomenon is noticeable in Nabataean coinage during the rule of Aretas IV (9 BCE – 40 CE) (MESHORER 1975, 49-52).
1030 Also noted by GOLDSTEIN / FONTANILLE 2006, 23.
1031 The same can be said of the use of the Phoenician language on the Tyrian coins minted during the early Roman Imperial period onwards, demonstrating a continued positive awareness of the Phoenician culture, LICHTENBERGER 2009, 152.
1032 Dio Cassius, Hist. Rom. 66.7.2.
tions out of obvious reasons ceased to exist. Considering that during the war many of the images of the coins can be connected with the temple or related to the temple cult, the ancient script should probably equally be viewed in this light.

The discontinuation of the payments of taxes and tithes to the Temple seem to have been replaced by alternative practices described in Rabbinic sources. According to a practice of ‘nullification’ described here, money which could not be brought to the Temple should be carried to the Dead Sea.\textsuperscript{1034} The large amounts of Hasmonaean coins – with a few exceptions all attributed to Alexander Jannaeus – found along the northwest shore of the Dead Sea between the harbour at Khirbet Mazin and ‘Ein Feshkha have tentatively also been connected with this phenomenon. As noted, the practice described in the literary sources took place after the destruction of the Temple, which may – or may not – have taken place and practised specifically by dissident Jewish groups – such as the Essenes at Qumran, who opposed the payment of taxes to the Temple before its destruction.\textsuperscript{1035}

5.2.2 YRWŠLM QDŠH and Tyrou Hieras

In addition to the numbering of the coins according to the years of their issue and the references to their denominational value different keywords and catchphrases were put to use on the coins. Some difficulties have arisen as to how they should be understood. Especially one inscription will receive more attention here, in which not only an affirmation of the appreciable continuity in the temple administration seems to be substantiated, but also reflects an immediate interaction with the Pagan world.

Of these the inscription YRWŠLM QDŠH (\textit{Yerushalem kedosha} – Jerusalem holy) used on the reverse of the silver shekels (e.g. Fig. 108, 109, 113), carrying the image of a branch or sprig with three pomegranates, reveals some information on the subject of the development and the continuity in the administration of the Jewish Temple and the cultural interaction which had taken place here. The explanation for the

\textsuperscript{1033} SAMUELS 2000a, 76; HEEMSTRA 2010, 7-23.
\textsuperscript{1034} Sources are listed by MAGNESS 2011, 104-105.
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wording used here is well-known\textsuperscript{1036} and reflects a significant development, here only briefly outlined to clarify the assumption of the continuity maintained throughout the history of the administration of the Jewish Temple, which seem to have had a brief revival during the First Jewish War, before its final destruction through the Romans in 70 CE.

The payment of the tributes and taxes to the temple had for centuries been made with the Tyrian silver shekels with the high silver content necessary for this purpose (with an average of 96-97\% silver content),\textsuperscript{1037} despite their distinctive Pagan iconography displaying the Tyrian patron god Heracles/Melqart on the obverse and the eagle on the reverse, surrounded by the inscription \textit{tyrou hieras kai asylou} and the date of the coins.\textsuperscript{1038}

Two facts ostensibly tie the Tyrian shekel and the Jewish shekel together. First of all, the minting of the silver Jewish war shekel appears to have superseded the minting of the Tyrian silver shekel, which had been minted since Tyre was established as an autonomous city in 126/25 BCE; at which time the head of the Seleucid king on the obverse was replaced by the city’s main deity, with the royal eagle preserved on the reverse.\textsuperscript{1039} So far, the last clearly legible dating on a Tyrian shekel “Year 191”, corresponds with the year 65/66 CE and thus with the beginning of the First Jewish War against Rome and the minting of the new Jewish silver shekel.\textsuperscript{1040} Some readings of the latest coin date on the Tyrian shekels have been questioned and in accordance with this the cessation of the production of the silver shekels and half-shekels tentatively tied with the Roman reform of the Antiochene tetradrachm in c. 59 CE, which may have replaced the Tyrian silver coinage.\textsuperscript{1041} However, no explanation is offered regarding the latest date identified on a Tyrian silver half shekel to the year 65/66 CE.\textsuperscript{1042} Secondly, without regard to any discussion of the end date and reason of the cessation in production of the Tyrian shekels, the similar wording of the inscription YRWŠLM QDŠH on the Jewish shekels indicates a specific connection between the Tyrian and the Jewish shekel. The Hebrew designation QDŠH (holy) is most likely to have imitated the com-

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[1036] Summarised in MESHORER 2001, 78.
\item[1037] GITLER / LORBER 2006, 25; outlined in the religious requirements of the later Mishnah, \textit{Shekalim} 2.4.
\item[1038] SEYRIG 1939, 35-9; RIGSBY 1996, 481-5; some examples of the defacing of the Pagan coin iconography do however exist, e.g. ESHEL / BROSHI 2003, 72.
\item[1041] RPC I, 52-3, 607, 655-6.
\item[1042] RPC I, 655, no. 4706 (silver half shekel).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
parable use of the Greek term *hiera* on the Tyrian shekels.\textsuperscript{1043} According to the testimony of the coinages and inscriptions found, several other Greek cities in the East were also granted the status of holy and inviolable – as well as autonomous – during the second half of the 2nd century BCE, amongst others Ascalon, Ptolemais-Akko, Seleuceia in Pieria, Sidon and Tripolis, but no other cities sustained the titles as long as Tyre and none of these cities coinages’ enjoyed the same close relationship with Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{1044} Furthermore, only in the case of Antioch has, next to Tyre, during the Roman imperial period the minting of silver coins been documented.\textsuperscript{1045}

The possibility that the production of the Tyrian silver shekel may have ceased at the same time as the production of the Jewish silver shekel began, although from time to time Tyre continued to produce bronze coins,\textsuperscript{1046} highlights some important points. First of all, the production of the Tyrian silver shekel had probably to some extent been continued to accommodate the payment of taxes in the Jewish Temple, as the only coins proper for this purpose,\textsuperscript{1047} since their general importance was decreasing during the 1st century CE.\textsuperscript{1048} In this period, city silver coinages well-known from the Hellenistic period were being replaced by Roman imperial coinage,\textsuperscript{1049} such as the Neronian tetradrachms from the mint of Antioch-on-the-Orontes (Fig. 217).\textsuperscript{1050} In general, the epithet *tou Tyriou nomismatos* seems increasingly to have established itself as an overall reference to silver coins of an equivalent value.\textsuperscript{1051} Secondly, the Jewish silver shekel may have been introduced to serve cultic needs. This would be consistent with the conclusions drawn by Fontanille and Goldstein in their examination of the coin production of the Jewish war shekels, which suggests that these were minted and issued to harmonise with the ritual needs of the Jewish season, i.e. new coins were prepared before the be-

\begin{footnotesize}\begin{enumerate}
\item[1043] The term sacred money (*ἱερὰ χρήματα*) is used by Josephus (e.g. *Ant*. 16.166-171), on this Hendin 2010, 479. Rigsby contests this in favour of a use of the word holy in accordance with its biblical usage, Rigsby 1996, 530. This does however seem inconsistent with the continued use of the Tyrian shekel as tax payment in Jerusalem.
\item[1044] Rigsby 1996, 485-496, 519-521.
\item[1045] Lichtenberger 2009, 155.
\item[1046] Rigsby 1996, 483; RPC II (1999), 294; Syon 2004, 253-258, 263.
\item[1047] Rappaport 2007, 107; Syon 2004, 164.
\item[1048] Although they were still in use and circulating at that time; see the survey by D. Syon (Syon 2004, 60-1 fig. 29, 65-8, 113, and 256). In the only reference made by Josephus directly to the use of Tyrian money (*τοῦ Τυρίου νομίσματος*) (BJ 2.592) in connection with John of Gischala it is explicitly stated that Tyrian money of the value of 4 Attic drachmas were put to use.
\item[1049] Levy 1993, 267, 272; Lichtenberger 2009, 155; some Tyrian silver coins may have circulated, although this does not seem to have been the rule, see Weiser / Cotton 2002, 243.
\item[1050] RPC I, 607; Syon 2004, 164-5.
\end{enumerate}\end{footnotesize}
ginnning of the new year commencing with the month of April (Nissan) at which time the annual Temple-tax was due. Thirdly, this required a continuous administration within the Jewish Temple also during the Roman period, which demanded the maintaining of the production of Tyrian shekels to provide the necessary means to pay the temple taxes, but without any visible involvement in or influence on their production. It has been suggested that the letters KP, found on the Tyrian shekels beginning with the year 14/13 BCE, should be interpreted as \textit{kata rhōmaiōus} (in accordance with the Roman), hence the coin inscription would have read \textit{Tyrou hieras kai asylou kata rhōmaiōus}, implying an official involvement of the Roman imperial administration in the issuing of these coins (Fig. 189). Different other suggestions have also been brought forth.

The most likely reason why the minting of the Tyrian shekel never verifiably came – or needed to come – under the control of the Jewish Temple must primarily be sought in the fact that the political importance of the Jewish Temple lessened with the increasing direct political involvement of the Roman government in Palestine from the time of the late Hasmonaean period onwards, beginning with the appointment of Hyrcanus II to \textit{ethnarchos}. This political move had not only officially diminished the political role of this Hasmonaean ruler, but also gave an outlook on the future political role and subordinated position of the temple under Roman dominance. Considering the political changes taking place in Palestine under Herod and the subsequent subdivision of Palestine under the rule of the Herodian tetrarchs the central political position of the Jewish Temple must also have changed accordingly. Any active political role and function as a monetary institution must have been radically reduced compared to earlier periods. Supporting this is the knowledge of persons of Herodian descent accounted for as public treasurers during the 1st century CE, where the authority of the temple money apparently had been transferred into the hands of non-priestly members of the Herodian family. The brief revival of the temple as an active political factor during the First Jewish War in the coinage emitted during this time only serves to underline this.

In light of the political situation in Palestine the continued use and production of the Tyrian shekel in Tyre during the Roman Imperial period does not appear particularly

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{References:} \\
1052 \textit{Goldstein / Fontanille} 2006, 20. \\
1053 \textit{Weiser / Cotton} 2002, 240. \\
1054 Summarized e.g. in \textit{Hübner} 2012, \textit{forthcoming}. \\
1055 Known by name are Helcias II and Antipas III, on this \textit{Kokkinos} 1998, 200, 201 n. 104, 232, 360.
\end{tabular}
peculiar, at least no more peculiar than the use of these coins as tax-payment during the Hellenistic period where no Jewish silver coins were minted. The answer to this might lie in the unchanged official status of Tyre as sacred and inviolable since 141/140 BCE, evidenced until 195/196 CE. Since the position of the Jewish Temple had undoubtedly changed under the rule of the Herodians Herod Archelaus and following him Herod Agrippa I – especially with the introduction of the Roman provincial administration of the procurators, it is not difficult to imagine the answer to the question why the production of the Tyrian shekel was upheld in Tyre during the early Roman Imperial period and continuously used in its traditional form within the Jewish Temple. An attempt of placing the mint of these coins in Jerusalem on the basis of Rabbinic sources as attempted by Meshorer, is not a plausible solution. The use of the word ‘Tyrian’ in connection with specific coin seems later increasingly to have gained the meaning of a general reference to silver coins of a specific value respectively purity, e.g. suitable for the payment of the temple tax, as shown by the use of the term in written documents from the 2nd century CE. The Tyrian coins show no obvious signs of having been controlled by a Jewish administration, which could perhaps have been expected if the sole reason for its continued production was the payment of the Jewish poll-tax and if the position of the temple as a monetary authority was indeed a factor still to be considered with at this point in time. But this is doubtful. The production of the traditional payment was upheld within the more secure frame of the inviolability of the city of Tyre, remaining relatively independent of any internal political changes taking place in or effecting the Jewish world, and the production of the Tyrian silver shekel was apparently discontinued close to the time where the Jewish Temple administration again began to act as a full political and monetary institution in its own right, producing its own silver shekels. The slow degradation of the silver purity noticeable in the later Tyrian shekels might have encouraged this development even further.

---

1057 Meshorer 1984, 171-179; Meshorer 2001, 77-78.
1058 Amongst others rejected by B. Levy (Levy 1993, 267-274) and W. Weiser (Weiser / Cotton 2002, 235-243); also Hübscher 2012, forthcoming; Jacobson 2012, forthcoming. A coin hoard from Qumran almost exclusively consisting of Tyrian shekels, which are otherwise rare at sites around the Dead Sea, may represent a local collection of tax from the male members of the Qumran sect, Magnes 2011, 102-103.
1060 Although the City of Tyre itself was also affected through a removal of its title of autonomous by Augustus in 20 BCE. The title was perhaps returned in 15/14 BCE, on this Levy 1993, 272.
5.2.3 Zion

The bronze prutot minted regularly during the second and third years carried the inscription HRT or HRWT ZYWN (Harat/Harawat Zion – Freedom of Zion) surrounding the vine leaf on the reverse (Fig. 110 & 112).\textsuperscript{1062} In Biblical texts the designation Zion is particularly used as a reference to the City of David,\textsuperscript{1063} i.e. Jerusalem, but also as reference to the Biblical Mount Zion in Jerusalem,\textsuperscript{1064} the distinction between the two is not always explicit, as they both implicate the same or a similar relation to god.\textsuperscript{1065} Zion can also be understood as a reference to a larger area or region inhabited by Jews, perhaps such as Judaea.\textsuperscript{1066} Since the other designations – Yisrael and Jerushalem (e.g. Fig. 109, 111 & 113) – used on these coins are both geographically very specific designations, there seems to be no reason to assume that the term Zion was used in any other way.\textsuperscript{1067}

In this case the most likely option is that of the biblical Mount Zion in the city of Jerusalem,\textsuperscript{1068} i.e. the place of the Holy temple or the Temple Mount itself, which was the possible meeting place of the highest Jewish council (Map 6).\textsuperscript{1069} With this the most important geographic focus of the Jewish religion would also have been entailed in the coin legends, next to the land of Israel and the city of Jerusalem.

The inscription LGYLT ZYWN (le-geulat Zion – of/for the Redemption of Zion) came into use with the bronze coins of the fourth year (Fig. 114 & 115). All three different bronze denominations carry this inscription on the obverse, surrounding their different images: the date palm with the two baskets (reverse: two lulavs and an ethrog), an ethrog (reverse: two bundles of lulavs), and the cup (reverse: a lulav and two ethrogs).\textsuperscript{1070} This inscription does – contrary to the content of the other earlier legends – not hold any references to the temple and are not known imitations of the wording of the coins of any poleis, such as the term kedosha probably imitating the legends of the Tyrian shekels.\textsuperscript{1071} This obvious change between the legends of the earlier coins and the

\textsuperscript{1062} MESHORER 2001, 120-121.
\textsuperscript{1063} E.g. 2 Samuel 5:7; 1 Kings 8:1; 2 Kings 19:31; 1 Chronicles 11:5; 2 Chronicles 5:2, etc.
\textsuperscript{1064} E.g. Psalm 2:6; Psalm 125:1; Isaiah 10:12.
\textsuperscript{1065} MESHORER 2001, 122, who suggest the term to be equivalent with “the Land of Zion”.
\textsuperscript{1066} Contrary to MESHORER 2001, 122.
\textsuperscript{1067} E.g. Isaiah 30:19; also MESHORER 2001, 122, who suggest the term to be equivalent with “the Land of Zion”.
\textsuperscript{1068} As it is also stated by RAPPAPORT 2007, 112-113.
\textsuperscript{1069} SCHÜERER 1979, 223-225; ABD 5, 978 s.v. Sanhedrin (A.J. SALDARINI).
\textsuperscript{1070} MESHORER 2001, 124, 127.
\textsuperscript{1071} RAPPAPORT 2007, 112.
coins from the 4th and 5th years can be understood in more ways, which will be discussed in more detail later (§5.4).

5.2.4 The Symbolic Value of the Palaeo-Hebrew Script

The resuming of the use of the palaeo-Hebrew script – after a gap of approximately 100 years in its use since the Hasmonaean coins were minted – is conspicuous. The reasons for this seem self-evident. The Jewish state was in a situation of outmost distress and the natural reaction was to demonstrate and propagate what was surely to bring victory, in this case the faith in the one true God and the temple representing and assuring this. The script was in this connection deliberately used to stress these qualities. It can by no means be seen as self-evident that legends written in the ancient script could be read and understood by the general population at the time of the First Jewish War, since it by this time had been out of common use for centuries long replaced by the use of the Aramaic square script. The impression gained from the coins is that at least the minting authorities understood this language perfectly well and used the legends deliberately. The role of the Palaeo-Hebrew script as the script of the pious Jews should probably not be underestimated. As the language of the temple cult and through its long use in religious literature the Hebrew language did – in contrast to the Aramaic language – probably hold a distinct recognisable symbolic value, even if the written words were not generally understood by all. This conforms to the use of the palaeo-Hebrew script on Jewish coins since the 4th century BCE. It is noticeable in the coins of the Hasmonaean rulers – disregarding the political ambitions of the individual rulers issuing the coins – where specific meanings where expressed by the use of languages, such as the connection of the king (written in Greek) with the position of high priest (written in Hebrew). The use of the denominations chetzi and revia introduced in the bronze ‘emergency money’ of the fourth year, replacing the silver coins of the same denominations previously issued, could be seen as a confirmation of this. Even if the general public using these coins were not able to read and understand even these few words, it is at least safe to surmise that the recognizable value of the script was high enough to guarantee the acceptance of the coins – not ignoring the fact that they in this crisis situation probably only had little choice. The palaeo-Hebrew script did clearly

\footnote{As also noted by \textit{Goldstein / Fontanille} 2006, 23.}
contain references which can only be viewed to be of a sacred nature. In this situation meant to encourage and project the religious reasons for the rightness of the Jewish cause, it referred to the Jewish state, to the Jewish people, and not least to the Jewish Temple.

The acceptance of the premise that the priestly authorities of the temple did indeed mint and issue these coins, at least during the first part of the war, the use of the palaeo-Hebrew script appears in an even clearer light. The educated temple authorities did without a doubt understand the script they used, since it had been in use within the temple cult and in religious literature since the 4th century BCE, as the examination of the YHD coins of this time has shown. Considering that during the time of the war many of the images of the coins, dealt with next, can be connected to the temple or the temple cult, the ancient script should probably also be viewed in this light. Although, as the examination of the iconography of the images will shows, a connection between the use of specific legends and specific images is not always apparent.

5.3 The Coin Iconography

The coins of the First Jewish War only display a handful images that have been the cause for vivid discussion. Common for all images is a lack of display of living beings of any kind on the coins, not seen since the coinage of the Hasmonaean rulers, and the exclusive use of the palaeo-Hebrew script, as already dealt with (appendix Table 7). All images appear to be of a somewhat moderate nature, without holding any obvious references to anything that could be conceived as personal or authoritative.1073 Agricultural images and images connected with the Jewish cult were displayed. Especially the identification of the sacred objects depicted – which without question were related to the temple observances – and their perhaps symbolic connotations or ambiguousness have lead to some discussion, but the main understanding of the depictions has remained consistent.

Contrary to the contemporary Pagan world, the identification and interpretation of the Jewish coin iconography is limited through a much smaller range of immediate comparable images, making the use of literary sources inevitable for their analysis. The following account of the iconography used is based on the assumption that the images and their con-

1073 GOLDSTEIN / FONTANILLE 2006, 23.
tent were generally to be understood within the Jewish society. The consistency of the use of these images speaks for this assumption. The few images used on the coins of the first Jewish War are here summarized with no regard to denominations, metal or year of issue: the cup or chalice, a branch with three pomegranates, an amphora depicted without a lid and with a lid, the vine leaf, the lulav, the ethrog, a palm tree with two (fruit)baskets placed beneath it. These images are always displayed in set combinations with each other and the same legends.

Some problems arise when addressing the subject of their identification. Throughout the history of ancient Jewish coinage no coins had been produced under comparable circumstances, which should be taken into consideration. The struggle for sole rulership as king between Mattathias Antigonus and Herod the Great a century earlier had been an internal and much more personal fight between two aspiring rulers both striving to become sole rulers (§2.5.1.2). The First Jewish War was a fight between the Jewish state and an unwanted sovereign on a much grander scale. The extreme situation under which the coins were issued did undoubtedly have an influence on both the formation of the iconography and the legends, in part also explaining why they in so many ways differ from previous Jewish coins minted. Comparable iconographic material is rare and the literary sources can only be used with caution, even if used in an attempt to understand the original context of the coinage.

5.3.1 The Cup/Chalice

The identification of the cup or chalice on the obverse of the silver shekels with the inscription Shekel Yisrael displayed throughout the time of the war has been the cause for much discussion. Only slight variations are found in the rendering of the image throughout its time of minting. During the first year, according to Y. Meshorer a more experimental phase of minting during which the appearance of the image was established, the coin image appear slightly less refined compared with the following years (Fig. 107). The vessel is shown with what appears to be two horizontal handles or more likely a broad unadorned flaring rim, with a dot placed beneath on both sides. The body of the vessel is hemispherical. The elongated stem of the vessel is decorated with a

---

slightly protruding knob in the middle. The base itself is broad and flat. From the second year onwards the vessel is clearly displayed with an ornate dotted rim, the two dots beneath the rim on each side have disappeared (Fig. 109, 111, 113 & 116). The stem is more defined, now mostly flaring somewhat out towards the base of the vessel. The base itself has on each side been lifted of the surface by two slightly protruding feet. This general appearance of the image remains consistent on the silver shekels from year two through year five. The same image is used on bronze prutot of the fourth year (Fig. 115). Though the style found here is more unsophisticated and the stem and foot of the vessel have diminished in comparison with the image on the silver shekels. The engraving technique of the dies used on the somewhat less distinct coins of the first year is more eye-catching than during the following years. Dots are used to define the ends of the straight lines forming the rim and base of the vessel, a general phenomenon found in the straight lines of the legends reminiscent of the palaeo-Hebrew legends of the Hasmonaean coinage, which disappears from the image itself from the second year onwards.

No known detailed descriptions and almost no comparable depictions are known of this kind of vessel, which has furthered the discussion of its identification resulting in very diverse suggestions trying to solving this question. The depiction of different kinds of vessels in ancient coin iconography is nothing new, but apparently none of these depictions parallel the one found in the coins of the First Jewish War. One parallel can be found in the coinage of Gamla (§5.2). On these coins a cup or chalice is displayed on the obverse (Fig. 117 & 118). One major difference in the display of the cup between the Jerusalem coins and those from Gamla is that what appear to be the right handle, and not the rim, of the Gamla cup is folded upwards and not displayed horizontally. Apart from this the depictions of the vessels are – despite the crude fashion of the Gamla renderings – similar. The repetition of the image in the coins of Gamla underlines its importance however without offering any details towards its identification, even if the precise reasons for the issuing of these coins can only be suggested and possibly connected with the siege of the city of Gamla by Agrippa II, which was continued by Vespasian until the city was taken in the second year of the war.1075

Two main approaches prevail in determining the meaning of the image: on the one hand it is understood to have been conceived as the image of an actual object stemming

from the Jewish Temple, on the other hand, the vessel has been viewed as a purely sym-

bolic rendering. In connection with the identification of the vessel having an actual func-

tion within the enactment of the temple cult different suggestions to its identification be-
ing a drinking vessel, a mixing bowl used during the libation-service, a pot of manna or a cup holding the measure of barley called an omer used as offering in the temple during Passover – the Jewish seven-day spring feast held in the month of Nissan, the first month of the religious calendar, commemorating the exodus from Egypt – have been brought forth. Among these suggested interpretations the identification of the vessel as the omer used as offering on the second day of Passover has generally been received as the most likely.

Literary references mentioning different golden utensils like bowls, pitchers, basins, snuffers, censers, etc. as being entailed in the equipment of the temple can be found, but almost none of these items are described in any detail, which makes any specific identification very difficult. Explicit literary references to single cups, pots or jars are extremely rare, but one can be found in the context of the temple in the Hebrew Bible, which is the basis for the identification of the vessel as the one holding an omer of manna: And Moses said to Aaron, "Take a jar and put an omerful of manna in it, and place it before the LORD, to be kept throughout your genera-
tions." As the LORD commanded Moses, so Aaron placed it before the Testimony, to be kept (Exodus 16). This mentioning does however not state that the vessel used was an actual omer, which can also be translated with both cup and sheaf just that it held manna (a kind of bread) of the measurement of an omer, which was the tenth of an ephah (a measure of grain). It is noticeable that the word zinzeneth is not used anywhere else in the Hebrew Bible and only the context of the word has brought forth the translation of it as a jar or a similar receptacle. No information on the appearance of the vessel is to be found.

1076 Exodus 16:33.
1077 Leviticus 23:9-11; Mishnah, Menahot 10.4
1078 KADMAN 1960, 84-87; MESHORER 1982b, 106-107; ROMANOFF 1944, 22-23; SAMUELS 2000a, 66-
67; MESHORER 2001, 117-118.
1080 E.g. 1 Kings 7:50; Numbers 7:86; Exodus 25:29; Leviticus 16:12; 2 Corinthians 4:21-22.
1081 Quotation from NAU 1995.
1083 Exodus 16:36.
In the New Testament a comparable slightly more elaborate description of the interior of the holy temple is found: *For there was a tabernacle prepared, the outer one, in which were the lampstand and the table and the sacred bread; this is called the holy place. *And behind the second veil, there was a tabernacle which is called the Holy of Holies, *having a golden altar of incense and the ark of the covenant covered on all sides with gold, in which was a golden jar holding the manna, and Aaron's rod which budded, and the tables of the covenant (Hebrews 9).*

This does enhance the possibility of the vessel (zinzeneth) mentioned in Exodus 16 being the one meant to hold the omer of manna regularly offered in the temple, although here the use of the word στάμνος in the Hebrew Bible does imply that a larger bulkier vessel than presumably the vessel displayed on the shekels was put to use in this connection. This could perhaps imply that also the Old Testament zinzeneth was indeed also a larger vessel. A closer definition of what kind of vessel this actually involved is however not possible to reach, since the term *stamnos* in ancient Greek inscriptions could in fact refer to the *pelike*, suitable for all kinds of commodities.

If the identification of the vessel depicted as the one containing an omer of manna is correct, it places it within the specific religious-ideological tradition of the remembrance (and celebration) of the Exodus from Egypt. This does not exclude an identification of the vessel as the object being the omer or holding the omerful of grain brought to the temple on the second day of Passover: *Then the LORD spoke to Moses, saying, “Speak to the sons of Israel, and say to them, ‘When you enter the land which I am going to give to you and reap its harvest, then you shall bring in the sheaf of the first fruits of your harvest to the priest. And he shall wave the sheaf before the LORD for you to be accepted; on the day after the sabbath the priest shall wave it”* (Leviticus 23), as it has also been suggested. This would be in accordance with the argumentation used with another of the images adorning the coins of the First Jewish War, the palm tree with two baskets beneath it dealt with shortly, placing it in the same religious-ideological context of the commemoration of the Exodus. But there is no proof that either one of these texts mentioning actual objects put to use within the temple can be connected with the depiction on the shekels, although both appear to be possible.

---

1085 Quotation from NAU 1995.
1086 DNP 11 (2001), 916-917.
1087 ROMANOFF 1944, 21-25.
The only other known depiction of a similar vessel is found on the transitional booty relief of the Arch of Titus in Rome erected during the rule of Domitian (81-96 CE) (text Fig. XXIV). On this relief a cup is shown in what appears to be at least near its life-size, when it is compared with the showbread table on which it stands. It is carried in the Roman triumphal procession, described by Flavius Josephus,\textsuperscript{1088} celebrating their victory together with other spoils taken from the temple, like the showbread table,\textsuperscript{1089} the menorah,\textsuperscript{1090} and the golden trumpets, according to their depiction here apparently removed from the temple before its “accidental” destruction.\textsuperscript{1091} But the presence of the vessel – with which the vessel on the shekels has been compared\textsuperscript{1092} – on the relief does not help clarify the actual identification of it. In the context of the Arch of Titus it can be viewed as the rendering of a random minor cultic object taken from the temple, perhaps the \textit{fialai} mentioned by Josephus used to sacrifice incense, which neither proves nor disproves that it could have held another more specific meaning within the Jewish temple cult prompting the representation on the coins. The presence of the vessel on the Arch of Titus could at the same time also be viewed as an indication of its actual impor-

\textsuperscript{1088} Josephus BJ 7.5.5 (148-150).
\textsuperscript{1089} HACHLILI 1998, 345-346.
\textsuperscript{1090} HACHLILI 1988, 236-256; HACHLILI 1998, 312-344.
\textsuperscript{1091} According to Sulpicius Severus (\textit{Chronicon} 2.30.6-7), the destruction was ordered by Titus, see GOODMAN 2003, 24-25.
\textsuperscript{1092} MESHORER 2001, 117.
tance, since it was the only vessel displayed, but one should not forget that apparently many vessels were put to use within the temple, if one is to believe the literary accounts. The parallel use of this image on both the shekels and the Arch of Titus does however enhance the possibility of a specific importance placed on this kind of vessel. But these considerations have to be disregarded, since an examination of the relief makes evident that it cannot possibly with conviction be stated that the same vessels are depicted on the shekels and on the Arch of Titus, rendering any comparisons obsolete. As a direct comparison shows, the vessel on the Arch of Titus has no stem contrary to the vessel on the coins which has a high stem and a broad base. The form of the upper half of the vessel might be similar, but this does not imply that the same vessel was put on display here. Furthermore, due to the state of preservation of the relief on the Arch it is mostly not noted that not one, but at least two vessels were probably put on display here. The right vessel beneath the right tabula carried by a member of the procession is often overlooked, since it is badly preserved. It might even be possible that a third vessel was originally placed at the centre of the table.1093

The second approach in interpreting the vessel on the coins is that it was a purely symbolic rendering. The image has by some been understood to be the rendering of a cup holding a purely symbolic meaning, namely depicting god’s ‘cup of fury’ or ‘cup of trembling’,1094 or more lately as the ‘cup of salvation’,1095 as can be found mentioned in the Hebrew Bible. There is however no direct evidence supporting the idea of it being a purely symbolic depiction. Different text-passages mentioning a “cup of God”, used in different settings or with different functions,1096 have been used to place a symbolic or symbolic-ideological content in the image of the shekels. These deductions are primarily based on the retrospective analysis of the historic circumstances. The question is: is it at all likely or possible that some images on these war coins were purely symbolic displays and others not? As it will become clear from the examination of the following images hardly any other representations minted during this time held this kind of symbolic meaning, solely based on the understanding and use of the literary tradition. The content of the religious texts did undoubtedly play important roles in the conception of

1093 PFANNER 1983, 51, 53, Pl. 59 Fig. 1, 3, 4.
1094 KLIMOWSKY 1964, 13.
1095 GOLDSTEIN / FONTANILLE 2006, 29.
the iconography, but not in an intangible way indicative of any abstract conceptions of the ‘cups of God’. These suggestions should according to this be excluded from the identification of the meaning of this vessel as purely symbolic.

The detailed rendering of the vessel on the war coins – after going through the experimental phase of the first year – does in itself suggest that a specific vessel was meant to be displayed here. It is with the help of the image itself not possible to say precisely which identification is the most proper: the idea if it being a drinking cup, the vessel holding the omer of manna offered in the temple or the omer offering of grain on the second day of Passover can neither be readily accepted nor dismissed. Judging by the consistent and detailed form of the vessel itself, it does however appear that a specific vessel was meant to be displayed here. It is however on the basis of the current evidence at hand not possible to give a clear identification of this vessel. It is so far only definite to say that the vessel on the coins most likely belonged to the temple furnishing (also illustrated by the placement of similar objects on the Arch of Titus) and was put to use – perhaps as a vessel for offerings or libation – during the enacting of the temple cult, according to the mentioning of utensils and vessels of different functions found in the Bible.

5.3.2 The Amphora

Another vessel is depicted on the bronze prutot from the second year carrying the inscription Herat or Arafat Sino (Freedom of Zion) and the vine leaf on the other side (Fig. 110). The vessel displayed has a broad rim, a high neck, the body is hemispherical in form ribbed lengthwise and has two handles attached to it. The stem of the foot is elongated with a slightly protruding knob in the middle and flaring out towards the broad flat base. On bronze prutot of the third year a similar vessel is depicted now garnished with a ribbed conical lid with suspended fringes or pellets attached to it (Fig. 112). The clear lines and profile of the form is reminiscent of a metallic vessel.

It is generally accepted that the vessel in question here was part of the temple equipment, where it was used for holding liquid and perhaps used as a libation-vessel. According to the Mishnah, the first Rabbinic book written around 200 CE, a vessel

---

1098 KADMAN 1960, 89; SAMUELS 2000a, 69; MESHORER 2001, 121.
1099 COHEN 2006, 206-207.
used for libation had to be covered (Sukkah 4.10; Terumot 8.4), hence the lid.\textsuperscript{1100} The combination with the reverse of these coins – carrying the depiction of the vine leaf and the reference to the year of issue – does lend support the identification of the amphora as a vessel intended for wine,\textsuperscript{1101} if the obverse and the reverse should be understood in combination with each other. But it has also been suggested that the vessel held the oil for the menorah on account of much later (4\textsuperscript{th}-6\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE) depictions of jugs appearing next to the menorah.\textsuperscript{1102} This item is in most cases however not comparable with the amphora depicted on these coins. It is not safe to surmise more than that the amphora belonged to the temple equipment and was put to use within the enactment of the temple cult. The inscription \textit{Freedom of Zion} and the vine leaf on the other side of the coins do not help to specify anything in particular other than the aspect of the use of wine, as perhaps in the libation of it with the vessel depicted. No attempts have been made at attributing any symbolic meaning to this vessel, contrary to the image of the cup and would also in this case not be appropriate.

A similar iconographic constellation was used earlier in the coinage of the Roman procurator Valerius Gratus. Also here larger vessels are depicted in combination with the reverse image of a vine (Fig. 200). It is in this case not clear if these images can be associated with either a Jewish or Pagan context, or if a specific sacred context can be assumed at all (§4.2.1). Both the obverse and the reverse images find possible parallels or suitable contexts in the Greco-Roman as well as within the Jewish culture. Therefore, it is difficult to actually determine if in the latter case the obverse-reverse combination of the coin images may have implied a reference to the Jewish Temple. The repetition of this specific motif in the coins of the First Jewish War, as well as the coins of the Bar Kokhba War (appendix Tables 7 and 8), does however suggest that already at an early point in time a special value had been placed on this motif, which may very well be connected with a central object found in the temple. The motif combination of the amphora and the vine was among the ones imitated in the so-called \textit{minima} issued in Caesarea Maritima during the second and third centuries CE (Fig. 178).\textsuperscript{1103}

\textsuperscript{1100} KADMAN 1960, 89; SAMUELS 2000a, 69.
\textsuperscript{1101} KADMAN 1960, 89.
\textsuperscript{1102} ROMANOFF 1944, 31-33; HACHLILI 1988, 266-268; IDEM 1998, 347; MESHORER 2001, 121.
\textsuperscript{1103} LEVINE 1975, 41-42.
5.3.3 The Vine

The vine had previously only been used on Jewish coins minted by Herodes and Herodes Archelaus and was not highlighted on these coins in any particular fashion. The identification of the image is in the case of both rulers somewhat insecure (§3.3.1 and §4.2.1). In the coinage of the First Jewish War the image of the vine was always used in combination with the amphora (Fig. 110 & 112). Here the depiction consistently shows one vine leaf with five fingers hanging from a branch and a tendril curling away from it. In some cases a small bunch of grapes attached to the branch can also be identified.

The importance of wine can be traced at least back to the early third millennium BCE in Egypt and later came to be one of the most commonly spread agricultural goods of the Mediterranean world and beyond this. The vine or the vine leaf can as a pictorial element alone be understood either as an image associated primarily with a Pagan (Dionysian) context or as an image referring to a Jewish cultural context, in this case then possibly to be associated with the enacting of the cult in the Temple in Jerusalem, both of these basically entailing a reference to agricultural wealth and fertility of the land, which does not exclude a more general use of the vine and its appending elements the vine leaf and the grapes as general signs of plenty. The image of the vine is in different variations repeatedly used in Jewish coinage at different times. Any sacred content of the image of the vine in regard to the context of use is difficult to pinpoint.

According to ancient literary sources the vine was an important part of the decoration of the Jewish Temple and was used as common adornment on items found here. The image of the vine leaf has especially been connected with the golden vine described at the entrance of the temple, which has been seen to be a representation of Israel or even Judaism (see §4.2.1). In the Mishnah (Middot 3.8) it is stated that offerings of golden leaves and grapes were hung on this vine. This does however not provide a secure basis for the exact interpretation of the image of the vine leaf on these coins, but it can by all means be hypothesised due to the context of the war coins that this motif did in fact belong in this context. If the interpretation of the term Zion in the accompanying inscription Harat or Harawat Zion (Freedom of Zion) surrounding the
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1104 E.g. DNP 12/2 (2003), 423-436.
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vine leaf on the bronze prutot of the 2nd and 3rd years as a reference to the place of the Holy Temple in Jerusalem is valid (Fig. 110 & 112), the use of the vine should perhaps also be understood in this context and could indeed have been a reference to the golden vine at the entrance of the temple, although without having held any sacred meaning in itself. Especially after the destruction of the temple the vine leaf became a common and popular motif in Jewish iconography, but at the time of the war this was not yet the case. The exact meaning of the vine on the coins is still not completely clear. The motif seems to a great extent to have functioned as a general sign of opulence or wealth, but may in the specific case of the war coins have been meant as a reference to the wealth of land of Israel and the golden vine of the Temple as such. As noted already, this image was also imitated in the minima of Caesarea Maritima, which would corroborate with a contemporary more general understanding of the image as found in different contexts.

5.3.4 The Pomegranate

The reverse of the shekels carrying the cup-like vessel are all decorated with the same image: three pomegranates attached to an artless stem springing from an enlarged dot at the bottom of it surrounded by the inscription Jerusalem ha-kedosha (§5.2.2). The pomegranates all have three protruding spikes at their bottom, generally with small dots at their ends caused by the engraving technique (e.g. Fig. 109, 111 & 116). Contrary to the obverse image, the image does not undergo any noticeable changes during its time of use from year one through year five. As with the obverse the execution of the decoration seems – compared with the following years – less refined, again suggesting the first year to have been a somewhat experimental phase regarding not only the actual technical execution of the stamps, but also the standardization of the image.

The pomegranate was one of the most expressive signs of fertility and abundance to be found. In Pagan iconography it was traditionally primarily associated with the goddesses Astarte and Demeter, but could also be attributed to other goddesses. In the coinage of the Hasmonaeans the pomegranate was inserted between the double
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110 KADMAN 1960, 90.
111 Identified as such by ROMANOFF 1944, 51-54; KADMAN 1960, 87; MESHORER 2001, 118.
cornucopiae and has here tentatively been seen as a reference either to the high priest or the Temple in Jerusalem (§2.5).

In the Jewish world the image of the pomegranate was one of the oldest images to be found. The use of it can in literary sources be traced back both to Solomonic times (1st century BCE). In the description of the adornment of the garment of Moses’ brother Aaron the high priest in the Hebrew Bible pomegranates play an important role: "And these are the garments which they shall make: a breastpiece and an ephod and a robe and a tunic of checkered work, a turban and a sash, and they shall make holy garments for Aaron your brother and his sons, that he may minister as priest to Me. […]"

And you shall make on its hem pomegranates of blue and purple and scarlet material, all around on its hem, and bells of gold between them all around: a golden bell and a pomegranate, a golden bell and a pomegranate, all around on the hem of the robe” (Exodus 28). According to the literary references the pomegranate was also widely used in the adornments of the Solomonic temple: And there were capitals on the two pillars, even above and close to the rounded projection which was beside the network; and the pomegranates numbered two hundred in rows around both capitals (1 Kings 7), or: And he made chains in the inner sanctuary, and placed them on the tops of the pillars; and he made one hundred pomegranates and placed them on the chains (2 Chronicles 3), and likewise in the second Herodian temple. This places the image firmly within the context of the temple. The pomegranate can in addition to this also be found in other literary contexts, e.g. referring to the plenty of the Promised Land, allowing for a more wide interpretation of the use of this image as both a literary reference to the temple adornments and as a general reference to the fertility of the land of Israel. The former does in itself not qualify the pomegranate to be a sacred object, even if the context was sacred. A further literary reference found in the Mishnah stresses the possibility of it being given a sacral meaning under certain circumstances. Here it is stated that three pomegranates attached to each other can be used to clean religiously unclean items. In the late antiquity the motif became widely spread in Jewish art.
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1113 A further reference to this is found in Exodus 39:24-26.
1116 Deuteronomy 8:8.
1118 HACHLILI 1998, 381.
Judging by the context within which the image is used, the pomegranates could possibly have referred to more than a general concept of prosperity. If read and understood directly the diction of the accompanying inscription *Yerushalem kedosha* directed the intention respectively the content of the image at Jerusalem, but a connection between the two is not discernible with certainty. A more specific identification of the image has also been attempted by R. Deutsch, who has suggested the image to be the depiction of Aaron’s rod which budded and bore almonds (Hebrews 9:4; Numbers 17:8) and was kept in the temple: 

> But the LORD said to Moses, “Put back the rod of Aaron before the testimony to be kept as a sign against the rebels, that you may put an end to their grumblings against Me, so that they will not die” (Numbers 17).

If this interpretation is valid, the rod would have been a sign of strength and leadership.

### 5.3.5 The Four Species

On the bronze coins of the 4th year carrying the inscription *le-geulat Zion* (of/for the Redemption of Zion) two new images were introduced hitherto unknown in Jewish iconography: the palm tree with two baskets of fruit and the four species (Fig. 114 & 115), the latter consisting of the lulav (a closed frond of the date palm), the myrtle and the willow bundled together, with the ethrog (a citrus fruit) next to it. The four species were displayed in different constellations, but always appeared together on the coins: palm tree with the two baskets/two lulav and an ethrog, an ethrog/two lulav, the cup/two ethrog with a lulav. This is the first time since the use of the menorah by Mattathias Antigonus that images were used in Jewish coinage, which with certainty can be said to have been of a genuine Jewish origin. These images find no parallels outside Jewish contexts.

The images of the lulav and ethrog referred to the Sukkoth feast, also known as the Feast of the Tabernacles celebrated in the fall during the month of Tishri, during which these objects were put to use in the temple. The four species was not only a

---

1119 KADMAN 1960, 87-88.
1120 Amongst others in his paper held at the International Meeting of the SBL in London July 2011, based on his unpublished dissertation submitted at the Tel Aviv University 2009; also HENDIN 2010, 351, 502 n. 76.
1122 HACHLILI 1998, 349-351.
1123 HACHLILI 1998, 351.
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specific reference to this holiday held for the harvest festival of Sukkoth, hence immediately connected with the prosperity, abundance and happiness of the land. But with this display, the importance of Sukkoth – whose significance lay in the prospect of what was to be accomplished through hardship, the actual 40 year wandering of the Israelites towards the holy land commemorated with this feast,\textsuperscript{1125} resulting in the redemption (\textit{geulat}) as expressed by the inscription of these coins – was emphasized decidedly.\textsuperscript{1126} The religious context and sacred content of this display belongs to the most distinctive Jewish images found, in line with depictions of the menorah or the showbread table.\textsuperscript{1127}

5.3.6 The Palm Tree with Baskets

The iconography of the palm tree was introduced into Jewish coinage with the obverse of the bronze coins of the 4\textsuperscript{th} year carrying the inscription \textit{le-geulat Zion} (of/for the Redemption of Zion) (Fig. 114). In Palestine the image had enjoyed a long tradition as an image of prosperity and abundance as the \textit{tree-of-life}, known from different numismatic, archaeological and literary sources.\textsuperscript{1128} The image of the date palm tree – \textit{φοινιξ} (phoenix) in Greek – was originally a phonetic descriptive connected with the name of Phoenicia and as such amongst others depicted in the Hellenistic coinage of Tyre (e.g. Fig. 188).\textsuperscript{1129}

In ancient coinage the image of the palm tree has first and foremost been connected with the Flavian \textit{Judaea Capta} coin series issued in the imperial Roman mint during the Flavian period as the embodiment of the province of Judaea (Figs. 226-227),\textsuperscript{1130} and in this context perhaps even carrying the connotation of victory in connection with the grieving personification of Judaea capta.\textsuperscript{1131} The image was however used during the previous centuries in the Hellenistic as well as the Roman imperial coinage. The image of the palm tree with two bunches of grapes hanging down is featured in a number of coins issued by the Roman procurators Coponius (6-9 CE) (Fig. 194),\textsuperscript{1132} Marcus Ambibulus (9-12 CE) (Figs. 195-196),\textsuperscript{1133} and Antonius Felix (54-60 CE) (Fig. 202).\textsuperscript{1134} In actual Jewish coinage the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{1125}Leviticus 23:41-43.
\item \textsuperscript{1126}KADMAN 1960, 94; SAMUELS 2000a, 71-72; MESHORER 2001, 125-126.
\item \textsuperscript{1127}KINDLER 2003, 139-145.
\item \textsuperscript{1128}SAMUELS 2000a, 74.
\item \textsuperscript{1129}On the use of the Greek term \textit{φοίνιξ} (Palm tree), see RE 20 (1941), 386, s.v. \textit{phoenix} (STEIER).
\item \textsuperscript{1130}Early \textit{“Judaea Capta”} coins were also issued under Vespasian in Palestine, RPC II (1999), 303, 317.
\item \textsuperscript{1131}CARRADICE 1982-1983, 18-19; MORESINO-ZIPPER 2009, 67.
\item \textsuperscript{1132}MESHORER 2001, nos. 311-312; HENDIN 2010, no. 1328.
\item \textsuperscript{1133}MESHORER 2001, nos. 313-315a; HENDIN 2010, nos. 1329-1331.
\end{enumerate}
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image makes its first appearance in the coinage of Herod Antipas (Fig. 60). Before this time the image was in Palestine found in the early coinage of Tyre, in the Siculo-Punic coinage of the Tyrian colony of Carthage during the 4th century BCE and regularly from the 2nd century BCE on the bronze coins of Tyre (Fig. 188), as for example during the rule of Antiochus II. It was probably not until the 1st century CE that the motif came to be narrowed down as the sign of the land of Judaea, which was first and foremost conditioned by its use in Roman coinage.

It is difficult to infer more or another meaning into the use of the palm tree other than it being a sign for the province of Judaea; i.e. in line with the Roman Judaea Capta coins issued after the war. In this case the motivic combination of the palm tree and the grieving figure – possibly the personification of Judaea – should be understood as a sign of the Roman victory. Principally, the palm tree was the representation of Judaea, as illustrated by the use of this motif amongst others on the reverse of the coin series minted by Nerva on the occasion of the revocation of the Fiscus Judaicus in 96 CE imposed by Vespasian on the Jews after the First Jewish War (Fig. 231), and rigorously enforced by Domitian (81-96 CE); reflected by the re-issuing of Judaea Capta coins during his rule and stressed by the scrupulous collection of the Jewish tax recorded by Suetonius (Domitian 12.2). During Domitian’s reign the designation ‘Judaist’ developed into a shameful expression for imperial opponents (Cassius Dio 68.1.2) and according to Cassius Dio the Roman consul Flavius Clemens was even executed due to his ‘Jewish behaviour’ (67.14.1-2).

The inconspicuous remains of the upper part of a Palm tree can be found in the booty relief on the Arch of Titus. In the spandrel on the right side of the relief arch
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1134 MESHORER 2001, nos. 340-341d; HENDIN 2010, nos. 1348, 1350; regarding the identification of this procurator, see KOKKINOS 1990, 126-141.
1135 Also HENDIN 2006, 58.
1136 SAMUELS 2000a, 74; SNG Israel 1, nos. 676-680 (Antiochus III/Tyre), no. 917 (Seleucus IV/Tyre), nos. 1096-1099 (Antiochus IV/Tyre), nos. 1248-1251 (Antiochus V/Tyre), nos. 1337-1342, 1345-1349 (Demetrius I/Tyre), nos. 1539-1543, 1547-1552 (Alexander Balas/Tyre), nos. 1691-1695, 1710-1714 (Demetrius II/Tyre); SC II, no. 1838 (Alexander I/Tyre), nos. 1462, 1470 (Antiochus IV/Tyre), no. 1580 (Alexander V/Tyre), etc.
1137 SAMUELS 2000a, 73.
1138 In accordance with the significance attached to the palm tree by GOLDSTEIN and FONTANILLE (GOLDSTEIN / FONTANILLE 2006, 23).
1140 SAMUELS 2000a, 76.
commemorating the triumph over the Jews, through which the procession is to proceed, a Victoria is rendered holding a wreath in the right hand and a palm frond in her left hand. Beneath her are the remains of the upper part of a palm tree with fruits hanging from it, an image now common in Flavian pictorial propaganda commemorating the Roman victory over the Jewish people.1143

On the coins of the 4th year of the Jewish war the palm tree is depicted with seven branches, a bundle of fruit is hanging from each side of the tree, and a basket is placed on both sides of the tree-trunk (Fig. 114). Due to the use of the two baskets of fruits the image of the palm tree on the Year 4 coins differs from any comparable compositions including the palm tree. The two baskets have been identified as depictions of or references to the bikkurim, i.e. the first produce (wheat according to Exodus 34:22) harvested and brought as an offering to the temple at the beginning of the harvest:1144

25"You shall not offer the blood of My sacrifice with leavened bread, nor is the sacrifice of the Feast of the Passover to be left over until morning". 26"You shall bring the very first of the first fruits of your soil into the house of the LORD your God" (Exodus 34),1145 this offering is also regularly just named as the first fruits.1146

This is in concordance with the interpretation of the image on the reverse of these coins, with the two lulavs and the ethrog. The baskets of fruit – or bikkurim – entail a reference to the prosperity of the land represented by the palm tree.1147 Together with the depiction of the reverse representing the feast of Sukkoth and therewith the redemption waiting mentioned in the inscription, the prosperity of the land is likely to come with this redemption. The baskets did not necessarily replace the cornucopia previously used on Jewish coins,1148 but probably to some extent held the same meaning and function as a depiction of abundance as the cornucopia, most likely more precisely identified as the representations of the actual bikkurim, hence meant as a reference to the feast of Sukkoth and the redemption waiting.1149

1143 PFANNER 1983, 50 (Pl. 56 Fig. 2), 71-72.
1144 KADMAN 1960, 91-92.
1145 Quotation from NAU 1995.
1146 E.g. Leviticus 2:12, 23:10.
1147 KADMAN 1960, 92; GOLDSTEIN / FONTANILLE 2006, 23.
1149 HENDIN 2010, 348, with further references. In addition he refers to the similar decoration of the so-called “pilgrim’s ring”, which may very well substantiate this identification, only in the case quoted neither the provenance or actual date of the context from which the item stems is documented, HENDIN 2010, 352.
5.4 Who Were the Minting Authorities?

The coins themselves are in their images and legends persistently silent concerning the question of the identity of the minting authorities. The time of the self-confident demon- stration of the Jewish rulers ended with this war, only through the naming of the po- litical leaders on the coins of the later Bar Kokhba-War similar tendencies became briefly traceable again. Since none of the coins of the First Jewish War carry any information pertaining to specific authoritative persons or groups, more or less general assumption concerning the identity of the minting authorities have ruled. These authorities have generally been considered to be either an official body representing all fractions of the Jews or that the temple authorities, managing all monetary issued connected with the temple, constituted this authority. The arrangement of the production of the different denominations and the noticeable changes occurring after the coins of the 3rd year does however provide information that can perhaps help narrow some of these questions down.

As generally the case with coinage, also the regulation of the minting of these war time coins and their denominations seem to have abided by very clear defined monetary rules with the addition of religious consideration specific for the region of Judaea as the centre for the minting of the coins. In addition to the standard financial aspects of the Jewish coinage minted during these few years, it is quite possible that the coinage itself was defined by it playing an active role in connection with the Jewish Temple. It has been argued that the production of the coins was arranged according to religious needs, but at the same time their development was also strongly influenced by the progress and political changes taking place throughout the war.

According to Goldstein and Fontanille’s examination of the production sequence of the coins, the half-shekels to be used at the beginning of the year to pay the tribute were minted first and in advance, the shekel for the temple treasury secondly, and the bronze coins were minted last. The regular issuing of the bronze prutot did apparently not commence until the 2nd year of the war; although one bronze prutah does carry the
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fig. 9.7. The circumstances concerning the acquisition of the so-called “pilgrim’s ring” have been published online by D. HENDIN, retrieved October 12, 2011 from: [http://www.amphoracoin.com/article.asp?id=7].

1150 MESHORER 2001, 115.
1151 GOLDSTEIN / FONTANILLE 2006, 14-16.
designation Year 1.1152 The silver shekels were primarily of importance to the temple treasury, the silver half-shekels were used by the public to pay the annual temple-tribute, the bronze prutah with its different minor denominations were used to cover everyday monetary purposes.1153 Minting in advance would explain why a large number of coins were produced for the 3rd year, when Jerusalem had once again become the showplace for the civil war, under which circumstances a regular production of coins was no longer likely to have taken place. Again, according to Goldstein and Fontanille the quota of half-shekels for the 3rd year must have been prepared before this time.1154 The primary consideration behind the organization of the production of coins was corresponding to this apparently not of a fiscal nature, but concerned the religious aspect of the use of these coins in connection with the maintenance of the temple and the religious calendar.1155 This would go well with the hypothesis of the minting authorities at this time being the high priests and Pharisees, who may well have attended to the religious requirements of the temple administration first.1156 Independent of this, the shear mass of coins produced in both metals does however show that the financial aspect of the coin production must have been considered equally important, irrespective of the actual annual organisation of the production in accordance with the Jewish calendar.1157

The source of the coin metal necessary for the minting was most likely to have been the bullions from the treasury of the temple. The actual place of the original mint was probably also placed within the area of the temple itself or on grounds administered by it.1158 Any further tentative conclusions are difficult. Nothing specific is known about the mint itself and it has also been discussed if not two mints were at work during the time war, but no undisputed ideas concerning the conception of the authorities, organisation, or even coin series issued by the supposed different mints have so far been established. The temple authorities consisting of the old aristocracy of the high priestly families ruling before the war, was presumably also the only party with a direct


1153 GOLDSTEIN / FONTANILLE 2006, 15.


1156 As also stated by RAPPAPORT 2007, 108.

1157 GOLDSTEIN / FONTANILLE 2006, 14-16.

1158 As also noted by RAPPAPORT 2007, 107-108; HENDIN 2010, 343.
access to the necessary funds and means, at least at the beginning of the war, hence they were most likely to have controlled the minting of the silver coinage.

Accepting the theory of the old authorities of the temple as the leading minting authority as a fact, the changes occurring between the 3rd and the 4th year can more readily be explained against the unfortunate course of the war for the Jews and the increasingly bad situation in Jerusalem. The changes between the coins of the 3rd and 4th year of the war are evident: the decline in the use of silver for the coins, replacing them by bronze coins of equivalent denominations, the changes of the wording of the legends and the introduction of new images not seen before in form of the four species and the palm tree with the baskets. The differences in the legends are not limited to their content. Also the epigraphic style between the 2nd and 3rd years and the 4th year shows some variations that could prove telltale as to determining changes or developments within the authorities minting these coins. Especially the differences in the shape of some of the letters (i.e. Aleph, Waw, and Shin) of the silver shekel and half-shekels and the bronze coins from the fourth year are noticeable.\footnote{Over view tables in Y. Meshorer (Meshorer 2001, 132) and Goldstein and Fontanille (2006, 25, Fig. 10); Meshorer 2001, 127.} Goldstein and Fontanille and others have amongst others taken these epigraphic distinctions to mean that different engravers and different mints were at work here, and have as a consequence thereof attributed these coins to another mint, namely that of Simon Bar Giora, who represented the strongest party at this time.\footnote{Kanael 1963, 59; Meshorer 2001, 131; Goldstein / Fontanille 2006, 21-25; Rappaport 2007, 103, 111-114.} Their understanding of the legends and iconography used on the later coins is determined by this maxim; this has however been disputed by others.\footnote{Personal communication with D. Jacobson.}

Although Flavius Josephus provides a detailed account of this time, the reasons for the changes taking place in the coinage can still only be argued on a hypothetical level, since they are not dealt with directly in any ancient sources. The noticeable changes between the legends of the earlier coins and the coins from the 4th and 5th years, i.e. the introduction of the term redemption (geulat) as a replacement of the until then used term freedom (cherut), can be understood in different ways. The traditional understanding of this is that the rebels at this point in time had realized that only divine intervention could help to improve their desperate situation, hence the call for the divine

\footnote{\footnotetext{\textsuperscript{1159} Overview tables in Y. Meshorer (Meshorer 2001, 132) and Goldstein and Fontanille (2006, 25, Fig. 10); Meshorer 2001, 127.}
\footnotetext{\textsuperscript{1160} Kanael 1963, 59; Meshorer 2001, 131; Goldstein / Fontanille 2006, 21-25; Rappaport 2007, 103, 111-114.}
\footnotetext{\textsuperscript{1161} Personal communication with D. Jacobson.}}
intervention. Although, viewed against the historic background of the ongoing internal problems taking place in Jerusalem a more comprehensive explanation can be proposed explaining the changes, as it has been suggested by Goldstein and Fontanille. The differences in the terminology used can also be understood as referring to two different philosophical ideas, in this case represented by the two main parties dominating Jewish society during this time: the pro-Roman peace party and the Zealots. The images used together with the legends – or vice versa – can be seen as illustrating this even further.

In Jerusalem during the winter 67/68 CE, between the 3rd and the 4th year of the war, the Zealots now lead by John of Gischala seized the power from the leading pro-Roman peace-party of the high priest families and enforced the appointment of a new high priest assigned by lot, thereby forcing the priestly families assuming this function since the days of Herod to step aside. In so doing, the Zealots probably attempted to weaken the power of the ruling aristocratic priestly families and to introduce an element of democracy into the hieratic appointment-system. In the course of the actions taking place throughout this part of the civil war the moderate peace-party was completely eliminated and John of Gischala occupied the Temple Mount and became the unrivalled ruler of Jerusalem from the early 4th year, at the same time probably causing the noticeable changes taking place in the coinage issued. His rule was challenged by another Zealot leader, Simon bar Gioras. During the spring of 69 CE the civil war erupted again as Simon occupied the upper part of Jerusalem, thereby weakening the position of the Jewish rebels even further (Map 6).

The new legends from the 4th year expressing the metaphoric wish of “redemption” – depending on (or hoping for) a divine intervention, contrary to the until then prevalent very concrete goal of simply gaining the “freedom” of the land, being the direct reaction to this. The iconography itself does not provide any obvious conclusive evidence clarifying these changes. But the interpretation of the depictions on these coins as representing Sukkoth is in exact concordance with the wording of the inscription,
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since this feast commemorates the redemption (and exodus) of the Israelites from the yoke of the Egyptian rule through divine intervention, the legends now implying the wish to escape the yoke of the Romans. The changes in the use of the metals could in this context be understood as the reaction to an increasing lack of silver, with the bronze coins carrying new written denominations *chatzi* and *revia* now being used as the replacements covering the everyday monetary needs. The existence of another (new) mint under a different authority than the authorities of the temple – in this case either John of Gischala or Simon bar Giora – is a possibility, but not necessary to explain these changes.
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1169 KÖRTING 2008.
1170 KADMAN 1960, 101; SAMUELS 2000a, 70; according to D. HENDIN, the known relative number of silver shekels is increasingly being reduced for each passing year, which may also reflect not only the increasing lack of silver, but also the internal instability (HENDIN 2010, 340).
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Chapter 6

The Bar Kokhba War (132-135 CE)

The Second Jewish War (132-135 CE)\textsuperscript{1172} was the response to the long ongoing political oppression of the Jewish population in Palestine by the Romans since the end of the First Jewish War (66-70 CE). The violent reaction to the loss of the holy city of Jerusalem and ultimately the centre of Jewish piety, the holy temple within it, represents the last Jewish attempt to forcefully restore the “divine order” of the ancient Jewish world. Apart from the findings of the written scrolls in the Judaean desert the so-called Bar Kokhba coins constitute the only substantial archaeological evidence from this brief period in Jewish history.\textsuperscript{1173} The precise dating of the Bar Kokhba War is based on the literary traditions of the Church Fathers and Rabbinic literature and the written scrolls found in the Judaic desert,\textsuperscript{1174} which has been supported by the numismatic evidence.\textsuperscript{1175}

The coinage issued by the authorities of the insurgents during this time reflects a Jewish society, which since the beginning of Jewish coinage had undergone major developments and changes. Both the political as well as the religious situation of the Jews during the early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE had, through the decentralisation due to the loss of the Temple in Jerusalem at the end of the First Jewish War, changed radically. All parts of the Jewish society were forced to re-define their religious practises and life as such, especially in Palestine. Most markedly was that after the First Jewish War the priestly aristocracy connected with the Temple lost its importance and the leading Jerusalemer elite was dispersed. The standing of the Jewish sectarianism in the Jewish society changed, which amongst others lead to the disappearance of the priestly groups of the Sadducees and the Qumran Essenes as recognizable factors within the Jewish society. The Rabbinic Ju-

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{1172} Named after the most prominent figure, according to his traditional name in the Christian sources of the Church fathers (will be treated in detail later). This war is also known under the more neutral name Second Jewish War; see H. ESHEL for a precise discussion of the exact dates of the Bar Kokhba era as found in the written documents (ESHEL 2003, 93-105).
\item\textsuperscript{1173} BENOIT / MILIK / de VAUX 1961; YADIN 1961, 36-52; YADIN 1978, 26; MILDENBERG 1984, 73.
\item\textsuperscript{1174} BENOIT / MILIK / de VAUX 1961, 118-148.
\item\textsuperscript{1175} MILDENBERG 1984, 82.
\end{itemize}
DAISM emerging after the First War was characterized by a higher – though not limitless – degree of religious tolerance, allowing a wider diversity of views regarding halakhic (Jewish religious) observances, than the Jewish religious groups previously.1176

6.1 The Second Jewish War in Ancient Literature

The outbreak of the Bar Kokhba War was the result of a long development and the deliberate oppressive politics on the part of the Romans, which can be traced back to the Jewish Diaspora revolt 115-117 CE during the time of the rule of Trajan, with roots going back even further to the time of the First Jewish War.1177 Hadrian’s decision to supplant the city of Jerusalem with the Roman colony of Aelia Capitolina in 130/131 CE seems to be his politically motivated reaction to the Diaspora revolt, even if this has not been accounted for in any ancient sources.1178 According to Cassius Dio (Hist. Rom. 69.12.1-2) Hadrian’s decision to build a temple for Jupiter in place of the old Jewish Temple, whose restitution apparently had been expected by the religious leaders of the Jews, may have played a major role in igniting the revolt. It is however more than likely that several reasons should be drawn together simultaneously,1179 but the decision to construct a temple for the supreme Jupiter Capitolinus was the final proof to the Jewish community that the long foreshadowed complete suppression of its religion and the Jewish culture was finalized. Hadrian’s politics was tailored to suppress the Jewish people and the constitution of the Colonia Aelia Capitolina was the instrument applied, although most likely again underestimating the readiness to violently reactions on the part of the Jewish population.1180

The statement made by the church historian Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 4.6.1-4) during the 4th century CE that the Roman colony of Aelia Capitolina was established after the end of the war, the appearance of which has only been substantiated by a relative minor

1176 MAGNESS 2011, 181-183.
1177 In the rabbinic literature known as the “War of Quietus”, SCHÜRER 1973, 529-534, SCHÄFER 1981, 18.
1178 GOODMAN 2007a, 462-463.
1179 See SCHÄFER for a thorough discussion of the generally assumed reasons (the building of the temple for Jupiter, the establishment of the Colonia Aelia Capitolina, or Hadrian’s prohibition of circumcision) catalysing the outbreak of the war (SCHÄFER 1981, 29-50); ISAAC 2003, 37-54.
amount of archaeological evidence,\footnote{ELIAV 2003, 241-277.} must be viewed as the least likely interpretation of the course of actions taking place during this time.\footnote{YADIN 1978, 21-22; BOATWRIGHT 2000, 196-197; TSAFRIR 2003, 31-36.} Even if the information delivered by Cassius Dio allows for more possible ways of interpretation,\footnote{TSAFRIR 2003, 31-32.} his statement that the \textit{colonia} was established by Hadrian before the outbreak of the war in 132 CE should probably be viewed as more credible in combination with the information gathered from the desert scrolls and the numismatic evidence,\footnote{KANAEL 1971, 40-41; SCHÄFER 1981, 26-27; MILDENBERG 1984, 82; MILDENBERG 1984-1985, 31; ZAHRT 1991, 475-477; BOATWRIGHT 2000, 197; KINDLER 2002, 176-179; GOODMAN 2003, 23; GOODMAN 2007a, 461; on the correct dating of the war according to the value of all the written sources available, see SCHÄFER 1981, 10-28.} although the circumstances surrounding the findings of the coins of the Second Jewish War together with coins from Aelia Capitolina sustaining this are not without controversy.\footnote{TSAFRIR 2003, 33-36.} This does not exclude the possibility that the colony was not actually realised until after the war, i.e. on the ruins of the Jewish capital as stated by Eusebius.\footnote{SCHÄFER 1981, 90-91.}

In the Jewish literature following the Second Jewish War different explanations for the war can be found. In the Mishnah, compiled around 200 CE, the explanation for the final elimination of the temple through Hadrian and the following banishment of the Jewish people is woven together from different historic motives. Here the predominant reason is the emperor’s desire for the recognition of the imperial ruler cult. In doing so the history of the First Jewish War is combined with the person of Hadrian.\footnote{SCHÄFER, 1981, 90-91.} The Babylonian Talmud on the other hand, even if not redacted until much later in time (c. 500-600 CE) in Babylonia, may allow another cautious retrospective picture of the Jewish perception of the time of the revolt: \textit{When Rabbi Yosi ben Kisma was ill, Rabbi Hanina ben Tradion came to visit him, Rabbi Yosi said to him, ‘Brother Hanina, do you not know that heaven has ordained that this nation [Rome] shall reign? For though she laid waste His House, burnt His Temple, slew His pious ones and caused His best ones to perish, still she is firmly established’... (Avodah Zarah 18a).}\footnote{English translation by R. HAMMER (1985, 37), slightly adapted.} Following this Rabbi Yose ben Kisma predicts that Rabbi Hanina ben Tradion because of his public teaching of the Torah will suffer death (as the first Jewish martyr). The message conveyed in this text, written from the point of view of the person of Rabbi Yosi ben Kisma, most likely from the
time of the last phase of or shortly after the Second Jewish War, was not to display Rome in its right as divinely appointed ruler of the world in a positive light, but to clarify the position of the Jews under this rule. Rome was the punishment for the sins committed, similarly to past times where god had used the Assyrians and the Babylonians as way of punishment of the Jews (Isaiah 10:24-26). Israel would, after the decline of the wrongful power of Rome, be given the possibility to rise again in an even greater magnificence than before (Jeremiah 31:13, 20),\(^{1189}\) an approach that to some extent appear to be expressed in the iconography used on the coins of the Second Jewish War.

Contrary to the extensive and relatively detailed writings of Flavius Josephus concerning the First Jewish War, the only contemporary Roman account of the Second Jewish War is preserved in the writings of the historian Cassius Dio (Hist. Rom. 69.13-14.3). Even if only briefly summarized by him the grave situation of the Romans on account of the unexpected fierce Jewish resistance is here clearly perceivable.\(^{1190}\) That Dio noted Hadrian’s omission “… in writing to the Senate, [Hadrian] did not employ the opening phrase commonly used by the emperors, ‘If you and your children are in health, it is well; I and the legions are in health’…” (Hist. Rom. 69.14.1-3) is an unquestionable illustration of the severe circumstances that the Jewish revolt caused the Romans. But also Dio’s brief account of the military efforts invested by the Romans and of the aftermath and consequences for the Jews of what unpredictably had turned in to a full blown war against the Roman Empire demonstrates the severe political implications of this historic incident.\(^{1191}\)

6.2 The Bar Kokhba Coinage

The coins exclusively carrying palaeo-Hebrew legends were issued during the brief span of the revolt and circulated in a very limited area. Despite these restrictions in time and space, they display a relative broad range of iconographic types allowing a good insight into a world where the political identity of the ruler had changed fundamentally compared with earlier periods and where the use of sacred iconography seems to have been underlying specific considerations.

\(^{1189}\) HAMMER 1985, 37-39.
\(^{1190}\) ECK 1999b, 78-82.
\(^{1191}\) SCHÄFER 2003c, VII; GOODMAN 2007a, 468-469.
The coinage reflects the well structured organization that was required from the rebels leading this revolt, at least from the point in time where the coins were issued, and that the outbreak of the revolt was by no means a spontaneous reaction comparable with the outbreak of the Maccabean Revolt in the 2nd century BCE, but far more a gradual development (Cassius Dio 69.13.1). The impression of an effective working Jewish – viewed with Roman eyes – dissident state, without the internal political tensions that had dominated the time leading up to the First Jewish War in 66 CE, is supported by the picture obtained from the desert documents. Unfortunately it is difficult to gather a more precise picture of the insurgents, but some hints are conveyed by the coin iconography.

6.2.1 Characteristics of Distribution and Minting

The coins of the Second Jewish War were presumably minted in different places one of which has tentatively been identified at Herodium, one of the headquarters of the rebels, a second location has not been identified but has been suggested to be situated somewhere in the area north of Jerusalem, although with so far no secure verification of this. In addition to the assumed immobile mints the rebels seems to have taken advantage of the use of mobile mints. One of these has, on the basis of coin fragments found here, been identified at Khirbet el-Aqd, approx. 22 km west of Jerusalem. The use of mobile facilities corresponds well with the general picture of guerrilla warfare carried out by the Jewish rebels.

An evaluation of the distribution area of the coins is one possible way to assess the extent of the territory of the Jewish rebels and where the Jewish population was affected by the war actions. Through the evidence of the distribution of coins finds a relative frequency can be established according to which the core areas of where the users of the coins must have moved or dwelled can be evaluated. Despite some elements of uncer-

1192 BIRLEY 1997, 268.
tainty, considering that only the coins found through controlled archaeological excavations opposed to the large number of coins without secure provenances can be used in the evaluation of their distribution area, a tentative overview of the area can be established. The total number of coins with secured provenance is however probably still not sufficient enough to extract precise information regarding the exact extent of the area affected by the revolt.  

As singular coin finds clearly illustrate, not every war coin found in an area, automatically qualifies this to have belonged in the hands of the rebels, since as it has often been seen that even coins also of minimal value have a tendency to travel long distances. It is not surprising that, according to the results of such a brief survey, a relative large number of the coin finds have been recorded coming from the caves of the Judaean Desert, the hills of the Judaean hills overlooking the Dead Sea and the Jordan Valley, presumably used by the rebels as places of refuge and hiding complexes. The area used by the rebels did according to the spread of the Jewish settlements connected with the rebels go beyond the boarders of Judaea, with the largest concentration of hiding complexes found south and west of Jerusalem. The archaeological evidence illustrates that the fighting between the Jewish rebels and the Romans was not restricted to the core areas of the rebels. Finds connected with the war have been found scattered throughout all peripheral areas of Jerusalem, the very few war coins found within the Jewish capital however show that the city never came under the control of the rebels.

Singular for the coins of the Second Jewish War is that they all were minted on Greek and especially Roman silver and bronze coins already circulating. Especially on the silver coins the method of over striking often allows the picture beneath to be identified (e.g. outline of head on Fig. 138). Fragments of coins prepared for over striking found at Khirbet el-Â’Aqd from this time show that apparently also a small number of Hasmonaean and Herodian bronze coins were reused in this process. Even though this find only includes a total of 10 coins, the choice of using coins verifiably coming

1200 ESHEL / ZISSU / BARKAY 2010, 91-97
1202 KLONER / ZISSU 2003, 181-216, Fig. 13.
1203 ECK 2003, 165.
1206 MILDENBERG 1984, 14, n. 18, 22-27.
from Mattathias Antigonus and Herod the Great could be an indication of deliberate choices of coins, with images that now were clearly considered unsuitable even if issued by former Jewish rulers. This is supported by the fact that not every coin falling into the hands of the rebels was uncritically re-stamped and re-distributed, as finds of coins that were not over struck among the coins of the Second Jewish War show. It is noteworthy that only few of the coins were struck on contemporary Hadrianic issues. Ne
erther the purity of the metal nor the nominal value of the coins seems to have been of predominant concern, although they were systemized to some degree through their images. The use of halved bronze coins seems to have increased during the later part of the war.

It is entirely questionable if the Bar Kokhba rebels would have been in possession of the means to produce new coins, since their access to bullions or similar amounts of accumulated metal – as found in the Jewish Temple and most likely used during the First Jewish War – would have been very limited. However, this choice of method was probably not just a question of the rebels exempting themselves from producing new blanks. From an economic point of view the coins were not necessary, considering the ample amount of coins – albeit Roman – already circulating, but the significant amount of coins emitted does suggest that an independent monetary system was attempted at, which would parallel the desert documents in which structures of the society under the rebels is evidenced by the content of the contracts and agreements found. Furthermore, the insurgents could through the use of this method send the Romans, as well as their own population, a clear signal of political sovereignty, which went far beyond the normal procedure of countermarking coins regularly documented in Palestine from the time shortly before the Bar Kokhba War in form of countermarks of the 10th Roman legion Fretensis or the over striking of coins established in numerous other cases mostly not with outspoken hostile intentions as found here, e.g. in the coinage of the Hasmonaeans (e.g. Fig.

1208 MILDENBERG 1984, 87.
1209 MILDENBERG 1984, 23, 27-28, 88-89 – MILDENBERG contradicts himself on the subject of how uncritically the rebels over struck different types of coins.
1211 KINDLER 1986-1987, 47.
1213 MILDENBERG 1984-1985, 30
1214 Only few examples of this kind of hostile procedure have so far been documented, i.e. coins from Charax Spasinu on the Tigris. Here Hyspaosines over struck the coins of the earlier Seleucid Satrap from Mesene, Characene. Also Mithritades II (124/3-90 BCE) during his brief occupation of the city over struck its coins, on this D.M. JACOBSON (JACOBSON 2000, 77); the custom of over striking coins without
The coins underlined the attempt of the reestablishment of the Jewish state and were used by the administration of the rebels as a legitimizing tool proclaiming the new state, similar to the use of coinage by the Hasmonaean dynasts previously during the process of founding the new Jewish kingdom in the course of the disintegration of the Seleucid kingdom during the 2nd century BCE, as well as the Herodian rulers. Also the insurgents of the First Jewish War had through their use of issuing coins shown a clear awareness of the political value of this medium. By using the method of over striking, the rebels did not only create a new sovereign coinage, even of an somewhat experimental nature compared with the iconographic standards of other ancient coinage of the time, they declared themselves and their political intentions through the deliberate elimination of the predominantly Roman political propaganda.\footnote{No specific person or place can be pinpointed as the actual issuing authority. This role should more correctly be ascribed to the obscured organisation of the rebels and not necessarily to the actual person of Ben Kosiba, which cannot be proven without doubt, further MILDENBERG 1984, 61-65.}

Through the over striking of the coins available the weight of the individual Bar Kokhba coin types could vary greatly. General agreement prevails to the fact that the rebel administration issued silver coins in three different denominations: tetradrachms/sela’im, didrachms/shekalim, and denarii/zuzim, whose Hebrew names are known from the contemporary desert documents.\footnote{Discussion is summarized by H. ESHEL, in ESHEL 2007-2008, 119-121.} The \textit{sela’im} and the \textit{shekalim} featured an obverse-reverse combination of the temple-façade and the lulav and ethrog or just the lulav, whereas the smaller \textit{zuzim} display an assortment of different images. Less security has ruled as to the division of the bronze coins, which has been suggested to have consisted both of three and four different denominations.\footnote{MESHORER 2001, 139; ESHEL 2007-2008, 120-124.} An examination of the weight of the bronze coins carrying the images of harps and lyres by H. Eshel has disclosed marked changes in the weight of these coins during the third year of the war, which may suggest that the bronze coins were in fact divided into four different denominations, of which the fourth was finalized in the third year carrying the image of the lyre.\footnote{Meshorer, in Eshel 2007-2008, 120-124.}
6.3 The Coin Legends

In the coinage of the Second Jewish War the palaeo-Hebrew legends, otherwise not commonly in use during this time, referred to names and titles, years, or were political keywords like redemption or freedom, as previously seen used on the coins of the First Jewish War, 1219 except for the term *kedosha* (holy). Especially the use of personal names and titles represented a major difference between the coinages of the two Jewish wars, which will be dealt with in detail in the following.

During the Second Jewish War the coins of the first year carried the inscription “Year One of the Redemption of Israel”, the coins of the second year the inscription “Year Two of the Freedom of Israel”, and the undated coins from the last phase of the war bore the inscription “For the Freedom of Jerusalem”. Hybrid silver and bronze coins were to some extent issued, on which the legends of two different years could be entailed (see appendix Tables 7 and 8). The consistent use of these legends speaks for caution towards placing a specific meaning on these in connection with the use of specific images with which these three legends were displayed.

The often flawed workmanship of the legends (missing letters, wrong spelling, etc.) probably simultaneously arise both from insufficient skills of the die-cutters, as well as the use of what by this time had largely become an otherwise unfamiliar script only used rarely, as amongst others in a smaller number of the Dead Sea scrolls. 1220 In the small group of the so called irregular issued coin series at the end of the war the legends often became almost unreadable. 1221 The question is who was actually able to read and understand these legends at this point in time? – Probably only very few people. The ancient script seems to have kept the symbolic value already established and implemented during the previous centuries, as the previous use of this script shows this value had already been recognised and implemented on the coins of the First Jewish War (§5.2.3) and before that by the Hasmonaean rulers (§2.5.2.1). Certain connotations
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1219 MILDENBERG 1984, 29; GOODMAN 2007b, 166; et al.
1220 HENDIN 2010b, 36.
1221 MILDENBERG 1984, 22; the use of the terminology „regular“ and „irregular“ Bar Kokhba coins is, as correctly stated by D. BARAG (BARAG 2002, 155), somewhat insecure. The coins were most likely not viewed by the rebels in a similar way. The explanation of the differing coins with the attribution of them to two different mints cannot be seen as final, since questions concerning the location of the stationary mints have not yet been solved, also considering the additional use of – an unknown number of – mobile mints during this time (e.g. KINDLER 1986–1987, 46–7). Also the difficult circumstances of the rebels must be considered, when examining the presumably later dating coins of the “irregular” coin series.
– even if only of a visual nature – must still have been stirred among the users of the coins, perhaps bringing forth associations of the holy Temple or earlier golden ages, otherwise the use of the script is inexplicable.¹²²

### 6.3.1 ‘L’ZR HKHN

Contrary to the coins of the First Jewish War, the leading figures of the war – *Eleazar* and especially the figure of *Shimeon* – were positioned centrally on the coins,¹²³ however with specific distinctions. The name and title ‘L’ZR HKHN (*Eleazar ha-kohen*) is found only in a very limited number of coin types and only in connection with few images on these coins (see overview text Tables VI & VII below).¹²⁴ Several attempts have been made to identify the historic person behind this name, which could help solve the question of his role during the war, but so far no completely satisfactory explanation has been found.¹²⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obverse:</th>
<th>Motif</th>
<th>Reverse:</th>
<th>Motif</th>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td><em>Eleazar the Priest</em></td>
<td>Jug w. branch</td>
<td><em>Year 1 of the Redemption of Israel</em></td>
<td>Bunch of grapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td><em>Shimeon</em></td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td><em>Eleazar the Priest</em></td>
<td>Jug w. branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td><em>Eleazar the Priest</em></td>
<td>Palm tree</td>
<td><em>Year 1 of the Redemption of Israel</em></td>
<td>Bunch of grapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td><em>Eleazar the Priest</em></td>
<td>Palm tree</td>
<td><em>Year 2 of the Freedom of Israel</em></td>
<td>Bunch of grapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undated</td>
<td><em>Eleazar the Priest</em></td>
<td>Palm tree</td>
<td><em>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</em></td>
<td>Bunch of grapes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Text Table VI.** The name Eleazar with corresponding coin images.¹²⁶

¹²² A similar mechanism can to some extend be identified in the Roman imperial coinage, where the repetition of standardised formulas would have ensured a higher factor of recognition of the coin inscriptions, even if not readable by all users. However a generally high degree of literacy is here assumed (e.g. WOLTERS 2003, 189-190).

¹²³ GOODMAN 2007b, 166.

¹²⁴ MILDENBERG 1984, 365-368.

¹²⁵ KINDLER 1974, 58; SCHÄFER 1981, 173-4; MILDENBERG 1984, 29-30; MILDENBERG 1984-1985, 27-28; MESHORER 2001, 142-3; SAMUELS 2000b, 87-8. Since the inscription does not say *Eleazar ha-kohen ha-gadol* (*Eleazar the High Priest*), any deductions concerning his possible role as a high priest should most likely be eliminated. Theoretically, the name Eleazar could even be a reminder of the priest Eleazar ben Ananias, who played an important role in the resurrection against the Romans at the beginning of First Jewish War (§5.1).

¹²⁶ MESHORER 2010, nos. 219, 224-226, 234-235, 300; HENDIN 2010, nos. 1374, 1384 (according to HENDIN this type should be considered a hybrid issue of the first and second year, p. 388), 1409, 1438.
On the silver coins of the first year the same obverse-reverse combination is always displayed: on the obverse a bunch of grapes and the inscription “Year One of the Redemption of Israel“, on the reverse a one handled jug and a small branch and the name of the priest Eleazar (Fig. 120). On the silver coins of the second year the name Eleazar only appears on the reverse together with the combination of a one handled jug and a small branch on coin types featuring Shimeon’s name on the obverse, either in a wreath with the inscription Shimeon at the centre (Fig. 130) or next to the image of the temple.1227

The repeatedly used combination of the jug with the branch and the inscription ‘L’ZR HKHN on the silver coins was probably not coincidental. The image of the one handled spouted jug can in the first instance with some confidence be identified as a libation vessel used in the temple cult, as found mentioned in the ancient literary sources and paralleled by the depiction of the amphora on the coins of the First Jewish War (§5.3.2). It has specifically been associated with the golden libation vessel used during the celebration of the transitional agricultural feast of Sukkoth (§5.3.5). The branch depicted together with the golden jug has generally been identified as a palm leaf serving as a reference to the abundance connected with the religious feast of the Sukkoth and used during this feast.1228 It is also possible to identify the branch next to the jug not as the palm leaf featured on other coins, but as a willow branch equally applied in temple rituals carried out by priests of the temple during Sukkoth and in connection with the ritual of water libation (Mishnah, Sukkah 4.5).1229 The combination of the image with the inscription ‘L’ZR HKHN, i.e. Eleazar the Priest, could be seen as evidence underlining this identification even further. These considerations apply to the image as found in a Jewish context, but it should be noted that a similar image of a kantharos with a small palm branch situated next to it can be found in the bronze coinage of the child-king Antiochus VI Dionysus (144-142 BCE) minted in Antioch-on-the-Orontes.1230

Also on the bronze coins the name Eleazar appears in one coin type (text Table VI). Here the name of the priest is always displayed together with the palm tree and on the other side a bunch of grapes attached to a small vine branch with a tendril, accompanied with the varying legends Year One of the Redemption of Israel, Year Two of the

---

1227 Also MILDENBERG 1998c, 189.
1230 SNG Israel 1, nos. 1798-1815.
Freedom of Israel, or For the Freedom of Jerusalem (Fig. 124, 133 & 144). Any correlation of the images on the obverse and the reverse, which remain constant, is not clear. The image of the palm tree with two bunches of fruit hanging down had until now had been of varying importance in the Jewish iconography. Contrary to the palm tree found in the coinage of the First Jewish War no baskets, i.e. bikkurim, are here displayed, which suggest that the intention here was not to display a reference to Sukkoth. If a connection between the inscription ‘L’ZR HKHN and the image of the palm tree is accepted, one could attempt to view the image in the same sacred context. The palm tree seems here rather to have been used as a sign for Judaea, as it by now had long been established (§5.3.6).

The Roman procurators had used the image as an iconographic identification of Judaea and it had appeared on the coins of the fourth year of the First Jewish War (Fig. 114). On the Roman Judaea Capta coins of the Flavian period the palm tree had been used as the identification of Judaea (Figs. 226-227). Nerva used the image similarly on the coin series issued on the occasion of the abolishment of the Jewish tax in 96 CE (Fig. 229). The image had by now fully established itself as the representation of Judaea.1231 Although the palm image at this point in time had already undergone a long tradition as a symbolic tree-of-life in the Semitic world,1232 it was probably introduced into Jewish coin iconography by a detour over the Roman Pagan imagery. In the coinage of the First War it was used in a motif undoubtedly referring to the feast of Sukkoth, whereas the palm tree in the coins of the Second Jewish War seems to have been used in a similar way as found in the Roman coinage, primarily as a reference to Judaea. The bunch of grapes on the opposite side enhances the fruitfulness of the land.

L. Mildenberg originally suggested that the palm tree always displaying seven branches on the small bronze coins of the Second War may have developed into a symbol for the seven branched menorah.1233 This interpretation of the image can on the basis of its history of use not readily be accepted. In the later Jewish art the menorah is a common motif found and in time it develops into the most significant symbol of Judaism in decorative arts,1234 but this was only beginning to be the case at the time of the

1231 MESHORER 2001, 149-150.
1233 MILDEMBERG 1984, 48; also HENDIN 2010, 352.
1234 HACHLILI 1988, 236; HACHLILI 1998, 312.
Second Jewish War. There can be no doubt that the menorah was closely connected with the Jewish temple cult and that it was – as already the coinage of Mattathias Antigonus had shown (§2.5.2.2) – a highly recognizable sacred image in a Jewish context.\footnote{HACHLILI 1988, 236-255; HACHLILI 1998, 312-344.} There, however, is no convincing reason why the palm tree on the coins of the Second War should be understood as a symbol of the menorah, despite of it having seven branches. If the palm tree had been depicted together with specific ritual objects later found in iconographic displays of the menorah in synagogal art, such as the lulav, the shofar horn, or an incense shovel, as also found in the caves of the rebels,\footnote{HACHLILI 1988, 256-262.} there would have been more ground to assume a connection between the two, now as it is, this cannot be verified.

Notable is that the name ‘L‘ZR HKHN was never used together with the depiction of the temple façade, which may have been to be expected according to his title. This must have had its reasons, even though they are no longer clearly comprehensible to us, since we do not possess the necessary historic facts about the identity and the history of the person Eleazar. The same is valid for the disappearance of his name from the silver coins of the first year and eventually also from the silver coins of the second year. Repeated attempts have been made to account for this fact, which on the basis of the sources have so far not been convincing enough. Even if according to this observation his political importance – as a person or as a priest – must have changed relatively soon after the beginning of the revolt to cause these changes, his name continued to be used to a limited degree on the small bronze coins. This implies that he still held a relevant public significance, even if his presence was diminished out of so far unknown reasons.

The question of the importance or function of ‘L‘ZR HKHN prominent on the silver coins of the 1\textsuperscript{st} year, partly on the silver coins of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} year and continuously on the bronze coins, is not quite as clear. Without any specific knowledge about the exact identity of Eleazar any further discussion must remain purely hypothetical. The use of the title of a priest could be understood as an attempt motivated by religious considerations carried out by the rebels to officially legitimise the rise of the revolt, possibly aiming at the parts of the own Jewish population that did not support the insurgency towards the Roman rule.\footnote{KANAEL 1971, 44.} The use of the title HKHN could imply an attempt of attach-
ing oneself to former political traditions, where the Jewish high priest had played an independent role not only as the religious leader of the Jewish people. A role also strongly delineated during the rule of the Hasmonaeans, where the function of the high priest and the role of the Jewish council was always specifically accentuated (§2.5.2).1238

The theoretic possibility of a duality existing in the leadership in Jewish society at this time is one potential way of explaining the appearance of the two names and the two different official titles in the coins of the Second Jewish War. This would not only offer a better understanding of Eleazar role on the coins, despite his disappearance from the silver coins after the 2nd year, but perhaps even – in extension of this – expand the understanding of the title and role of the NŚY’ used in connection with Shimeon ben Kosiba, placing the actors in the coin legends more firmly within the largely decentralised Jewish world at this time – whose changes were caused by the loss of the Jewish Temple – seems to some extent to be reflected in the legends of these last Jewish coins minted.

6.3.2 ŠM’WN NŚY’

Little more is known of the identity of the more prominent figure of ŠM’WN NŚY’ (Shimeon Nasi), who lead the revolt against the Romans. Through the rabbinic tradition and later also in the Christian tradition the figure of Shimeon was – as the Son of a Star according to the written tradition after the revolt, assigned with a messianic status, which to a large extent has been transferred into the interpretation of the coin iconography of the war attributed to him respectively his leadership. A controversial question is if he was already ascribed with – or ascribed himself – with this status during his lifetime and if so, if he himself used this status deliberately.1239 But other than the later sources mentioned above, nothing seems to confirm this theory.

The name of the Jewish rebel Shimeon Bar Kokhba (Shimeon Son of a Star) was from the time after the revolt in the Rabbinic literature primarily tradited as Kozeba or Koziba and in the Christian written sources of the Church Fathers exclusively he was known as Barchochabas or Cocheba.1240 Shimeon’s actual name Bar (Aramaic) or Ben

1239 Possibly through Rabbi Akiva, see SCHÄFER 1981, 55-67; MILDENBERG 1984, 13, n. 8; SCHÄFER 1981, 169.
1240 Βαρχωχεβάς: Justin I Apologia 31.6 (= Eusebius Hist. Eccl. 4.8.4), and Eusebius Hist. Eccl., 4.6.4; Χοχεβας: Orosius Hist. adv. pag. 7.13; detailed list of references in SCHÄFER 1981, 51.
(Hebrew) Kosiba was, however, settled through the finds of the desert scrolls from the
time of the revolt.\textsuperscript{1241} The negative connoted change of his name from Kosiba (probably
deriving from a still insecure patronymic or toponymic origin) to Koziba (liar) in the
Rabbinic literature did not occur until after the Jewish defeat in 135 CE. The somewhat
incongruent use of the terms Kosiba and Koziba in the later Rabbinic sources could
stem from an insecurity of the Jewish authors regarding when this change had taken
place. Ben Koziba or Kozeba was not Shimeon’s original name.\textsuperscript{1242}

On the bronze coins primarily of the first year Shimeon ben Kosiba is designated
NŚY’ Yisrael (Prince of Israel) (Fig. 121), thereby positioning him politically as the
new ruler not only towards the Romans, but also towards his own people.\textsuperscript{1243} In the
desert scrolls, where the title of NŚY’ is equally used in connection with Shimeon, he is
basically treated as the sovereign and the military leader, identified through the use of
this title.\textsuperscript{1244} If this reflected the use of the earlier Hasmonaean rulers or if it arose from
its use in Biblical sources,\textsuperscript{1245} where bearers of this title in part also appeared as the
leaders of the people in times of redemption – and thus connected with a certain messi-
anic status, is not clear,\textsuperscript{1246} but the latter appears very unlikely.\textsuperscript{1247}

According to the Mishnah redacted c. 200 CE, the use of the title NŚY’ came
very close to the worldly definition of the state leader or king.\textsuperscript{1248} The exact time of the
introduction of the use of the designation NŚY’ known from rabbinic sources for the
head of the Sanhedrin is however not clear, other than this was a later development.\textsuperscript{1249}
It does seem necessary to draw a clear line between the understanding of the title of

\textsuperscript{1241} \textsc{Zeitlin} 1952, 77-82; \textsc{Yadin} 1961, 36-52 and \textsc{Yadin} 1962b, 227-257; \textsc{Benoit / Milik / de Vaux}
1961, 123-134; \textsc{Schürer} 1973, 543-544; \textsc{Schafer} 1981, 51-52; \textsc{Mildenberg} 1984, 13, n. 7; \textsc{Milden-
berg} 1984-1985, 27; \textsc{Samuels} 2000b, 84.

\textsuperscript{1242} \textsc{Samuels} 2000b, 84; \textsc{Schafer} 1981, 51-52, 168-169; \textsc{Zeitlin} 1952, 78, 80; \textsc{F. Nötscher}
argues for the understanding of the name \textit{Ben Kosba} as the \textit{magnificent} (\textsc{Nötscher} 1961, 449-451). According
to \textsc{P. Schafer} the pronunciation \textit{Koseba} or \textit{Kosiba} must be viewed as certain (\textsc{Schafer} 1981, 51).

\textsuperscript{1243} \textsc{Mildenberg} 1984, 13; \textsc{Mershorer} 2001, 152.

\textsuperscript{1244} \textsc{Benoit / Milik / de Vaux} 1961, 124-5; \textsc{Schafer} 2003a, 151-154; \textsc{Jacobson} 2008b, 165.

\textsuperscript{1245} \textsc{Ezra} 1:8; \textsc{Ezekiel} 34:23-24; \textsc{The Qumran scroll: “The War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of
Darkness”}, Sec. 5, Col. 3.14-15 (see \textsc{Yadin} 1962a, 272-273), also known as the “War Scroll”; \textsc{Samuels}
2000b, 84-85.

\textsuperscript{1246} \textsc{Mershorer} 2001, 141.

\textsuperscript{1247} \textsc{Mildenberg} 1984-1985, 31; \textsc{Schafer} 2003c, 17-18.

\textsuperscript{1248} \textsc{Schafer} 1981, 72.

\textsuperscript{1249} EncJud 14., 784 s.v. Nasi (G. Y. Blidstein); \textsc{Schafer} 2003c, 15-22.
NŚY’ during the Hellenistic and earlier periods and the later much more exclusive use of the title NŚY’ as the head of the Sanhedrin (on the term NŚY’, see §2.4).\footnote{Gesenius, s.v. נִשְׂיא; KOehler / Baumgartner, s.v. נִשְׂיא; EncJud 14., 784-785 s.v. NASI (G. Y. Blidstein); see Botterweck / Ringgren / Fabry 1986, 647-657 s.v. נִשְׂיא (H. Niehr).}

To which sources Ben Kosiba alluded to in his use of the title of NŚY’ can only be tentatively clarified. In view of the use of images and legends on the coins the use of the term can by all means be understood according to the biblical definition of a military and sovereign ruler of a people in times of distress. This does however not imply that Ben Kosiba accredited himself with or was attributed by others the religious connotated messianic qualities of a redeemer, emerging from the later written sources mentioned. His use of the title could have been relying on its use as it was later documented in the Mishnah, primarily using this to define himself as the Jewish secular ruler carrying a Jewish title.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription Motif</th>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Temple-Façade</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Letters in wreath</td>
<td>126-128, 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Bunch of grapes</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Temple-Façade</td>
<td>134-135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Temple-Façade (distyle)</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Letters in wreath</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Bunch of grapes</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bronze</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Prince of Israel</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Prince of Israel</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Prince of Israel/Shimeon</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Letters in wreath</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Prince of Israel</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Palm tree</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Palm tree</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon Lyre</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Text Table VII.** The name ŠM’WN with or without the title NŚY’ and corresponding coin images.

It is noteworthy that after the first year the title NŚY’ almost completely disappears from the bronze coins, although it is still in use in the written documents.\footnote{Gesenius, s.v. נִשְׂיא; KOehler / Baumgartner, s.v. נִשְׂיא; EncJud 14., 784-785 s.v. NASI (G. Y. Blidstein); see Botterweck / Ringgren / Fabry 1986, 647-657 s.v. נִשְׂיא (H. Niehr).} The rea-
son(s) for it disappearing from the coins can only be speculated upon, but might be a reflection of changes of the public display of the political structures, also noticeable perhaps in the changes of use of the name of Eleazar, although not necessarily meaning that Shimeon was no longer seen or saw himself as the NŚY’, enhanced by the use of the wreath together with his name. This image had already been used by the Hasmonaeans, who on their part had imitated Seleucid coinage. On the coins of the Second Jewish War this sign of victory, or elevated status as the corona civica would have implied (discussed below), was primarily used in connection with Shimeon, with the name of Jerusalem, or enhanced by the palm leaf, but was never seen with the name Eleazar (see appendix Tables 7 and 8).1252

The name ŠM’WN is in the silver coins used without title and found in connection with the façade of the temple, placed in a wreath or together with a bunch of grapes. In the bronze coins Shimeon’s name is used alone or in connection with his title NŚY’ (overview text table VII). Also here the main images are similarly distributed: Shimeon’s name with or without title in a wreath, together with a wreath enclosing a palm branch or together with the palm tree. In one undated bronze coin his name is shown with the image of the lyre, this “anomaly” may be explained with the irregular work of a singular mint and is here not considered of specific importance for the overall understanding of the image in this connection. Notable is the lack of “Year 1” silver coins bearing Shimeon’s name. The reverse types a listed in the Tables 7 and 8.

The image of the palm tree was probably used together with Shimeon out of the same reasons as conj ected in connection with the priest Eleazar (§6.3.1) (Fig. 122 & 131). The same appears to be the case for the use of the image of the grapes (see §5.3.3) (Fig. 129 & 138). The image of the wreath is however interesting (e.g. Fig. 121, 126 & 139). The use of wreaths in Jewish coin iconography was nothing new and can be found in a number of different variations beginning with the coinage of the Hasmonaean rulers (e.g. Fig. 23, 26 & 29). There seem to be some distinctions to be made between the types of wreaths used. Marked in the coins of the Second Jewish War is the central ovoid or round object always featured in the middle of the wreath, sometimes also con-

1251 In case of the scroll it has to be remembered that these documents did not represent an official political medium and that the use of the title NŚY’ might have occurred as part of a standardised phrase used for dating and identification of the documents, MESHORER 2001, 141.
1252 MESHORER 2001, 151.
sisting of two circles. D. Jacobson has rightly pointed out that the wreath on the coins of the Second Jewish War may very well have been meant as a stylised representation of the Roman *corona civica*, the civic crown bestowed on Roman individuals who had been recognised as the saviour of the life or lives of fellow Roman citizen(s), a deduction based on comparisons with different Roman coin types featuring this item.

As accounted for by Jacobson, the *corona civica* is displayed on a number of Roman coins beginning with Augustus. Similar types of wreath featuring a central round object can however also be found in the coinage of Herod Archelaus enclosing varied forms of the inscription ΕΘΝΑΡΧΟΥ (Fig. 52), and on coins issued by the procurator Valerius Gratus during the reign of Tiberius enclosing the inscription KAICAP (Fig. 197). In all of these cases the wreath is used to pronounce respectively enhance the status of the name or carrier of the title placed in the wreath.

The primary purpose of the wreath was undoubtedly to be a sign of victory and peace and belonged to the most common motifs in ancient Jewish art. The function of the image was in some of the coins of the Second Jewish War enhanced through the placement of the palm leaf at the centre of the wreath. If the intention was to depict the *corona civica*, it is indeed difficult if not impossible to judge whether the use of the wreath as a Roman military sign was recognized among the followers of Shimeon and whether specifically the *corona civica* and the title of NŚY’ were used by Shimeon respectively by the inner circle of the leaders of rebels with deliberation as sign of military leadership and in this case as sign of the highest rulership of Palestine. The regular connection of the wreath first and foremost with the name of Shimeon and only in a few cases enclosing the name Jerusalem would enhance this interpretation.

The name of ŠM’WN is only in one case connected with a sacred image, namely that of the temple façade with the reverse of the lulav and ethrog (Fig. 134-135), which will be treated separately below (§6.4). Other than this representation the use of sacred images was much reduced. Sacred objects otherwise to be identified can all be attributed to the Temple in Jerusalem or the temple cult: the different music instruments, the harp

---

1254 JACOBSON 2008b, 64-66.
1255 MESHORER 2001, nos. 69-69c.
1256 MESHORER 2001, nos. 320-324.
1257 HACHLILI 1988, 318.
1258 MESHORER 2001, nos. 223-223h, 296-296a, 297-297b.
(Fig. 123, 126 & 132), the lyre (Fig. 127, 129, 137 & 143), trumpets (Fig. 128 & 140) known from Biblical sources, the jug with or without a branch (Fig. 120, 141 & 142), the amphora (Fig. 121), or the palm branch alone (Fig. 138 & 139), the latter ambiguous as this could have functioned both as a sign of prosperity and victory according to the context of use (§2.6 and §4.6). Only due to the specific context and association with the Jewish cult a sacred content can be claimed for these items, which otherwise cannot automatically be assumed. It should also be noted that some of these motifs were not exclusive for Jewish coinage, but find parallels in Roman coinage as well, as evidenced by the use of an almost identical image of a lyre in the coinage of Domitian. 1259

The different images used in connection with the legends of Shimeon and Eleazar do not seem to have been interchangeable, whereas the overall picture of the obverse respectively reverse types accompanying them do not appear to have been formed quite so strictly and could be varied. No arguable interrelation between the obverse and reverse types seems to have existed and also only in a few cases a link between image and inscription can be presumed, such as Shimeon and the wreath and to some extent Eleazar and the Jug. Through the use of similar catchwords and some extent similar images a connection to the coins of the First Jewish War can be established. 1260 Nevertheless a closer inspection reveals that the utilization of the motifs and the contents of the legends had changed in comparison with the coinage of the previous war. 1261

6.4 The Image of the Temple-Façade: a Jewish Ideal or the Pagan Reality?

The desire for the restitution of the Temple in Jerusalem played a particular role in the coinage of the Second Jewish War. A number of images with assumable associations with the temple or the temple cult, such as the different vessels – in part paralleled by depictions on the coins of the First Jewish War (§5.3.2) – and the music instruments, were depicted. This did not in itself make these images sacred, but placed them in a very specific sacred context. The most discussed coin type found is, however, without question the somewhat schematic representation of the flatroofed temple-façade on the largest silver

1259 JACOBSON 2008a 6-7.
1260 As stated by GOODMAN 2007b, 166.
1261 MESHORER 2001, 140.
coins, the sela’im. On the reverse of these coins the lulav and ethrog were displayed, objects indisputably connected with the Jewish cult (§5.3.5).\textsuperscript{1262} Only one exception to this standardised display of the temple-façade has been found. On one of the undated coin series a distyle flat-roofed structure is displayed (Fig. 136), which exhibits a superficial resemblance to depictions of altars found on contemporary Roman coins (e.g. Fig. 229).

On the coins of the first year the temple is placed on a substructure consisting of a single line (Fig. 119). From the second year onwards it is placed on a higher foundation or podium, which in appearance has been compared to a ladder lying down (Fig. 125, 134 & 135). Different suggestions have been made towards an identification of this part, ranging from the representation of a podium divided into panels by pilasters,\textsuperscript{1263} or that a colonnade in front of the temple.\textsuperscript{1264} The most convincing option is, however, that a specific balustrade was in fact rendered here, namely the stone balustrade referred to as the soreg in ancient Jewish sources,\textsuperscript{1265} which surrounded the sacred area of the Temple in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{1266} Written on this were inscriptions “warning Gentiles not to enter further, on pain of death”.\textsuperscript{1267} As also D. Jacobson points out, restrictive barriers commonly marked the temene of sanctuaries in ancient times and were evidently equally part of the Jewish Temple sanctuary.

The capitals of the columns were initially joined through a single line. Above it is a dotted line, presumably illustrating a part of the architrave. In the later representations both lines are dotted and connected at their ends. No pediment is visible, leaving the distinct impression of a structure conceived with a flat roof. In the first year the space above the temple façade was left empty. During the years of the war different decorative elements alternate here: an element which alternatingly has been described as cruciform, star- or rosette-like, parts of the coin inscription, a wavy line, also in combination with each other (Fig. 119, 125, 134 & 135).

\textsuperscript{1262} Yadid 1978, 27.
\textsuperscript{1263} As possibly in the depictions of the temple of Caesarea Maritima issued under Trajan, Hill 1965, 17, Pl. III Caesarea Maritima no. 1 and 2).
\textsuperscript{1264} Despite the fact that comparable depictions from Neapolis was not minted until after the Bar Kokhba War under Antoninus Pius and Macrinus, Hill 1965, 48, pl. V Neapolis nos. 14 and 59, pl. VI Neapolis no. 12.
\textsuperscript{1265} Josephus BJ 5.193-194, AJ 15.417; Mishnah, Middoth 2.3.
\textsuperscript{1266} This was first pointed out by Price / Trell 1977, 177; Jacobson 2008a, 8.
\textsuperscript{1267} Jacobson 2008a, 8 – in reference to Schürer 1979, 284-285, mentioning two surviving stone slabs, one in the fragment in the Rockefeller Museum in Jerusalem and a complete example in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum.
The Temple depictions gain in detail in the course of time and especially the changes found here during the time of the revolt have caused theoretical questions to rise. This especially concerns if these changes in any way possibly reflect how the temple was actually viewed according to a specific historic or written tradition or if certain contemporary pictorial conventions were displayed through this. Especially the discussion of the cruciform-, star- or rosette-like element above the Temple has received much attention in relation to an understanding of it as a iconographic reflection of the messianic role attributed to Shimeon in the written tradition following the war. As already outlined, this can in no certain terms be deduced for the time of the war (§6.3.2).

The discussion about the messianic connotation of the ‘star’ displayed above the façade is characteristic for the understanding of the title NŠY’ and how the person Shimeon Ben Kosiba has been received in research, as outlined above. First of all, it can not even be assumed that this element was in fact a ‘star’ (consciously or unconsciously associated with a messianic significance) displayed as part of the Temple decoration. Rather, the element above the Temple appears to be a schematic display of a somewhat uncertain decorative element. It may simply be that a rosette was displayed here, which held no specific meaning of its own. This image had by now firmly established itself as a decorative element in Jewish iconography, among others well known from its use on ossuaries (text Fig XXVI); a burial tradition introduced around the middle of the reign of Herod the Great, which in Jerusalem continued until 70 CE. If the decorative element above the Temple had been conceived as an item holding a specific programmatic meaning, it could reasonable be expected to have repeated also on other coin types of the war and not to have been replaced from the second year onwards.

Contrary to the rosette the interpretation of the depiction of the wavy line above the Temple-façade has proven much less difficult (Fig. 135). The wavy line, which replaced the decorative element of the rosette from the second year onwards, has convincingly been understood as a crenellated cornice and therewith as part of the entablature of the temple. It may well have been the intention to illustrate a scrolled vine with this line, again as found in the upper panel of the ornamented ossuary from Jerusalem (Fig.

---

1268 MILDENBERG 1984, 44; MESHLER 2001, 158.
1269 MILDENBERG 1984, 43; HACHLILI 1998, 381.
1270 MAGNESS 2011, 151.
XXVI), for which reason the wavy line, based on Josephus description of the great golden vine beneath the cornice of the façade of the Temple (BJ 5.5, AJ 15.11), has specifically been interpreted as the stylised rendering of this vine. As the wavy line, the ornamental decoration preceding it should first and foremost be understood as a decorative element and not as a reference to Shimeon.

On the reverse of the large silver coins with the representations of the Temple the lulav and the ethrog are depicted together with an accompanying inscription (Fig. 119, 125 & 135). Both images were used frequently during the time of the First and the Second Jewish Wars. During the First War the ethrog was always placed between two lulavim (e.g. Fig. 114) or on both sides of it (Fig. 115), now the ethrog is always placed left of the lulav at the centre. This has been suggested to be an acknowledgment of the description found in the Babylonian Talmud that the lulav should always be held with the right hand and the ethrog should always be held with the left (Sukkah 37b). As the production method of over striking coins, due to mechanical reasons, demanded more frequent replacements of worn reverse punches than of the obverse, the specific combination of the obverse with the Temple and the reverse with the lulav and ethrog seem to have held a particular meaning and effort was obviously put into keeping this obverse-reverse composition.

1271 Mildenberg 1984, 44.
1272 Sporty 1983, 121-123; Patrich 1994, 264-266.
1273 Samuels 2000b, 90.
6.4.1 The Ark of the Covenant

It is reasonable to deduce that the intention with the display of the object between the two central columns was to present the Ark of the Covenant or the Torah shrine, analogue to renderings of deities in contemporary Pagan temples on local city coinage. The object consisted of two vertical parallel dotted lines connected at the top through a dotted arched line, which in later representations is replaced by a closed arched line (Fig. 119, 125 & 134). Two horizontal lines connect the longer vertical lines. In the upper part of the panel formed by these lines two dots are rendered.

The question if the Ark of the Covenant was in fact positioned in the Temple in Jerusalem or not, is for the iconographic analysis of the image and the correct interpretation of the representation not essential, since the temple itself did also no longer exist. The intention was to present the idea or ideal of the temple. To the ancient beholder the Jewish Temple and the Ark were an inseparable unity; even if the written Jewish tradition stated that the second temple never actually housed the Ark. Without the rendering of the Ark of the Covenant the temple displayed would just have been another temple structure barely differentiating itself from the depictions of Pagan temples. In its present form the temple is despite its schematic appearance together with the rendering of the Ark clearly identifiable as the Temple in Jerusalem.

The depiction of the Ark of the Covenant, together with other cultic items from the temple, on the transitional booty relief of the arch of Titus in Rome allow for the presumption that an Ark had actually been located in the temple as it was looted by the Romans during the First Jewish War, even when the Jewish literary tradition stated something else. Otherwise this Roman celebration of the victory over the Jews would have to be evaluated as a mere symbolic representation; which it according to its own nature as a public representative medium of course was. Although the detailed and precise renderings of the objects from the temple indicate that the executing artist(s) actually had specific objects in mind or at hand when completing the reliefs, even if
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1275 On this, see HACHLILI 1988, 272-280; IDEM 1998, 360-373, especially pp. 370-373.
1276 MILDENBERG 1984, 33-42.
1278 As established by Y. MESHORER (1982, 140; IDEM 2001, 144); also HACHLILI 1998, 363.
1279 Ancient written sources are listed by P. ROMANOFF (1944, 40); SAMUELS 2000b, 91-92.
1280 PFANNER 1983, 52 (Fig. 40-41), 54 (pl. 61.1-2, pl. 63.1-7), 73-74.
these in reality did not stem from the temple, also taking into consideration that the Arch of Titus was not erected until the time of Domitian (§5.3.1).

The identification of the building presented has been subject to extensive discussion, with proposed identifications ranging from it being a representation of the Temple gate, an ideal representation of the Temple, to a depiction of the inner of the Temple. Although it, according to the much later compiled Babylonian Talmud, was prohibited to depict the exact image of the temple, there is no reason to believe that any other temple was meant to be displayed here. The most likely identification of the image is that it represented the façade or the idea of the Jewish Temple as held in memory at the time of the war: a flat-roofed structure with four fluted columns with capitals and bases standing on a low platform, in front of it a balustrade, which probably should be identified as the soreg, between the central columns the Ark of the Covenant.

6.4.2 The Tradition of the Temple-Display

The overall conception of the tetra style temple as a Pagan tetra style cultic building is through comparisons with earlier and contemporary Pagan temple coin images obvious (e.g. Fig. 177 & 209). However, the rendering of the flat roof does mark a specific distinction in use of tradition. Judged by the coin motif the temple was conceived as a free standing building without any of the related structures (courtyards and halls) described in the written sources (Josephus AJ 15.391-402), except for the soreg mentioned, analogue to the common Pagan depiction of a temple on coins.

 Principally, details found in the contemporary Roman coins with representations of temples can very well be compared with the representation of the Jewish Temple on the coins of the Second Jewish War, of which examples are found in the city coins of Aelia Capitolina, Caesarea Maritima or Gaba (e.g. Fig. 182), amongst others in the similar displays of the podium structure. However, the depiction of the Temple as a flat-roofed structure marks a fundamental difference, clearly separating it from the traditional way of depicting temples in Roman imperial coinage. D. Jacobson has suggested that the Temple on the Jewish war coins to be the imitation of denarii issued by
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1281 Meshorer 2001, 55.
1282 Summarized by D. Jacobson (2008a, 6).
1283 BT, Avodah Zarah 43a.
1284 Already accounted for by P. Romanoff (Romanoff 1944, 42); further Samuels 2000b, 90, et al.
Domitian in the years 94-96 CE, depicting a flat-roofed Cybele temple on the reverse. The parallels between these depictions are evident, but some critical remarks must be made on this. The display of the Cybele temple itself is not conform with the norm of Roman temple depictions on coins found more regularly and a convincing explanation for why the rebels of the Second Jewish war should have chosen exactly these coins with this display out of Domitian’s coinage as their temple-prototype is lacking.

The conception of the temple as a flat roofed structure does, however, find immediate comparisons in other temples of the Levant at this time, most prominently displayed in the Baal-temple in Syrian Palmyra. Furthermore, also other depictions of the Jewish Temple show a similar flat roofed construction with a crenellated battlement, most prominently is the later dating wall-painting of the Torah shrine on the west wall of the Dura Europos synagogue (text Fig. XXV). It seems more likely that the image of the Jewish Temple on the Jewish war coins was conceived according to eastern traditions existing at the time of its creation. At this point in time the Jewish Temple had already been destroyed for decades and other guidelines than the images found in contemporary Roman coinage iconographic archetypes did not exist. It is very probable that the depiction of architecture on Jewish coinage was an imitation of a traditional Pagan way of representing the own religious affiliation, even if it is no longer definitely certifiable that the choice of depicting an architectural structure was the direct imitation of a specific prototype such as the denarii of Domitian mentioned above. Though, the design of the Temple was made according that of contemporarily existing sanctuaries.
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1285 JACOBSON 2008a, 7-8; RIC II, no. 205 (Domitian).
1286 First published by ROSTOVZEF et al. 1936, 339 Fig. 24, 350-351, pl. XLVIII; HACHLILI 1998, 360-362.
1287 BURNETT 1999, 137-164; GOODMAN 2007b, 166.
The references to the Temple in Jerusalem had by now undergone a long development on the Jewish coinage. Until now the temple had only been referred to indirectly. The Hasmonaeans had to some extent probably made reference to it in the use of the image of the lily (§2.5.1) and the palaeo-Hebrew script, Mattathias Antigonus through the menorah, but no previous Jewish coins had displayed depictions of sacred Jewish architecture. Sufficient examples of the depiction of Pagan religious edifices are known both from earlier Roman, as well as Jewish coinage minted by Herod Philip (e.g. Fig. 65 & 69), Herod Agrippa I (Fig. 74 & 81) and Agrippa II (Fig. 100) known from the 1st century BCE. They, however, referred to the Roman imperial ruler cult, using the iconographic tradition known from the contemporary coinage. 1288 A completely new development in Jewish iconography was displayed here, which had no Jewish iconographic traditions to fall back upon. The pictorial conventions of the temple were borrowed from Pagan iconographic traditions, the representation itself having undergone a distinct transformation in becoming a Jewish conception.

1288 HOWGEGO 2007, 4.
6.4.3 The Temple as an Iconographic Monument

The representation of a god, a deity, or architectural structures on Palestinian coins cannot automatically be seen as evidence for the actual existence of such a cult respectively cult place. These representations could have been dictated by the desire to comply with certain mythological traditions, the own or those of a supreme sovereign, without referring to specific circumstances like the time of construction or inauguration, helping to establish this.\(^{1289}\) It seems that the depiction of an architectural monument in coinage, as it was introduced by the Romans, must not always be understood as proof for the actual existence of such a structure or building.\(^{1290}\) Although later than the coins with the façade of the Jewish Temple, this is illustrated by the possible example of Kefar 'Otnay (Legio). The only coherent documentation of the religious preferences of this city is preserved in the coinage from the time of Elagabalus (218-222 CE). On these coins the source of the Yarkon River generating the prosperity and fertility of the city is venerated. The river god himself is depicted either lying down in the current iconographic fashion, or at the feet of Tyche who is dressed in the tunic of the Amazons, or standing in the temple of Tyche holding the bust of the emperor. In one representation the source is flanked by two cult edifices. So far no archaeological remains have been found at the source of the river that could disprove this assumption.\(^{1291}\) This symbolic way of representation could from a Roman point of view be recognised as *monumenta* on their own.\(^{1292}\) This iconographic mechanism seems likely to have applied to the representation of the Jewish Temple during the time of the Second Jewish War. The pronounced ambition was undoubtedly the rebuilding of the holy temple, the iconographic way of expressing this was quite consistent with the Pagan iconographic traditions of the time.

Another question sometimes expressed is, if with this representation the intention was to depict the First Solomonic Temple or the Second Herodian Temple, or if essentially the intended rebuilding of the temple was an idealised objective, is not of primary interest. Though the conventions of rendering seem to refer to the Second Herodian Temple, it could for all we know now just as well have been meant as a depic-
tion of the First Temple or the desired new temple. With this image the intension was primarily to depict the idea of the temple.

The choice to depict the – no longer existing – Temple in Jerusalem must be viewed as a fundamental change in Jewish iconography, which was motivated by political considerations. Through the choice of image the coins of war were simultaneously fitted into the contemporary Roman iconographic traditions, to which also the use of the palm tree and probably also the form of the wreath found here can be added. This had previously only taken place during the time of the Jewish client kings of the 1st century CE, whereas in their cases the coinage must mainly be understood as Jewish on political grounds, leaving them only marginally to be distinguished from pagan iconography. If these changes where dictated by conscious decisions or not, can only be presumed. But the transformation of the depiction of the façade of the temple in Jewish iconography indicates an extensive comprehension of the world of Pagan imagery, as in the case of the wreath as a corona civica. Simultaneously, choosing to change the content of the image according to the own religious standards, making it a politically useful sign suggests a conscious action taking place here. If the introduction of the image caused any reactions or even resistance in the Jewish society it is no longer known.

6.5 Ben Kosiba and the End of Ancient Jewish Coinage

The principal ambition of the coin iconography of the Second Jewish War seems to have been the portrayal of the Jewish world by using images and signs familiar within this. The rebel administration kept a relatively uncomplicated iconographic repertoire, within which the primary intention of the rebels may have been to detach themselves from the surrounding Pagan world and to accentuate the Jewish religion. It is in some cases not possible to draw a clear line between the images used as resting on either Jewish or the Hellenistic-Roman iconographic traditions. The point of view of the beholder seems to have determined the understanding of the images.
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The introduction of the image of the tetra-style temple – an image traditionally associated with Pagan Temples – on the coins of the Second Jewish War can on the one hand be viewed as a sign of the cultural changes that had taken place within the Jewish society since the beginning of the production of Jewish coinage, but simultaneously reflects the continued assimilation in the visual reception, not necessarily equalling a similar content. The result of the Hellenistic and Roman cultural impact may in many ways have been of a superficial nature compared with the everyday religious beliefs of the minting authority or the users of the coins, and the approach – or more precisely – the understanding of the images may to a large extent have rested in the eyes of the beholder and hence varied greatly – this is however no longer reproducible in detail. In the coinage the way of expression was apparently very much depending on the iconography of the surrounding Roman world. Both the choice of images as well as motifs was kept simple, comparable to the First Jewish War, in both cases kept so simple that the modern viewer at times has difficulties judging the content expressed. Compared with the First Jewish War the iconography of the coinage of the Second Jewish War is kept even simpler through a consistent use of the reverse legends renewed each year and apparently not directly related to the images used. This leaves only the option to view the iconography on its own or in connection with the personal names.

In the coinage of the Second Jewish War two distinct groups of images are traceable, those found connected to the use of the personal names and those applied in connection with the more generalized legends. As shown, the names of Shimeon and also Eleazar appear only in connection with a limited number of images. The use of these images, such as the variations of the palm tree and the wreath found here, seems to imply a strong dependency on Roman iconographic traditions, but it should not be forgotten that both had previously undergone a long history of use in Palestine, which may have blurred the finer details of the original content of the specific image imitated on the part both of the Jewish creators as well as users, such as the case of the wreath which does come very near the appearance of the Roman corona civica, if this connection was realised can however no longer be confirmed. The finer details may very well only have played a minor role. Opposite this stands the use of images with clear Jewish connotations, such as the lulav and the ethrog, or even the different music instruments or vessels most likely connected with the Jewish cult, which were not used in connection with the
legends entailing personal names, but the more general slogans *redemption* and *freedom*. A few exceptions to this are found, which may have been caused by the individual circumstances of the different mints at work, also evidenced by the coins stemming from different faulty emissions.

The rebel administration of the Second Jewish War was in the coinage unmistakably centred on the person and position of their leader Shimeon ben Kosiba. He claimed the Biblical traditions as his by using the old title of NŚY’ – as known from the desert documents – and a part of the coin iconography issued under his authority was evidently used to stress this further, in line with the earlier use found in the Hasmonaean period.\(^\text{1295}\) Our lack of knowledge concerning Shimeon clouds any hypotheses concerning his personal involvement in the conception of the coin iconography applied, but also how the iconography should be interpreted, as we do not know anything about his religious background or motives. The – admittedly comparably minor – presence of the name and title of the priest Eleazar does suggest a certain internal division of the rebel administration, but since Eleazar has also not yet securely been identified, any considerations concerning this are highly speculative. Judging by the iconography alone found in connection with both names their roles appear to have been defined quite clearly: Shimeon was the primary military leader, Eleazar subordinate and mainly connected with the Jewish cult. Any details concerning anything else can however not be deduced, only assumed.

The defeat of the Jews in 135 CE, marked by the battle at Bethar (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4.6.1),\(^\text{1296}\) did not only mean the end of Jewish coinage and the use of iconography with any Jewish connotations on ancient coinage, but changed the course of the development of the Jews as a nation, and therewith the future of the Jewish religion and culture.\(^\text{1297}\) All Jews were expelled from Jerusalem (Justin the Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryphone* 16.2-3),\(^\text{1298}\) and the name of the Roman province *Judaea* was changed to *Syria Palaestina*. A very telling political move made by Hadrian – characterizing his politics towards to the Jewish culture that had been annoying him since the beginning of his reign. Changing the nomenclature of the province meant eradicating the Jewish people from the political map
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of the Roman Empire, not leaving the Jews with any trace of an official identity. This approach has in the history of the Roman Empire no parallels, although the procedure of changing the names of (defeated) provinces had occurred in other instances.\textsuperscript{1299}

The importance for Hadrian of his victory over the Jews is underlined by the fact that he for the first time allowed the title of \textit{Imperator} to be bestowed upon himself by the Roman senate in 135 or 136 CE.\textsuperscript{1300} He himself appears never officially to have claimed and celebrated the abatement of this revolt, which had turned into a brief but very severe war, probably because it had developed into a considerable internal – as well as external – political threat, which severely burdened his personal political image.\textsuperscript{1301} A public recognition of his victory would alone through the issues of coin series on this occasion had been easily possible – comparable to the numerous coin types commemorating Hadrian’s founding of \textit{Aelia Capitolina},\textsuperscript{1302} but this was not the case. This victory over the Jews was, contrary to victory celebrated by Vespasian and Titus after the First Jewish War, and later repeated by Domitian through issues of commemorative coin series and the erection of the Arch of Titus in Rome, never officially demonstrated and celebrated on the same grand scale,\textsuperscript{1303} even though archaeological remnants of the recognition of the triumph have been found in Rome.\textsuperscript{1304} Hadrian’s acceptance of the title of \textit{Imperator} should therefore also be viewed as a concession, since he previously had not accepted this political honour as emperor.\textsuperscript{1305} Even if this probably remains the only official recognition by Hadrian of the political implications of the war, the archaeological record reflects a more differentiated reality.

The monumental inscription found near Tel Shalem may be viewed as a prominent – perhaps non-official, since the benefactor of the arch has not unequivocally been identified – local conformation or reflection of the severity of the Roman military situation in Palestine during the time of the revolt.\textsuperscript{1306} This is however not without discussion, as the inscription of the monument has also been reconstructed differently and
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dated to the time of Hadrian’s visit to Palestine in 130 CE. The erection of this monumental approximately 10-11 m wide arch to which the inscription originally belonged arch would in case of a post-war date have expressed the relief following the war – at the same time verifying the distress it had actually caused the Romans; according to W. Eck and based on his reconstruction of the Tel Shalem arch, Hadrian accepted the title of Imperator for the second time in 136 CE after the end of the war. Since no detailed knowledge of the actual historic context of the memorial arch in the more or less isolated area in which it was erected has been preserved, it cannot remain without doubt that the arch was erected as a confirmation of Hadrian’s victory, or that this was in a place where an important event appears to have taken place, or whether perhaps it was erected due to the close proximity to the camp of the legio VI Ferrata. The same goes for the Tel Shalem bronze statue of Hadrian (text Fig. XXVII), which can possibly be viewed either as a monument commemorating the Roman victorious outcome of the war, or as the result of a tribute to Hadrian upon his visit in 130 CE.

Fig. XXVII. Bronze Statue of Hadrian from Tel Shalem. Israel Museum, Jerusalem (GERGEL 1991, 232, Fig. 1).
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A similar mechanism is found in a display constituting a local reaction to an actual military event, which otherwise has found no clear expression, does however seem to make itself apparent in the coinage of Petra after the annexation of the Nabataean kingdom by the Romans in 106 CE. On the reverse of coins from the early Hadrianic period the sitting Tyche is displayed with a *tropaeum* leaning on her shoulder. This attribute could be understood as a reference to an actual military victory that had been commemorated by the Romans through the erection of a monument, which was (officially or unofficially) erected after the supposedly peaceful annexation of the Nabataean kingdom under Trajan in 106 CE.\(^\text{1313}\) In this case the actual monument itself has not been preserved – if it was indeed ever actually build, but only an iconographic reflection or the idea of it. In these cases the Roman victory monuments function as indirect documentation of local responses to previous military conflicts.

The local conflicts had on the other hand enabled the bestowal of the title of *Imperator* on the emperors, which again permitted the bestowal of the *ornamenta triumphalia* on successful military leaders otherwise not possible. This again can cast light upon other historic facts that otherwise would have remained obscured. In the case of the Second Jewish War, not until Hadrian had accepted the title of *Imperator* was it possible for him to bestow the military honour of the *ornamenta triumphalia* on his generals in recognition of their successful leadership throughout the war. Without these officially bestowed titles, preserved in inscriptions connected with their names, the actual extent of the military involvement of the Romans in the Second Jewish War would not have become evident.\(^\text{1314}\) The bestowal of the *ornamenta triumphalis* offers an important indication that the whole region surrounding Judaea, and not as long assumed just the immediate Jewish core area of Judaea, was affected by the Bar Kokhba war and therefore a much larger military presence was demanded from the Romans. The Roman governors from the neighbouring provinces *Syria* (under Publicius Marcellus) and *Arabia* (under T. Haterius Nepos) were both – in addition to Julius Severus commanding the Roman troops against the Jewish rebels – bestowed with the *ornamenta triumphalis* on this occasion due to their military accomplishments during the Jewish war.\(^\text{1315}\) Even if strongly
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worded, the brief account delivered by Cassius Dio only presents a part of the picture of the much discussed political implications of the Jewish War.

In the numismatic material from the time following the Second Jewish War it is no longer possible to identify iconographic displays, which can specifically be related to Jewish contexts. This was on the one hand the result of the elimination of all Jewish power factors, but simultaneously apparently also the result of an increasing public acceptance of iconographic displays of any kind. This did at least pertain to parts of the Jewish society. In the Rabbinic literature – reflecting thoughts on the ways of living as a Jew under the Roman rule – a continuing change in the Jewish attitude towards the use of figurative pictorial presentations is documented. The liberalizing distinction between religious offensive and inoffensive figurative representations came to allow a more pragmatic handling of the everyday contact with these. 1316 This is basically due to the continued development of a cultural koiné, in part consisting of a Jewish population so far Hellenized that iconographic displays were not only commonly understood, but also applied, enabling imitations of Pagan iconographic representations and ornamental repertoires. Iconographic elements from the Pagan (religious) world was transferred into private and public Jewish facilities both in Palestine and in the Diaspora, like the winged victories found on Jewish sarcophagi in Beth Shearim and Rome (Vigna Randanini), or onto lintels in the Byzantine synagogues in Galilee (Rama, Bar’am, or Ed-Dikke). 1317 Also in the decoration of the mosaic floors in the synagogues the use of Pagan cultic figurative representations is notable, such as the zodiacs found in the southern synagogue in Hammat Tiberias dating from the early fourth century CE, 1318 or the fifth century synagogue of Sepphoris. 1319 This should however not necessarily be equated with fundamental changes in the Jewish religious beliefs or attitudes, but with increasing changing conceptions of the application of the use of iconographic anthropomorphic displays within the Jewish world.
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Part 4

CONCLUSION
Chapter 7

Political Instrumentalization of Iconography in Jewish Coinage

The history of ancient Jewish coinage and especially the use of sacred iconography in this context not only illustrate the development of the medium itself, but also the transformation of the ancient Jewish world within which it was put to use. As one of the central political means of communication of the rulers and the public municipal authorities and as an essential mean of public self-portrayal ancient coinage was one of the most important ways of transmitting political and religious ideas, as well as a more general mean of demonstrating power and public propaganda. With coinage the individual political identity – or the construction of it, being conscious or not – became centre of attention. In Palestine this approach can be detected at least from the 4th century BCE, but may in fact go back as far as coinage in this area in general. Particularly the iconography used during the Greek Hellenistic and Roman imperial periods shows the varying importance and apparent effectiveness of public displays of political and religious power. The depiction of the identities of the minting authorities was especially warranted through the pictorial presentation of religious ideas. The presentation of these – i.e. the use or non-use of sacred iconography – did, however, change radically over the centuries of existence of ancient Jewish coinage, probably to some extent caused by the rather sensitive ethnic aspects of the Jewish culture. The constantly changing political leadership of the ancient Jewish society in Palestine between the 4th century BCE and the early 2nd century CE and with this the continuously developing and changing frame of the Jewish religion caused each time period to be distinctively characterized.

With only very few exceptions the development of the Jewish coin iconography was over the centuries always closely connected with the coinages of the major surrounding Pagan societies. This is first and foremost displayed through the persistent imitation or even copying of Pagan coin iconography, especially visible during the Roman imperial period. Despite of this, Jewish coinage to a great extent kept a recognisable appearance among the contemporary coinages minted, amongst others through the use of specific palaeo-Hebrew inscriptions. The distinction between the Jewish and Pa-
gan coinages did however increasingly diminish over time, as the boundaries between the cultures changed, the decentralisation of the Jewish world in the Diaspora after the First Jewish War being the most dramatic and lasting of these changes.

7.1 The Persian Period: YHD Coinage

The ancient Jewish Temple State that was established after the return from the Babylonian exile and the reconstruction of the holy city of Jerusalem in the 6th century BCE was by the time of the emergence of Jewish coinage at the beginning of the 4th century BCE in the process of being re-shaped. The interaction with other cultures in Palestine (and in the whole region) at the time and especially the increasing contact with the Greek culture significantly affected the history of ancient Judaism of which its coinage must be considered one of the most prominent and immediate reflections.

The acquisition and imitation of foreign coin images or iconographic elements into Jewish coinage seems at its very beginning first and foremost to have been dictated by the wish to affiliate oneself with the already established traditions connected with this medium. This wish is clearly exemplified by the imitations of the Athenian coinage displaying Athena and her owl, which was not an isolated phenomenon. The general acceptance of the Athenian coinage as a common currency at that time is in fact reflected by the widespread use of imitations of the Athena-owl iconography in a number of Palestinian coinages, of which the YHD coinage was only one. This clearly illustrates that in most cases the common denominator and catalyst for the production of coinage in Palestine was the same, the increasing contact with the Greek world.

The adherence to the established iconographic traditions continued in the later periods – although at no time exactly the same way, as at different times more room for the development of the own Jewish iconographic traditions was allowed than at others. In the earliest Jewish coins an apparent conglomeration of contemporary iconographic traditions can be found spanning from the said imitations of Athenian coin iconography and coinages issued in other areas under Archaemenid rule, such as coinages from Asia Minor, the larger Palestinian cities, or even the neighbouring Samaria. Still, the evidence collected from the provincial coinage shows a specific unique nature attached to
the YHD coin iconography, which to a great extent was also connected with the use of language and script on these coins, its weight system, and the fact that the use of this coinage was limited to the province of Judah.

The use of the Hebrew language and the palaeo-Hebrew script was at all times simultaneously a religious and a national statement functioning as the strongest representation of the Jewish land, people and religion in one. The palaeo-Hebrew script as well as the Hebrew language did at several points in time come to play an important role in ancient Jewish coinage and especially the script came to be used to pronounce values specifically regarding nationality and religious identity during all times. Already the change in use of the two legends between the late Persian and the early Hellenistic period in the YHD coinage, from the exclusive use of the Aramaic YHD to be partially replaced by the Hebrew YHDH, is evidence of this as well as the fact that the minting of the early Jewish coins probably continued within the priestly administration of the Jewish Temple between the Persian and Ptolemaic periods of rule. Due to this connection the palaeo-Hebrew script in time also gained a strong symbolic component causing it to be used also during later periods. The importance of the script evidently extended beyond pure nostalgia, it also gave the coinage an authenticity that the contemporary Aramaic script, which was used in everyday life by that time, did not seem to hold.

Despite the initial adaptation of already established iconographic traditions, recognisable traits of the Jewish coinage began to form already during the early 4th century BCE, such as the introduction of the image of the lily in place of the olive branch on the largest YHD coins and later the development of this image as a unique motif. In Palestine the treatment of images and motifs found according to culture-specific connotations is at times very difficult, as since the 5th century BCE verifiable parallel developments took place between the different local coinages. In Jewish coinage this manifests itself through the continuous reliance on contemporary Pagan coin iconography also found in Pagan coinages during all the periods of its existence, i.e. the widely spread imitations of the Athenian tetradrachms in all major Palestinian cities. A collective iconographic vocabulary not only remains consistent, but was continuously developed, and due to this the early Jewish coin iconography was most likely to a great extent understandable beyond its own context. Simultaneously, a distinct Jewish iconographic vocabulary emerged, such as the use of the image of the lily and the use of the
palaeo-Hebrew script, which held an individual form of its own – mirroring the characteristic form of ancient Judaism within the Pagan world at all times.

The most important aspect of the YHD coinage considered in detail here was its firm connection with the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem as a financial institution within which the coins were minted, as it amongst others is well illustrated by the coin of the priest YWHNN. The most likely political reality at the time of the existence of the YHD coinage is that the functions of the Persian governor and the Jewish religious leaders in most cases, if not always, were combined in one person, amongst others substantiated by the strict use of Hebrew personal names.

This fact evidently only had a minor impact on the use of the iconography in the early Jewish coinage, since during the 4th century apparently few hesitations existed towards the use of images of living beings – both humans and animals, which according to Jewish law, i.e. the Torah, might have been considered inappropriate also at this point in time. This should most likely be interpreted as evidence for a general lack of religious orthodoxy, which was not to follow until the time of the later Hasmonaean rules. Still, the coin iconography of the province of Judah was by no means as open towards the use of religious symbols or images as the contemporary and geographically close Samarian coinage, where a multitude of images from a number of different traditions were put to use simultaneously, neither did it reach the same quality in its execution except for in a few cases such as the stand-alone display of the lily. Judging by the iconography alone, the religious and national self-identity of the Jewish authorities minting during the early time of Jewish coinage seems to have been fundamentally different from other areas, and compared with the representational ways of later Jewish rulers.

Even though the material culture from the Persian period is meagre compared with the preceding and following periods, the lack of detectable changes to be found between the Persian and the Hellenistic periods, the Jewish Temple – as the centre of the Jewish Temple State – apparently remained a semi-autonomous institution both under Archaemenid and Ptolemaic rule. Despite the fact that the iconography the YHD coins of the 3rd century BCE shows a great conformity with the requirements of the Ptolemaic rulers and their use of iconography, the fact alone that YHD coinage was still being produced at this time is openly contrasting with the predominantly centralised financial management of other areas under Ptolemaic control. The answer to the contin-
ued use of the specific Jewish coins seems to lie in their connection with the Jewish Temple of Jerusalem, which appears to have been a continuous financial factor to be acknowledged during both periods. Despite this, a considerable gap in the production of what with any conviction can be claimed to be coinage of a Jewish origin exists between the middle of the 3rd century BCE and the beginning of the Hasmonaean coinage.

The apparent cessation of the production of Jewish coinage, especially if indeed as closely connected with the Jewish Temple as assumed here, is still in need of an explanation. It can at this point in time only be hypothesised if another form of coin production replaced the YHD coinage since particularly taxes and tithes still had to be paid to the temple. Most likely, these payments were made with silver coins circulating at the time, i.e. Ptolemaic coinage or local city coinages, until this was narrowed down to be exclusively made with the silver coinage of Tyre. Tentative attributions of coin types to a mint in Jerusalem under Seleucid rule during the 2nd century BCE may suggest that coins were continuously produced here, at least periodically, but the evidence is to scant to base firm conclusion on it and there can in no terms be spoken of Jewish coinage in this connection. Another group of material, the stamped seals carrying inscriptions similar to the YHD coins, seems continuously to have functioned as a Jewish administrative tool during the 3rd and early 2nd century BCE, until this group of material ceased to be used with the beginning of the production of Hasmonaean coinage during the later 2nd century BCE. Although it is clear that these, of course, could not have replaced the coins as mean of payment, but they offer evidence of the continuation of the administrative system of the Jewish province.

7.2 The Hellenistic Period: Hasmonaean Coinage

At the latest from the time of Alexander the Great's conquest the Greek presence became permanent in Palestine. Before this time the Greek material culture found here had mainly centred in areas previously dominated by the Phoenician culture, where the active trading taking place between Palestine and Mediterranean areas dominated by the Greek culture can be observed at the latest from the beginning of the Iron Age, hence also the all consuming importance of the Athenian tetradrachm in these areas. The
Greek settlers, partly settled by Alexander the Great as known in the case of Samaria, seem specifically to have built a co-existence especially with the native Phoenician population, although the Greek presence in Palestine did not limit itself to the areas connected through this interaction.\textsuperscript{1320}

The ruling elites or magistrates of some of the coastal cities periodically minted their own coins under Ptolemaic and later under Seleucid rule, such as found in the cities of Ascalon, Gaza, Akko-Ptolemais, Dora and Demetrias. The significance of Greek ancestry and culture was demonstrated most effectively in the coinage of the Hellenistic poleis, where one can observe how in coinage basic mythological presentations with prominent and specific divine heroes or founding myths were used to demonstrate the desired public collective identity and simultaneously express the religious and cultural affiliation,\textsuperscript{1321} well-known among these the god Doros on the coinage of Dora. A more characteristic development can be observed in Jewish coinage, as here a particular shaping of the images took place, based on their different cultural and religious tradition.

The coinage of the Hasmonaean rulers to follow the century long gap in the history of Jewish coinage, from around the mid 3rd century until after the mid 2nd century BCE, reflects a completely changed Jewish world. The specific coin of the anchor and the lily type attributed either to Antiochus VII Sidetes or John Hyrcanus I issued in the years 131/130 and 130/129 BCE may have been the initial spark for the Jewish coinage to follow this gap. The use of these two specific images together may have been a statement of the unity between the Seleucid ruler and the Jewish ruler made either by the Seleucid ruler or Hyrcanus I at the beginning of his rule in 134 BCE, either after Antiochus’ VII defeat of Hyrkanos I in Jerusalem in 134 BCE or possibly on the occasion of their joint mission – disregarding any actual voluntary participation on the part of the Jewish ruler – against the Parthians in 131 BCE.

The decades predating the establishment of the Hasmonaean kingdom had been characterised by the continued struggle with the Seleucid kingdom and the internal fighting between the Hellenizers and the in the end successful orthodox Jewish parties led by the Maccabaean family. The iconographic repertoire of the Hasmonaean coinage to follow from the time of John Hyrcanus I to a great extent mirrors aspects of the changes towards religious orthodoxy, which had taken place in the Jewish society dur-
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ing this time. The Hasmonaean coin iconography was undemanding and inoffensive in relation to Jewish religious law. This conforms very well with the knowledge of the strong nationalistic aspect of the Hasmonaean rule, adhering to a rigid religious orthodoxy both expressed in their choice of iconography but also use of their legends. Nonetheless, a distinct use of royal iconographic elements borrowed from the contemporary Seleucid coinage, such as the star or the diadem, clearly portrayed the Hasmonaean rulers as Hellenized kings. Also, a maximum of the use of different languages and scripts was drawn. The different languages and scripts came to signify the self-expression of the individual rulers offering a tool to express statements concerning ethnicity and religion, but also hierarchical positions within society. In the coins of the Hasmonaeans specific intentions were expressed solely by the use of languages, such as the connection of the king (written in Greek or Hebrew) with the position of high priest (only written in Hebrew).

The iconography of the Hasmonaean coins was, despite its adherence to specific religious values, from the outset designed and developed according to the iconographic language of the coinage of the Hellenistic Greek world within which they were issued, although it at no times held any blatant or outrageous images that could have sparked controversy. The predominant uniformity found in Hasmonaean coin iconography could suggest that the coins were predominantly issued to meet with economic demands in the realm of Hasmonaean rule. Although, some contradictions with the developing Jewish religious law occurred, especially in case of the latest coins issued by Mattathias Antigonus and the display of the menorah and the showbread table.

Overall, Mattathias remained faithful to the Hasmonaean coin traditions developed before his time, but he is distinguished by being the first and only Hasmonaean who deliberately used Jewish sacred iconography in his coinage. This use of the sacred on the profane medium coinage was at this time not a well-defined tradition, since before no images of a secured sacred nature had been used. In this case, Mattathias Antigonus chose to resort to the display of sacred iconography as a last desperate attempt to appeal to the Jewish population in a severe political crisis, a tactic which later repeated itself during the two Jewish wars. He was trying to tie together the disparate forces of the religious and political powers that had been struggling with one another since the beginning of the Hasmonaean uprising.
The importance of coinage or rather coin iconography both as a medium supporting authoritative and propagandistic declarations, as well as a medium of religious self-representation, is highlighted in the situation where the identity and legitimacy of the ruler was questioned, as the case of the last Hasmonaean king Mattathias Antigonus clearly shows. In the cases of utmost distress sacred iconography repeatedly came to play an important role in Jewish coin iconography. Until this point in time the sacred aspect had however been next to non-existent in Jewish coinage, aside from the use of the palaeo-Hebrew script, which due to its context of use seems very early on to have received this additional aspect.

The end of the Hasmonaean rule again brought radical changes to the Jewish world, which now became ruled by a Jewish king, whose loyalty was directed towards the centre of the Roman world. Herod the Great, who to a great extent owed his kingship to Rome, actively pursued a much grander line of Hellenistic kingship than the Hasmonaean rulers preceding him, both inside and outside of Palestine. For all the unique architecture and material culture pioneered by King Herod, his numismatic legacy is by comparison quite insignificant, although not less discussed than his other merits.

7.3 The Roman Period: Coinage of the Herods

The coinage of Herod the Great has proven to entail some difficulties concerning the understanding, interpretation, dating and attribution of which only some has been solved. Herod evidently equally drew from both Greek Hellenistic, as shown by the image of the galley, the shield or the anchor, as well as Roman iconographic traditions, as displayed by the use of the winged caduceus, in his coinage. The differences between the traditions found may at the time of their use not have been viewed as distinct, since Jewish coin iconography was in effect primarily based on the contemporary Pagan iconographic traditions and the use of similar images within both cultural traditions was a given reality.

The actual dates of Herod’s coins have been subject to much debate, as apparently the iconography does not offer any definite indications to when these should be placed. Especially the “Year 3” coins have received much attention and a number of
suggestions have been made, either placing them in the year 37 BCE, the same year Herod defeated the last Hasmonaean king Mattathias Antigonus, or in the year 27 BCE, the third year after the reconfirmation of Herod’s kingship by Augustus and the time of Samaria’s refoundation as Sebaste. Though very persuasive the placing of the date of the “Year 3” coins to 27 BCE this cannot yet fully convince. The date of the “Year 3” coins is here still favoured to be 37 BCE, the year Herod became sole ruler.

Nothing immediately points in the direction of Herod minting coins with any specific regard to the Jewish cult. Most of Herod’s coin motifs are, especially compared with the coinages of some later Herodian rulers, not openly in offence of the Jewish Bilderverbot, though with one marked exception, the eagle. This apparent reluctance to use offensive iconography has aided the general understanding of Herod’s coinage as ambiguous. Even if the iconographic evidence suggests that the understanding of the different images used on Herod’s coins in some cases could have varied according to the social and religious context of the users of the coins. The same image, such as the three-legged table or perhaps even the tripod with lebes, may have evoked different religious associations among the different users of the coin, but these are to a great extent still hypothetical considerations. It is very difficult to assess if the suggested ambiguity was indeed present in Herod’s coin iconography. It cannot be ignored that the understanding of Herod’s coinage as ambiguous to a great extend relies on the different modern interpretations of the individual images, therefore it is also not to say if this may have been intentional or not. In contrast, other aspects of Herod’s accomplishments, such as his building program, cannot be argued to have been the least ambiguous.

The identification of some images has at times proven to be very difficult. Most marked among these is the discussion of the “Year 3” coins depicting the helmet of Herod, which has also been identified as a single pilos of the Dioscurids, and the pomegranate/poppy. Contrary to this, the interpretation of other motifs seemingly presents no problems at all, such as the use of the winged caduceus based on a direct comparison with Roman coinage or images inherited from the coinage of the Hasmonaeans which to a great extend were based on the iconographic traditions of the Hellenistic rulers. The attribution of the coins to the two mints of Jerusalem and Samaria does solve some problems connected with the use of the images, but still only partly delivers possible reasons for the application of the iconography or the intentions respectively rather the
motivation for the implementation of some distinct images found in Herod’s coinage, such as the tripod, the table or the eagle, against the use of the known images, such as the anchor or the shield resting on the Hellenistic traditions. Recapitulatingly stated, Herod’s coin iconography displays a mixture of Hellenistic and Roman iconographic traditions and at the same time a distinct individual creativity, which should most likely be placed in the time of Herod’s rise to sole ruler.

Marked differences can be found in the use of coin iconography by the immediate successors of Herod the Great, the Herodian tetrarchs, that illustrate to which extent the use and understanding of the iconographic language itself had changed, but along with this the individual self-conception of the rulers, since the time of the Hasmonaeans kings.

As the immediate successor to Herod the Great, Herod Archelaus inherited the Jewish core areas of Judaea, Samaria and Idumaea, which may in part explain his indeed unspectacular coin iconography. Archelaus’ coins lacked an explicit sacred iconography probably as a result of his continuation of the Jewish-Hellenistic iconographic traditions already established in this area. Furthermore, Archelaus seems to have placed little value on the use of coin iconography as a political medium applied to disseminate messages, one of the key functions of the iconography cited above. He did specifically stress his politically elevated position in the Jewish nation as the ethnarch, contrary to his two brothers. Although, generally speaking, he did not seem to place a premium on the use of coins as a medium for propaganda otherwise, suggesting that he predominantly issued coins to meet with economic demands and his involvement in the administration of the coinage may have been very limited.

The possible sacred content of the coin iconography of Archelaus has been the cause for some debate. In his case, the image of the vine may both be understood as a reference to the golden vine of the Jewish Temple of Jerusalem or simply as a sign of agricultural fertility. Again, the determining factor for the understanding of the images seems to have depended on the comprehension of the beholder and the expectations with which the image was encountered.

Herod Antipas issued the least conspicuous but most coordinated coinage of all the Herodian rulers. Although he only issued coins during very few years of his rule, all carrying unsophisticated pictorial repertoires mainly consisting of palm leafs, reeds, wreaths and palm trees, he upheld an elaborate denominational system. In the coin leg-
ends he stressed his own role as tetrarch and primarily the founding of his new capital Tiberias in the 24th year of his reign. An effort which was as much an effort to honor the emperor Tiberius, as it was to specify himself as the tetrarch of the city. Antipas’ last coin series testifies to his unsuccessful attempt at establishing himself with the Roman Empire and in the eyes of the emperor by stressing his adherence to him in the coin inscription of his last coin series in 39 CE. By the time these were issued it did little to forestall Antipas’ banning the same year. Despite, or rather because of, its limited vocabulary Antipas’ coinage had a lasting impact on the coins of the city of Tiberias during the next century or so, as it was repeatedly used in the coinages minted here at least until the reign of Trajan.

All iconographic elements found in the coinage of Herod Philip clearly distinguishes his coinage from the coinages of his brothers and absolutely no traces of his Jewish descent or even a Jewish religious identity – if this was a factor to be reckoned with – can be found. Far more, his iconography finds its immediate parallels in the contemporary Greco-Roman coin iconography already implemented by the previous rulers of his area, the Ituraeans. As noted time and again Philip was the first Jewish ruler to place his own portrait on a coin and even if he only did this twice, at the beginning and at the end of his rule, this represents the most clear indication of the changes which had taken place in the Jewish world and the self-conception of the Jewish rulers. Descent no longer seemed to be a factor which played a major role in the portrayal of the public identity of the ruler, but the time and place of his rule. Since no evidence of Herod Philip’s personal beliefs are known it is only possible to speculate if the Jewish religion played a role in his life. Judging by his coin iconography this was not a factor.

The use of sacred coin iconography came to play a major, but decidedly different, role in his coinage than previously encountered in Jewish coinage and was based on completely new and different political considerations. Now, the temple of Roma and Augustus, next to the effigies of the Roman rulers, was the dominating motif used. Through the frequent use of the image of the temple façade the imperial ruler cult was decidedly emphasised and therewith the honouring of the Roman emperor the centre statement addressed in Philip’s coin iconography. The additional presentation of the empress Livia in her role as Julia Augusta, respectively Ioulia Sebaste, underlines this even further. Philip used his coinage as a political medium to directly address his Roman
sovereign and therewith to pay him, at the time, the highest honours possible while maintaining a unique status. If this was directly connected with the imperial ruler cult situated in his capital Paneas – and perhaps an allusion to Livia or Livia in her role as priestess of the Divus Augustus – is hypothetical, but since almost all of his coin types address the imperial cult and also based on the reality that as we repeatedly encounter similar iconographic displays in the coinage of Paneas under the rulers to follow, it seems most reasonable to at least give this some consideration.

In the coinage of Herod Agrippa I, the first Herodian king to rule after Herod the Great, the traditions of his Herodian predecessors are to some extent combined. The most noticeable aspect of Agrippa’s I coinage is the close and personal relationship demonstrated to the Roman rulers, especially to Caligula, most likely due to their common history growing up in Rome. This is amongst others noticeable in the minor coins displaying his wife Kypros demonstrating the virtues *fecunditas* and *constantia* imitating coin types issued in Rome honouring Antonia Minor, the mother of the later emperor Claudius. That the coinage of Agrippa I also otherwise closely followed the example of the Roman imperial coinage is evidenced by his imitations and copies of Roman imperial coin types displaying members of the imperial family, such as the three sisters and the father of the emperor Caligula, or – next to his wife Kypros – the presentation of Agrippa’s I own son and heir, Agrippa II, in imitation of displays found in the Roman imperial coinage. By displaying his own family in a fashion directly imitating the typology used by the Roman emperor, Agrippa I not only elevated his own position, but also repeatedly confirmed his adherence to the Roman emperor. Also his demonstration of loyalty towards the emperor through the crowning of him, together with his brother Herod of Chalcis, or the joint sacrifice at the pagan altar underlined the close relationship with the Roman sovereign at all times. The different coin types demonstrate a hitherto unprecedented adherence to the Roman rulers, with personal and direct references, especially to the emperor Caligula and members of the imperial family. Only a few iconographic elements can be associated with traditions found in Hellenistic Greek coin iconography, such as the anchor. In the case of the latter an image was applied as mark of the future sovereign, which already during the rule of the Seleucids had been used as a mark of dynastic recognition.
No iconographic elements can be associated with any specific Jewish traditions or contexts in Agrippa’s I coin iconography. The coins issued in Jerusalem displaying the canopy and the three grain ears did evidently observe the religious sensitivity regarding iconographic displays found here, but this appears to have been a strictly local phenomenon and neither of the two images can be stated to be of specific Jewish origin, since the bundled grains ears were likewise common in Roman coin iconography found both in Asia Minor and Alexandria and the use of the canopy rested on a much older Eastern tradition, the remnants of which still visible in the coinage of Indian Kushan during the 1st and early 2nd century CE.

The last Herodian king, Agrippa II, was the Herodian ruler who in his iconographic language came closest to Rome. Through the general use of imitations of images and even copies of common coin types found in the Roman imperial coin iconography including the display of a number of Pagan gods and deities such as Tyche, Victory and Pan, he displays a subservience to the Roman sovereign not encountered before. Few elements found in his coin iconography still betray his Hellenistic heritage, but no traces of his Jewish decent are to be found at all. The Hellenistic origin of the images used by Agrippa II becomes pronounced when the use of specific local iconographic developments in his coin iconography can be determined; otherwise Agrippa II primarily mechanically imitated or copied Roman coin types with few variations. A pronounced example of Agrippa’s II Hellenistic inheritance is the display of his sister Berenike, which simultaneously underlines his – and her – political aspirations. But apart from this, Agrippa II displays a high degree of self-restraint, if not to say anonymity, in his coin iconography, especially compared with his father Agrippa I, who deliberately imitated the personal self-representation exemplified by Caligula.

The outbreak of the First Jewish War during Agrippa’s II reign no doubt played a major role in the development and shaping of his coinage of which most stem from the time after the war. After the defeat of the Jews an overall change in the Roman imperial coinage both issued in Palestine and directed towards Palestine is noticeable. Until the war the majority of the coinage of the Roman prefects and procurators acting on behalf of the Roman emperor in Palestine had demonstrated an understanding of the Jewish (religious) sensibilities. This restraint by the rulers suggests a certain amount of
religious lenience prevailed. This attitude effectively changed in response to the war.\textsuperscript{1322} Afterwards coin series were minted by the Roman authorities, without any tolerance for the sensibilities of the Jews. This course seems to have been fully accepted by Agrippa II.

The coin iconography of some coin series issued after the war has been judged to heed Jewish sensibilities also after this time, such as the coins from Sepphoris which at the time of Trajan still displayed the familiar images of reeds, palm branches, wreaths with legends and the like known already from the coinage of Herod Antipas.\textsuperscript{1323} This may have to do with both the concentrations of Jews in this area, as well as the passage of time since the initial uprising there, but this understanding of the Sepphoris aniconic iconography may not necessarily reflect the reason for the continued use of the iconographic repertoire established under the rule of Herod Antipas. Far more, the aniconic iconographic traditions previously established had in this case been continuously applied over the decades following Antipas’ reign as iconographic references to the city itself. What appears to be religious tolerance may just as well be reflections of local iconographic characteristics. Upon the death of Agrippa II the rule of the Herods came to its conclusion as the old Jewish kingdom was finally absorbed by the Roman Empire and with this the regular issuing of Jewish coinage ended.

\section*{7.4 The Jewish Wars against Rome}

The coinage minted and issued during the First Jewish War and the Second Jewish War represent independent short-lived incidents both in Jewish history and in Jewish coinage as such. The two wars were completely different in nature and the character of the coinages and the reasons for their emission represented completely different political considerations. They had in common that the coins issued by the individual authorities were minted and issued by Jews for Jews, in a much narrower sense than any other Jewish coins produced at any time previously as a local coinage for a semi-autonomous people. The administrations responsible for the Jewish war coins respectively clearly viewed

\textsuperscript{1322} Meshorer 2001, 167; Goodman 2007b, 164.
\textsuperscript{1323} Belayche 2001, 39.
themselves as the representatives of an autonomous people minting coins for their own reasons in their own rights.

The images and legends of the coins of the *First Jewish War* display a completely new development within Jewish coinage, where the actual enactment of the Jewish cult came to play a major role in Jewish iconography for the first time since Mattathias Antigonus. Contrary to Jewish coins minted earlier the individual no longer played a role in the representation and therefore the precise identification of the issuing party has proven difficult. The coin iconography was used to define a collective Jewish identity, primarily focused on the Jewish cult and the land of the Jewish people, and was to some extend issued as a challenge to the oppressive Roman rule. Both the legends and the images were used for maximum effect. There was not only the iconography of the Jewish temple cult, such as the actual utensils used within the Temple, but also a message of ‘freedom’ and ‘redemption’, both set on the background of Jewish religious history – for the Jewish land and people as a political and religious entity. It should however not be underestimated that the motivation for the emission of the coinage of this time was to comply with both the religious requirements of the temple, which until now had been sustained with the use of the Tyrian shekel, and the economic demands of the Jews, which through the war to a great extend had been isolated in Jerusalem and the immediate surrounding land.

The fact that the Tyrian shekel for several decades stood as the coin of choice for Temple needs is a testament to the Jewish flexibility with regards to coinage – more specifically in regard to coin iconography – before the First War. It is clear that the Jewish shekel chronologically superseded the Tyrian shekel. It is however controversial if this was due either to the establishment of the Jewish shekel or if the reform of the Antiochene tetradrachm in c. 59 CE was responsible for this development. The result was effectively the same. The production of the new Jewish war shekels in Jerusalem did replace the Tyrian shekels as the currency of choice for annual Temple tributes. The examinations of the minting order of the war shekels has so far conveyed that the production of the coins was in fact tied closely to the Temple calendar.

Different theories have been offered providing explanations for the understanding of the development of the coins of the war and the identity of the issuing authorities behind these. Since the internal political power struggle was causing so many difficulties
that not even the massive threat of the Romans could bring unity among the different frac-
tions of the Jewish society, it is extremely difficult to imagine that all fractions at any time
would have been able to agree upon one official body minting on behalf of them all. The
minting and issuing of coins was more than likely connected with the strongest parties
throughout the duration of the war, which in the beginning meant the priests of the Tem-
ple were responsible. The noticeable changes which took place within the war-coinage,
the introduction of the new motifs of the palm tree with two baskets of fruit and the four
species with the ethrog and the inscription referring to the redemption of Israel in the
fourth year, could have been induced by and reflecting the changes in power taking place
throughout the war, in the later years moving into the hands of the Zealot leaders John of
Gischala and Simon bar Giora respectively. We are however still moving on a hypotheti-
cal level concerning these questions.

Due to the decentralisation of the Jewish world after the loss of the Temple in
Jerusalem at the end of the First Jewish War, both the political as well as the religious
situation of the Jews especially in Palestine changed radically. The coinage issued by
the authorities of the insurgents during the Second Jewish War to some extent reflects
these developments and changes. Whereas the issuing of the coinage of the First War
seems to have been based on the Jewish religious calendar a similar organisation of the
coinage of the Second War has not been established. The coins of the Second War seem
far more to have met with the political demands to portray an independent state with its
own administration and coinage. The most important part of the coinage of the Second
War was undoubtedly its way of manufacture. The idea to overstrike coins was not new
and numerous examples of such practises can be found throughout the history of ancient
coinage and also within Jewish coinage itself, as amongst others found in the later coin-
age of the Hasmonaeans. This procedure was however never the rule, as it was the case
with the coins of the Second Jewish War. Here the method was applied to underline the
political message as much as the iconography and the self-presentations itself.

The coin iconography finds a number of parallels in the coinage of the First War
and all images used can either be connected with the Jewish cult, the wealth of the land
or military strength. No other Pagan representation used previously in the Jewish ico-
nography had established itself as an iconographic manifestation of Judaism as did the
image of the Temple façade. On the coins of the Second Jewish War sacred architecture
became the instrument to display the national religious identity. The Jewish literary sources seem to have played a decisive role in this development. The pictorial language used had a distinct Pagan origin. Roman period temples were found throughout the empire and the use of temple architecture in coinage was standard in Roman coinage, but the implementation of the architecture on the Jewish war coins clearly followed local conventions and intentions of the time. The iconographic source for the design of the Temple façade was not the Roman gabled temple architecture, but local flat-roofed temple architecture, as prominently displayed by the Baal Temple in Palmyra or the later wall-painting from Dura Europos. These distinctions were most likely even clearer to the Jews of Palestine in the early 2nd century CE. The use of temple architecture clearly demonstrates how the comprehension of an image could develop and change over time.

Another new development in the coinage of the Second Jewish War, in comparison to the coinage of the First War, was the use of personal names and the specific titles. Yet again, the political identities had become important factors and the coin iconography seems to some extent to have been used to underline the differences between the two, as the images and the personal legends do not appear to have been randomly interchangeable. Eleazar’s name was e.g. never combined with the Temple façade or a wreath and Shimeon’s name was never displayed with the jug and the branch. Of the two names applied Shimeon was clearly the most important, as it has also been recognised on the basis of other sources, such as the written documents found in the Judaean desert. He was the undisputed military leader, where Eleazar seems to have played a minor role, the reasons for which we can no longer grasp due to our lack of information.

7.5 Afterthoughts

After the end of the Second Jewish War no further ancient Jewish coinage was minted or issued in Palestine. The continuously developing acculturation of Jewish Palestine, in part, forced as a result of the wars, exhibited an increasing public acceptance of iconographic displays at least by parts of the Jewish society. A new source of Jewish information, Rabbinic literature, makes it self known in the 3rd century CE. In these sources
the omnipresence of Pagan life and the Rabbinic need to work out an accommodation for the perpetuation of Jewish religion in a new reality of the post-war life of the Jews is in tension. These writings deliver a wealth of information illustrating the Jewish everyday religious life during the Roman imperial period (and also after this period), although these cannot often securely be placed in specifically in time and place. The literature of the Talmud cannot be viewed as a coherent literary or historical work of the Rabbis. Both in the Palestinian and the later Babylonian Talmud we have traditions that can be compared with the ‘realia’ of the periods that they purport to cite but they were not intended to be a comprehensive history. The traditions should be compared with the contemporary Roman literature and the material culture. These texts can be seen as a literary counter-balance to the Roman imperial culture and religion, as reactions (sometimes from a vastly different perspective and period) to the Roman rule.

In the emerging Rabbinic literature – reflecting thoughts and ways of living of the Jewish population under the Roman rule (and purporting to represent traditions that pre-date the Romans) – a continuing change in the Jewish attitude towards the use of figurative pictorial presentations is documented. The liberalizing distinction between religious offensive and inoffensive figurative representations allowed a more pragmatic handling of the everyday contact with the figurative and especially Pagan iconography. Iconographic elements from the Pagan (religious) world were transferred both into the private realm of the Jews, as well as some of the public Jewish facilities, such as the synagogues. This should however not be equated with actual changes in religious beliefs or attitudes, but with changed Jewish conceptions of the application of the use of anthropomorphic iconography.

Generally speaking, where connections between the Jewish cult and other cultures and cults could develop, through Greco-Roman institutions, conventions, or traditions, the boundaries between the post-wars cultures are clearly drawn and mostly adversarial. This has especially been articulated in detail in Rabbinic sources, which in itself are not homogeneous and need to be divided into three very different types of sources of information chronologically spread over a long period of time: the Mishnah,
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the Talmud, and the Midrash. Evidently, in the course of time, views also changed regarding ancient Jewish coinage. These changes are reflected in the archaeological, literary, as well as in the numismatic material found. The study of the use of sacred iconography in Jewish coinage, the long development and the changes Jewish coinage underwent has made this especially clear.

In the *Genesis Rabbah* – a Midrash (a biblical interpretation) edited some time in the 5th century CE – we find a very brief but interesting account listing coins that were minted by various Biblical protagonists, more precisely by the patriarchs Abraham, Joshua, David, and the prophet Mordechai. According to this, Abraham minted a coin with ‘an old man and an old woman’ on one side and ‘a young man and a woman’ on the other. Joshua minted a coin with an ‘ox’ on one side and a ‘wild-ox’ on the other. David’s coin had ‘a staff and a knapsack’ on one side and a ‘tower’ on the other. Mordechai’s coin had ‘a sackcloth and ashes on one side’ and ‘a golden crown’ on the other (*Genesis Rabbah* 39:11). At the same time *Genesis Rabbah* is offering a way to understand the iconography of these coins.1328

It is nothing new that the depictions on the coins described here find their immediate counterparts in the coinage minted by the Romans during the time where the various parts of this text where developed – i.e. during the 2nd to the 4th century CE, presenting images of the Roman emperors and members of their families, animals, architecture, and so forth. It is significant that Abraham’s coinage has an ‘old man and woman’ and a ‘young man and woman’, representations that Rabbis might have thought to be out of step with ancient Jewish iconography. The idea that the display may have represented the life and times of Abraham might have made the iconography more acceptable. The perception of a comprehensive ban by the Jews on all human representations is not be as comprehensive as once thought.

1328 Other examples of references to coins minted by biblical protagonists can also be found in the Midrash (Esther Rabbah 8:15) and the Babylonian Talmud (Tractate Babba Kamma 97b).
# Appendix: Tables

## Table 1. A Chronological Overview of Jewish Coinage under different Periods of Sovereign rule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Jewish Coinage (coin production)</th>
<th>Sovereign Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th century BCE</td>
<td>YHD coinage (c. 400-330 BCE)</td>
<td>Archaemenidic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YHD coinage (c. 330-305 BCE)</td>
<td>Greek/Macedonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd century BCE</td>
<td>YHD coinage (c. 305-250 BCE)</td>
<td>Ptolemaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>No Jewish coinage</em> (c. 250-200 BCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd century BCE</td>
<td><em>No Jewish coinage</em> (c. 200-135 BCE)</td>
<td>Seleucid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hasmonaean Rulers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hyrcanus I (<em>Yehohanan</em>) (135-104 BCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judas Aristobulus I (<em>Yehudah</em>) (104-103 BCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Jannaeus (<em>Yehonathan or Yonatan</em>) (103-76 BCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salome Alexandra (76-67 BCE)</td>
<td>&quot;Autonomous&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st century BCE</td>
<td>Judas Aristobulus II (<em>Yehudah?</em>) (67-63 BCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hyrcanus II (<em>Yonatan?</em>) (63-40 BCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mattathias Antigonus (<em>Mattataya</em>) (40-37 BCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herod the Great (40-4 BCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st century CE</td>
<td>Herodian Successors:</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herod Archelaus (4 BCE-6 CE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herod Antipas (4 BCE-39 CE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herod Philip (4 BCE-34 CE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agrippa I (37-44 CE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agrippa II (c. 53-100 CE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd century CE</td>
<td>First Jewish War (66-70 CE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bar Kokhba War (132-135 CE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. The Coin Types of Herod Archelaus (4 BCE-6 CE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Inscription*</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Aw. Weight (g.)</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
<th>TJC/GBC Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>HPWΔΟΥY</td>
<td>Double Cornucopiae w. Caduceus</td>
<td>ΕΘΝΑΡΧΥ</td>
<td>1.16-1.35</td>
<td>67 / 1192</td>
<td>67 / 1192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>HPWΔΗ</td>
<td>Double Cornucopiae w. Caduceus</td>
<td>EΘΝ</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>68-68f</td>
<td>69-69c / 1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor (wide arms)</td>
<td>Anchor (wide arms)</td>
<td>HPWΔΟΥY</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>EΘΝΑ</td>
<td>1.28-1.45</td>
<td>69-69c / 1193</td>
<td>69-69c / 1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Parallel Cornucopiae</td>
<td>Two Parallel Cornucopiae</td>
<td>HPWΔΗC</td>
<td>Galley</td>
<td>EΘΝΧΡΑΗΣ</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>70-70h / 1194</td>
<td>70-70h / 1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Parallel Cornucopiae</td>
<td>Two Parallel Cornucopiae</td>
<td>HPW[ΔΗC]</td>
<td>Galley</td>
<td>EΘΝΡΑΗΧ</td>
<td>1.00-1.60</td>
<td>71-71f / 1195</td>
<td>71-71f / 1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prow of Galley</td>
<td>Prow of Galley</td>
<td>HPWΔΟΥY</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>EΘΝΑ</td>
<td>1.19-1.30</td>
<td>72-72i / 1197</td>
<td>72-72i / 1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine</td>
<td>Vine</td>
<td>HPWΔΟΥY</td>
<td>Helmet</td>
<td>EΘΝ[Α]PX[ΟΥ]</td>
<td>2.00/0.80-1.00</td>
<td>73-73f</td>
<td>73-73f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine</td>
<td>Vine</td>
<td>EΘΝΑΡΧΟΥY</td>
<td>Helmet</td>
<td>HPWΔΟΥY</td>
<td>2.06-2.23</td>
<td>74 / 1196</td>
<td>74 / 1196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Many variations of the legends and placement of letters exist.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Weight (g.)</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
<th>TJC/GBC Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Grain</td>
<td>ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Palm Tree</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΗΣ</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>75 / 1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>TIBE ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>-- / 1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>TIBE ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>76 / 1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>TIBE ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>3.85-3.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>77-77a / 1201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>TIBE ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>78 / 1202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 24</td>
<td>19/20 CE</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΗΣ</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>79 / 1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>TIBE ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>80 / 1204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>TIBE ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>81 / 1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕ</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 / 1206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 33</td>
<td>28/9 CE</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΗΣ</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>83 / 1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>TIBE ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>84 / 1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>TIBE ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>85 / 1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕ</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>86 / 1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 34</td>
<td>29/30 CE</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΗΣ</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>87 / 1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>TIBE ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>5.78-5.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>88-88a / 1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>TIBE ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>89 / 1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕ</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>90 / 1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 37</td>
<td>32/3 CE</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΗΣ</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>91-91c / 1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕ ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>5.78-5.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>92-92a / 1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕ ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>93 / 1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 43</td>
<td>39 CE</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΗΣ</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>94 / 1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Branch</td>
<td>ΗΡΩΔΙΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥΔΗΣ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕ ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>94 / 1218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. The Coin Types of Herod Philip (4 BCE-34 CE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Weight (g.)</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
<th>TJC/GBC Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>ΚΑΙΚΑΡ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / LE</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>95-95a / 1219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / LE</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΚΑΙΚΑΡ ΚΕΒΑΣ</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>96 / 1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>ΚΑΙΚΑΡΙ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΩ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / LIB</td>
<td>8.93-9.61</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>97-97b / 1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 16</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>ΚΑΙΚΑΡΙ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΩ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / LΓΣ</td>
<td>5.37-6.15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>99-99a / 1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 19</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>ΤΙΒ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΚΕΒΑΣ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / LΘ</td>
<td>4.29-6.62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>101-101d / 1224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 26/7</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΚΑΡ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / ΛΓ</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>102 / 1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 30</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>ΤΙΒ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΚΕΒΑΣ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / ΛΓ</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>102a / --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 33</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΚΑΡ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / ΛΓ</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>103 / 1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 37</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΚΑΡ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / ΛΓ</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105 / 1228a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livia</td>
<td>ΙΟΥΛΙΑ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΗ</td>
<td>Hand w. grain ears</td>
<td>ΚΑΡΠΟΦΟΡΟΣ / ΛΔ</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-- / 1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 34</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>ΚΑΙΚΑΡΟΣ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / ΛΓΣ</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>104 / 1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 37</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΚΑΡ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / ΛΓ</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105 / 1228a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 33</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΚΑΡ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / ΛΓ</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105 / 1228a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livia</td>
<td>ΙΟΥΛΙΑ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΗ</td>
<td>Hand w. grain ears</td>
<td>ΚΑΡΠΟΦΟΡΟΣ / ΛΔ</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-- / 1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 34</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΚΑΡ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / ΛΓ</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105 / 1228a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livia</td>
<td>ΙΟΥΛΙΑ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΗ</td>
<td>Hand w. grain ears</td>
<td>ΚΑΡΠΟΦΟΡΟΣ / ΛΔ</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>107 / 1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 37</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΚΑΡ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / ΛΓ</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105 / 1228a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livia</td>
<td>ΙΟΥΛΙΑ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΗ</td>
<td>Hand w. grain ears</td>
<td>ΚΑΡΠΟΦΟΡΟΣ / ΛΔ</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>107 / 1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ</td>
<td>Date in wreath</td>
<td>ΛΔ</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>108 / 1232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 37</td>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΚΑΡ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ / ΛΖ</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>109 / 1233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livia</td>
<td>ΙΟΥΛΙΑ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΗ</td>
<td>Hand w. grain ears</td>
<td>ΚΑΡΠΟΦΟΡΟΣ / ΛΖ</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110 / 1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ</td>
<td>Date in wreath</td>
<td>ΛΖ</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>111 / 1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Augustus / Livia</td>
<td>ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΙ</td>
<td>Temple-façade</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ</td>
<td>10.30-11.03</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100-100m / 1229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. The Coin Types of Herod Agrippa I (37-44 CE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Weight (g.)</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
<th>TJC/GBC Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paneas</strong></td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Caligula</td>
<td>ΓΑΙΩ / LB</td>
<td>Julia, Drusilla, Agrippina</td>
<td>ΙΟΥΛΙΑ ΔΡΟΥΣΙΑΛΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΝΑ</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>112 / 1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agrippa I</td>
<td>ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑΣ</td>
<td>Agrippa II on Horse</td>
<td>ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΝΑ ΥΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ / LB</td>
<td>8.70-8.90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>113-1138 / 1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kypros</td>
<td>ΚΥΠΡΟΣ</td>
<td>Hand with Grain Ears and vine</td>
<td>ΓΑΙΩ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ / LB</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>114 / 1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>ΓΑ ΒΑΣ</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>115 / 1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tiberias / Paneas</strong></td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Caligula</td>
<td>ΓΑΙΩ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΩ</td>
<td>Germanicus in Quadriga</td>
<td>ΝΟΜΙΣ[ΜΑ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ / LE</td>
<td>9.81-11.80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>116-116a / 1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caesonia</td>
<td>ΚΑΙΣΩΝΙΑ ΓΥΝΗ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ</td>
<td>Drusilla</td>
<td>ΔΡΟΥΣΙΛΗΘ ΘΥΓΑΤΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ / LE</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>117 / 1241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agrippa I</td>
<td>ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ</td>
<td>Kypros</td>
<td>ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ ΚΥΠΡΟΣ / LE</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>118 / 1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agrippa II</td>
<td>ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΥΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ / LE</td>
<td>Double Cornucopiae</td>
<td>ΒΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ ΦΙΛΟΚΑΙΣΑΡ</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>119 / 1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jerusalem</strong></td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>Canopy</td>
<td>ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ</td>
<td>Three Grain Ears</td>
<td>Λζ</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>120-120m / 1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caligula</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΓΕΡΜΑΝ</td>
<td>Temple, 2 figures sacrificing</td>
<td>ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΑΓΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΑΙΣΑΡ / ΛΖ</td>
<td>15.56-16.05 / 8.60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>121-121b / 1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agrippa I</td>
<td>ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΑΓΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΑΙΣΑΡ</td>
<td>Tyche</td>
<td>ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙΑ Η ΠΡΟΣ ΤΩ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ ΛΙΜΗΝ[Ι] / LZ</td>
<td>6.86-8.60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>122-122b / 1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agrippa II</td>
<td>ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΟΥ ΥΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ</td>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>ΛΖ</td>
<td>4.60-4.70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>123-123a / 1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caesarea</strong></td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>Caligula</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΓΕΡΜΑΝ</td>
<td>Temple, 2 figures sacrificing</td>
<td>ΟΡΚΙΑ ΒΑΣ ΜΕ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ ΠΡ ΣΕΒ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΑΣ ΕΠΙ ΣΥΝΚΑΙΤΟΝ Κ ΛΗΜΟ ΡΟΜ ΦΙΛΟ ΜΑΓΑΣ ΠΟΣΟΝ ΖΥΛΟ ΛΗΜΗΝ[ΙΝΝ] ΑΧΙ ΑΥΤ</td>
<td>15.25-15.93</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>124-124a / 1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agrippa I / Herod of Chalcis / Claudius</td>
<td>ΒΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑΣ ΣΕΒ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΒΑΣ ΗΡΩΔΗΣ / LH</td>
<td>Two Hands Clasping</td>
<td>ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΑΓΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΑΙΣΑΡ / ΛΗ</td>
<td>14.60-15.23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>125-125a / 1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claudius</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΓΕΡΜΑΝ</td>
<td>Temple, 2 figures sacrificing</td>
<td>ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΑΓΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΑΙΣΑΡ / ΛΗ</td>
<td>7.53-9.11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>126-126a / 1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agrippa I</td>
<td>ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΑΓΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΑΙΣΑΡ</td>
<td>Tyche</td>
<td>ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙΑ Η ΠΡΟΣ ΤΩ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ ΛΙΜΗΝ[Ι] / LZ</td>
<td>15.90-16.50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>127-127a / 1251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mint**</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Obverse</td>
<td>Inscription</td>
<td>Reverse</td>
<td>Inscription</td>
<td>Weight (g.)</td>
<td>Size (mm)</td>
<td>TJC/GBC Nos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refounding of Paneas as Neronias</td>
<td>60/1 CE</td>
<td>Nero (litus)</td>
<td>ΝΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ</td>
<td>Inscription in Circle and Wreath</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙ ΝΕΡΩΝΙΕ</td>
<td>9.96-12.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>129-129a / 1273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nero (star)</td>
<td>ΝΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ</td>
<td>Inscription in Circle and Wreath</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙ ΝΕΡΩΝΙΕ</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>130 / 1274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nero (star or crescent)</td>
<td>ΝΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ</td>
<td>Inscription in Circle and Wreath</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙ ΝΕΡΩΝΙΕ</td>
<td>2.80-3.65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>131-131b / 1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paneas</td>
<td>Year 11 also 6</td>
<td>Tyche</td>
<td>ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙΑ ΤΗ ΚΑΙ ΝΕΡΩΝΙΑΔΙ</td>
<td>Double Cornucopia / Caduceus</td>
<td>ΒΑΣ ΑΓΡ / ΕΤΟΥΣ ΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ζ</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>132 / 1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60/1 CE</td>
<td>Hand w. grain ears and fruit</td>
<td>ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΑΡΚ[ΟΥ] ΑΓΙΠΠΟΥ</td>
<td>Inscription in Diadem</td>
<td>ΕΤΟΥΣ ΑΙ ΤΟΥ Κ ζ</td>
<td>1.30-2.65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>133-133b / 1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 14</td>
<td>Vespasian</td>
<td>ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΣΙΑΣΙ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ</td>
<td>Tyche-Demeter</td>
<td>ΕΤ ΔΙ / ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>135 / --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>ΑΥΤΟΚΡ ΤΙΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣ</td>
<td>Nike / advancing</td>
<td>ΕΤ ΙΔΙ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>137 / 1302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>ΑΥΤΟΚΡ ΤΙΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣ</td>
<td>Nike / advancing</td>
<td>ΑΙΔ ΒΑΣΙΛ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΟΥ</td>
<td>11.72-14.90</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>138-138c / 1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑ[ΝΟΣ] ΚΑΙΣΑΡ</td>
<td>Nike / Shield</td>
<td>ΑΙΔ ΒΑΣΙΛ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΟΥ[Υ]</td>
<td>5.59-6.77</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>139-139c / 1304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberias</td>
<td>Year 15</td>
<td>69/70 CE</td>
<td>ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΝΙΚ ΣΕΒ / ΕΤ ΙΕ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>ΤΙΒΕ ΡΙΑΣ</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>134 / 1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vespasian</td>
<td>ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΣΙΑΣΙ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ</td>
<td>Tyche-Demeter</td>
<td>ΕΤ ΙΕ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ</td>
<td>15.48-16.49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>140-140b / 1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑ[ΝΟΣ] ΚΑΙΣΑΡ</td>
<td>Nike / Shield</td>
<td>ΔΟ / ΕΤΟΥ ΙΕ ΒΑΣΙ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙ</td>
<td>5.68-7.32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>141-141a / 1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 18</td>
<td>Vespasian</td>
<td>ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΣΙΑΣΙ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ</td>
<td>Τυχε-Δημ(ε)τερ</td>
<td>11.06-11.43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>142-142a / 1307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>ΑΥΤΟΚΡ ΤΙΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣ[ΑΣ]</td>
<td>Nike / advancing</td>
<td>ΕΤ ΗΙ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>143 / 1308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ</td>
<td>Nike / advancing</td>
<td>ΕΤΟΥ ΗΙ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>144 / 1309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 19</td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΤΙΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ</td>
<td>Τυχε-Δημ(ε)τερ</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>145 / 1310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Coinage</td>
<td>Numeral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 CE</td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>AYTOK TITOS KAIKAP CEBACTOC</td>
<td>Galley</td>
<td>ETO IΘ / BA AΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>5.47-8.44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>146-146b / 1311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟC KAIKAP</td>
<td>Nike / Shield</td>
<td>EΤΟΥ IΘ / BA AΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>6.75-7.06</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>147-147a / 1313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟC KAIKAP</td>
<td>Galley</td>
<td>ETO IΘ / BA ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>3.76-4.34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>148-148a / 1312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79 CE Berenike</td>
<td>CEBACTH</td>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>ΔΙΘ ΒΑ</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>149 / 1314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 24</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΕΤ KAIKAP ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙ</td>
<td>Nike / advancing</td>
<td>EΤΟ ΚΑ / ΒΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>8.88-9.17</td>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>150-150a / 1315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΕΤ KAIKAP ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙ</td>
<td>Inscription in Wreath</td>
<td>EΤΟ ΚΑ / ΒΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>7.51-7.72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>151-151a / 1316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΕΤ KAIKAP ΓΕΡΜΑ</td>
<td>Nike / Shield</td>
<td>EΤΟ ΚΑ / ΒΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>152 / 1317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 25</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>IMP CAES DIVI VESP F DOMITIAN AUG GER COS X</td>
<td>Moneta / Scales &amp; Cornucopia</td>
<td>MONETA ΕΠΙ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>9.44-10.89</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>153-153a / 1318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>IMP CAES DIVI VESP F DOMITIAN AUG GER COS X</td>
<td>Altar</td>
<td>SΑLVΤΙ ΕΠΙ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>11.18-11.40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>154-154a / 1319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟC KAIKAP</td>
<td>Nike / Shield</td>
<td>EΤΟ ΕΚ / ΒΑΣ</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>155 / 1321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΕΤ ΚΑΙ ΓΕΡΜΑ</td>
<td>Palm Tree</td>
<td>ET KE / ΒΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>156 / 1320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΕΤ ΚΑΙ[ΑΠ] ΓΕΡΜΑ[ΝΙ]</td>
<td>Cornucopia</td>
<td>ET KE / ΒΑ ΑΓ</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>157 / 1322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 26</td>
<td>Vespasian</td>
<td>AYTOKPΑ ΟΥΕΞΙΑΙΚI ΚΑΙΑΡΙ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΩ</td>
<td>Tyche-Demeter</td>
<td>EΤΟΥ ΚΣ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>15.75-18.58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>158-158c / 1282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vespasian</td>
<td>AYTOKPΑ ΟΥΕΞΙΑΙΚI ΚΑΙΑΡΙ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΩ</td>
<td>Tyche-Demeter</td>
<td>ΒΑΣI ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΕΤΟΥ ΚΣ</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>159 / 1283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>AYTOKP TITOS KAIKAP CEBAC</td>
<td>Nike / advancing</td>
<td>EΤΟΥ ΚΣ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>10.57-11.64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>160-160c / 1284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>IMP CAES DIVI VESP F DOMITIAN AUG GER COS XII</td>
<td>Moneta / Scales &amp; Cornucopia</td>
<td>MONETA ΕΠΙ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>161 / 1323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>IMP CAES DIVI VESP F DOMITIAN AUG GER COS XII</td>
<td>Altar</td>
<td>SΑLVΤΙ ΕΠΙ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>162 / 1324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>IM CA D VES F DOM AV GER COS XII</td>
<td>Double Cornucopiae / Caduceus</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ / ET KE / S C</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>163 / 1325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>IM CA D VES F DOM AV GER COS XII</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ / ET KE</td>
<td>4.70-5.04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>164-164b / 1326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΙΤΙ ΚΑΙΑΡΙ</td>
<td>Nike / Shield</td>
<td>EΤΟΥ ΚΣ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ / ΑΟ</td>
<td>3.94-7.07</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>165-165h / 1285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Titus &amp;</td>
<td>AYTOKPΑ TITOS KAIKAP</td>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>168 / 1281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

325
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 27</th>
<th>Paneas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vespasian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟϹ ΚΑΙϹΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑϹΤΙϹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vespasian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟϹ ΚΑΙϹΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑϹΤΙϹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus &amp; Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟϹ ΚΑΙϹΑΡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟϹ ΚΑΙϹΑΡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟϹ ΚΑΙϹΑΡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟϹ ΚΑΙϹΑΡ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vespasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Here are only coin types included in which definite references to Agrippa II are found. Not all variations in spelling of the legends are listed.
** Only listed when secured.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Inscription*</th>
<th>Motif</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Motif</th>
<th>TJC / GBC Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Temple-Façade</td>
<td>Year one of the redemption of Israel</td>
<td>Lulav with ethrog</td>
<td>218 / 1373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132/133 CE</td>
<td>Eleazar the Priest</td>
<td>Jug with branch</td>
<td>Year one of the redemption of Israel</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes</td>
<td>219 / 1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Harp</td>
<td>Year one of the redemption of Israel</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes</td>
<td>236 / 1383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Palm branch</td>
<td>Year one of the redemption of Israel</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes</td>
<td>237 / 1382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Temple-Façade</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Lulav with ethrog</td>
<td>229 / 1385-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133/134 CE</td>
<td>Eleazar the Priest</td>
<td>Jug with branch</td>
<td>Year one of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Lulav with ethrog</td>
<td>233 / 1388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Temple-Façade</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td>243 / 1392, 1402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td>Eleazar the Priest</td>
<td>Jug with branch</td>
<td>245-7 / 1390, 1398, 1400-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Harp</td>
<td>250 / 1391, 1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Lyre</td>
<td>240 / 1393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Two trumpets</td>
<td>242 / 1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Palm branch</td>
<td>248-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Jug with branch</td>
<td>253 / 1394-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Temple-Façade</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Lulav with ethrog</td>
<td>267-9 / 1411, 1413-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134/135 CE</td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Temple-Façade</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Lulav</td>
<td>270 / 1412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Temple-Façade (distyle)</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Lulav</td>
<td>271 / 1415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Lyre</td>
<td>272-3 / 1419, 1424, 1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Two trumpets</td>
<td>279-80 / 1416, 1420, 1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Palm branch</td>
<td>283 / 1418, 1422, 1427-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>284 / 1423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Lyre</td>
<td>274-5 / 1435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Two trumpets</td>
<td>276-8 / 1431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Palm branch</td>
<td>281-2 / 1430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Jug with branch</td>
<td>285 / 1433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>-- / 1434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No variations in the spelling of the legends, nor all hybrid coin types or faulty dies are here included.
Table 8. The Bronze Coinage of the Bar Kokhba War (Legends and Images).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Obverse:</th>
<th>Motif</th>
<th>Reverse:</th>
<th>TJC / GBC Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132/133 CE</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td>Year one of the redemption of Israel</td>
<td>Amphora 221 / 1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Palm tree</td>
<td>Year one of the redemption of Israel</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes 227 / 1381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon Prince of Israel</td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td>Year one of the redemption of Israel</td>
<td>Amphora 220 / 1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon Prince of Israel</td>
<td>Palm branch in wreath</td>
<td>Year one of the redemption of Israel</td>
<td>Harp 223 / 1377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon Prince of Israel / Shimeon</td>
<td>Palm tree</td>
<td>Year one of the redemption of Israel</td>
<td>Vine leaf 222 / 1378-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eleazar the Priest</td>
<td>Palm tree</td>
<td>Year one of the redemption of Israel</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes 224 / 1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Amphora 255 / 1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133/134 CE</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Palm tree</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes 266 / 1410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Letters in wreath</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Amphora 256 / 1405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon Prince of Israel</td>
<td>Palm branch in wreath</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Harp 263 / 1406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Palm tree</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Vine leaf 257, 259-60 / 1408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eleazar the Priest</td>
<td>Palm tree</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes 265 / 1409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2/3 Hybrid</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Palm branch in wreath</td>
<td>Year two of the freedom of Israel</td>
<td>Harp 296 / 1407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Palm tree</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes 301 / 1439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134/135 CE</td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Palm tree</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Vine leaf 289-94 / 1437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Palm tree</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes 302-4 / 1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shimeon</td>
<td>Lyre</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Palm branch in wreath 297-9 / 1436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eleazar the Priest</td>
<td>Palm tree</td>
<td>For the Freedom of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Bunch of grapes 300 / 1438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No variations in the spelling of the legends, nor all hybrid coin types or faulty dies are here included.
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**Part I: Jewish Coinage**

Coinage of the Province of Judah (ca. 400-250 BCE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 1. Judah, 4th century BCE. AR Shekel (0.68g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Helmeted head of Athena right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Owl standing right, head facing, olive sprig in left field; retrograde palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD below right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 1, no. 4a © Amphora Books.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1050; Meshorer 2001, no. 4a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 2. Judah, 4th century BCE. AR Shekel (0.46g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Helmeted head of Athena right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Owl standing right, head facing, olive sprig in left field; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 1, no. 4 © Amphora Books.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1051; Meshorer 2001, no. 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 3. Judah, 4th century BCE. AR Shekel (0.52g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Helmeted head of Athena right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Owl standing right, head facing, lily in upper left field; palaeo-Hebrew inscription [YH]D in right field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bibliographic Reference**
Meshorer 2001, no. 7.

---

* The images displayed are for the most part not pictured 1:1 according to size, but in regard to a maximum recognisability of the display. The diameters and weights of the coins are listed when known.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Bibliographic Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Fig. 4.** Judah, 4th century BCE. AR Half-shekel (0.29g).  
Obv.: Bearded male head with crown right (Persian king?).  
Rev.: Falcon with spread wings, head right; retrograde palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD right.  
Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 2, no. 16c © Amphora Books. |
| **Fig. 5.** Judah, 4th century BCE. AR Half-shekel (0.30g).  
Obv.: Bearded male head with crown right (Persian king?).  
Rev.: Falcon with spread wings, head right; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD right.  
Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 2, no. 16a © Amphora Books. |
| **Fig. 6.** Judah, 4th century BCE. AR Shekel (0.38g).  
Obv.: Head of horse(?) right.  
Rev.: Bird, head turned backwards left; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD right.  
Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 4, no. 27 © Amphora Books. |
| **Fig. 7.** Judah, 4th century BCE. AR Half-shekel (0.35g).  
Obv.: Lily.  
Rev.: Falcon with spread wings, head right; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD right.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 8. Judah, 4th century BCE. AR Shekel (0.60g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Ear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Falcon with spread wings, head right; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1061; Meshorer 2001, no. 18.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 9. Judah, 4th century BCE. AR Half-shekel (0.30g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Horn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Falcon with spread wings, head right; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1062; Meshorer 2001, no. 19.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 10. Judah, 4th century BCE. AR (?g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Helmet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Falcon with spread wings, head right; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 11. Judah, mid 4th century BCE. AR Quarter-shekel (0.16g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Head facing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Owl standing, head front; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YWḤNN left, HKHN right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1071; Meshorer 2001, no. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 12. Judah, 4th century BCE. AR Half-shekel (0.29g).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Obv.:** Young male head left.  
**Rev.:** Protome of winged and horned animal left; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YḤZQYH lover right field. |
| Bibliographic Reference  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 13. Judah, 4th century BCE. AR Half-shekel (0.30g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Obv.:** Horned animal head left.  
**Rev.:** Protome of winged and horned animal with human crowned and bearded head left; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YḤZQYH lover right field. |
| Bibliographic Reference  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 14. Judah, 4th century BCE. AR Half-shekel (0.21g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Obv.:** Head facing.  
**Rev.:** Owl standing, head front; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD left, YHDH right. |
| Bibliographic Reference  
Hendin 2010, no. 1072; Meshorer 2001, no. 21. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 15. Judah, late 4th century BCE. AR Half-shekel (0.23g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Obv.:** Head facing.  
**Rev.:** Owl standing, head front; palaeo-Hebrew inscription HPḤḤ left, YHZQYH right. |
| Bibliographic Reference  
Hendin 2010, no. 1069; Meshorer 2001, no. 22. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 16. Judah, 3rd century BCE. AR Hemidrachm (1.75g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Diademed head of Ptolemy I right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Eagle standing with spread wings left; pa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laeo-Hebrew inscription YHDH and Greek letters BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in left field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 4, no. 31 © Amphora Books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1084; Meshorer 2001, no. 31.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 17. Judah, 3rd century BCE. AR Hemiobol (0.20g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Head of young man, left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Eagle standing with spread wings left; pa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laeo-Hebrew inscription YHD left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 4, no. 29 © Amphora Books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1078; Meshorer 2001, no. 29.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 18. Judah, early 3rd century BCE. AR Tetartemorion (0.14g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Head facing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Eagle with thunderbolt, left; left palaeo-Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscription YHD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Barag 1994-1999, Pl. 4, no. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barag 1994-1999, Pl. 4, no. 11.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 19. Judah, first half of the 3rd century BCE. AR Tetartemorion (0.19g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Diademed head of Ptolemy I or II, right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Head of Berenike I or II right; palaeo-Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscription YHD right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1081; Meshorer 2001, no. 31.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 20. Judah, 3rd century BCE. AR Hemiobol (0.35g).

Obv. Jugate heads of Ptolemy I and Berenike I, right.
Rev.: Jugate heads of Ptolemy II and Arsinoë II, right; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHD

Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 4, no. 35 © Amphora Books.

Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1083; Meshorer 2001, no. 35.
Jewish Coinage Minted under Hasmonaean Rule (134-37 BCE)

**John Hyrcanus I (134-104 BCE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 21.</th>
<th>Jerusalem, John Hyrcanus I. AE Prutah (3.71g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Obv.: Double cornucopiae; Hebrew inscription YHWHN HKHN HGDWL R’S ḤBR HYHWDMY (Yehohanan the High Priest and Head of the Council of the Jews); border of dots. Rev.: Crested helmet; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1136; Meshorer 2001, no. H1P.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 22.</th>
<th>Jerusalem, John Hyrcanus I. AE Quarter prutah (c. 0.9g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Obv.: Palm branch; Hebrew inscription YHWHN HKHN HGDWL WHBR HYHWDMY (Yehohanan the High Priest and the Council of the Jews). Rev.: Rose between two corn ears; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 23.</th>
<th>Jerusalem, John Hyrcanus I. AE Half prutah (c. 2.0g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Obv.: Wreath tied at bottom, with palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHWHN HKHN HGDWL WHBR HYHWDMY (Yehohanan the High Priest and the Council of the Jews), above Greek letter A. Rev.: Double cornucopiae adorned with ribbons, pomegranate between horns; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BCE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 24.</strong> Jerusalem, Alexander Jannaeus. AE Half prutah (c. 1.4g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Obv.: Palm branch; inscription YHWNTN HMLK (Yehonathan the King).  
Rev.: Lily between two corn ears; border of dots.  
Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 27, no. O1 © Amphora Books.  
**Bibliographic Reference**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 25.</strong> Jerusalem, Alexander Jannaeus. AE Half prutah (14mm, 2.56g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Obv.: Anchor in diadem; around it Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ.  
Rev.: Rose, border of dots; palaeo-Hebrew inscription MLK’ ‘L[KSNDRWS] (King Alexander); border of dots.  
**Bibliographic Reference**  
Hendin 2010, no. 1148; Meshorer 2001, no. N1; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 54. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 26.</strong> Jerusalem, Alexander Jannaeus. AE Half prutah (c. 2g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Obv.: Wreath tied at bottom, with palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHWNTN HKHN HGDWL ḪḤR HYDYM (Yehonatan the High Priest and the Council of the Jews) in block-style characters.  
Rev.: Double cornucopiae adorned with ribbons, pomegranate between horns; border of dots.  
**Bibliographic Reference**  
Hendin 2010, no. 1144; Meshorer 2001, no. Q23; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 111. |
**Fig. 27.** Jerusalem, Alexander Jannaeus. AE Prutah (15mm, 3.32g).

Obv.: Anchor; Greek inscription [Β]ΑΣΙΛΕΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ; border of dots.
Rev.: Star in diadem, palaeo-Hebrew inscription YHWNTN HMLK (Yehonathan the King) between rays.


**Bibliographic Reference**

**Fig. 28.** Jerusalem, Alexander Jannaeus. AE Prutah (13mm, 1.22g).

Obv.: Anchor in circle; flanking anchor L KE (Year 25); Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ.
Rev.: Star border of dots; Aramaic inscription MLK’ ‘LKSNDRW (SHNT K’) (King Alexander) (Year 25).


**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1152; Meshorer 2001, no. L2; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 77.

**Judas Aristobulus II (67–63 BCE) (?)**

**Fig. 29.** Jerusalem, Judas Aristobulus II. AE Half-prutah (av. 1.5-2.5g).

Obv.: palaeo-Hebrew inscription in wreath: YHDH KHN GDWL WHBR HYHDYM (Yehudah High Priest and the Council of the Jews).
Rev.: Double cornucopiae adorned with ribbons, pomegranate between horns; border of dots.


**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1142 (attributed to Judas Aristobulus I (104 BCE); Meshorer 2001, no. U7; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 137.
Salome Alexandra on behalf of John Hyrcanus II (63–40 BCE)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 30. Jerusalem, John Hyrcanus II. AE Halfprutah (2.25g) – overstruck on coin of Alexander Jannaeus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: palaeo-Hebrew inscription in wreath: YNTN KHN GDWL WHֶBR HYHWDYM (Yo- natan High Priest and the Council of the Jews); parts of original anchor/circle design and inscription (N N – Yehonatan the king?). Rev.: Double cornucopiae adorned with ribbons, pomegranate between horns; Greek inscription [Β]ΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ; border of dots; part of lily and Hebrew inscription (YHWNTN HMLK?) remain from original design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.178 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1159.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 31. Jerusalem, John Hyrcanus II. AE Prutah (2.72g) – overstruck on coin of Alexander Jannaeus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: palaeo-Hebrew inscription in wreath: YNTN HKHN GDWL WHֶBR HYHWDYM (Yonathan the High Priest and the Council of the Jews); parts of anchor/circle design and inscription [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ] ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ remain from overstruck coin (Alexander Jannaeus). Rev.: Double cornucopiae (?); palaeo-Hebrew inscription YEeldonatan HAMELECH; parts of rose/lily and Hebrew inscription remain from earlier coin; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.150 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1159.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mattathias Antigonus (40-37 BCE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 32. Jerusalem, Mattathias Antigonus. AE Eightfold prutah (av. 14.00g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Obv.: Double cornucopiae, palaeo-Hebrew inscription MTYH KHN GDWL W_IBR HYHWDYM (Mattataya High Priest and the Council of the Jews).  
Rev.: Wreath with ribbons; Greek inscription BAC1ΛΕΩC ANT1ΓONOY.  
Bibliographic Reference  
Hendin 2010, no. 1162; Meshorer 2001, no. 36a; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 184. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 33. Jerusalem, Mattathias Antigonus. AE Prutah (c. 1.7g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Obv.: Showbread table border of dots; around Hebrew inscription (almost illegible, reconstructs as: Mattathya kohen gadol).  
Rev.: Menorah; Greek inscription BA[ΣΙΛΕΩΣ] ΑΝΤ[Ι].  
Source: Meshorer 2000, 45, Fig. 2.  
Bibliographic Reference  
Hendin 2010, no. 1168; Meshorer 2001, nos. 41-43. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 34. Jerusalem, Mattathias Antigonus. AE Prutah (av. 1.7g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Obv.: Wreath with palaeo-Hebrew inscription MTYH (Mattataya).  
Rev.: Double cornucopiae with grain ear between horns.  
Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 43, no. 40b © Amphora Books.  
Bibliographic Reference  
Hendin 2010, no. 1164; Meshorer 2001, no. 40b; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 192-194 (type). |
Fig. 35. Jerusalem, Mattathias Antigonus. AE Halfprutah (av. 1.5-2.5g).


Bibliographic Reference
Meshorer 2001, no. 37b; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 189 (type).
Palestine under Herodian Rule (ca. 40 BCE-100 CE)

Herod the Great (40-4 BCE)

**Dated Coin Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 36. Samaria, Herod the Great. AE large (octuple) ‘prutah’ (24mm, 6.99g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Tripod with bowl; inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ; left field date LΓ (Year 3), right field monogram; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Helmet on rack, flanked by 2 palm branches, above star, diadem ends hanging down; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1882,0705.21 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1169; Meshorer 2001, no. 44; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 195-200.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 37. Samaria, Herod the Great. AE medium ‘prutah’ (av. 4.5-5.0g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Crested Helmet w. cheek pieces; inscription ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ; left field date LΓ (Year 3), right field monogram; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Macedonian Shield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1170; Meshorer 2001, no. 45; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 201.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 38. Samaria, Herod the Great. AE medium ‘prutah’ (av. 3.0-4.0g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Winged caduceus; inscription ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ; left field date LΓ (Year 3), right field monogram; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Pomegranate/poppy; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fig. 39.** Samaria, Herod the Great. AE small ‘prutah’ (av. 1.5-2.5g).

Obv.: Aphlaston; inscription ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ; left field date ΛΓ (Year 3), right field monogram; border of dots.
Rev.: Palm branch with fillet; border of dots.


Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1172; Meshorer 2001, no. 47.

**Undated Coin Types**

**Fig. 40.** Jerusalem, Herod the Great. AE Double prutah (18mm, 2.89g).

Obv.: Closed diadem surrounding Χ; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ; border of dots.
Rev.: Three-legged table with bowl on top, 2 flanking palm branches, left and right; border of dots.

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.276 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1178; Meshorer 2001, nos. 48-48a; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 205.

**Fig. 41.** Jerusalem, Herod the Great. AE Prutah (1.23g).

Obv.: Closed diadem, below Χ; inscription ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ.
Rev.: Three-legged table on surface; border of dots.


Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1181; Meshorer 2001, no. 52.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 42. Jerusalem, Herod the Great. AE Prutah (av. 1.12g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Three-legged table; inscription ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Vine branch; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1187; Meshorer 2001, no. 58.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 43. Jerusalem, Herod the Great. AE Half prutah (av. 0.8g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Three-legged table; inscription ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ; in circle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Two crossed palm branches in circle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1185; Meshorer 2001, no. 55.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 44. Jerusalem, Herod the Great. AE prutah (av. 1.5g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Anchor; inscription ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Double cornucopiae with ribbons, inserted caduceus, above 4 pellets; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 45. Jerusalem, Herod the Great. AE Half prutah (av. 1.0g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Anchor; in circle with running Y-design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 46, no. 61 © Amphora Books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1175; Meshorer 2001, no. 61.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fig. 46.</strong> Jerusalem, Herod the Great or Herod Archelaus. AE (Half) prutah (av. 0.8-1.5g).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Obv.: Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥϹ ΗΡΩΔΗϹ; border of dots. 
Rev.: Anchor in wreath. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 47.</strong> Jerusalem, Herod the Great. AE (Half) prutah (av. 1.0g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Obv.: Anchor; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥϹ ΗΡΩΔΗϹ. 
Rev.: Galley; border of dots. |
| Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 46, no. 65b © Amphora Books. |
| Bibliographic Reference: Meshorer 2001, no. 65b. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 48.</strong> Jerusalem, Herod the Great. AE (Half) Prutah (av. 1.0g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Obv.: Cornucopia; left Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥϹ, right ΗΡΩΔΗϹ; border of dots. 
Rev.: Standing eagle, right; border of dots. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 49. Jerusalem, Herod Archelaus. AE Prutah (2.23g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Vine branch with grapes and leaf; Greek inscription ΕΘΝΑΡΧΟΥ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Crested helmet with cheek pieces, below left small caduceus; Greek inscription ΗΡΩΔΗ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 48, no. 74 © Amphora Books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meshorer 2001, no. 74.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 50. Jerusalem, Herod Archelaus. AE Prutah (15.5mm, 2.34g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Vine branch with bunch of grapes and leaf on left; Greek inscription ΗΡΩΔΗ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Crested helmet with cheek pieces, below left small caduceus; Greek inscription ΕΘΝΑΡΧΟΥ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.346 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1196; Meshorer 2001, no. 73; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 255-260.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 51. Jerusalem, Herod Archelaus. AE Prutah (av. 1.40g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Anchor; Greek inscription right HP W, left ΔΗ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Double cornucopiae with inserted caduceus; Greek inscription ΕΘΝ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1192; Meshorer 2001, no. 68.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Fig. 52. Jerusalem, Herod Archelaus. AE Prutah (av. 1.45g).
|---|
| Obv.: Anchor; Greek inscription ΗΡΩΔΟΥ; border of dots. 
Rev.: Greek inscription ΕΘΝΑΡΧΟΥ, in wreath, two lower lines written retrograde.  
Bibliographic Reference 
Hendin 2010, no. 1193; Meshorer 2001, no. 69; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 251-254. |

| Fig. 53. Jerusalem, Herod Archelaus. AE Double prutah (20mm, 2.45g).
|---|
| Obv.: Double parallel cornucopiae; Greek inscription ΗΡΩΔ; border of dots.  
Rev.: Galley; Greek inscription ΕΘΝΑΡΧΩ; border of dots.  
| Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.338 © The Trustees of the British Museum.  
Bibliographic Reference 
Hendin 2010, no. 1194; Meshorer 2001, no. 71; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 240-242. |

| Fig. 54. Jerusalem, Herod Archelaus. AE Prutah (14mm, 1.15g).
|---|
| Obv.: Prow of galley; Greek inscription ΗΩ; border of dots.  
Rev.: Greek inscription in wreath ΕΘΝ; border of dots.  
| Source: BM Reg. No.: 1876,0901.5 © The Trustees of the British Museum.  
Bibliographic Reference 
Hendin 2010, no. 1197; Meshorer 2001, no. 72; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 243-250. |
Herod Antipas (4 BCE-39 CE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 55. Sephoris (?), Herod Antipas, 1 BCE/1 CE. AE (14.1mm, 1.58g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obv.</strong>: Grain; Greek inscription TETPΑ[PΧ]ΗC Δ (Year 4); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rev.</strong>: Palm tree; below right Greek inscription HPW; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1198.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 56. Tiberias, Herod Antipas, 20/21 CE. AE (17.76g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obv.</strong>: Reed; Greek inscription HPWΔΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΟ, in field date L ΚΔ (Year 24); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rev.</strong>: Inscription in wreath TIBEPIAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 49, no. 75 © Amphora Books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1199; Meshorer 2001, no. 75; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 227.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 57. Tiberias, Herod Antipas, 28/29 CE. AE (18mm, 5.49g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obv.</strong>: Palm branch; Greek inscription HPWΔΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΟΥ, in field date L ΔΓ (Year 33); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rev.</strong>: Inscription in wreath TIBEPIAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1203; Meshorer 2001, no. 79; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 229.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fig. 58. Tiberias, Herod Antipas, 29/30 CE. AE (22mm, 10.47g).

Obv.: Palm branch; Greek inscription **ΗΡΩΔΟΥΤΕΤΡΑΧΥ** in field date **ΛΔ** (Year 34); border of dots.
Rev.: Inscription in wreath TIBEPIAC.


**Bibliographic Reference**

### Fig. 59. Tiberias, Herod Antipas, 32/33 CE. AE ‘Half’ (20mm, 6.14g).

Obv.: Palm branch; Greek inscription **ΗΡΩΔΟΥΤΕΤΡΑΧΥ** date **ΛΖ** (Year 37); border of dots.
Rev.: Greek inscription in wreath TIBEPIAC.

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1884,0705.6 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1212; Meshorer 2001, no. 88.

### Fig. 60. Tiberias, Herod Antipas, 39 CE. AE (12.58g).

Obv.: Palm tree; Greek inscription **ΗΡΩΔΗΤΕΤΡΑΧΗ** right, date in field **ΕΤΟΜΓ** (Year 43).
Rev.: Inscription in wreath **ΓΑΙΩΚΑΙΡΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΩ**.


**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1215; Meshorer 2001, no. 91; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 231.
Fig. 61. Tiberias, Herod Antipas, 39 CE. AE ‘Half’ (6.36g).

Obv.: Palm branch; Greek inscription ΗΡΩΔΗΚΤΕΤΡΑΧΗΣ, in field date ΛΜΓ (Year 43); border of dots.
Rev.: Inscription in wreath ΓΑΙΩ ΚΑΙΚΑ ΓΕΡΜΝΙΚΩ; border of dots.


Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1216; Meshorer 2001, no. 92; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 232.

Fig. 62. Tiberias, Herod Antipas, 39 CE. AE ‘Quarter’ (3.55g).

Obv.: Bunch of dates; Greek inscription ΗΡΩΔΗΚΤΕΤΡΑΧΗΣ, in field date ΛΜΓ (Year 43); border of dots.
Rev.: Inscription in wreath ΓΑΙΩ ΚΑΙΚΑΠ; border of dots.


Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1217; Meshorer 2001, no. 93; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 233.

Fig. 63. Tiberias, Herod Antipas, 39 CE. AE ‘Eight’ (1.67g).

Obv.: Palm branch; Greek inscription ΗΡΩΔΗΚΤΕΤΡΑΧΗΣ, in field date ΛΜΓ (Year 43); border of dots.
Rev.: Inscription in wreath ΓΑΙΩ.

Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 49, no. 94 © Amphora Books.

Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1218; Meshorer 2001, no. 94.
Herod Philip (4 BCE-34 CE)

**Fig. 64.** Paneas, Herod Philip, 1/2 CE. AE (25mm, 9.61g).

Obv.: Bare head of Augustus, right; Greek inscription ΚΑΙ ΚΑΠΟ [--] ΚΕΒΑΚΤΟΥ; border of dots.
Rev.: Bare head of Herod Philip, right; Greek inscription ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥ, date ΛΕ (Year 5); border of dots.

Source: Spink, Auction 6018 (26.09.2006), Lot 819.

Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1219; Meshorer 2001, no. 95.

**Fig. 65.** Paneas, Herod Philip, 8/9 CE. AE (3.82g).

Obv.: Head of Herod Philip, right; Greek inscription ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΟΥ, date ΛΕ (year 5); border of dots.
Rev.: Tetrastyle temple on high platform, floral decorateon in pediment; Greek inscription ΚΑΙ ΚΑΠ ΚΕΒΑΚ.

Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 50, no. 96 © Amphora Books.

Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1220; Meshorer 2001, nos. 96.

**Fig. 66.** Paneas, Herod Philip, 8/9 CE. AE (22mm, 9.61g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Augustus, right; Greek inscription [CE]ΒΑΚΤΩΚΑΙ ΚΑΠΙ; border of dots.
Rev.: Tetrastyle temple with stairs leading to it, dot in pediment, date between columns ΛΙΒ (Year 12), design and date are displayed retrograde; Greek inscription ΤΕΤΡΑΠΧΟΥ.

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.364 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1221; Meshorer 2001, no. 97; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 234 rev.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 67.</th>
<th>Paneas, Herod Philip, 26/27 CE. AE (14mm, ?g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.:</td>
<td>Bust of Livia, right; Greek inscription ΙΟΥΛΙΑ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.:</td>
<td>Hand holding three ears of grain; Greek inscription ΚΑΡΠΟΦΟΡΟΣ, date Λ (Year 30); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1227.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 68.</th>
<th>Paneas, Herod Philip. AE (c. 23mm, 11.03g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.:</td>
<td>Jugate heads of Augustus or Tiberius and Livia, right; Greek inscription ΣΕΒΑΣΤΗ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.:</td>
<td>Tetrastyle temple on high platform, circular object between centre columns; Greek inscription ΕΠΙ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 50, no. 100 © Amphora Books.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1229; Meshorer 2001, no. 100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 69.</th>
<th>Paneas, Herod Philip, 30/31 CE. AE (17mm, 5.51g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.:</td>
<td>Bare head of Tiberius, right; branch in lower right field; Greek inscription [CE]ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΚΑΙ ΚΑΠΙ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.:</td>
<td>Tetrastyle temple, dot in pediment, date between columns Λ Λ (Year 34); Greek inscription ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ ΚΤΙΣ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1229; Meshorer 2001, no. 106; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 238-239.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 70. Paneas, Herod Philip, 30/31 CE. AE (15mm, 4.17g).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Bust of Livia, right; Greek inscription ΙΟΥΛΙΑ ΒΑΤΗ; border of dots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Hand holding three ears of grain; Greek inscription ΚΑΡ[ΠΟΦ]ΟΡΟΣ, date ΛΔ (Year 34); border of dots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 71. Paneas, Herod Philip, 30/31 CE. AE (1.56g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Head of Herod Philip, right; Greek inscription ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Date in wreath ΛΔ (Year 34); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Numismatica Ars Classica NAC AG, Auction 59 (04.04.2001), Lot 1343.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1232; Meshorer 2001, no. 111.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Herod Agrippa I (37-44 CE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 72. Paneas, Agrippa I, 38 CE. AE (c. 24mm, 15.90g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Head of Caligula, left; Greek inscription ΓΑΙΩ[…], date LB (year 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Caligula’s sisters: Julia, Drusilla and Agrippina standing, holding cornucopiae; Greek inscription ΙΟΥΛΙΑ ΔΡΟΥΣΙΛΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΝΑ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 52, no. 112 © Amphora Books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1236; Meshorer 2001, no. 112.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 73. Paneas, Agrippa I, 38 CE. AE (19mm, 7.06g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Diademed head of Agrippa I, right; Greek inscription [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ] ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Young Agrippa II riding horse, right; Greek inscription ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΠΙΑ ΥΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥ, below horse date LB (year 2); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1237; Meshorer 2001, no. 113; RPC I, 4974.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 74. Paneas, Agrippa I, 38 CE. AE (c. 14mm, 2.79g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Greek inscription in wreath ΓΑ ΒΑΣ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Tetrastyle temple façade; date between columns LB (year 2); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1239; Meshorer 2001, no. 115.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 75. Paneas, Agrippa I, 38 CE. AE (c. 16mm, 5.49g).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Obv.**: Head of Kypros, right; Greek inscription ΚΥΠΡΟ.  
**Rev.**: Hand holding two corn ears and vine branch; Greek inscription ΓΑΙΩ ΚΑΙΚΑΠΗ, date LB (year 2); border of dots.  
**Source**: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 52, no. 114 © Amphora Books.  
**Bibliographic Reference**: Hendin 2010, no. 1238; Meshorer 2001, no. 114. |
| Fig. 76. Paneas, Agrippa I, 40/41 CE. AE (23mm, 11.53g). |
| **Obv.**: Wreathed head of Gaius Caligula, left; Greek inscription [Γ]Α[Ι]ΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ [ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΩ]; border of dots.  
**Rev.**: Germanicus holding sceptre standing in quadriga, right; Greek inscription ΝΟΜ[ΙΣΜΑ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕ[ΩΣ] ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ, date LE (year 5); border of dots.  
**Source**: CNG, Triton XI (7.1.2008), Lot 519 © www.cngcoins.com.  
**Bibliographic Reference**: Hendin 2010, no. 1240; Meshorer 2001, no. 116; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 261. |
| Fig. 77. Paneas, Agrippa I, 40/41 CE. AE (c. 20mm, 5.60g). |
| **Obv.**: Head of Caesonia, left; Greek inscription ΚΑΙΣΩΝΙΑ ΓΥΝΗ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ.  
**Rev.**: Drusilla standing, left, holding branch in left arm, small Victory on extended right hand; Greek inscription ΔΡΟΥΣΙΛΛΗ ΘΥΓΑΤΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ, in left field date LE (year 5).  
**Source**: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 52, no. 117 © Amphora Books.  
**Bibliographic Reference**: Hendin 2010, no. 1241; Meshorer 2001, no. 117. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 78. Paneas or Tiberias, Agrippa I, 40/41 CE. AE (c. 17mm, 3.75g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Diademed head of Agrippa I, right; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Kypros standing, left, holding long torch(?) in left arm, wreath in right raised hand; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ ΚΥΠΡΟΣ, in left field date LE (year 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1242; Meshorer 2001, no. 118.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 79. Paneas, Agrippa I, 40/41 CE. AE (c. 15mm, 2.38g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Bust of young Agrippa II, left; Greek inscription ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΥΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ; in left field date LE (year 5); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Double crossed cornucopiae; Greek inscription ΒΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΦΙΛΟΚΑΙΣΑΡ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, 270, no. 1243; Meshorer 2001, Pl. 52, no. 119.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 80. Jerusalem, Agrippa I, 41/42 CE. AE (18mm, 2.62g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Umbrella-like canopy with fringes; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Three corn ears growing between two leaves; date ΛϹ (Year 6); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1244; Meshorer 2001, no. 120; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 262-271.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Image](90x595 to 246x672)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Image](130x355 to 202x488)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Image](126x129 to 206x289)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fig. 84.** Caesarea Maritima, Agrippa I, 43 CE. AE (c. 24mm, 15.25g).

Obv.: Agrippa I, left, and Herod of Chalcis, right, crowning togated Claudius, centre; Greek inscription ΒΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΠΑΣ ΣΕΒ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΒΑΣ ΗΡΩΔΗΣ, date LH (year 8); border of dots.

Rev.: Clasping hands in wreath; Greek inscription in two circles ΟΡΚΙΑ ΒΑΣ ΜΕ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ ΠΡ ΣΕΒ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΥΝΚΛΗΤΟΝ Κ ΔΗΜΟ ΡΟΜ ΦΙΛΙ Κ ΣΥ[Ν]ΑΧΙΑΥΤ (covenant between King Agrippa and Caesar Augustus and the Senate and people of Rome, brotherhood and mutual help).


**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1248; Meshorer 2001, no. 124.
Fig. 85. Chalcis (Syria), Herod of Chalcis 43/44 CE. AE (26mm, 14.34g).

Obv.: Agrippa I, left, and Herod of Chalcis, right, crowning togated Claudius standing left with wreath; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛ Η[ΡΩΔΗΣ Β]ΑΣΙΛ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑΣ, in exergue ΚΛΑΥ-ΔΙΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ, date ΛΓ (year 3); border of dots.
Rev.: Greek inscription in wreath ΚΛΑΥΔΙΩ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ, date ΕΤ Γ (year 3); border of dots.


Bibliographic Reference

Fig. 86. Chalcis (Syria), Herod of Chalcis 43/44 CE. AE (c. 25mm, 13.39g).

Obv.: Diademed head of Herod of Chalcis, right; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΗΡΩΔΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΣ; border of dots.
Rev.: Greek inscription in wreath ΚΛΑΥΔΙΩ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ, date ΕΤ Γ (year 3); border of dots.


Bibliographic Reference
**Agrippa II (53-100 CE)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 87. Sepphoris/Neronias, Agrippa II?/most likely minted under Vespasian, 67/68 CE. AE (24mm, 17.03g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Inscription in circle and wreath Λ ΔI (year 14) ΝΕΡΩΝΟ ΚΛΛΑΥΔΙΟΥ ΚΑΙΚΑΡΟΣ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Double crossed cornucopiae with inserted caduceus; Greek inscription ΕΠΙ ΟΥΕΣΠΙΑΣΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΙΡΗΝΟΠΟΙΛΙ ΝΕΡΩΝΙΑ ΣΕΠΦΙΩ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 88. Sepphoris/Neronias, Agrippa II?/most likely minted under Vespasian, 67/68 CE. AE (c. 20mm, 7.01g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Inscription in circle and wreath Λ ΔI (year 14) ΝΕΡΩΝΟ ΚΛΛΑΥΔΙΟΥ ΚΑΙΚΑΡΟΣ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Σ C surrounded by inscription ΕΠΙ ΟΥΕΣΠΙΑΣΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΙΡΗΝΟΠΟΙΛΙ ΝΕΡΩΝΙΑΣ ΣΕΠΦΙΩΡ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1277; Meshorer 2001, no. 128 (here dated to 67/68 CE).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Agrippa II (53-100 CE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 89. Paneas/Neronias, Agrippa II, 60/61 CE. AE (c. 13mm, 2.61g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Hand holding grain ears and fruit; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΑΡΚΟΥ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΟΥ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Concentric inscription in diadem ΕΤΟΥ ΑΙ ΤΟΥ Κ, numeric letter ζ (6) in centre (year 11 also 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1279; Meshorer 2001, no. 133 (dated to 67/68 CE); SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), 282 (dated to 66/67 CE).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 90. Sepphoris/Neronias, Agrippa II, before 69 CE. AE (17mm, 6.16g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Laureate head of Nero, right; star in right field; Greek inscription ΝΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Greek inscription in circle and wreath ΕΠΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙ ΝΕΡΩΝΙΕ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1273; Meshorer 2001, no. 129; RPC I (1992), no. 4989; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 278 (type).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 91. Paneas, Agrippa II, 74/75 CE. AE (30mm, 18.28g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Wreathed bust of Vespasian, right; Greek inscription ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΣΠΙΑΣΙ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Tyche-Demeter standing left, holding cornucopia in left arm, two corn ears in right extended hand; Date and inscription ET ΔΙ (Year 14) ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1301; Meshorer 2001, no. 135.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 92. Paneas, Agrippa II, 74/75 CE. AE (24mm, 13.34g).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Laureate bust of Titus, right; Greek inscription ΑΥΤΟΚΡ TΙΤΟC ΚΑΙΚΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Nike advancing right, wreath in raised hand, palm branch over shoulder; Date and inscription across field ET ΙΔ (Year 14) ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1302; Meshorer 2001, no. 137; RPC II (1999), no. 2248.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 93. Paneas, Agrippa II, 74/75 CE. AE (25mm, 11.72g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Laureate bust of Titus, right; Greek inscription ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ TΙΤΟC ΚΑΙΚΑΡ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Nike advancing right, wreath in right hand, palm-branch in left over shoulder; Greek date and inscription ΙΔ (Year 14) ΒΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1900,0707.349 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1302; Meshorer 2001, no. 137; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 286.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 94. Paneas, Agrippa II, 74/75 CE. AE (c. 20mm, 6.70g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Laureate bust of Domitian, right; Greek inscription ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑ ΚΑΙΚΑΡ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Nike standing left, writing on shield resting on right knee; Date and inscription across field ΙΔ (year 14) ΒΑΣΙ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΟ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 55, no. 139 © Amphora Books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1304; Meshorer 2001, no. 139; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 293.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Palm branch; Greek inscription ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΝΙΚ ΣΕΒ, date across field ET IE (year 15); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Greek inscription in wreath ΤΙΒΕΡΙΑΣ; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1280 (here dated to the year 69/70 CE); Meshorer 2001, no. 134.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 96.</th>
<th>Paneas, Agrippa II, 75/76 CE. AE (c. 28mm, 15.48g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Laureate bust of Vespasian, right; Greek inscription ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΣΠΙΑΣΙ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Tyche-Demeter standing left, holding cornucopia in left arm, two corn ears in right extended hand; Date and inscription ΕΤΟΥ ΙΕ (year 15) VA ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1305; Meshorer 2001, no. 140b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 97.</th>
<th>Paneas, Agrippa II, 75/76 CE. AE (c. 20mm, 5.68g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Laureate bust of Domitian, right; Greek inscription ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ; border of dots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Nike standing right, writing on shield resting on left knee; letters on shield ΔΟ; date and inscription ΕΤΟΥ ΙΕ (year 15) ΒΑΣΙ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1306; Meshorer 2001, no. 141.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fig. 98.** Paneas, Agrippa II, 78/79 CE. AE (c. 25mm, 11.06g), silver plated.

Obv.: Laureate bust of Vespasian, right; Greek inscription ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΚΑΙΠ ΚΕ-ΒΑΚΤΩ; border of dots; countermarked. 
Rev.: Tyche-Demeter standing left, holding cornucopia in left arm, two corn ears in right extended hand; Date and inscription ΕΤΟΥΗΙ (year 18) ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ.


Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1307; Meshorer 2001, no. 142a.

---

**Fig. 99.** Paneas, Agrippa II, 79/80 CE. AE (c. 12mm, 1.70g).

Obv.: Veiled head of Berenike; Greek inscription ΚΕΒΑΧΤΗ; border of dots.
Rev.: Anchor; in field inscription ΛΙΘ (year 19) ΒΑ.


Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1314; Meshorer 2001, no. 149.

---

**Fig. 100.** Paneas, Agrippa II, 85/86 CE. AE (26-27mm, 11.40g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Domitian, right; Latin inscription IMP CAES DIVI VESP F DOMITIAN AVG GER COS X; border of dots.
Rev.: Altar; around, Latin and Greek inscription ΣΑΛΥΤΙ ΕΠΙ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙ ΑΥΓVΣΤ; date across field ΕΤ KE (year 25); border of dots.


Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1319; Meshorer 2001, no. 154.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 101. Paneas, Agrippa II, 86/87 CE. AE (28mm, 10.57g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Laureate head of Domitian, right; Latin inscription IMP CAES DIVI VESP F DOMITIAN AVG GER COS X; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Moneta standing left, holding scales in right and cornucopia in left hand; Latin and Greek inscription MONETA EΠΠ ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙ ΑVGVST, across field date ET KS, S C; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 102. Paneas, Agrippa II, 86/87 CE. AE (35mm, ?g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Confronted laureate busts of Titus, left, and Domitian, right; Greek inscription ΑΥΤΟΚΠΑ ΤΙΤΟΚ ΚΑΙ ΑΡΤΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Pan walking left, playing syrinx with right hand, shouldering pedum with left hand, tree trunk on right; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΑΒΩΚΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΕΤΟΒΚ ΚΖ (Year 26).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1281.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 103. Paneas, Agrippa II, 87/88 CE. AE (c. 30mm, 19.32g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Confronted laureate busts of Titus, left, and Domitian, right; Greek inscription ΑΥΤΟΚΠΑ ΤΙΤΟΚ ΚΑΙ ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Pan walking left, playing syrinx with right hand, shouldering pedum with left hand, tree trunk on right; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΑΒΩΚΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΕΤΟΒΚ ΚΖ (Year 27).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1286; Meshorer 2001, no. 168.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fig. 104.** Paneas, Agrippa II, 87/88 CE. AE medallion? (35.50g).

Obv.: Laureate bust of Vespasian, right; Greek inscription ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΣΠΙΑΙΑΝΩ ΚΑΙΚΑΠΙ ΚΕΒΑΚΤΩ; border of dots.
Rev.: Fortuna standing left, holding cornucopia in left arm, supporting rudder resting on globe with right raised arm; star in upper left field; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΑΕ-ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΕΤΟΥΚ ΚΖ (Year 27); border of dots.


**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1287; Meshorer 2001, no. 167.

---

**Fig. 105.** Paneas, Agrippa II, 94/95 CE. AE (12mm, 1.97g).

Obv.: Turreted head of Tyche, right; Greek inscription ΒΑ ΑΓΡ; border of dots.
Rev.: Cornucopia; date across field ΕΤ ΔΛ (Year 34); border of dots.


**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1297; Meshorer 2001, no. 178; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 318-320.

---

**Fig. 106.** Paneas, Agrippa II, 95/96 CE. AE (29.5mm, 16.17g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Domitian, right; Greek inscription ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑ ΚΑΙΚΑΡΑ ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙ; border of dots.
Rev.: Tyche-Demeter standing left on basis, wearing kalathos, holding ears of grain in right hand, cornucopia in left; Greek date and inscription ΕΤΟΥΚ ΕΑ (Year 35) ΒΑ ΑΓΡΙ ΠΠΑ; border of dots.

Source: BM Reg. No.: G.2631 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1298; Meshorer 2001, no. 179; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 315.
The Jewish Wars against Rome

First Jewish War (66-70 CE)

Jerusalem

**Year 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 107. Jerusalem, 66/67 CE. AR Shekel (c. 22mm, 14.28g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Cup, pellet below handle on each side, surrounded by circle of pellets, above letter ALEPH ([Year] 1); palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠKL YSR’L (shekel Israel); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Sprig with three pomegranates, surrounded by circle of pellets; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YRWŠLM QDŠH (Jerusalem holy); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 61, nos. 183 © Amphora Books.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 108. Jerusalem, 66/67 CE. AR Shekel (22mm, 14.15g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Cup, pellet below handle on each side; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠKL YSR’L (shekel Israel), letter ALEPH ([Year] 1); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Sprig with three pomegranates; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YRWŠLM QDŠH (Jerusalem holy); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1927,1219.1 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Year 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 109. Jerusalem, 67/68 CE. AR Shekel (24mm, 13.80g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Cup, pearled rim, base raised by projections; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠKL YSR’L (shekel Israel), Š(NAT) BETH (Year 2); border of dots. Rev.: Sprig with three pomegranates, pearled base; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YRWŠLM HQDŠH (Jerusalem the Holy); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1881,0606.1 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 110. Jerusalem, 67/68 CE. AE Prutah (18mm, 3.20g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Narrow-necked amphora with broad rim, fluted belly and curved handles; palaeo-Hebrew inscription Š(NAT) ŠTYM (Year 2); border of dots. Rev.: Vine leaf on branch with tendril; palaeo-Hebrew inscription HRT ZYWN (Freedom of Zion); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.623 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1360; Meshorer 2001, no. 196.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Year 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 111. Jerusalem, 68/69 CE. AR Shekel (21.5mm, 13.79g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Cup, pearled rim, base raised by projections; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠKL YSR’L (shekel Israel), Š(NT) GIMEL (Year 3); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Sprig with three pomegranates, pearled base; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YRWŠLM HQDŠH (Jerusalem the Holy); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1838,0402.9 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 112. Jerusalem, 68/69 CE. AE Prutah (16mm, 3.50g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Narrow-necked amphora with broad rim, fluted belly and curved handles, lid decorated with pellets around the edge; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠNT ŠLWŠ (Year 3); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Vine leaf on branch with tendril; palaeo-Hebrew inscription HRWT ZYWN (Freedom of Zion); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.628 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1363; Meshorer 2001, no. 204.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 113.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Cup, pearled rim, base raised by projections; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠKL YSR'L (shekel Israel), Š(NAT) dalet (Year 4); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Sprig with three pomegranates, pearled base; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YRWŠLM HQDŠH (Jerusalem the Holy); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.7 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1364; Meshorer 2001, no. 207.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 114.</th>
<th>Jerusalem, 69/70 CE. AE ‘Half’ (25mm, 15.07g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Seven-branched palm tree with two bunches of dates, flanked by baskets of fruit; palaeo-Hebrew inscription LGYLT ZYWN (to the redemption of Zion); border of dots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Ethrog flanked by two lulav (4 species, including myrtle and willow); palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠNAT ‘RBH ĤTZY (Year 4 half); border of dots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.12 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1367; Meshorer 2001, no. 211.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 115.</th>
<th>Jerusalem, 69/70 CE. AE Eigth Prutah (19mm, 6.21g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Cup with pearled rim, knob on stem; palaeo-Hebrew inscription LGYLT ZYWN (to the redemption of Zion); border of dots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Lulav flanked by two ethrogs (4 species, including myrtle and willow); palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠNT ‘RBH (Year 4); border of dots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.31 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1369; Meshorer 2001, no. 214.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year 5

Fig. 116. Jerusalem, 70 CE. AR Shekel (22mm, 14.01g).

Obv.: Cup with pearled rim, base raised by projections; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠHKL YSR’L (shekel Israel), Š(NT) Hé (Year 5); border of dots. Rev.: Sprig with pearled base and three pomegranates; palaeo-Hebrew inscription YRWŠLM HQDŠH (Jerusalem the holy); border of dots.

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1887,0202.1 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, 1370; Meshorer 2001, no. 215.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 117. Gamla, c. 67 CE. AE (13.80g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Cup; crude palaeo-Hebrew inscription reading LGWLT (for the redemption of) or BGMLH (Gamla [Year] 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: crude palaeo-Hebrew inscription YRŠLMHQ (Jerusalem Holy)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1372; Meshorer 2001, no. 217.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 118. Gamla, c. 67 CE. AE (13.80g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Cup; crude palaeo-Hebrew inscription reading LGWLT (for the redemption of) or BGMLH (Gamla [Year] 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: crude palaeo-Hebrew inscription YRŠLMHQ (Jerusalem Holy)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1372; Meshorer 2001, no. 217.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Second Jewish War (132-135 CE)

Year 1

*Silver Coins*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 119. Judaea, 132/133 CE. AR Sela (14.35g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Façade of temple; around palaeo-Hebrew inscription YRWŠLM; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Lulav, etrog in left field; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠNT ḤḤT LGWLṬ YSR’L (Year one of the redemption of Israel); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 64, no. 218 © Amphora Books.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 120. Judaea, 132/133 CE. AR Sela (3.35g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Jug, branch in upper right field; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ‘L’ZR HKHN (Eleazar the Priest); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Bunch of grapes; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠNT ḤḤT LGWLṬ YSR’L (Year one of the redemption of Israel); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bronze Coins

**Fig. 121.** Judaea, 132/133 CE. AE *large* (c. 30-32mm, 21.02g).

Obv.: palaeo-Hebrew inscription in wreath ŠM’WN N’SY YSR’L (Shimeon prince of Israel); border of dots.

Rev.: Amphora with fluted belly and two handles, narrow foot; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠNT HḤT LGWLT YSR’L (Year one of the redemption of Israel).

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1909,0513.1 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1376; Meshorer 2001, 64, no. 220.

**Fig. 122.** Judaea, 132/133 CE. AE *medium* (c. 24-27mm, 11.17g).

Obv.: Palm tree with seven branches; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠM’WN N’SY YSR’L (Shimeon prince of Israel); border of dots.

Rev.: Vine leaf with tendril; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠNT HḤT LGWLT YSR’L (Year one of the redemption of Israel).

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.697 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1378; Meshorer 2001, no. 222.

**Fig. 123.** Judaea, 132/133 CE. AE *medium* (24mm, 7.62g).

Obv.: Palm branch in wreath; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠM’WN N’SY YSR’L (Shimeon prince of Israel).

Rev.: Harp with six strings; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠNT HḤT LGWLT YSR’L (Year one of the redemption of Israel).


Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1377; Meshorer 2001, no. 223.
Fig. 124. Judaea, 132/133 CE. AE small (18mm, 5.71g).

Obv.: Palm tree; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ‘L’ZR HKHN (Eleazar the Priest).
Rev.: Bunch of grapes; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠNT HH'T LGWLT YSR['L] (Year one of the redemption of Israel).


Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1380; Meshorer 2001, no. 224.
Year 2

Silver Coins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![Fig. 125](image) | **Fig. 125.** Judaea, 133/134 CE. AR Sela (13.87 g).  
Obv.: Façade of the temple, rosette above, stylised rendering of Ark of the Covenant between central columns; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠM’WN (Shimeon); border of dots.  
Rev.: Lulav, ethrog in left field; palaeo-Hebrew inscription Š B LHR YSR’L (Year two of the Freedom of Israel); border of dots.  
Bibliographic Reference  
Hendin 2010, no. 1388; Meshorer 2001, no. 233. |
| ![Fig. 126](image) | **Fig. 126.** Judaea, 133/134 CE. AR Zuzim (3.17g).  
Obv.: palaeo-Hebrew inscription in wreath ŠM’WN (Shimeon); border of dots.  
Rev.: Harp; palaeo-Hebrew inscription Š B LHR YSR’L (Year two of the Freedom of Israel); border of dots.  
Bibliographic Reference  
Hendin 2010, no. 1389; Meshorer 2001, no. 238. |
| ![Fig. 127](image) | **Fig. 127.** Judaea, 133/134 CE. AR Zuzim (3.04g).  
Obv.: palaeo-Hebrew inscription in wreath ŠM’WN (Shimeon); border of dots.  
Rev.: Lyre; palaeo-Hebrew inscription Š B LHR YSR’L (Year two of the Freedom of Israel); border of dots.  
Bibliographic Reference  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 128.</strong> Judaea, 133/134 CE. AR Zuzim (3.38g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: palaeo-Hebrew inscription in wreath ŠM (Shim); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Two trumpets, letter resh between trumpets; palaeo-Hebrew inscription Š B LHR YSR’L (Year two of the Freedom of Israel); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1392; Meshorer 2001, no. 243.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 129.</strong> Judaea, 133/134 CE. AR Zuzim (3.15g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Bunch of grapes; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠM’WN (Shimeon); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Lyre; palaeo-Hebrew inscription Š B LHR YSR’L (Year two of the Freedom of Israel); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 130.</strong> Judaea, 133/134 CE. AR Zuzim (3.24g). Undated hybrid year 1/2 issue.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: palaeo-Hebrew inscription in wreath ŠM (Shim).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Jug, branch in upper right field; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ‘L’ZR HKHN (Eleazar the Priest); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1384; Meshorer 2001, nos. 234-235.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fig. 131.** Judaea, 133/134 CE. AE *medium* (c. 20-25mm, 10.88g).

Obv.: Palm tree with seven branches; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠM’WN (Shimeon); border of dots. Rev.: Vine leaf with tendril; palaeo-Hebrew inscription Š B LHR YSR’L (Year two of the Freedom of Israel); border of dots.

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1888,0512.40 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1408; Meshorer 2001, no. 259.

**Fig. 132.** Judaea, 133/134 CE. AE *medium* (7.5g).

Obv.: Palm branch in wreath; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠM’WN N’SY YSR’L (Shimeon prince of Israel); border of dots. Rev.: Harp; palaeo-Hebrew inscription Š B LHR YSR’L (Year two of the Freedom of Israel).


**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1406; Meshorer 2001, no. 263.

**Fig. 133.** Judaea, 133/134 CE. AE *small* (20mm, ?g).


**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1409.
### Undated (Year 3/4)

**Silver Coins**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 134. Judaea, 134-135 CE. AR Sela (14.33g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Façade of the temple, above rosette, stylised rendering of Ark of the Covenant between central columns; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠM’WN (Shimeon); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Lulav, ethrog in left field; palaeo-Hebrew inscription LHRWT YRWŠLM (for the freedom of Jerusalem); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.762 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, nos. 1411-1412; Meshorer 2001, no. 267.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 135. Judaea, 134-135 CE. AR Zuzim (2.93g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Façade of the temple, above wavy line, stylised rendering of Ark of the Covenant between central columns; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠM’WN (Shimeon); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Lulav, ethrog in left field; palaeo-Hebrew inscription LHRWT YRWŠLM (for the freedom of Jerusalem); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.776 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1411-1412; Meshorer 2001, no. 269.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 136. Judaea, 134-135 CE. AR Half-sela (7.38g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Distyle façade of temple, stylised rendering of Ark of the Covenant between central columns; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠM’WN (Shimeon); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Lulav; palaeo-Hebrew inscription LHRWT YRWŠLM (for the freedom of Jerusalem); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Meshorer 2001, Pl. 69, no. 271 © Amphora Books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1415; Meshorer 2001, no. 271.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 140.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: palaeo-Hebrew inscription in wreath ŠM’WN (Shimeon).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Two trumpets, pellet between; palaeo-Hebrew inscription LHRWT YRWŠLM (for the freedom of Jerusalem); border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.796 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 141.</th>
<th>Judaea, 134-135 CE. AR Zuzim (2.85g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: palaeo-Hebrew inscription in wreath ŠM’WN (Shimeon); border of dots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: One-handled fluted Jug, branch in right field; palaeo-Hebrew inscription LHRWT YRWŠLM (for the freedom of Jerusalem); border of dots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.780 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1418; Meshorer 2001, no. 283.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 142.</th>
<th>Judaea, 134-135 CE. AR Zuzim (3.32g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: palaeo-Hebrew inscription in wreath ŠM’WN (Shimeon); border of dots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: One-handled fluted Jug; palaeo-Hebrew inscription LHRWT YRWŠLM (for the freedom of Jerusalem); border of dots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.786 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1423; Meshorer 2001, no. 286.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bronze Coins

**Fig. 143.** Judaea, 134-135 CE. AE *middle* (c. 22mm, 7.73g).

Obv.: Palm branch in open wreath; around palaeo-Hebrew inscription LHRWT YRWŠLM (for the freedom of Jerusalem).

Rev.: Lyre; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ŠM’WN (Shimeon).

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.825 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, 1436; Meshorer 2001, no. 297.

**Fig. 144.** Judaea, 134-135 CE. AE *small* (c. 18-20mm, 6.80g).

Obv.: Palm tree with seven branches; palaeo-Hebrew inscription ‘L’ZR HKHN (Eleazar the Priest); border of dots.

Rev.: Bunch of grapes with tendril; palaeo-Hebrew inscription LHRWT YRWŠLM (for the freedom of Jerusalem); border of dots.

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.686 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1438; Meshorer 2001, no. 300.
### Part II: Comparison Material

**Persian Period / Early Hellenistic Period**

**Cilicia (Asia Minor)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 145.</strong> Tarsus, Cilicia, satrap Tarkumuwa (Datames) 384-361/0 BCE. AR Stater (22mm, 10.04g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Female head facing slightly left (Arethusa?). Rev.: Helmeted and bearded male head with crested helmet, right; inscription TRKMW (Tarkumuwa).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNG France (Cilicie), nos. 258-70; SNG Switzerland I (Levante-Cilicia), nos. 78-79.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 146.</strong> Cilicia, 4th century BCE. Uncertain City/Satrap. AR Tetartemorion (0.20g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Persian king or hero in kneeling-running stance right, holding dagger and bow. Rev.: Youthful male head right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troxell / Kagan 1989, 276, no. 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 147.</strong> Cilicia, 4th century BCE. Uncertain City/Satrap. AR Tetartemorion (6mm, 0.20g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Persian king or hero in kneeling-running stance right, holding dagger and bow. Rev.: Youthful male head right, K in lower left field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troxell / Kagan 1989, 276, no. 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 148. Cilicia, 4th century BCE. Uncertain City/Satrap. AR Tetartemorion (0.18g).

Obv.: Persian king or hero in kneeling-running stance right, holding dagger and bow.
Rev.: Female head (Arethusa?) with long hair frontal.

Source: Münzen & Medaillen GmbH (DE), Auction 30 (28.05.2009), Lot 654.

Bibliographic Reference
Troxell / Kagan, 276, no. 2.

Athens

Fig. 149. Attica, Athens, c. 454-404 BCE. AR Tetradrachm (23mm, 16.98g).

Obv.: Head of Athena right, wearing disc earrings, necklace and crested Attic helmet.
Rev.: Owl standing right, head facing, olive sprig and crescent left; inscription ΑΘΕ right; all in incuse square.


Bibliographic Reference
SNG Copenhagen 31.

Hierapolis (Bambyce-Manbog) (Syria)

Fig. 150. Hierapolis (Bambyce), Abd Hadad c. 340-332 BCE. AR Didrachm (8.19g).

Obv.: Facing head of Atargatis with turreted crown, left field circle and crescent, right Aramaic inscription ‘TR’TH (Atarateh) (Atargatis).
Rev.: Priest/ruler Abdhadad wearing conical hat, standing below temple/canopy in front of altar, holding pine cone; right Aramaic inscription ‘BDHDD (Abdhadad).

Source: Seyrig 1971, Pl. 1 no. 3c.

Bibliographic Reference
Seyrig 1971, Pl. 1 no. 3c.
Fig. 151. Hierapolis (Bambyce), Abdhadad, c. 340-332 BCE. AR Didrachm (7.85g).

Obv.: Facing head of Atargatis with turreted crown, left field circle and crescent, right Aramaic inscription ‘TR’TH (Atarateh) (Atargatis).
Rev.: Priest/ruler Abdhadad wearing conical hat, standing below temple/canopy in front of altar, holding pine cone; right Aramaic inscription ‘BDHDD (Abdhadad).

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1902,0610.55 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
Seyrig 1971, Pl. 1 no. 3c.

Fig. 152. Bambyce, Abdhadad, c. 340-332 BCE. AR Didrachm (20mm, 8.21g).

Obv.: Draped bust of Atargatis with turreted crown, left, in right field circle and crescent; Aramaic inscription ['TR’TH] (Atarateh) left.
Rev.: Priest/king wearing cylindrical tiara with raised hand and driver on curricle left, countermark on horse; above Aramaic inscription ‘BDHDD (Abdhadad).


Bibliographic Reference
Seyrig 1971, Pl. 1 no. 2a.

Persia

Fig. 153. Persia, time of Darios I late 6th century BCE. AR Siglos (5.28 g).

Obv.: Half-length bust of Persian king or hero right, holding bow and arrows.
Rev.: Incuse punch.

Source: CNG, Triton XII (06.01.2009), Lot 377 © www.cngcoins.com.

Bibliographic Reference
Carradice 1987, Type I (Pl. XI, no. 10).
**Fig. 154.** Persia, time of Artaxerxes I-Xerxes II, c. 455-420 BCE. AV Daric (8.32g).

Obv.: Persian king or hero in kneeling-running stance right, holding dagger and bow.

Rev.: Incuse punch, with lion's head facing downward.

Source: CNG, Mail Bid Sale 69 (08.06.2005), Lot 715 © www.cngcoins.com.

Bibliographic Reference
Carradice 1987, Type IV, Group A (Pl. XIII, 32).

**Fig. 155.** Persia, Bagadat (Baydād) I, 2nd century BCE. AR Tetradrachm (15.62g).

Obv.: Bearded male head wearing Baschlyk/Kyrbasia, diadem and earring, right; border of dots.

Rev.: Fire altar/temple, left male figure (Bagadat?) raising hand in prayer, standard right; Aramaic inscription BGDT PRTRK’ ZY ’LHY’ BR; border of dots.


Bibliographic Reference

**Philistia**

**Fig. 156.** Philistia, 4th century BCE. AR Drachm (3.29g).

Obv.: Bearded male head wearing crested Corinthian helmet right; border of dots.

Rev.: Bearded male figure in himation seated right on winged wheel, falcon on extended left hand, right, letters Yod, Hé in upper right field, letter Daleth (or Resh or Waw) in upper left field, bearded mask or stele in lower right field; all in square.


Bibliographic Reference
Rhodes

**Fig. 157.** Island of Rhodes, c. 188-84. AR Diobol (0.88g).
Obv.: Head of Helios wearing radiate crown, right.
Rev.: Rose with bud; Greek letter P in left field; border of dots.

Bibliographic Reference
SNG Keckman (Karia), nos. 693-701.

Samaria

**Fig. 158.** Samaria, c. 375-333 BCE. AR Hemiobol (0.31g).
Obv.: Head of Lion, facing; border of dots.
Rev.: Female head with large earrings, facing; border of dots.
Source: CNG, Auction Mail Bid Sale 69 (08.06.2005), Lot 632 © www.cngcoins.com.

Bibliographic Reference
Meshorer / Qedar 1999, Pl. 24, no. 168.

**Fig. 159.** Samaria, c. 375-333 BCE. AR Obol (0.67g).
Obv.: Two standing figures, left figure raised hand, right figure hand raised in adoration, thymiaterion in-between; in dotted square.
Rev.: Winged griffin bringing stag down; border of dots.
Source: CNG, Auction Mail Bid Sale 69 (08.06.2005), Lot 626 © www.cngcoins.com.

Bibliographic Reference
Meshorer / Qedar 1999, Pl. 20, no. 134.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 160.</strong> Samaria, c. 375-333 BCE. AR Obol (0.62g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obv.:</strong> Head of mythical horned bird in dotted square, right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rev.:</strong> Head of Bes facing, with headdress and wings, above winged solar disc (Ahura Mazda); in dotted square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 161.</strong> Samaria, c. 375-333 BCE. AR Drachm (3.9g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obv.:</strong> Bridled horse walking right; Aramaic inscription (Daleth, Yod); in dotted square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rev.:</strong> Winged sphinx, right; in dotted square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1903,0306.1 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meshorer / Qedar 1999, Pl. 5, no. 24.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Ptolemaic Rulers

## Ptolemy I Soter (305-283 BCE)

**Fig. 162.** Alexandria, Ptolemy I Soter (305-283 BCE). AR Tetradrachm (25mm, 14.26g).

Obv.: Diademed head of Ptolemy I right, wearing aegis around neck, Δ behind ear.
Rev.: Eagle standing left on thunderbolt; Greek inscription ΡΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ, in left field P above monogram.


**Bibliographic Reference**
Svoronos, no. 255.

## Ptolemy II Philadelphus (284-246 BCE)

**Fig. 163.** Alexandria, Ptolemy II Philadelphus (284-246 BCE). AV Oktadrachm (27.78g).

Obv.: Diademed heads of Ptolemy II and Arsinoë II; inscription ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ; border of dots.
Rev.: Diademed heads of Ptolemy I and Berenike I, right; Greek inscription ΘΕΩΝ; border of dots.


**Bibliographic Reference**
Svoronos, no. 1248; BMC Greek (Ptolemy), p. 40, no. 9.
### Magas (first half of the 3rd century BCE)

**Fig. 164.** Kyrenaica, Kyrene, Magas, first half/mid 3rd century BCE. AR Didrachm (19mm, 5.57g).

Obv.: Diademed and draped bust of Berenike I or II, right; border of dots.
Rev.: Club downwards, monogram left, trident right; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΗΣ; in wreath.


**Bibliographic Reference**
Svoronos, no. 318.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>![Coin Image]</th>
<th>Fig. 164. Kyrenaica, Kyrene, Magas, first half/mid 3rd century BCE. AR Didrachm (19mm, 5.57g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obv.</strong> Diademed and draped bust of Berenike I or II, right; border of dots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rev.</strong> Club downwards, monogram left, trident right; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΗΣ; in wreath.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 165.** Kyrenaica, Kyrene, Magas, governor 307-277 BCE. AR Didrachm (21mm, 7.71g).

Obv.: Head of Apollo Karneius with horns, left.
Rev.: Silphium plant, left monogram, right star; Greek inscription KY PA.


**Bibliographic Reference**
BMC Greek (Cyrenaica), p. 52, no. 238.
Seleucid Rulers

Eucratides I (ca. 170-145 BCE)

Fig. 166. Graeco-Bactrian Kingdom, Eucratides I. AR Tetradrachm (35mm, 16.44g).

Obv.: Diademed, draped and cuirassed bust of Eucratides wearing a crested helmet adorned with ear and horn of bull; in circle.
Rev.: Mounted Dioscuri prancing right, carrying spears and palm branches; monogram below hooves right; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΕΥΚΡΑΤΙΔΟΥ.


Bibliographic Reference
SNG ANS 9 (Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek Coins), no. 465.

Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164 BCE)

Fig. 167. Jerusalem or Samaria (or Ptolemais?), Antiochus IV Epiphanes. AE Chalkous (16mm, 4.98g).

Obv.: Radiate and diademed head of Antiochus IV, right, monogram in left field; in circle.
Rev.: Goddess enthroned left, holding Nike, bird at feet left, A below throne; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ right, ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ left; border of dots.

Source: CNG, eAuction 236 (07.06.2010), Lot 279 © www.cngcoins.com.

Bibliographic Reference
Houghton II, nos. 365-367; SC II, no. 1489.2 var.
**Fig. 168.** Seleucia on the Tigris(?) Antiochus IV Epiphanes. AE (24mm, 10.75g).

Obv.: Diademed head of Antiochus IV, right, monogram in left field; border of dots.
Rev.: Goddess enthroned left, holding Nike and sceptre, monogram in right field; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΟΥΣ; border of dots.


**Bibliographic Reference**
Houghton II, no. 374; SC II, no. 1513.

---

**Demetrius II Nicator (first reign, 146-138 BC)**

**Fig. 169.** Seleucia-in-Pieria, Demetrius II Nicator (First reign 145-138 BCE). AR Drachm (4.21g).

Obv.: Diademed head of Demetrius II, right; border of dots.
Rev.: Anchor; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΝΙΚΑΤΟΡΟΣ.

Source: Gemini, LLC, Auction IV (08.01.2008), Lot 218.

**Bibliographic Reference**
SC II, no. 1927.

---

**Tryphon (142-138/7 BCE)**

**Fig. 170.** Antioch-on-the-Orontes, Tryphon. AR Tetradrachm (17.10g).

Obv.: Diademed head of Tryphon, right; fillet border.
Rev.: Spiked Macedonian helmet with large horn; monogram left field; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΤΡΥΦΩΝΟΣ right, ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΟΣ left; in wreath.

Source: Houghton II, no. 564.

**Bibliographic Reference**
Houghton II, no. 564; SC II, no. 2031.
Alexander I Balas (152-145 BCE)

**Fig. 171.** Antioch-on-the-Orontes, Alexander I Balas, 150-146 BCE. AE (14mm, 2.99g).

Obv.: Head of Athena wearing crested Corinthian helmet, right.
Rev.: Tripod, star in exergue; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ right, ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ left.


Bibliographic Reference
Houghton II, no. 454; SC II, no. 1796.

**Fig. 172.** Antioch-on-the-Orontes, Alexander I Balas, 150-146 BCE. AE (18mm, 5.07g).

Obv.: head of Alexander wearing crested Boeotian helmet and diadem, right; border of dots.
Rev.: Nike standing left, holding wreath in right hand, shouldering palm leaf left; monogram in left field; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ, N below.


Bibliographic Reference
SC II, no. 1790.

Antiochus VII Euergetes (Sidetes) (138-129 BCE)

**Fig. 173.** Ascalon(?), Antiochus VII Sidetes. AE (12mm, 0.99g). Bevelled edge.

Obv.: Crested Boeotian helmet with cheek pieces; border of dots.
Rev.: Aphlaston; Greek inscription [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ].


Bibliographic Reference
Houghton I, no. 818; SC II, no. 2122.
### Fig. 174. Jerusalem, Antiochus VII Euergetes (Side-tes), 132/131 CE. AE prutah (15mm, 2.33g).

Obv.: Anchor; Greek inscription left ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ, right ΕΥΕΡΓΕΤΟΥ, date below ΑΠΡ (181 = 132/131 BCE).

Rev.: Lily; border of dots.


**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1131; SNG Israel 1, no. 2134.

---

### Antiochus VIII Grypus (109-97/96 BCE)

### Fig. 175. Antioch-on-the-Orontes, Antiochus VIII Grypus. AE (1.66g).

Obv.: Diademed head of Antiochus VIII, right.

Rev.: Rose; Greek inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ right, ΕΠΙΦΑΝΟΥΣ left.

Source: Houghton II, no. 454.

**Bibliographic Reference**
Houghton II, no. 454; SC II, no. 2316.
Late Hellenistic Period / Roman Imperial Period

Mints in Palestine

Caesarea Maritima

**Fig. 176.** Caesarea Maritima, Augustus, 14 CE. AE (16mm, 2.4g).

Obv.: Bust of Tyche; draped, wearing turreted crown and veil; right; Greek inscription ΛΙΔ; border of dots.

Rev.: Inscription within wreath, with pellet at top, tied at bottom; Greek inscription ΤΕΒΑΝΤΟΣ.

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.1455 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

**Bibliographic Reference**
SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 746-752.

**Fig. 177.** Caesarea Maritima, Trajan, 98-117 CE. AE (32mm, 12g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Trajan, right; Latin inscription [IMP CAES NER TRAJANO ORAV].

Rev.: Tetrastyle temple, Tyche standing left within, right foot on prow, holding bust and sceptre; altar in front of temple; inscription in exergue barely readable [C·Γ·F CAI?].


**Bibliographic Reference**
SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 761.

**Fig. 178.** Caesarea Maritima, 1.-2. century CE. AE minima (12mm, 0.72g).

Obv.: Amphora with broad rim in wreath.

Rev.: Grape leaf; border of dots.


**Bibliographic Reference**
Meshorer 2001, no. 369.
Demetrias by the Sea (Strato’s Tower)

**Fig. 179.** Demetrias, 63/62 BCE. AE (17mm, 4.11g).

Obv.: Turreted, veiled head of Tyche, right; border of dots.
Rev.: Cornucopia with grain, grapes and ribbon; flanked by Greek letters LA and DH in fields; border of dots.

Source: Gemini, LLC, Auction VI (10.01.2010), Lot 700.

Bibliographic Reference
Hoover 2007, Pl. 14.3.

Dor

**Fig. 180.** Dor/Dora, 64/65 CE. AE (22mm, 10.98g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Doros, right.
Rev.: Turreted Astarte frontal, head right, holding standard and cornucopia; date in left field L PKH (Year 128); border of dots.

Source: CNG, eAuction 259 (06.06.2011), Lot 262 © www.cngcoins.com.

Bibliographic Reference

**Fig. 181.** Dor, Trajan, 111/112 CE. AE (24mm, 13.27g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Trajan, right; Greek inscription AYTOK KAICAP TRAIANOC CEB ΓΕΡΜ ΔΑΚ.
Rev.: Laureate head of Doros, right; Greek inscription POE ΔωΡ ΠΙΕΠ ACΥΛ ΑΥΤΟΝ NAYAP (year 175 of Dora, holy, city of asylum, autonomous, ruler of the sea).


Bibliographic Reference
Meshorer 1986-1987, no. 33.
### Gaba

![Gaba Coin](image)

**Fig. 182.** Gaba, Hadrian, 124/25 (?) CE. AE (29mm, 24.89g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Hadrian, right; Greek inscription [AYT KAIC·TRAIAAΔPIANOCCEB].
Rev.: Tetrastyle temple, Tyche standing left within, holding sceptre and cornucopia, being crowned by Nike on column left; Greek inscription [CABEINA CEBÁ ΠΑΒΗ, date in exergue ΕΠ (not secure)].


**Bibliographic Reference**
SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 902.

### Gadara

![Gadara Coin](image)

**Fig. 183.** Gadara, 47/46 BCE. AE (22mm, 8.07g).

Obv.: Veiled and turreted head of Tyche, right, palm branch left.
Rev.: Winged caduceus; Greek inscription ΓΑΔΑ left, WN right, below date L ΙΗ (year 18).

Source: CNG, eAuction 210 (13.05.2009), Lot 60 © www.cngcoins.com.

**Bibliographic Reference**
Spijkerman 1978, 128 no. 3 (Gadara).
### Gaza

**Fig. 184.** Gaza, Hadrian, 136/137 CE. AE (19mm, 6.04g).

Obv.: Laureate, draped bust of Hadrian, right; Greek inscription ΑΥΤΩΝ ΑΠΟ ΑΔΡΙΑΝΟ. Rev.: Distyle temple with Corinthian columns and pediment; within left, Artemis standing right wearing short chiton, with bow, drawing arrow from quiver; right, standing nude Zeus Marnas facing left holding staff/thunderbolt; Greek inscription ΓΑΖΑ ΜΑΡΝΑΣ, in exergue date ΓΕΠΙΒ[.]Ρ (Year 197).


Bibliographic Reference
SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 922-923.

### Marisa (Tell Sandakhanna)

**Fig. 185.** Marisa, Aulus Gabinius 57/6 BCE. AE (4.46g).

Obv.: Head of Gabinius, right. Rev.: Palm branch, serpent behind; left field LL (Year 3), below ΓΑ, right field Μ and below A; in circle.

Source: Numismatica Ars Classica AG, Auction 59 (04.04.2011), Lot 1431.

Bibliographic Reference
Gitler / Stein 2004, Pl. XII, no. 6; Qedar 1992-1993, Type C.

**Fig. 186.** Marisa, Aulus Gabinius 57/6 BCE. AE (10.9g).

Obv.: Head of Tyche, right, wearing turreted crown and veil; border of dots. Rev.: Eagle standing left on thunderbolt, palm branch over shoulder; inscription in left field LL (Year 3), below ΓΑ, in right field MA; border of dots.

Source: Numismatica Ars Classica NAC AG, Auction 59 (04.04.2011), Lot 1429.

Bibliographic Reference
Gitler / Stein 2004, Pl. XII, no. 4; Qedar 1992-1993, Type B.
Tiberias

**Fig. 187.** Tiberias, Trajan, 99/100 CE. AE (19mm, 5.69g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Trajan, right; Greek inscription AYT KAI NER TPAIANOC CEB ΓΕΡ; border of dots.
Rev.: Two crossed cornucopiae, palm branch between horns; Greek inscription TIBEP ΚΑΛΑV, date in field ET Α; border of dots.

Source: CNG, Mail Bid Sale 60 (22.05.2002), Lot 1269 © www.cngcoins.com.

Bibliographic Reference
SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 1102.

Tyre

**Fig. 188.** Tyre, 126/125 BCE. AE (13mm, 1.72g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Heracles-Melqarth, right; in circle.
Rev.: Palm Tree; monogram and date TO/E in field.


Bibliographic Reference
BMC Greek (Phoenicia), p. 254, no. 251 var.

**Fig. 189.** Tyre, 42/43 CE. AR Half shekel (20mm, 6.60g).

Obv.: Laurated head of Heracles-Melqart, right; border of dots.
Rev.: Eagle on prora, left, palm branch at right wing; Greek inscription ΤΥΡΟΥ ΙΕΡΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΣΥΛΟΥ, left field date ΡΞΗ (Year 168), P above club, letters KP, B and monogram in right field; border of dots.


Bibliographic Reference
RPC I 4700 (1992), no. 4700.
Nabataea

**Fig. 190.** Petra, Malichus I, 35/34 BCE. AR Ma’ah (22mm, 6.50g).

Obv.: Diademed head of Malichus I, right; border of dots.
Rev.: Eagle standing left, closed wings; Nabataean inscription MLK' MLKH MLK NBTW (Malichus the king, king of Nabataea), in right field IKC, in left field numeral ‘1’; border of dots.

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1881,0606.2 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
Meshorer 1975, no. 12.

**Fig. 191.** Petra, Obodas III, 28/27 BCE. AR Ma’ah (6.56g).

Obv.: Jugate diademed busts of Obodas III and the queen, right, in right lower field H.
Rev.: Eagle standing left, closed wings; Nabataean inscription 'BDT MLK' MLK NBTW (Obodas the king, king of Nabataea), ŠNT TLT (year 3) and O H.

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1898,0902.1 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
Meshorer 1975, no. 21.

**Fig. 192.** Petra, Aretas IV, 9 BCE. AE 1/2 Ma’ah (2.27g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Aretas IV, right; Nabataean inscription H (Aretas); within border.
Rev.: Two crossed cornucopiae, with inserted pomegranate stalk; Nabataean inscription ŠLY (Syll[aeus]); within border.

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1938,1007.114 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
Meshorer 1975, nos. 43A/44/45 (variant)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 193.</strong> Petra, Aretas IV and Shuqilath I, c. 39/40 CE. AE Ma’ah (4.02g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Jugate busts of Aretas, laureate, and Shuqailath, right; within border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Two crossed cornucopiae, Nabataean inscription between HRTT ŠQYLT (Aretas Shuqailath); within border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meshorer 1975, no. 112 (type).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Roman Prefects and Procurators in Palestine

### Coponius (6-9 CE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 194. Jerusalem, Coponius, 5-6 CE. AE Prutah (5mm, 1.5g).</th>
<th>Obv.: Ear of barley; Greek inscription KAICA POC. Rev.: Eight-branched palm-tree bearing two bunches of dates; Greek date L ΑC (year 36).</th>
<th>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1874,0602.11 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Coponius coin" /></td>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1328; Meshorer 2001, nos. 311-312; RPC I (1992), no. 4954 (type); SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 321-325.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marcus Ambibulus (9-12 CE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 195. Jerusalem, Marcus Ambibulus, 8-9 CE. AE Prutah (15mm, 1.93g).</th>
<th>Obv.: Ear of barley; Greek inscription KAICA POC; border of dots. Rev.: Eight-branched palm-tree bearing two bunches of dates; Greek date L ΑΘ (year 39).</th>
<th>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1905,1018.61 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Marcus Ambibulus coin" /></td>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
<td>Hendin 2010, nos. 1329-1330; Meshorer 2001, no. 313; RPC I (1992), no. 4955 (type); SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 326-330.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 196. Jerusalem, Marcus Ambibulus, 10-11 CE. AE Prutah (16.5mm, 1.48g).</th>
<th>Obv.: Ear of barley; Greek inscription KAICA POC; border of dots. Rev.: Eight-branched palm-tree bearing two bunches of dates; Greek date L MA (year 41).</th>
<th>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.461 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Marcus Ambibulus coin" /></td>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
<td>Hendin 2010, no. 1331; Meshorer 2001, no. 315; RPC I (1992), no. 4957 (type); SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 333-338.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Valerius Gratus (15-26 CE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 197. Jerusalem, Valerius Gratus, 16/17 CE. AE Prutah (15mm, 2.43g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Obv.: Inscription within wreath formed of two branches springing from a cut stem; Greek inscription KAI CAP.  
Rev.: Double cornucopia, crossed, with caduceus between horns; date L Γ (Year 3); border of dots. |
| Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.510 © The Trustees of the British Museum. |
| Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1335a; Meshorer 2001, no. 324; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 341-343. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 198. Jerusalem, Valerius Gratus, 16/17 CE. AE Prutah (15mm, 1.79g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Obv.: Inscription within wreath formed of two branches springing from a stem IOV ΛΙΑ; border of dots.  
Rev.: Three lilies springing from single base; date L Γ (Year 3); border of dots. |
| Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.469 © The Trustees of the British Museum. |
| Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1335; Meshorer 2001, no. 321; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 344-347. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 199. Jerusalem, Valerius Gratus, 17/18 CE. AE Prutah (15mm, 1.89g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Obv.: Vine leaf on branch with tendril and small bunch of grapes; border of dots.  
Rev.: Krater with scroll handles and arched lid; date L Δ (Year 4); border of dots. |
| Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.517 © The Trustees of the British Museum. |
| Bibliographic Reference Hendin 2010, no. 1337; Meshorer 2001, no. 325; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 351-352. |
Fig. 200. Jerusalem, Valerius Gratus, 17/18 CE. AE Prutah (14mm, 1.97g).

Obv.: Vine branch with leaf and grapes; Greek inscription above IOYIA; border of dots.
Rev.: Amphora; date LΔ (Year 4) across field; border of dots.


Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1336; Meshorer 2001, no. 326; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 348-350.

Pontius Pilate (26-36 CE)

Fig. 201. Jerusalem, Pontius Pilatus, 29/30 CE. AE Prutah (14mm, 2.03g).

Obv.: Three ears of barley, central upright, outer two drooping; tied together with two horizontal bands; Greek inscription IOYΛIA K[AICAPO]C; border of dots.
Rev.: Simpulum (libation ladle); Greek inscription [T]BEPI[OY] KAICAPOC, date L IC (Year 16).

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1908,0110.509 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1341; Meshorer 2001, no. 331; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 367-372.

Antonius Felix (54-60 CE)

Fig. 202. Jerusalem, Antonius Felix, 54-55 CE. AE Prutah (17.5mm, 2.65g).

Obv.: Two oblong hexagonal shields and two spears, crossed; Greek inscription NEΠ Ω ΚΛΛΔΥ KAICAPO. Rev.: Six-branched palm tree bearing two bunches of dates; Greek inscription BPIT L [I]Δ K AI (Brit[annicus] year [1]4 of Caesar); border of dots.


Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1348; Meshorer 2001, 340; RPC I (1992), no. 4971 (type); SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), nos. 397-404.
**Fig. 203.** Rome, Moneyer M. Volteius, 78/74 BCE. AR Denarius (3.86g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Jupiter, right; border of dots.  
Rev.: Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus; below, Latin inscription M·VOLTEI·M·F; border of dots.

Source: BM Reg. No.: R.8490 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

**Bibliographic Reference**
RRC no. 385/1 (type).

**Fig. 204.** Rome, Moneyer D. Junius Brutus Albinus, 48 BCE. AR Denarius (3.52g).

Obv.: Head of Pietas, right; behind, Latin inscription PIETAS; border of dots.  
Rev.: Two hands clasped round caduceus; below, inscription ALBINVS·BRVTI·F; border of dots.


**Bibliographic Reference**
RRC no. 450/2 (type).

**Fig. 205.** Rome, Moneyer L Flaminius Chilo, 43 BCE. AR Denarius (3.82g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Caesar, right; border of dots.  
Rev.: Goddess standing left, holding caduceus in right hand, sceptre in left hand; on right, Latin inscription L·FLAMINIVS; on left, inscription IIII·VIR; border of dots.

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1867,0101.1250 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

**Bibliographic Reference**
RRC no. 485/1 (type).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 206. Rome, Moneyer C. Vibius Varus, 42 BCE. AV Aureus (8.07g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Obv.**: Head of Octavian, right; around, inscription C·CAESAR·III·VIR·R·P·C; border of dots.  
**Rev.**: Clasped hands; above, Latin inscription C·VEIBIVS; below, inscription VAARVS; border of dots.  
Source: BM Reg. No.: 1896,0608.4 © The Trustees of the British Museum.  
Bibliographic Reference  
RRC no. 494/12. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 207. Rome, Moneyer C. Vibius Varus, 42 BCE. AV Aureus (7.94g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Obv.**: Bearded head of M. Antonius, right; around, Latin inscription M·ANTONIVS·III·VIR·R·P·C; border of dots.  
**Rev.**: Clasped hands; above, Latin inscription C·VEIBIVS; below, inscription VAARVS; border of dots.  
Source: BM Reg. No.: 1913,0410.1 © The Trustees of the British Museum.  
Bibliographic Reference  
RRC no. 494/11 (type). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 208. Rome, Moneyer Mark Antony and Octavian, 39 BCE. AR Denarius (3.79g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Obv.**: Bearded head of Octavian, right; behind, Latin inscription CAESAR; in front, inscription IMP; border of dots.  
**Rev.**: Winged caduceus; around, inscription ANTONIVS IMP; border of dots.  
Bibliographic Reference  
RRC no. 529/2c (type). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 209. Rome, Octavian, 36 BCE. AV Aureus (?g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Bearded head of Octavian, right; around Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscription IMP·CAESAR·DIVI·F·III·VIR·ITER·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R·P·C; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Tetrastyle temple; within, figure wearing veil,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holding lituus in right hand; inscription on architrave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVO·IVL; star in pediment; on left, lighted altar;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>around, inscription COS·ITER·ET·TER·DESIG;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1896,0608.5 © The Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRC no. 540/1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Roman Imperial Coinage**

**Mint of Alexandria**

**Augustus (27 BCE-14 CE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 210.</strong> Alexandria, Augustus, 11/10 BCE. AE (3.81g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Round altar, on which K; Greek inscription CEBACTOC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Cornucopia; Greek inscription KAICAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1906,1103.2676 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNG Copenhagen (Alexandria-Cyrenaica), no. 23.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 211.</strong> Alexandria, Augustus, between 27 BCE-14 CE. AE (12.68g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Diademed head of Augustus, right; Greek inscription [ΠΑΤΗΡ ΠΑΤΡΙΔ Σ].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Ears of corn bound together; Greek inscription CEBACTOC; border of dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: G.3177 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMC Greek (Alexandria), p. 4, no. 27.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fig. 212.</strong> Alexandria, Augustus, between 27 BCE-14 CE. AE (7.48g).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.: Head of Livia, right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: Modius, containing ears of corn and poppy-heads, bound with wreath of flowers, right and left torches with serpents twining around; Greek inscription below [L]ΛΘ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: BM Reg. No.: 1864,1118.262 © The Trustees of the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tiberius (14-37 CE)

**Fig. 213.** Alexandria, Tiberius, 17-18 CE. AE (2.33g).

Obv.: Head of Livia, right.
Rev.: Ears of corn and poppy-heads tied together; Greek letters in fields L Δ (Year 4).

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1887,0704.15 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
BMC Greek (Alexandria) p. 8, no. 61.

Claudius (41-54 CE)

**Fig. 214.** Alexandria, Claudius, 41-54 CE. AE (10.38g).

Obv.: Laurate head of Claudius, right, LI in right field; Greek inscription [TIKAAYKAI] CEBAC ΓΕΡΜΑ.
Rev.: Ears of corn and winged caduceus tied together; Greek inscription AYTO KRA.

Source: BM Reg. No.: TOW.114 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference

**Fig. 215.** Alexandria, Claudius, 41-54 CE. AE (10.60g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Claudius, right; Greek inscription TIKAYKAI CEBAC ΓΕΡΜΑ.
Rev.: Ears of corn tied together, in right field LB (Year 2); Greek inscription AYTOKRA.


Bibliographic Reference
BMC Greek (Alexandria) p. 12, no. 101.
**Fig. 216.** Alexandria, Claudius, 50-51 CE. AE Obol (19mm, 3.80g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Claudius, right; Greek inscription TIB KAΛ AV KAI CEBAC ΓΕPM. Rev.: Hand holding grain ears and poppie; Greek inscription AYTOK date LIA (year 11); border of dots.


Bibliographic Reference
RPC I (1992), no. 5184.

—

**Mint of Antioch-on-the-Orontes**

**Nero**

**Fig. 217.** Antioch-on-the-Orontes, Nero, ca. 63 CE. AR Tetradrachm (15.11g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Nero with aegis, right; Greek inscription ΝΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ; border of dots.
Rev.: Eagle on thunderbolt, right; dot and palm branch in right field; Greek inscription ΕΤΟΥΣ ΑΙ Π; border of dots.

Source: BM Reg. No.: G.2294 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
RPC I (1992), no. 4186/1.
Mint of Pergamon (Mysia)

Augustus (27 BCE-14 CE)

**Fig. 217a.** Pergamon, Augustus, 4/5 CE. AE (19mm, 4.54g).

Obv.: Tetrastyle temple façade with statue of Augustus(?), standing facing, holding sceptre; Greek inscription ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΝ ΔΗΜΟΦΩΝ.

Rev.: Standing togate figure (M. Plautius Silvanus) facing, holding patera, being crowned by figure in military dress; Greek inscription ΣΙΛΒΑΝΟΝ ΠΕΡΓΑΜΗΝΟΙ.


Bibliographic Reference
RPC I (1992), no. 2364.

Mint of Rome

Tiberius (14-37 CE)

**Fig. 218.** Rome, Tiberius, 22/23 CE. AE Dupondius (29mm, 14.59g).

Obv.: Draped bust of Livia/Julia Augusta as Salus, right; Latin inscription SALVS AVGVSTA; border of dots.

Rev.: Large S C; Latin inscription TI CAESAR DIVI AVG F AVG P M TR POT XXIII; border of dots.

Source: CNG, eAuction 211 (03.06.2009), Lot 358 © www.cngcoins.com.

Bibliographic Reference
RIC I, no. 47 (Tiberius).
Gaius (Caligula) (37-41 CE)

Fig. 219. Rome, Caligula, 37/38 CE. AE Sestertius (36mm, 24.07g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Gaius Caligula, left; Latin inscription C CAESAR AVG GERMANICVS PON M TR POT.
Rev.: The three sisters of Gaius, standing facing, draped; left, Agrippina (as Securitas), head right, holding cornucopia in right hand, leaning on column, left hand on Drusilla's shoulder; centre, Drusilla (as Concordia), head left, patera in right hand, cornucopia in left; right, Julia (as Fortuna), head left, holding rudder in right hand, cornucopia in left; Latin exergue inscription S C, around AGRIPPINA DRVSILLA IVLIA.


Bibliographic Reference
RIC I, no. 33 (Gaius).

Fig. 220. Rome, Caligula 37/38 CE. AE Dupondius (28mm, 17.07g).

Obv.: Nero and Drusus Caesar riding right, with cloaks flying behind; Latin inscription NERO ET DRVSVS CAESARES.
Rev.: Latin inscription SC, around C CAESAR AVG GERMANICVS PON M TR POT.

Source: BM Reg. No.: R.6439 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
RIC I, no. 34 (Gaius).

Fig. 221. Rome, Caligula 37-41 CE. AE Dupondius (29mm, 14.42g).

Obv.: Germanicus, bare-headed and cloaked, standing in quadriga right, holding eagle-tipped sceptre in left hand; Latin inscription GERMANICVS CAESAR.
Rev.: Germanicus, bare-headed, cuirassed and wearing tunic, standing left, raising right arm, holding aquila (standard) in left hand; Latin inscription SIGNIS RECEPT DEVICTIS GERM, in lower field SC.

Source: BM Reg. No.: 1853,0105.130 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic Reference
RIC I, no. 57 (type) (Gaius).
**Fig. 222.** Rome, Caligula 39/40 CE. AE Sestertius (28.40g).

Obv.: Pietas, veiled and draped, seated left, holding patera in right hand and resting left arm on a small draped figure, standing facing on base; Latin inscription C CAESAR DIVI AVG PRON AVG P M TR P III P P, in exergue PIETAS.

Rev.: Hexastyle garlanded temple of Divus Augustus, sacrificial scene in pediment, quadriga and victories as acroteria, statues of Romulus and Remus on roofline; in front Gaius, veiled and togate, standing left, sacrificing with patera in right hand over garlanded altar on left; left attendant leading bull to altar; right second attendant holds patera; Latin inscription DIVO AVG, S C across field.


Bibliographic Reference
RIC I, no. 36, 44 (Gaius).

**Claudius (41-54 CE)**

**Fig. 223.** Rome, Claudius 41-45 CE. AV Aureus (20mm, 7.82g).

Obv.: Draped bust of Antonia Minor, right, wearing wreath of grain ears, hair in long plait behind; Latin inscription ANTONIA AVGVSTA.

Rev.: Antonia as Constantia, standing facing, draped, holding long torch in right hand, cornucopia in left hand; Latin inscription CONSTANTIAE AVGVSTI.


Bibliographic Reference
RIC I, no. 65 (Claudius).
### Nero (54-68 CE)

#### Fig. 224. Rome, Nero, 64 CE. AE Semis (16mm, 2.66g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Nero, right; Latin inscription NERO CAES AVG IMP; border of dots.  
Rev.: Table, from front and right, with urn on left and wreath on right; on the front panel, a bas-relief of two facing sphinx-like figures; a round shield resting against table leg; denominational mark S on table; Latin inscription: CER QVINQ ROM CO, exergue SC; border of dots.  


Bibliographic Reference  
RIC I, no. 233 (Nero).

#### Fig. 225. Caesarea Maritima, Nero, 65-68 CE. AE (18mm, 6.26g).

Obv.: Distyle temple on podium, seated female figure within (Poppaea); Latin inscription DIVA POP[PA]EA AVG.  
Rev.: Round hexastyle temple on podium, female statue/standing figure within (Claudia) holding cornucopia; Latin inscription DIVA CLAVD [NER F]; border of dots.  


Bibliographic Reference  
Hendin 2010, 1270; Meshorer 2001, no. 354; RPC I (1992), no. 4846; SNG ANS 6 (Palestine-South Arabia), no. 858.
Vespasian (69-79 CE)

**Fig. 226.** Rome, Vespasian, 71 CE. AE Sestertius (32mm, 24.76g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Vespasian, right; Latin inscription IMP CAES VESPASIAN AVG P M TR P P P COS III; border of dots.
Rev.: Palm tree; left, bound captive standing right; right, mourning female captive/Judaea seated right on cuirass; both figures surrounded by arms; Latin inscription IVDAEA CAPTA, exergue S C; border of dots.


**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1504; RIC II, no. 233 (Vespasian).

**Fig. 227.** Rome, Vespasian (Titus as Caesar), 72 CE. AE Sestertius (26.03g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Titus, right; Latin inscription T CAES VESPASIAN IMP PON TR POT COS II.
Rev.: Palm tree; left, Titus standing right, holding spear in right hand, cradling parazonium in left arm, foot on helmet; right, mourning female captive/Judaea seated right; Latin inscription IVDAEA CAPTA, exergue S C; border of dots.


**Bibliographic Reference**
Hendin 2010, no. 1527; RIC II, no. 422 (Vespasian).

**Fig. 228.** Rome, Vespasian, 74 CE. AE Dupondius (26mm, 12.42g).

Obv.: Radiate head of Vespasian, right; Latin inscription IMP CAES VESP AVG P M T P COS V CENS.
Rev.: Felicitas, draped, standing left, holding caduceus in right raised hand and cornucopia in left hand; Latin inscription FELICITAS PVBLICA, S C across field.


**Bibliographic Reference**
RIC II, no. 715 (Vespasian).
Domitian (81-96 CE)

Fig. 229. Rome, Domitian, 85 CE. AE As (26mm, 9.30g).

Obv.: Laureate bust of Domitian, right, wearing aegis; Latin inscription IMP CAES DOMITIAN AVG GERM COS XI CENS P S TR P; border of dots.
Rev.: Altar; Latin inscription SALVITI AVGVSTI, S C across field; border of dots.


Bibliographic reference
RIC II, no. 304a (Domitian).

Fig. 230. Rome, Domitian, 88 CE. AE Dupondius (11.83g).

Obv.: Radiate head of Domitian, right; Latin inscription IMP CAES DOMIT AVG GERM COS XIII CENS PER [P P]; border of dots.
Rev.: Domitian standing left, sacrificing over altar; to left, victimarius with goat and sheep, flute-player and lyre-player standing right; in background, six-column temple, eagle in pediment; Latin inscription COS XIII LVD SAEC FEC, in exergue S C; border of dots.

Source: BM Reg. No.: BNK,R.800 © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliographic reference
RIC II, no. 365 (Domitian).

Nerva (96-98 CE)

Fig. 231. Rome, Nerva, 96 CE. AE Sestertius (34mm, 25.81g).

Obv.: Laureate head of Nerva, right; Latin inscription IMP NERVA CAES AVG P M TR P COS II[I P P]; border of dots.
Rev.: Palm tree with two bunches of dates; Latin inscription FISCI IVDAICI CALVMNIA SVBLATA, S C in field; border of dots.

Source: CNG, Printed Auction 84 (05.05.2010), Lot 1012 © www.cngcoins.com.

Bibliographic Reference
Hendin 2010, no. 1603; RIC II, no. 82 (Nerva).
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1. English Abstract

As the first illustrated mass medium of the ancient Mediterranean world, the coins from Palestine dating to the late Persian, the Hellenistic and the early Roman Imperial period are an almost uninterrupted attestation to the history and to the continuously changing and developing political and religious ideas of this time. As one of the most essential ways of communication of the ruling elite(s) and as a primary medium of demonstrating the official political identity(ies), ancient coinage was one of the most important instruments for the transportation of political and religious ideas, as well as the demonstration of power and propaganda. The intention with the dissertation submitted here is the examination of the political instrumentalization of sacred iconography on Jewish coins primarily throughout the Hellenistic and Roman imperial periods. The objective is not only the processing of the development of the sacred iconography used on Jewish coins, but also to evaluate their consistently changing political function – especially viewed against the constantly changing political and religious constellations in Palestine during the different historical periods (highlighted by its use during the two Jewish wars against Rome, 66-70 CE and 132-135 CE). In a further step, the numismatic evidence is valued critically against the comparative archaeological and textual evidence to gain an integral picture of the cultural history developing. The combining of the numismatic evidence with further ancient – archaeological and textual – sources broaden and complement the information gained from the coins, especially concerning the correct interpretations of the motifs and symbols used.
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