

## REVIEW

David M. Jacobson & Nikos Kokkinos (eds.), *Herod and Augustus. Papers Presented at the IJS Conference, 21<sup>st</sup>–23<sup>rd</sup> June 2005 (IJS Studies in Judaica – 6)*, Brill, Leiden–Boston 2009, pp. 502, b/w ill. ISSN 1570-1581, ISBN 978-90-04-16546-5

Herod, the king of Judea, is a figure who has commanded growing interest in recent years. Apart from his standard biographies, several books have appeared which detail selected aspects of his reign. Among various issues, much interest is constantly aroused by the mutual relations between the Judean king and the first emperor of Rome, Augustus. This subject was addressed by a conference held at the Institute of Jewish Studies of University College London in 2005 with the participation of representatives of various disciplines: historians, archaeologists, philologists, and a numismatist. The papers delivered there have recently been published by Brill Publishers (Leiden). They were arranged into several thematic groups as per the varied topics discussed and the specifics of research methods in respective disciplines: Augustan and Herodian Ideology (E. Gruen, *Herod, Rome, and the Diaspora*, pp. 13–27; K. Galinsky, *The Augustan Programme of Cultural Renewal and Herod*, pp. 29–42; A. Lichtenberger, *Herod and Rome: Was Romanization a Goal of the Building Policy of Herod?*, pp. 43–62), Literary and Documental Evidence (M. Toher, *Herod, Augustus, and Nicolaus of Damascus*, pp. 65–81; J. Sievers, *Herod, Josephus, and Laqueur: A Reconsideration*, pp. 83–112; D.T. Ariel, *The Coins of Herod the Great in the Context of the Augustan Empire*, pp. 113–126; D. Goodblatt, *Dating Documents in Herodian Judaea*, pp. 127–154), Augustan and Herodian Building Programmes (J. Geiger, *Rome and Jerusalem: Public Building and the Economy*, pp. 157–169; E. Netzer, *Palaces and Planning of Complexes in Herod's Realm*, pp. 171–180; J. Patrich, *Herodian Entertainment Structures*, pp. 181–213), Individual Herodian Sites (B. Burrell, *Herod's Caesarea on Sebastos: Urban Structures and Influences*, pp. 217–233; D. Bahat, *The Architectural Origins of Herod's Temple Mount*, pp. 235–245), Applied Arts in the Herodian Kingdom (S. Rozenberg, *Wall Paintings of the Hellenistic and Herodian Period in the Land of Israel*, pp. 249–265; M. Hershkovitz, *Herodian Pottery*, pp. 267–278), Administration and Client Network (A.A. Barrett, *Herod, Augustus, and the Special Relationship: The Significance of the Procuratorship*, pp. 28–302; D.B. Saddington, *Client Kings' Armies under Augustus: The Case of Herod*, pp. 303–323; S.G. Schmid, *Nabataean Royal Propaganda: A Response to Herod and Augustus?*, pp. 325–359; J. Creighton, *Herod's Contemporaries in Britain and the West*, pp. 361–381), and Religion under Augustus and Herod (D.R. Schwartz, *One Temple and Many Synagogues: On Religion and State in Herodian Judaea and Augustan Rome*, p. 385–398). Since this volume's main heroes are Augustus and Herod, I want to focus on those papers which concern various aspects of their mutual relations.

Erich S. Gruen (*Herod, Rome, and the Diaspora*, pp. 13–27) attempted to resolve the question of Herod's attitude toward Jews in the diaspora. His starting point was Herod's intercession with Marcus Agrippa during their meeting in Asia Minor in the year 14

B.C. in support of Jews living in Ionian cities. In Gruen's opinion, there are no grounds to treat this episode as reflecting any special care by Herod for the interests of Jewish diaspora. A spontaneous gesture, it was rather to show off his influence in Rome, while helping to strengthen his own status in Judea.

Karl Galinsky (*The Augustan Programme of Cultural Renewal and Herod*, pp. 29–42) tried to integrate Herod's construction activities in Judea and neighbouring lands in Augustus' broad cultural policy. He believes that Herod's building projects and imported Roman cultural patterns largely contributed to the intensive Romanization of the Near East. Some of the themes Galinsky addressed were picked up and further developed by Achim Lichtenberger (*Herod and Rome: Was Romanisation a Goal of the Building Policy of Herod?*, pp. 43–62). In his opinion, the structures Herod erected were a clear sign of his subordination to Rome and his loyalty to its ruler. He pointed out that incorporating Roman-style elements in architecture might have stemmed from either ideological or technical premises. Specifically, this refers to the use in Herod's building projects of the *opus reticulatum*, of pozzolana, and of decorative black-and-white floor mosaics (p. 50) (on the same subject, cf. also remarks by E. Netzer (p. 179) and B. Burrell (pp. 219–220)). According to Lichtenberger, the use of Roman patterns may or may not be seen as ideological, but, more to the point "... as expression of wealth, prestige and therefore monarchic power. It is a claim to be a Hellenistic king." (p. 58)

Donald T. Ariel (*The Coins of Herod the Great in the Context of the Augustan Empire*, pp. 113–126) attempted to interpret two series of Herod's bronze coins, untypical of his coinage in terms of their size and weight. One, described as a large diadem/table type, was produced in Jerusalem, while the other comes from another mint which stands out for bearing a date on its obverse (year-three). In Ariel's opinion, both these series, to a greater or lesser degree, reflect Herod's relations with Rome. The scholar believes that the earlier series was struck to commemorate Augustus confirming Herod's rule in 30 B.C. and at the same time the latter's tenth anniversary on the throne, as is perhaps indicated by the number/sign X on the obverse. The reason why the other series was produced, most likely in the Samaria mint, was the refoundation of Samaria into Sebaste in honour of Augustus in 27 B.C. Both series were designed not only to mark events important for Herod. Their greater weight suggests that they were meant to be handed out as *congiaria* and *donativa*.

Barbara Burrell (*Herod's Caesarea on Sebastos: Urban Structures and Influences*, pp. 217–233) studied the motives and factors which contributed to the founding of Caesarea, and discusses the functions the city served in Herod's state. In passing, she notes that building materials from Italy were used in the construction of the port. In her opinion, Caesarea's founder showed his loyalty toward the Roman emperor not only in naming the city, but also in erecting a number of buildings dedicated to Augustus and in holding sports games in it. Creating Caesarea was of economic benefit to Herod himself and gave him an opportunity to display his own greatness and his links with Greek culture.

Anthony A. Barrett (*Herod, Augustus, and the Special Relationship: The Significance of the Procuratorship*, pp. 281–302) tried to determine Herod's competences as procurator of Syria. He would serve in this role from 20 B.C. (Jos., *BJ* 1,399) and it was to testify to his special relations with Augustus. Barrett was of the opinion that it is hardly likely that a vassal ruler in Judea could have any real influence on the internal

affairs of the Roman Empire. A study of evidence on the role of a procurator in Augustus' time and of the careers of other vassal rulers who obtained official positions from the Romans in the imperial period enables him to say that Herod's appointment did not mean giving him any real authority; instead it was rather an honorary appointment: "Thus Josephus could well have been right, that Herod was held in special regard by Augustus, but in the very limited sphere of financial acumen, without any suggestion that he was, in the emperor's eyes, invested with the *potestas* and *auctoritas* of a traditional Roman magistrate." (p. 300).

Denis B. Saddington (*Client Kings' Armies under Augustus: The Case of Herod*, p. 303–323) tried to explain how Augustus allowed Herod to keep a large army. He admits that while Herod was no exception in this respect as other rulers also had their armies, unlike them, Herod not only commanded a much larger force, but possessed a broad network of fortresses across his state. Saddington thought that Herod's exceptional status was due to his being both an ally and a guarantor of political stability in the entire region, which allowed Rome to reduce its own military involvement there.

The volume under discussion includes two papers which, while not directly referring to Herod's relations with Augustus, show how such relations could influence the attitudes and behaviour of Rome's other contemporary client rulers. There are indications that Herod was imitated by the Nabatean king (S.G. Schmid, *Nabataean Royal Propaganda: A Response to Herod and Augustus*, pp. 325–359). Some commonality of behaviour and practices was noticed by the rulers of lands in other parts of the Roman world: in Mauretania, Britain, Noricum, the Bosporan Kingdom (J. Creighton, *Herod's Contemporaries in Britain and the West*, pp. 361–381).

These few remarks are meant to give a potential reader an idea of the book's contents. It is worth perusing for its varied subjects in its many articles which may be of interest to a broad number of researchers into the history of Judea at the time of Herod and into that of Rome under Augustus. It is regrettable that the contributions on Judean archaeology in the time of Herod present a state of affairs several years old, dating to the time when they were presented at the conference. None considers the important discoveries (such as in Herodium) made between 2005 and 2010. Nor is there any mention of the Roman standard and its inscriptions dating to Herod's time (see L. Di Segni, A Roman Standard in Herod's Kingdom, *Israel Museum Studies in Archaeology*, vol. 4, 2005, 23–48); cf. *L'Année épigraphique 2005* (Paris 2008), no. 1589 a–b.

Edward Dąbrowa