

The Coinage of Agrippa II

Alla Kushnir-Stein

The most extensive of all the coinages of the Herodian dynasty belongs to Agrippa II. This coinage is also the most problematic. Agrippa ruled from the time of Claudius until that of Domitian. We have coins of his from the reigns of Nero and all three Flavian emperors.¹

Apart from a single series under Nero, all the coins of Agrippa II are dated by his regnal years. Usually, regular dating facilitates the chronological arrangement of coins and is thus of help in solving both numismatic and historical problems. However, with the coins of Agrippa II the opposite happens. According to the current view, all issues of this king were dated by a single system, based on the era of 60 AD.² But when the coins are arranged according to this system, several odd phenomena become apparent.

The issues under Nero are limited in scope and can be omitted for the present. The coinage under the Flavians is diverse, but it is possible to identify three main reverse types. One, usually appearing on the largest denomination, has a standing figure of the city goddess, Tyche. The second shows Nike, a goddess of victory, walking and holding a wreath in her extended hand; the third type also has Nike, but here she is writing on a shield on her knee. I shall refer to these types as Tyche, Nike and wreath, and Nike and shield. On the last mentioned type, Nike looks to the left on the earliest coins and to the right on all subsequent issues.

The earliest date on these types is year 14. Vespasian appears on the largest coin, with Tyche on the reverse. Titus is on the second denomination, with Nike and wreath on the reverse; Domitian is on the smallest coin, with Nike and shield. For the years 15 and 18 the picture is similar, with the three members of the imperial family associated with the same reverses as in the year 14. The reverses thus seem to have been fixed according to the degree of importance of the person shown on the obverse. The reigning emperor appears with Tyche, his elder son with Nike and wreath, and his younger son with Nike and shield. Counting by the era of 60 AD, these coins belong to 73/4, 74/5 and 77/8.

In year 19 there is a change. Not only were there no more coins minted with Vespasian, but Titus now appears on the largest denomination with Tyche on the reverse,

¹ For the updated catalogues of Agrippa's coins see Y. Meshorer, *A Treasury of Jewish Coins*, Jerusalem 1997, 94-104, 208-16, 306-12 (Hebrew); *RPC I*, nos. 4988-4992; *RPC II*, nos. 2242-2298.

² According to earlier scholars this era falls in 61 AD: F.W. Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage*, 1967 (reprint), 122; Th. Mommsen, 'Zu den Münzen Agrippas I und II', *Numismatische Zeitschrift* 3, 1871, 451; E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, Leipzig 1901, 589 (note 7), 597 (note 43); *BMC, Palestine*, xcvi; etc. However, it has been shown recently that the correct date is 60 AD: N. Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty*, Sheffield 1998, 398.

while Domitian has his usual reverse of Nike and shield. The smallest coin of this year shows Julia, Titus' daughter, with the title 'Sebaste'. According to the era of 60 AD, the series belongs to 78/9, the year in which Vespasian died and Titus became emperor. These coins, therefore, must have been minted in the late summer or early autumn of 79, after the death of Vespasian; the new emperor, Titus, would accordingly have had his portrait on the largest denomination with an appropriate reverse. We may note that this interpretation excludes the possibility of the era of 60 falling in spring, since in this case the year 19 would have ended in spring 79, when Vespasian was still alive.

The next date is 24. Of the usual types, there are only Nike and wreath, and Nike and shield. Domitian, who appears with both reverses, has the title Germanicus, which he acquired in 83.³ Counting by the era of 60, one indeed arrives at 83/4 as the date for these coins.

For the year 25 there are also only portraits of Domitian. The coins form two distinct groups. One group has Greek legends and consists of small-size coins; the other has Imperial types and Latin legends on both obverse and reverse. The obverse mentions the 10th consulate of Domitian, while in the empty space of the reverse there are legends in Greek, giving Agrippa's name, title and the date 25. These coins also have an exceptional axis, 6 o'clock, in the fashion of Roman Imperial issues.

Imperial types with Latin legends also appear with the date 26 and the 12th consulate of Domitian. These coins fix the era of Agrippa at 60 AD, as pointed out recently by Kokkinos.⁴ Domitian was consul for the 10th time in 84, consul XI in 85, and consul XII in 86. There seem to be no coins of Agrippa with the number XI for Domitian's consulate, which means that the only possibility of reconciling all the indications would be to put the end of the year 25 and the beginning of the year 26 in 85 AD, which finally gives the era of 60.

Up to this point, the chronology seems fairly logical. However, the coins with Latin legends are not the only ones bearing the date 26. The same date also appears on a series which seems to be an exact repetition of Agrippa's first coinage under the Flavians. Once again we find Vespasian with Tyche, Titus with Nike and wreath, and Domitian, called simply ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ, on the smallest coin with Nike and shield. On a number of coins, Domitian is called Germanicus as well,⁵ but these coins seem to constitute a separate group, characterized by a crescent under Nike's wing.

The same series, which I would call anachronistic, also appears with the date 27, with an additional type, showing Titus and Domitian face to face.⁶ The imperial

³ T.V. Buttrey, *Documentary Evidence for the Chronology of the Flavian Titulature*, 1980, 52-6; D. Barag, 'The Palestinian "Judaea Capta" coins of Vespasian and Titus and the era on the coins of Agrippa II minted under the Flavians', *Numismatic Chronicle* 138, 1978, 21-2.

⁴ Kokkinos (above, note 2), 398.

⁵ *RPC* II, no. 2281. These coins, which seem to be relatively rare, usually also have a peculiar type of Domitian's portrait, reminiscent of that appearing on coins dated year 24.

⁶ Meshorer (above, note 1), no. 168 = *RPC* II, no. 2284; *Das Heilige Land*, Katalog der Sonderausstellung 1993/94 der Staatlichen Münzsammlung München, no. 198 (enlarged photograph on 81).

prototype of this obverse belongs to the earlier part of Vespasian's reign;⁷ the reverse shows the god Pan, suggesting Caesarea Paneas as the place where these coins were manufactured.

The whole series appears again with the date 29. In this year, however, there is also a coin of Domitian, with all his imperial titles and Tyche on the reverse.⁸ For the year 30 we have only coins of Titus, who is once again upgraded to the largest denomination with Tyche.

The last two dates found on Agrippa's coins are 34 and 35. For the year 34 there is one small coin. In the next year, two familiar reverses are back, this time associated with Domitian. If counted by the era of 60, these coins would belong to 94/5.

Table 1: Coinage under the Flavians according to the era of 60 AD

Year	Tyche	Nike/wreath	Nike/shield	Other
14 = 73/4	V	T	D	
15 = 74/5	V		D	Tiberias
18 = 77/8	V	T	D	
19 = 78/9	T		D	Ship, Julia
24 = 83/4		D(Ger)	D (Ger)	Wreath
25 = 84/5			D (Ger)?	CosX, tree(G), corn.
26 = 85/6	<i>V</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>D, D (Ger)</i>	Cos XII
27 = 86/7	<i>V</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>T/D, 2 corn.</i>
29 = 88/9	<i>V, D(Ger)</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>D</i>	
30 = 89/90	<i>T</i>			
34 = 93/4				Tyche/corn.
35 = 94/5	D (Ger)	D (Ger)	D (Ger)?	Wreath

V — Vespasian; T — Titus; D — Domitian, without titles; D (Ger) — Domitian, with the title Germanicus; D (Ger) ? — the existence of the coin is in doubt. The problematic coins are in bold and italics.

Thus we have the following picture. Up to and including the year 25, the coins of Agrippa under the Flavians do not pose serious chronological problems. For practically all of them, the era of 60 AD can be deduced from various indications on the coins themselves. For the years 26, 27, 29 and 30 there is a series which looks anachronistic. Vespasian and Titus, both long dead, re-appear with exactly the same legends as during their lifetime (Table 2). Domitian, the reigning emperor, is relegated in this series to the smallest denomination and is named simply Domitianus Caesar.

⁷ *BMCRE* II, xxxii, nos. 1, 351A, 368, 433, etc.

⁸ Meshorer (above, note 1), no. 174 = *RPC* II, no. 2289. This specimen seems to be unique. A. Kindler (*Coins of the Land of Israel*, Collection of the Bank of Israel, Jerusalem 1974, no. 64) published yet another coin with Domitian/Tyche and the date 29, on the reverse of which he reads ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚ. Examination of the coin showed, however, that this reading is difficult to reconcile with the letters still preserved at the end of the legend. The coin is thus more likely to belong to Vespasian.

There are a few other oddities in the same years. For the year 26 we have both the series with Latin legends, which seems to have been fairly extensive, and the series with anachronistic features, which is also extensive. To this, one must add the group of Domitian's coins which has the same reverse as the anachronistic series but where Domitian is called Germanicus. Yet another bizarre combination belongs to the year 29, where both the living and the dead emperor appear on the same denomination and with the same reverse.

Table 2: Legends on coins of Vespasian and Titus

<i>Vespasian</i>	Year 14	ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΣΠΑ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒ or ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΣΠΑΣΙ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ
	Year 15	ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΣΠΑΣΙ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ
	Year 18	ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΣΠΑ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ
	Year 26	ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΣΠΑΣΙ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ
	Year 27	ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΣΠΑΣΙ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ
	Year 29	ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΟΥΕΣΠΑΣΙ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ
<i>Titus</i>	Year 14	ΑΥΤΟΚΡ ΤΙΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒ (or ΣΕΒΑΣ)
	Year 18	ΑΥΤΟΚΡ ΤΙΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣ
	Year 19	ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΤΙΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΣ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ
	Year 26	ΑΥΤΟΚΡ ΤΙΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣ
	Year 27	ΑΥΤΟΚΡ ΤΙΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣ
	Year 29	ΑΥΤΟΚΡ ΤΙΤΩ ? ΚΑΙΣΑΡ (or ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ) ΣΕΒΑΣ (or ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ)
Year 30	ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΤΙΤΩ ? ΚΑΙΣΑ ΣΕΒΑ	

These oddities are not easy to explain. The suggestion that the coins with anachronistic features belong to a kind of restoration series is not entirely satisfactory. To begin with, there are no similar examples among the coinages of the Roman East, either from client kings or from cities. The fact that the quantity of restoration coins far exceeds that of the original series would also seem abnormal.⁹ The inclusion of the small coins of Domitian without the title Germanicus in a restoration series is also hard to explain, especially since coins of exactly the same type *with* this title were also produced. And, finally, the coin with Titus and Domitian facing each other could not have been a restoration coin, since it does not appear with an earlier date.

In order to solve these problems, scholars have tried dating Agrippa's coins by several different eras. Thus, more than a century ago, Madden proposed no fewer than four such eras.¹⁰ Hill, in his introduction to the British Museum Catalogue a few decades

⁹ The series of year 26 seems to be extensive; those of years 27 and 29 may be somewhat smaller, but are still fairly large. Taken together, the series of 26, 27 and 29 far exceed the combined quantities of years 14, 15 and 18. Of these earlier dates, only the first one, year 14, is known in relatively large numbers, while the coins of year 15 and 18 are relatively rare.

¹⁰ Madden (above, note 2), 113-33. Madden proposed eras of 49, 53 and 61 AD for Agrippa and also one era according to Nero's regnal years (54 AD).

later, rejected Madden's arrangement and insisted on a single system of dating for all the coins of Agrippa II.¹¹ His view is the one adopted by the majority of scholars today.

Of course, dispersing Agrippa's coins among four different eras can hardly be a solution. However, Madden may have been only partially wrong. As has been shown, practically all the difficulties are created by one specific group, and it may be sufficient to find a suitable earlier era just for this group.¹² We know of two earlier eras of Agrippa II. One, nowhere attested independently, but calculated from the double dates on coins and inscriptions, is held to fall in 55 AD.¹³ However, the application of this era to the problematic coins would be somewhat pointless, since most of these coins would still fall under Domitian. We are then left with the era of 49, mentioned by Josephus in *BJ* 2.284. Josephus says that the Jewish revolt began in the twelfth year of Nero and the seventeenth of Agrippa, in the month Artemisios. This means the spring of 66. Seyrig has shown that the starting point of Agrippa's era is the autumn of 49.¹⁴ When the problematic coins of the king are arranged according to *this* era, the following picture emerges:

Table 3: Coinage under the Flavians according to the eras of 49 and 60 AD

<i>Era of 60 AD</i>	T	N/W	N/S	Other	<i>Julian year</i>	T	N/W	N/S	Other	<i>Era of 49 AD</i>
14	V	T	D		73/4					---
15	V		D		74/5	V	T	D		26
---					75/6	V	T	D	T/D, 2c.	27
---					76/7					---
18	V	T	D		77/8	V	T	D		29
19	T		D	Ship, Julia	78/9	T				30
---					82/3				Tyche/c	34?
24		D(G)	D(G)	Wreath	83/4	D(G)	D(G)	D(G)?	Wreath	35?
25			D(G)?	Cos X, etc.	84/5					---
26		D(G)		Cos XII	85/6					---
27					86/7					---
29	D(G)				88/9					---
34 ?				Tyche/c	93/4					---
35 ?	D(G)	D(G)	D(G)?	Wreath	94/5					---

V — Vespasian; T — Titus; D — Domitian, without titles; D (G) — Domitian, with the title Germanicus; D (G) ? — the existence of the coin is in doubt.

¹¹ *BMC, Palestine*, xcvi-xcix.

¹² This was suggested already about a century ago by G. Macdonald (*Catalogue of Greek Coins in the Hunterian Collection*, vol. 3: *Further Asia, Northern Africa, Western Europe*, Glasgow 1905, 290-1). According to Macdonald, the earlier era of Agrippa fell in 48 and the later one in 60. Hill (previous note) rejected this arrangement together with that of Madden.

¹³ Kokkinos (above, note 2), 398.

¹⁴ H. Seyrig, 'Sur quelques ères syriennes, 2. Les ères d'Agrippa II', *Revue Numismatique*, 1964, 56.

As can be seen, this transfer removes all the difficulties mentioned previously. All the coins of Vespasian and Titus fall within the years of their reigns, with each having his appropriate reverse. The coins of Domitian which name him only Domitianus Caesar also find their proper place. But the most noteworthy phenomenon is the change from Vespasian to Titus on the largest denomination, which would thus occur in both groups in the same year, 78/9, the year in which Vespasian died and Titus became emperor.

The somewhat illogical pictures for the years 85/6 and 88/9 would also disappear. The coinage of the year 85/6 would have only coins with Latin legends and the series which calls Domitian Germanicus. The coinage of year 88/9 would no longer have both the dead and the living emperor with the same reverse.

As regards the issues with the latest dates, 34 and 35, they seem to fit either of the two eras. The chronology of these coins is of importance for the question of the date of Agrippa's death and it is to be hoped that new evidence will clarify the matter in the future.

Coins dated by two different eras could have hardly been produced in the same place simultaneously. The locality which dated its issues by the era of 49 is possible to establish. Since one of the anachronistic coins features Pan, the tutelary deity of Caesarea Paneas, the era of 49 must belong to this city.¹⁵

If the basic era of Caesarea Paneas was that of 49, then the second era implied by the double dates on its coins would have been 54. The combination of 49 and 54 is, of course, much easier to explain than that of 55 and 60. When Agrippa was appointed king over Chalcis, there must have been a counting by his regnal years which started in 49/50. Josephus reports that, several years later, Claudius took Chalcis away from Agrippa, but gave him instead the former tetrarchies of Philip, Lysanias and Varus.¹⁶ When moving into these new territories Agrippa may well have retained his earlier era, with an additional era, marking the beginning of his actual rule in these territories, being introduced as well.¹⁷

¹⁵ It would not be entirely surprising if the mention of the era of 49 in Josephus turns out to be correct. The Jewish historian was the commander of the rebel forces in Galilee in 66/67, and since a significant part of the territory under his control belonged to Agrippa's kingdom, he is bound to have come across various documents and decisions dated by the regnal years of this king.

¹⁶ *BJ* 2.247; *AJ* 20.138.

¹⁷ There is an inscription from Aere in Batanaea dated by years 37 and 32 of Agrippa's reign (*OGIS* 426). Going by the eras of 55 and 60, it would belong to 91/2. However, this dating presents a problem. Josephus mentions in *AJ* 17.28 a village called Bathyra, which is situated very close to Aere. He writes that the people of Bathyra were crushed by taxes imposed by the Romans after they had succeeded the king Agrippa I and his son. Josephus (*AJ* 20.267) dates the conclusion of the *Antiquities* to the thirteenth year of Domitian (93/4), and this year is usually taken as the *terminus ante quem* for Agrippa's loss of Batanaea. However, before Josephus could write the passage in *AJ* 17.28, Agrippa would have lost these territories, the Roman administration would have been installed and the people of Bathyra must have paid their taxes at least a couple of times in order to suffer financial collapse. After this, the news had to reach Josephus in Rome. This means that at least a year and a half or even more must have elapsed between Agrippa's loss of Bathyra and Josephus' writing of this passage. After this Josephus would have needed time to finish book 17 and to

The date of 54 seems to be a little late for what Josephus tells us, but it is still more probable than the era of 55. The coins and inscriptions with double dates all have to do with the former tetrarchy of Philip which, according to Josephus, was given to Agrippa by Claudius after the emperor completed his 12th year.¹⁸ This is usually interpreted as having taken place in Claudius' 13th year, which was 53. However, Josephus does not indicate year 13 directly, and it is possible that all he knew was that the event was subsequent to the 12th year of Claudius. He also says that Claudius took Chalcis from Agrippa after the latter had ruled it for four years.¹⁹ If Agrippa began to rule Chalcis some time in 49/50, he would have completed his fourth year some time in 53/4. It is, therefore, possible that Claudius made the grant not long before his death in October 54, and if so, the secondary era of Caesarea Paneas *could* have been fixed at the autumn of 54.

The question that remains concerns the origin of the era of 60. We do not know what exactly happened in the year 60/61. Mommsen suggested (not without some reservations) that Agrippa was made king in this year, being up to this time a mere tetrarch.²⁰ This, however, does not seem to be a solution. First, a change in status, even if it took place, would not necessarily cause the beginning of a new reckoning, and known examples would rather point to the contrary. Seleucus I became king in 306/5 BC, but counted his regnal years from 312. Alexander Jannaeus counted his regnal years from the moment of his accession, although he took the title of king many years later.

Secondly, it seems unlikely that Agrippa became king only in 60/61. Josephus nowhere hints that Agrippa was not a king from the very beginning, and Tacitus calls him 'king' while describing the events of 54/5.²¹ General considerations would also argue against Mommsen's hypothesis. Chalcis was a small kingdom, but Claudius appointed Agrippa's uncle Herod to rule over it with the title of king. It may be suggested that Claudius could only make Agrippa a tetrarch at first because of his youth. However, the transfer to Agrippa of much larger territories four years later seems to show that by that time the emperor had full confidence in Agrippa's ability to rule. The same may be said about the further territorial grants by Nero around 54/5.²² Therefore, it would be rather odd if Claudius and Nero still grudged Agrippa the title of king while heaping new territories on him.

A more realistic possibility thus seems to be a further enlargement of Agrippa's kingdom by Nero. This was already suggested in 1962 by Frankfort, who observed that

write his three remaining books. If, as has been suggested, he wrote approximately two books a year (S. Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaeae Politics*, 1990, 40, note 56), this would also have taken no less than a year and a half. In other words, the real *terminus ante quem* for the loss of the region of Bathyra and Aere by Agrippa should be moved up by at least three years, i.e. to 90/91. The date of 91/2 for the inscription of Aere thus seems too late. If, however, the dates of this inscription are counted by the eras of 49 and 54, the date would be 85/6, which is much more appropriate.

¹⁸ *AJ* 20.138.

¹⁹ *ibid.*

²⁰ Mommsen (above, note 2), 453.

²¹ Tacitus, *Ann.* 13.7.

²² *BJ* 2.252; *AJ* 20.159.

in the year 60/61 new territories were given to a few other Eastern client kings.²³ If this was the case, then the old era of Agrippa would have been current in these new territories as well, with a possibility that a secondary local era of 60 was also introduced, as in the case of Caesarea Paneas. We have an example relevant to this question. In 37/6 BC Cleopatra VII was given some regions of Syria, Palestine and south Phoenicia by Mark Antony. Cleopatra counted her regnal years in Alexandria from 52 BC. The era of 52 was current in her new territories as well, together with an additional era of 37. We have coins with double dates from Berytus and Chalcis,²⁴ while a coin from Dora is dated by her Egyptian era only.²⁵ At the same time, the secondary era of 37 alone is found on coins of Tripolis, Orthosia, Berytus and Ptolemais.²⁶

The coins of Agrippa dated by the era of 60 AD could thus have been struck in a place which came under his control in 60/61. In fact, the attribution of all coins of Agrippa to Caesarea Paneas is far from necessary. The coins of Antiochus IV of Commagene were struck in many parts of his kingdom.²⁷ Agrippa's father struck coins in Caesarea Paneas, Jerusalem and Caesarea Maritima,²⁸ while a coin of Agrippa II issued in Tiberias²⁹ demonstrates that a place other than Caesarea Paneas could have been involved in minting coins for the king.

Unfortunately, the precise territorial extent of Agrippa's kingdom is unknown, so it may be difficult to suggest a specific locality. What may be noted, however, is that the coins with Latin legends would have belonged there. The Imperial types of these coins, as well as their axis, have given rise to the suggestion that they were manufactured in Rome.³⁰ This may be true, although the irregular flans of the majority of these coins would rather suggest that only the dies were manufactured in Rome, while the actual minting was local. Whatever the case, since these coins were made of copper, not bronze,³¹ they were clearly intended to imitate Roman Imperial issues, and were thus most probably destined for the use of the Roman army. It is therefore conceivable that a Roman army unit (or units) was stationed in or near the locality which dated coins by a

²³ T. Frankfort, 'Le royaume d'Agrippa II et son annexion par Domitien', in M. Renard (ed.), *Hommages à Albert Grenier*, Collection Latomus 58, 1962, 663-4.

²⁴ H. Seyrig, 'Antiquités Syriennes, 42. Sur les ères de quelques villes de Syrie', *Syria* 27, 1950, 43-6 (nos. 2, 5).

²⁵ H.R. Baldus, 'Zur Münzprägung von Dora/Phönizien zu Ehren Kleopatras VII. und Mark Antons', *Chiron* 19, 477-80; *RPC* I, no. 4752.

²⁶ Seyrig (above, note 24), 44 (nos. 1, 3, 4); *RPC* I, nos. 4741-4742.

²⁷ Coins of Antiochus of Commagene were struck, apart from Commagene, in various cities of Cilicia, as well as in Lycaonia and Lacantis. Some of these coins have identical types: *RPC* I, 3533-3537, 3701-3710, 3712-3713, 3717-3722, 3852-3867.

²⁸ Meshorer (above, note 1), nos. 112-126; *RPC* I, nos. 4973-4987.

²⁹ S. Qedar, 'A coin of Agrippa II commemorating the Roman victory over the Jews', *Schweizer Münzblätter* 39, 1989, 33-6; *RPC* II, no. 2242.

³⁰ Meshorer (above, note 1), 102; *RPC* II, 309.

³¹ Non-destructive SEM analysis has been made of ten coins of Agrippa II with Latin legends. Three coins from the Kadman Museum (Tel Aviv) were cleaned, seven coins from the Israel Museum (Jerusalem) had a patina. Eight coins showed a copper content of between 95 and 99 percent. The analysis was performed in the Geological Survey, Jerusalem, by Michael Dvorachek.

secondary era of 60 AD. This may explain why this locality produced coins over a substantial number of years.

We may now sum up. The current arrangement of Agrippa's coins involves both numismatic and chronological abnormalities. The two problems are interconnected and stem from the assumption that, apart from the issue from Tiberias, all coins of Agrippa II were struck in the same place, Caesarea Paneas. The difficulty may be solved by accepting that only some of the coins were minted in Caesarea Paneas, where the basic era was 49 and the secondary era was 54. The remainder must have been struck in a locality which appears to have been added to Agrippa's kingdom in 60/61 AD.³²

Tel Aviv University

³² The implications of the suggested arrangement for the possible date of Agrippa's death may be summarized as follows. If the coins dated years 34 and 35 were struck in Caesarea Paneas, they would belong to 82/3 and 83/4. In this case, the coin with Domitian/Tyche dated year 29 (88/9) would be the latest numismatic evidence concerning Agrippa II. The only material evidence with a later date would then be the lead weight allegedly dated 'year 43' (S. Qedar, 'Two lead weights of Herod Antipas and Agrippa II and the early history of Tiberias', *INJ* 9, 1986/7, 30-3, pl. 5), which would belong to 91/2, in the event that its date is also counted by the era of 49. However, the correct reading of the date is 'year 23', which equals 71/2 according to the era 49, or 82/3 according to the era of 60. (I am grateful to J.C. Kaufman, Antwerp/Tel Aviv, for allowing me to examine weights from his collection.)

The possibility thus exists that Agrippa may have died as early as 88/9. As noted above, the coin which testifies to Agrippa's being still alive in 88/9 is unique (above, note 8), which is rather unusual. In all other cases, even among the rarer coins of Agrippa, more than one specimen is known. Could it be that Agrippa died while the minting of the series was still in its initial stages?