post-biblical זרד have the same meaning. The root is not found in biblical Hebrew, but the adjective זד 'crushed' and the noun זדה 'crushing' occur.[1]

Verses 9b–10 may accordingly be translated as follows:

On (every) sand-flat shall they graze,
    and on every sand-dune shall be their pasture;
They shall neither hunger nor thirst,
    neither shall scorching wind nor sun strike them,
For he who has compassion upon them shall lead them,
    and by springs of water shall he guide them.

D. WINTON THOMAS

## THE DATE OF HEROD'S DEATH

HISTORIANS and works of reference have long accepted the view that Herod of Judaea, surnamed the Great, died in the spring of 4 B.C.[3] Recently, however, this date has been called in question by W. E. Filmer.[4] Lest another such attempt ever be made to deny it, the evidence that Herod died in 5/4 B.C. will here be set out in detail. It will also be suggested that the precise date need not be March/April 4 B.C., as is normally assumed, but may instead be December 5 B.C.

Filmer rests his case for rejecting 4 B.C. upon the dates of Herod's appointment in Rome as king of Judaea and of his capture of Jerusalem: the dates are not 40 and 37 B.C., as is commonly held, but 39 and 36.[5] Since Josephus states that Herod reigned thirty-seven years from his initial appointment and thirty-four from his final capture of Jerusalem,[6] he will have died c. 2 B.C. Filmer argues from Josephus' method of reckoning reign-lengths, combined with the fact that an eclipse of the moon preceded Herod's death, that the year was in fact 1 B.C.[7]

The problem of the dating of Herod's appointment and of his taking possession of his capital city will be ignored here. Even if these two dates

[1] M. Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, etc., p. 307.
[2] Brown–Driver–Briggs, A Heb. and Eng. Lex. of the O.T., p. 194b.
[3] Thus, to cite seven works almost at random, F. de Saulcy, Histoire d'Hérode (1867), pp. 3, 345; F. K. Ginzel, Spezieller Kanon der Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse (1899), pp. 195 f.; E. Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, i (1901), pp. 415 ff.; F. Boll, P–W vi (1900), col. 2359; W. Otto, P–W Supp. ii (1913), col. 145; A. H. M. Jones, The Herods of Judaea (1938), pp. 151, 262 f.; P.I.R.[2] H 153.
[4] 'The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great', J.T.S. n.s. xvii (1966), pp. 283 ff.
[5] Op. cit., pp. 283 f., 291 ff.
[6] War, i. 665; Ant. xvii. 191.
[7] Op. cit., pp. 283 f., 285 ff.

could be determined exactly and with certainty, and even if Josephus' method of calculating reign-lengths were both fully known and completely consistent, it could not simply be assumed without argument that he never made a mistake. The evidence which will be discussed here falls (except for one item) into two categories: the evidence that Herod's successors all reckoned their reigns as beginning in 5/4 B.C.; and the synchronisms with events datable in the wider context of the history of the Roman empire which are provided by Josephus' narrative of the circumstances attending Herod's death.

Archelaus was deposed from the throne of Judaea and banished to Gaul in A.D. 6,[1] when he was in the tenth year of his reign.[2] Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee and the Peraea, lost his tetrarchy during the second year of the reign of the emperor Gaius (March 38 to March 39),[3] while coins survive which were minted in his forty-third year as ruler.[4] The end of Philip's reign of thirty-seven years is assigned by Josephus to the twentieth year of Tiberius, i.e. to 33/34.[5] Calculation backwards demonstrates that all three began their reigns in 5 or in 4 B.C. Hence it is to be inferred that Herod's death occurred in one of these years: Archelaus, Antipas, and Philip reckoned their reigns either from their father's decease or from Augustus' confirmation of his last will.

Filmer denies the legitimacy of this deduction. In the case of Philip he claims that the context shows that the date stated by the received text of the Jewish Antiquities is wrong: that Philip died in Tiberius' twenty-second year (not in his twentieth) is the reading of the Latin translation (of the mid-sixth century or thereabouts), is reported as the reading of a Greek manuscript no longer extant, and ought to be accepted as what Josephus wrote.[6] But the chronological confusions of Antiquities xviii deprive of all its force the argument that the context requires the acceptance of a reading which is comparatively ill-attested.[7] Moreover,

[1] Dio, lv. 27. 6; cf. P.I.R.[2] A 1025.
[2] Ant. xvii. 342; Life, 5. War, ii. 111, however, has the ninth year.
[3] Ant. xviii. 252; cf. 238, 256; xix. 351.
[4] Br. Mus. Cat., Palestine, pp. xcvii, 230, nos. 10; A. Reifenberg, Ancient Jewish Coins[2] (1947), pp. 19, 45.
[5] Ant. xviii. 106. For a coin of Philip's thirty-seventh year see Br. Mus. Cat., Palestine, p. 228, no. 5.
[6] Op. cit., pp. 297 f.; cf. Niese, ad loc.
[7] Ant. xviii has the following items in ostensible temporal order:
  (a) the arrival of Pilate in Judaea (35)—late in 26 (89);
  (b) the death of Germanicus (53 f.)—in 19 (P.I.R.[2] J 221);
  (c) the scandal at Rome involving the priests of Isis and the expulsion of the Jews from the city (65 ff.)—in 19 (Tacitus, Annals, ii. 85);
  (d) Vitellius' sending of Pilate to Rome—during the winter of 36/37 (89);
  (e) Vitellius' dealings with Parthia (96 ff.)—35 onwards (Tacitus, Annals, vi. 31 ff.; Dio, lviii. 26);

as tetrarch Philip refounded the cities of Julias and Caesarea Philippi (Paneas).[1] Josephus states that the former was named after Augustus' daughter: if that is not an error, then it surely received its name before her disgrace in 2 B.C.[2] The refoundation of Paneas was probably in 3 B.C.: in later centuries the city used for dating an era the first year of which seems to have been 3/2 B.C.[3]

Archelaus and Antipas, so Filmer maintains, were for some time co-rulers with Herod; so that, although he did not die until 1 B.C., they were able none the less to count their reigns as beginning in 5/4.[4] But the notion that the heir was co-ruler is found only as a rhetorical hyperbole, in speeches put into the mouths of Herod and Antipater in the *Jewish War*.[5] The same facts are described in the *Antiquities* in a speech by Nicolas of Damascus, who is made to say that Antipater was 'κοινωνὸς τῆς βασιλείας ὢν τοῖς ἔργοις καὶ διάδοχος προφανθείς'.[6] If Antipater managed affairs of state, it was because Herod allowed it: his legal status was not thereby altered.[7] Furthermore, neither Archelaus nor Antipas was named as Herod's heir until shortly before his death. After he had uncovered Antipater's intrigues, Herod made a will bequeathing his kingdom to Antipas.[8] Later still, when Antipater had been executed, he made a fresh will in order to leave his kingdom to Archelaus while nominating Antipas tetrarch of Galilee and the Peraea.[9] Since Antipater was put to death a mere five days before Herod's own decease,[10] Archelaus at least was in the position of heir to his father for no more than the last few days of Herod's life.

Josephus' narrative of the events subsequent to the death of Herod records that Varus was governor of Syria.[11] P. Quinctilius Varus had come to that post to replace C. Sentius Saturninus some time earlier.

(f) the death of Philip (106)—in 33/34: (g) the death of Tiberius (124)—March 37 (*P.I.R.*[2] C 941).

[1] *Ant.* xvii. 28.
[2] *Br. Mus. Cat.*, *Galatia*, p. 299, no. 5 is a coin of year 220 bearing the name of Diadumenianus, who was killed in early June 218 (H. von Petrikovits, *Klio*, xxxi (1938), pp. 103 ff.). The era of Caesarea began, therefore, in 3 B.C., if its new year fell in the second half of the Julian year, as was normal in the east (see E. J. Bickermann, *La cronologia nel mondo antico* (1963), pp. 69 f., 75 f.). But an inscription of the mid-fifth century seems to point rather to 2 B.C. (*Pastirkingsjörbuch*, xxix (1933)), pp. 102 f.). The fact that Eusebius in his *Chronicle* dated the foundations to A.D. 25 (*G.C.S.* xx, p. 212; xlvii, pp. 172 f.) is of no weight whatsoever.
[3] *War*, i. 625, 631. For the facts *War*, i. 623 f.
[4] *War*, i. 646; *Ant.* xvii. 146.
[5] Note *Ant.* xvii. 3: οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ συνέφερε γε τῷ παρὸν αὖθις ἄλλο ἢ ὡς βασιλεὺς ... A clear proof that Antipater was not counted as co-ruler.
[6] *War*, i. 664; *Ant.* xvii. 188 ff.
[7] Op. cit., p. 297.
[8] *P.I.R.*[2] J 634.
[9] *War*, i. 665; *Ant.* xvii. 191.
[10] *War*, ii. 16 ff.; *Ant.* xvii. 221 ff.

perhaps in 7 B.C.[1] Coins were minted at Antioch bearing his name from the twenty-fifth to the twenty-seventh year of the Actian era (i.e. the years 7/6 to 5/4 B.C.).[2] Though it cannot be proved that Varus was not legate of Syria for several years after 4 B.C., a tenure of that important position lasting much over three years ought not to be introduced into this period without some corroborative evidence—even for a man who had married (or was soon to marry) a granddaughter of the emperor's sister.[4] Archelaus and Antipas went to Rome to press their rival claims to the throne of Judaea before Augustus.[5] When he was about to hear then, the emperor summoned several Roman notables, among whom was Gaius Caesar, his grandson by blood and son by adoption, to serve as a *consilium*. According to the *Jewish War*, Augustus

συνέδριον μὲν ἀθροίζει τῶν ἐν τέλει 'Ρωμαίων, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὸν ἐξ 'Αγρίππας καὶ 'Ιουλίας τῆς θυγατρὸς θετὸν παῖδα Γάιον πρῶτος καθίσας (ii. 25).

The *Antiquities* uses slightly different words:

συνέδριον ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ γνωρίμων τοὺς φίλους, σὺν οἷς καὶ Γάιον τὸν Ἀγρίππου μὲν καὶ Ἰουλίας τῆς αὐτοῦ θυγατρὸς υἱόν, ποιητὸν δὲ αὐτῷ γεγονότα πρῶτόν τε καθεδούμενον, παρέλαβεν (xvii. 229).

Is 'πρῶτος/πρῶτον' to be taken in a purely temporal sense? The experts in Josephan scholarship disagree,[6] and a recent writer on the imperial *consilium* has no hesitation in concluding that Josephus meant that Gaius took a place of honour among Augustus' counsellors.[7] But this interpretation renders Josephus' observation pointless and trivial:

[1] *Ant.* xvii. 89. There is no reason why Varus should not have come to Syria in 7 B.C. The standard date of 6 (P.-W ii. A, cols. 1519 f.) rests on the erroneous belief that he was proconsul of Africa in 7/6. (For a refutation see B. E. Thomasson, *Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diocletianus* (1960), i, p. 20 ff.; ii, pp. 13 f.)
[2] *P.I.R.*[2] Q 27.
[3] W. Liebenam, *Forschungen zur Verwaltungsgeschichte des römischen Kaiserreiches*, i (1888), pp. 363 ff.; Schürer, op. cit., pp. 316 ff., list the known legates of Syria (asserting that P. Sulpicius Quirinius was legate twice; against which see the conclusive arguments of various scholars collected by H. Braunert, *Historia*, vi (1957), pp. 208 ff.). L. Calpurnius Piso (*P.I.R.*[2] C 289) may well have replaced Varus in 4/3: see, most recently, B. M. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (1967), pp. 208 ff., on *I.L.S.* 918.
[4] *War*, ii. 14 ff.; *Ant.* xvii. 219 ff.
[5] *P.I.R.*[2] C 1116; the marriage might well be later than 4 B.C.
[6] H. St. J. Thackeray (The Loeb Classical Library, *Josephus*, ii (1927), p. 353) translates the first passage quoted '(Augustus) summoned a council of leading Romans, at which for the first time he gave a seat to Caius ...': R. Marcus (The Loeb Classical Library, *Josephus*, viii (1963), p. 479) translates part of the second as 'among them he gave first place at his side to Gaius'.
[7] J. A. Crook, *Consilium Principis* (1955), pp. 32, 110.

to a Jew, and probably to a Roman even of the Augustan age, it would in no way be surprising that the emperor's son should have precedence over his elders. (It ought also to be remarked that there is no other evidence for a place of honour or an order of precedence on the imperial *consilium*.) The statement, however, possesses great point if the occasion was the first on which Gaius sat on his father's *consilium*. In that case, the date is 5 B.C. or very soon afterwards: it was in 5 B.C. that the Senate voted that the young prince should participate in public business.[1]

Whatever the interpretation given to 'πρώτως ἱππέων', the two passages of Josephus provide a conclusive refutation of any theory which puts Herod's death later than 4 B.C. Gaius was in Rome in the summer of 2 B.C., and then went to the Danube frontier.[2] From there he was despatched to the east;[3] and Tiberius met him on Chios or Samos, with abject obeisance.[4] After going to Egypt and conducting an expedition into Arabia,[5] he passed through Palestine in time to enter upon his consulate on 1 January A.D. 1 in Antioch.[6] Although temporal indications are completely lacking for Gaius' movements between his being in Rome in 2 B.C. and his presence in Syria in A.D. 1, the time needed for the operations on the Danube and in Arabia requires him to have left Rome in early spring 1 B.C. at the very latest. That he did not return to Rome from the northern frontier before going to Egypt seems to be indicated by the fact that he travelled there by way of the Ionian islands: the voyager from Rome was carried very swiftly by the prevailing winds direct from the straits of Messina to Alexandria.[7] Since Archelaus and Antipas left Judaea for Italy almost immediately after a Passover,[8] they will have arrived in Rome at the end of May or even later.[9] Herod died shortly after an eclipse of the moon,[10] and there was no lunar eclipse visible in Jerusalem between that of 13 March 4 B.C. and that of

---

[1] *Res Gestae*, 14; Dio, lv. 9. 2 ff.

[2] Dio, lv. 10. 6 f., 10. 17. Cf. in general *P.I.R.*² J 216.

[3] Dio, lv. 10. 18. ff; Orosius, vii. 3. 4; Pliny, *Natural History*, vi. 141.

[4] Dio, lv. 10. 19 (Chios); Suetonius, *Tiberius*, 12. 2 (Samos); cf. Velleius Paterculus, ii. 101. 1.

[5] Pliny, *Natural History*, ii. 168; vi. 141, 160; xii. 55 f.; xxxii. 10. Velleius, ii. 101. 1 predictably dismisses Gaius' activities in Egypt as tourism.

[6] Suetonius, *Augustus*, 93; Dio, lv. 10a. 4; *I.L.S.* 140. It is not recorded that Gaius had reached Syria before 1 January A.D. 1: but could the prince have considered entering on his consulate elsewhere than in Antioch?

[7] L. Casson, 'The Isis and her voyage', *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* lxxxi (1950), pp. 43 ff.

[8] *War*, ii. 10 ff.; *Ant.* xvii. 213 ff.

[9] L. Casson, 'Speed under sail of ancient ships', *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* lxxxii (1951), pp. 136 ff.; A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284-602* (1964), ii, pp. 843 ff., list ancient voyages whose duration is known.

[10] *Ant.* xvii. 167.

---

10 January 1 B.C.[1] The possibility that he died after the second of these two eclipses is excluded by the presence of Gaius Caesar in Rome some weeks after the Passover which followed his death.

Finally, Herod was just under seventy-five years old when he died.[2] As he appears to have been aged twenty-five years in 47 B.C.,[3] his death ought to fall before 2 B.C.; and there is no difficulty at all if it fell in 5/4.

This then is the evidence which proves beyond any doubt that Herod died in 5 or in 4 B.C. It does not, however, suffice to establish the traditional view that he died between the lunar eclipse in the very early hours of 13 March 4 B.C. and the Passover in the following month. An eclipse also occurred during the night of 15/16 September 5 B.C., of greater amplitude than that of 13 March 4 B.C.[4] The *Megillat Taanit* records 7 Kislev (in December) as a festival but does not specify a reason. A later commentator supplies one: on that day Herod died.[5] He may simply be guessing—but is it not possible that he had some evidence? On the standard view, there is little time, perhaps too little, for all the events which Josephus inserts between the eclipse on 13 March and the Passover in the next month.[6] The argument for such a rapid sequence of events rests heavily on interpreting what Josephus may have intended to be a vague phrase as a precise indication of time.[7]

That Herod died in late March or early April 4 B.C. cannot be disproved. Yet December 5 B.C. is an alternative, equally valid and clearly preferable. For the only precise evidence which exists for the day of Herod's death gives 7 Kislev.

TIMOTHY D. BARNES

## THE USE OF ΑΓΑΠΗ IN P.OXY. 1380: A REPLY

MRS. WEST's valiant attempt (*J.T.S.*, N.S., xviii, p. 102) to emend *P.Oxy.* 1380, l. 109, is doomed to miscarry. The papyrus may be in *some sense* accurate.

---

[1] P. V. Neugebauer–R. Hiller, 'Spezieller Kanon der Mondfinsternisse für Vorderasien und Ägypten von 3450 bis 1 v. Chr.', *Astronomische Abhandlungen*, ix/2 (1934), p. 46.

[2] *War*, i. 647; *Ant.* xvii. 148; περὶ ἔτος ἑβδομηκοστὸν.

[3] *Ant.* xiv. 158 reads: 'Ἡρώδη τῷ Ἀντιπάτρου τῶν πατέρων ἄγαν.' Either the text is corrupt and '25' to be read instead of '15', or Josephus has made a bad mistake and the argument based on the passage must lapse.

[4] Neugebauer–Hiller, loc. cit.

[5] See H. Lichtenstein, 'Die Fastenrolle, eine Untersuchung zur jüdisch-hellenistischen Geschichte', *Hebrew Union College Annual*, viii–ix (1931–2), pp. 257 ff. at pp. 293 ff.

[6] *Ant.* xvii. 167–213; cf. *War*, i. 656–ii. 10; xii. 84)

[7] *Ant.* xvii. 213: ἀνεδέχετο δὲ καὶ νόσῳ τῶν κοινῶν δεσποτεία; cf. *War*, ii. 10; xii. 84)

# ARTICLES

## THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE REIGN OF HEROD THE GREAT

FOR many years the dates of the birth and crucifixion of Christ have been matters of controversy. The birth of Christ must have been before the death of Herod the Great, for Herod, on hearing that a child had been born who was to become king of the Jews, ordered the massacre of all male children under two years of age in Bethlehem. Now according to Josephus, Herod died shortly after an eclipse of the moon and not long before a Passover. Since there was an eclipse of the moon on the night of 12/13 March, 4 B.C., which was exactly a month before the Passover, it has been widely assumed that Christ died in the spring of that year, and consequently that Christ was born ƒ least as early as 5 B.C.

Within the possible limits for the date of the crucifixion, the 14th Nisan fell on a Friday only in the years A.D. 30 and 33,² and of these two dates recent opinion has tended to favour the latter. But Luke iii. 23 says that Jesus was 'about thirty years of age' when he began his ministry; and this could not have been earlier than A.D. 29 if we take A.D. 33 for the crucifixion. Since Jesus may have been anything up to two years of age when Herod died, we find ourselves obliged either to accept Luke's statement with an unduly large degree of latitude, or to question the evidence for the date of Herod's death as early as 4 B.C.

### *The Eclipse of the Moon*

Professor J. Finegan in his *Handbook of Biblical Chronology*, p. 231 (§ 365), quotes Emil Schürer as saying, 'Only on the night of Mar. 12/13, 4 B.C. was there a lunar eclipse, and there was no such phenomenon in 3 or 2 B.C. Accordingly the death of Herod took place between Mar. 12 and Apr. 11 in the year 4 B.C.' Reference to the English translation of Schürer's work confirms that he did make such a statement, but in the German second and later editions he added, 'Only in 5 B.C. on 15 Sept. and in 1 B.C. on 9 January did other lunar eclipses occur which were visible in Jerusalem. But these cannot be considered on account of the other dates.' Regarding the eclipse in 1 B.C. he refers the reader to

¹ *Ant.* xvii. vi. 4 (167) and ix. 3 (213).
² J. Finegan, *Handbook of Biblical Chronology*, § 459, table 140.
³ E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* 4 (1901), vol. i, p. 416, n. 167.

F. Riess, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi* (1880). Reference to this work, however, reveals that Riess believed that Herod did not die in 4 B.C., but soon after the eclipse in 1 B.C., because the other date, namely the numerous events that took place between the eclipse and the Passover, could not be squeezed into the four weeks available in 4 B.C. In other words, Riess not only fails to support Schürer's thesis, but flatly contradicts it.

If Riess's arguments were completely valid, we should be obliged to reject 4 B.C. altogether; but he overstates his case[1] and although it is conceivable that all these events could have taken place in a month, it is nevertheless much more likely that two or three months elapsed in between the eclipse and the Passover. Three months are available in 1 B.C. and, moreover, the eclipse was total, as against only four digits on the earlier occasion.[2]

However, the value of the lunar eclipse as a useful piece of evidence is further reduced when it is realized that yet another eclipse took place on the evening of 29 December, 1 B.C.,[3] which fell three months before a Passover, that of A.D. 1. This may have been overlooked, because its mid-point occurred shortly before the moon rose at Jerusalem; but since its magnitude was seven digits, it would still have been visible during the early evening when people would have been likely to notice it.

Thus, so far as the evidence of lunar eclipses goes, Herod may have died in either of the years 4 or 1 B.C., or even in A.D. 1.

## The Megillat Ta'anit

Before going on to consider the historical background in more detail, it will be convenient at this stage to mention the evidence provided by the *Megillat Ta'anit*, a Jewish list of days on which, by reason of notable events associated with them, the Jews were not allowed to fast. The list was compiled shortly before the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70, and the reason for the holiday is given in every case but two. S. Zeitlin explains that 'undoubtedly the chronicler's silence in these instances is due to their being recently instituted holidays *pro tempore*. The incidents being well known to all, it was not necessary to add any explanations.'[4] According to Jewish tradition these holidays, which fell on 7 Kislev and a Shebat, commemorated the death of Herod and the death of Jannai, both kings who had died within recent memory and whom the Jews hated. Now 7 Kislev, which the Jewish commentator actually preferred to associate with Herod, fell earlier in the year than any of the above three

[1] See Schürer, *Das Todesjahr des Königs Herodes* (1880).
[2] F. K. Ginzel, *Kanon der Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse* (1899), p. 146, nos. 960 and 962.
[3] Ginzel, no. 963.
[4] S. Zeitlin, *Megillat Ta'anit*, p. 100.

lunar eclipses, and for this reason it must be ruled out. But 2 Shebat, although it fell before the eclipse in 4 B.C., occurred fifteen days after each of the eclipses in 1 B.C. In view of the serious deterioration in Herod's health which Josephus says set in immediately after the eclipse,[5] it does not seem likely that he could have lived much longer than the fortnight that this allows. If, then, there is any truth in the Jewish tradition, it would rule out 4 B.C., but support either of the two later years, 1 B.C. or A.D. 1, as the date of Herod's death.

## Herod's Accession

The principal historical evidence for the date of Herod's death is provided by Josephus in two statements in which he says that he reigned thirty-four years from the death of his predecessor Antigonus, but thirty-seven years from the time when he was declared king by the Romans.[6] It is therefore important to establish precisely these two dates for his accession. Regarding his appointment in Rome Josephus says: 'Thus did this man receive the kingdom, having obtained it on the hundred and eighty-fourth Olympiad, when Gaius Domitius Calvinus was consul the second time, and Caius Asinius Pollio the first time.'[7] This makes it 40 B.C., but in this he is contradicted by Appian, who mentions Herod's appointment in a context that can be dated from Dio's Roman History to 39 B.C.[8]

Following his appointment, Herod had to fight three years for his kingdom against Antigonus who was ruling in Jerusalem. Finally, with the help of the Roman general Sosius, he took the city, says Josephus, 'when Marcus Agrippa and Caninius Gallus were consuls at Rome, on the hundred and eighty-fifth Olympiad, on the third month, on the solemnity of the fast, as if a periodical revolution of calamities had returned since that which befell the Jews under Pompey; for the Jews were taken by him on the same day, and this was after twenty-seven years' time'.[9]

The consular dating gives 37 B.C., but this does not agree with what follows: Pompey captured Jerusalem in 63 B.C., and twenty-seven years later would bring us to 36, not to 37 B.C. The twenty-seven years might well be rejected if it stood alone, but Josephus states that on both occasions Jerusalem was taken not only on the same fast day, that is the same calendar date, but also on the same day; that appears to mean the same day of the week. Now 27 years is almost exactly 334 lunar months, and 334 lunations require 9,863 days, 5½ hours. Since 9,863 days is

[5] *Ant.* xvii. vi. 5 (168).
[6] *Ant.* xvii. viii. 1 (191); *War* i. xxxiii. 8 (665).
[7] *Ant.* xiv. xiv. 5 (389).
[8] Appian, *Civil Wars*, v. 75 (chap. viii).
[9] *Ant.* xiv. xvi. 4 (487).

a multiple of seven, every date in the Jewish calendar in 36 B.C. would fall on the same day of the week as it did in 63 B.C. This coincidence would not apply to 37 B.C., however, so the twenty-seven years interval that Josephus gives looks like being genuine.

Historians have usually accepted the consular dates and rejected the twenty-seven years as an error for two main reasons: firstly, because only by so doing can Herod's reign be brought to an end as early as 4 B.C., as required by the eclipse, and secondly, because support is supposed to be found for the earlier date in Dio's Roman History. Actually a superficial reading of Dio's account of the capture of Jerusalem by Sosius appears to date this event in the consulship of Claudius and Norbanus, 38 B.C., not 37, but a more careful examination reveals that Dio is giving a year-by-year account of the activities of Antony. He says that after making peace with Antiochus at Samosata on the Euphrates, Antony returned to Italy leaving Sosius in charge of Syria. He then inserts, as a parenthesis, a thumb-nail sketch of the career of Sosius which ends with his capture of Jerusalem and the downfall of Antigonus.[1] This is followed, most misleadingly, by the words 'This was the course of events in the consulship of Claudius and Norbanus' (i.e. 38 B.C.).[2] But actually this date refers back to the departure of Antony for Italy and the appointment of Sosius as general in charge of Syria.

This becomes evident from what follows, for Dio goes on to say that Sosius did nothing in 37 B.C. 'During the following year (i.e. 37 B.C.)', he says, 'the Romans accomplished nothing worthy of note in Syria. For Antony spent the entire year in reaching Italy and returning again to the province; and Sosius ... spent the time in devising means, not for achieving some success and incurring his enmity, but for pleasing him without engaging in any activity.'[3] According to Dio, then, Sosius did nothing in 37 B.C., and since the consular date for 38 B.C. does not apply to Sosius, there is no support at all here for the date given by Josephus, but rather a rebuttal of it. It follows, then, that Sosius captured Jerusalem in 36.

Now the sources from which Josephus drew his historical material were mainly Jewish, and so would not include dates in terms of Roman consuls or Greek Olympiads. These two dates, namely for the appointment of Herod as king and for the overthrow of Antigonus in Jerusalem, are not given in his earlier work, The Jewish War, although the same events are reported.[4] It is clear that Josephus added them in the Antiquities, and probably obtained them by conversion from Jewish or

[1] Dio, xlix. 22.
[2] Dio, xlix. 23. 1.
[3] Dio, xlix. 23. 1-2.
[4] War i. xiv. 4 (282-3); i. xviii (347-63).

---

Seleucid dates. But owing to the Roman and Greek years starting in January and July, while the Jewish and Seleucid years began in Nisan or Tishri, he might easily have made an error of one year. Even Schürer, who accepts the consular dates, is obliged to confess that the 184th Olympiad is impossible for the appointment of Herod as king by the Romans.[1] Apart from this, several other consular dates given by Josephus are impossible to reconcile with one another.

In fact, the dates 40 and 37 B.C. for the accession of Herod are at variance with the chronology of this period as given by Josephus himself. In a list of high priests and the periods for which they held office, he gives Hyrcanus twenty-four years and Antigonus three years and three months.[2] Now Hyrcanus was appointed by Pompey in 63 B.C.,[3] whence we deduce that Antigonus began his reign in 39 and was removed by Sosius in 36. These two terms of office together total twenty-seven years, and so confirm the twenty-seven years' interval between the two captures of Jerusalem by Pompey and Sosius which historians reject. Neither can it be argued that the twenty-four years of Hyrcanus were inclusive of an accession year, for, as we shall see, Josephus did not use that system of reckoning, and furthermore, Antigonus' term of office is given as three years and three months, which is clearly factual.

Another entirely independent calculation leads to the same result. It is agreed that Julius Caesar was murdered in 44 B.C., and that his assassins were defeated by Octavian Caesar and Antony at the battle of Philippi towards the end of 42 B.C.[4] Now Josephus mentions this battle and records that Antony then marched into Asia where he met and fell in love with Cleopatra.[5] This must have been in 41 B.C., and he goes on to relate how Antony at this time appointed Herod and his brother Phasaelus tetrarchs. It was two years after this, he says,[6] after the Parthians had meanwhile conquered Syria, that they deposed Hyrcanus as high priest, and made Antigonus both king and high priest. Two years after 41 B.C. is 39 B.C., and it was only then that Herod went to Rome where he interviewed Antony, and got himself appointed king in place of Antigonus. Once again Josephus does not support his own consular dates.

### Correlation with Roman History

A date in 39 B.C. for Herod's appointment as king by the Romans fits into Roman history better than 40 B.C., as the following table of Antony's movements after the battle of Philippi (42 B.C.) shows:

[1] E. Schürer, History of the Jewish People, vol. i. p. 393, n. 3.
[2] Ant. xx. x.
[3] Ant. xiv. iv. 4 (73).
[4] C.A.H., x. p. 34.
[5] Ant. xiv. xiii. 3 (330).
[6] Ant. xiv. xiii. 1 (324).

41 B.C. Antony went to Asia, met Cleopatra in Cilicia and returned with her to Egypt, leaving Sara in charge of Syria (Dio xlviii. 24).

40 B.C. Parthian invasion of Syria under Labienus and Pacorus; defeat of the Roman general Saxa; Parthian conquest of Syria except Tyre (Dio xlviii. 25-26). Antony, hearing of Parthian conquests, returned from Egypt to Tyre, but went on to Greece and finally to Italy, where he became involved in hostilities with Caesar's forces at Brundisium (Dio xlviii. 27). Following the death of Antony's wife Fulvia, a peace pact was made in October and Antony married Octavia (Dio xlviii. 28). If Herod was made king in this year, it could only have been after October, and even then the friendly relations between Caesar and Antony, described by Josephus,[1] are at variance with their mutual distrust indicated by Dio.

39 B.C. In Asia the Parthian conquest extended to Palestine; Hyrcanus was deposed and Antigonus made ruler (included in Dio xlviii. 26 under the account of the previous year, but he states, xlviii. 34, that the foregoing covered two years). In Italy, following trouble between Caesar and Sextus over Sicily, a peace treaty was signed between Caesar, Antony, and Sextus (Dio xlviii. 36-38). At this time Herod might well have visited Antony in Rome and been made king. In fact Appian actually names Herod among several petty kings who were appointed by Antony in this year.[2] Finally Antony left Italy for Greece where he stayed the winter, sending Ventidius to Asia to deal with the Parthians (Dio xlviii. 39).

38 B.C. Ventidius, having defeated Labienus (Dio xlviii. 40), was again victorious over the Parthians under Pacorus (Dio xlix. 19-20). Later Antony arrived from Greece and sent Ventidius home. He attacked Antiochus at Samosata on the Euphrates, but finally made peace (Dio xlix. 22). Finally Antony returned to Italy, leaving Sosius in charge of Syria (Dio xlix. 22).

37 B.C. Antony spent most of the year in going to Italy, while Sosius was doing nothing in Syria (Dio xlix. 23). Exchange of forces in Italy between Antony and Caesar (Dio xlix. 50), after which Antony returned to Asia (Plutarch, Antony, 35). There he married Cleopatra and prepared for his conquest of Parthia (Plutarch, Antony, 36-37).

36 B.C. Antony's disastrous campaign in Parthia (Dio xlix. 24-31).

Meanwhile Herod's activities during the years 39 to 36 B.C. as related by Josephus would have been as follows:

1 Ant. xiv. xiv. 4-5 (383-8).
2 Appian, Civil War, v. 75 (chap. viii).

39 B.C. Parthians under Pacorus and Barzapharnes invaded Judea[1] and some weeks after Pentecost captured Hyrcanus and Phasaelus; meanwhile Herod escaped to Masada where he left his relatives in safety.[2] About a month after Pentecost Antigonus was made king and high priest by the Parthians. Herod sought help first in Arabia and then in Egypt, before going to Rome via Pamphylia and Rhodes; there he interviewed Antony and was declared king by the Senate.[3] Meanwhile Antigonus besieged Masada and bought off Ventidius, the Roman general who had been sent to drive out the Parthians.[4] Towards the end of the year Herod arrived back from Italy, mustered an army in Galilee and marched south to rescue his relatives at Masada, after which he went into winter quarters.[5] About the same time Antony was staying at Athens,[6] says Josephus,[7] agreeing with Dio xlviii. 39 above.

38 B.C. In the new year Herod conducted a campaign against cave robbers, while Pacorus and the Parthians were defeated by Ventidius.[8] Herod, unable to make progress against Antigonus, went and joined Antony at the siege of Samosata.[9] At the end of the year Antony left for Egypt and gave orders to Sosius to assist Herod.[10]

37 B.C. When Herod came back from Samosata he first mustered an army in Lebanon and marched south to Jericho to revenge his brother Joseph who had been killed there. After that he conducted campaigns against Antigonus in various parts of Judea and Samaria,[11] ultimately confining Antigonus to Jerusalem before the winter came on.[12]

36 B.C. After a siege lasting five months Jerusalem was taken with the help of the Romans under Sosius, probably on the Day of Atonement, 10 Tishri, Antigonus having reigned three years and three months,[13] Antigonus was taken captive and sent to Antony as soon as he arrived back from Parthia at the end of the year.

### Confirmation by Sabbatic Years

Josephus records that the year in which Jerusalem was besieged was sabbatic,[1] and that the resulting food shortage continued even after Herod had become sole ruler. Sabbatic years ran from Tishri to Tishri, so it follows that if Jerusalem was taken in Tishri 36 B.C., the sabbatic year in question ran from Tishri 37 to Tishri 36, and the consequent

1 Ant. xiv. xiii. 3 (330-6); War i. xiii. 1 (248-9).
2 Ant. xiv. xiii. 4-9 (337-69).
3 Ant. xiv. xiv. 1-5 (370-89).
4 Ant. xiv. xiv. 6 (390-1).
5 Ant. xiv. xv. 5 (420).
6 Ant. xiv. xv. 1-4 (394-412).
7 Ant. xiv. xv. 8 (439-46).
8 Ant. xiv. xv. 5-7 (420-34).
9 Ant. xiv. xv. 9 (447).
10 Ant. xiv. xv. 10-11 (448-61).
11 Ant. xiv. xv. 12 and 14 (461 and 463).
12 Ant. xiv. xvi. 2 (473).
13 Ant. xiv. xvi. 1 (465-8).

food shortage would have continued until the harvest of 35. Alternatively, if Jerusalem was taken in 37 B.C., the sabbatic year was one year earlier. Since sabbatic years occurred at intervals of seven years, a consideration of the dates of other recorded sabbatic years should decide the issue between the two dates.

An earlier sabbatic year, ending in 150 of the Seleucid era (162 B.C.) is mentioned in 1 Maccabees in connexion with the Maccabean revolt. Owing to the Second Book of Maccabees giving the date of this as 149 B.C. it was at one time thought that the Seleucid era was calculated from Nisan 312 in the First Book of Maccabees, but from Nisan 311 in the Second. But W. Kolbe's opinion that both books use the same era starting from Nisan 311 seems to have been generally accepted. J. C. Dancy,[4] however, believes that 1 Macc. vi. 20, giving 150 B.C., must be an error. But since one of his main reasons for rejecting this date is that it would be incompatible with a sabbatic year in 37 when Herod captured Jerusalem, this argument is circular and therefore invalid. A sabbatic year ending in Tishri 162 (150 B.C.) would, however, be compatible with a sabbatic year ending in 36 B.C., the interval being 126 (7×18) years, which Josephus himself gives for the duration of the Hasmonean dynasty.[5]

Another argument against Dancy's view is that he confesses[6] that he is quite unable to reconcile his sabbatic year in 149 B.C. with that mentioned in connexion with the death of the high priest Simon, and the succession of his son Hyrcanus. 1 Macc. xvi. 14 ff. tells us that Simon went down to Jericho in the eleventh month Shebat, in the 177th year of the Seleucid era, and that shortly afterwards he was murdered and two of his sons were imprisoned in the fortress of Dok or Dagon. Josephus adds that when Hyrcanus was besieging the fortress in an attempt to rescue his brethren, the 'year on which the Jews used to rest came on',[7] and so he was obliged to give up the siege. This statement is peculiar, because there is no reason to think that the Jews ceased from war as soon as a sabbatic year began. What Josephus probably meant was that the *effects* of the sabbatic year came on, namely food shortage. This would have made itself felt first in the barren mountainous regions near Jericho where the fortress was situated, thus compelling Hyrcanus to withdraw to Jerusalem where he would find stores of food. The siege of Dagon evidently began in the spring of the year beginning Nisan 178 B.C. (134 B.C.) and the food shortage became acute in the summer

---

[1] 1 Macc. vi. 49 and 53.
[2] *Hermes* (Berlin), vol. lxii (1927), pp. 225 ff.
[3] *Commentary on I Maccabees*, p. 51.
[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 51.
[5] *Ant.* xiv. xvi. 4 (490).
[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 113.
[a] 2 Macc. xiii. 1.
[7] *Ant.* xiii. viii. 1 (234).

of that year. The sabbatic year in question ran, therefore, from Tishri 135 to Tishri 134 B.C., exactly twenty-eight years after that in the time of the Maccabean revolt, provided that this was in 150 S.E. (162 B.C.) and not 149.

Against this it has been argued that according to Jewish tradition a sabbatic year ended in A.D. 69, the year before the destruction of Jerusalem. It is true that the Talmudic Tractate Ta'anith (29a, p. 154) seems to imply that both the first and second temples were destroyed in a year following a sabbatic year; but it is only fair to point out that another Tractate, 'Arakin (11b, p. 65), states equally clearly that on both occasions the temple was destroyed at the end of a sabbatic year. Consequently *The Jewish Encyclopaedia* says that 'the exact year of the Shemittah is in dispute and different dates are given.'[1] Both statements in the Talmud will be found on examination to be founded on superstition, the only solid fact being that on both occasions the temple was destroyed on the same date, 9th Ab: both writers evidently seek to extend this coincidence to the same year in the sabbatic cycle. The argument that later sabbatic years during the Christian era seem to support A.D. 69 as sabbatic is worthless, because the Jews began to count a new era from the destruction of Jerusalem, reckoning A.D. 70 as year 1, thus making 69 appear to be the 7th year of the previous cycle.

The balance of evidence, therefore, seems to favour sabbatic years in 150 and 178 S.E. (162 and 134 B.C.), and these confirm that a sabbatic year would have fallen in 36 B.C., not 37.

## Herod's Reign

Josephus says that Herod reigned thirty-seven years from his appointment by the Roman Senate, or thirty-four years from the overthrow of Antigonus. To calculate the date of his death from these figures, it is necessary to know what system of reckoning Josephus used. Under the system most commonly used in western Asia, called the 'accession-year' system, the regnal years began to count from new year's day next after the king's accession, the foregoing fraction being termed his accession year. According to this system the last regnal year was numerically the same as the length of the reign. Under the 'non-accession-year' system, the accession year counted as the king's first year, so that all subsequent years counted one year higher, and the length of the reign, again taken as numerically the same as the last year, appeared to be one year longer.[2] The accession-year rule is clearly the more practical,

---

[1] *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, x, pp. 607 f.
[2] E. R. Thiele, *Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*, pp. 14 f.

since the interval between two events separated by several reigns could be readily calculated by simply adding together the reigns of the intervening kings. Under the non-accession-year rule, straightforward addition would give an excess of one year for every reign involved.

This fact provides a simple means of checking which system Josephus used. It is agreed both by Josephus¹ and 1 Maccabees² that Simon became high priest in 170 S.E. (142 B.C.), and a second well-established date is 63 B.C., when Pompey captured Jerusalem and reinstated Hyrcanus as high priest.³ The interval is seventy-nine years. During this period there were six priestly rulers whose reigns are given by Josephus as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Simon | 8 years | Ant. xiii. vii. 4 (228) |
| Hyrcanus I | 31 years | Ant. xiii. x. 7 (299); War I. ii. 8 (68) |
| Aristobulus | 1 year | Ant. xiii. xi. 3 (318); War I. iii. 6 (84) |
| A. Jannaeus | 27 years | Ant. xiii. xv. 5 (404); War I. iv. 8 (106) |
| Alexandra | 9 years | Ant. xiii. xvi. 6 (430); War I. v. 4 (119) |
| Aristobulus | 3½ years | Ant. xiv. vi. 1 (97) |
| Total | 79½ years | |

If each of these reigns had been reckoned by the non-accession-year system, the total would have exceeded the actual period by six years, and the fact that it does not do so proves that Josephus used the accession-year system. Following the above period Josephus adds that Hyrcanus II reigned twenty-four years and Antigonus three years and three months,⁴ together 27½ years, the exact interval between the summer of 63 and the autumn of 36 B.C., when Herod captured Jerusalem.

In general it would be necessary to know whether Herod's regnal years began on 1 Nisan or 1 Tishri, but it so happens that this is immaterial for calculating the year of Herod's death. We can be fairly certain that both Herod's capture of Jerusalem as well as his appointment in Rome fell after 1 Tishri and before Nisan. Josephus says that Jerusalem was captured 'on the solemnity of the fast', evidently meaning the Day of Atonement, 10 Tishri. When the Parthians invaded Palestine three years earlier, Herod and the Jews were still in possession of Jerusalem at Pentecost, and Antigonus was not made king until a month after that, for he reigned three years and three months ending on 10 Tishri. Thus if Herod arrived in Rome before 1 Tishri, he would have less than three months for his flight to Masada with his family, his negotiations with the king of Arabia, his visit to Cleopatra in Egypt and

1 Ant. xiii. vi. 7 (213).
2 1 Macc. xiii. 41–42.
3 C.A.H. ix. pp. 382 f.
4 Ant. xx. x (245–6).

finally his journey to Rome, which was delayed by bad weather that caused a diversion to Rhodes where he was obliged to get a new ship.

It follows, then, that Herod's first regnal year, counting from his appointment in Rome, began in 38 B.C. either on 1 Nisan or 1 Tishri, and his 37th and last year began in Nisan or Tishri 2 B.C. Alternatively, counting from his capture of Jerusalem on 10 Tishri, 36 B.C., his first regnal year began in 35 B.C. either in Nisan or Tishri, and his 34th and last year in Nisan or Tishri 2 B.C. In either case his death would have been at the end of January 1 B.C., if he died on 2 Shebat, as the Megillat Ta'anit suggests. Thus by accepting the revised dates for Herod's accession, and applying in a straightforward manner the most elementary rules of chronology current in western Asia, we find that Herod died a little over a fortnight after the total eclipse of the moon on the night of 9 January, 1 B.C.

### Herod's Age

Josephus informs us that Herod was about 70 years of age when he died.¹ This provides a further check on the date of his death, for we are told that he was 25* years of age when his father Antipater made him governor of Galilee.² This occurred shortly after Antipater had been made administrator of Judea by Caesar, as he was on his way from Egypt to Asia Minor in 47 B.C.³ From this it follows that Herod would have been 70 in 2 or 1 B.C., but not more than 72 or 68, if he died in the spring of 4 B.C.

### Schürer's Chronology

According to current opinion, Herod was declared king by the Romans towards the end of 40 B.C., and died less than 35½ years later in the spring of 4 B.C.; alternatively, he reigned as king from his capture of Jerusalem in the autumn of 37 B.C. until the spring of 4 B.C., a period of 32½ years. Since three periods are given by Josephus as 37 and 34 years respectively, it becomes necessary to explain the discrepancy of over 1½ years in each case. In order to do this E. Schürer,⁴ whose chronology is generally accepted, makes the following three assumptions:

1. That Josephus always reckons reigns or periods of time inclusively, that is by the non-accession-year rule.

1 Ant. xvii. vi. 1 (148); War I. xxxiii. 1 (647).
2 Ant. xiv. ix. 2 (158).
3 C.A.H. ix. p. 678.
4 Schürer, History of the Jewish People, vol. i. p. 465, n. 165.
* The Greek text reads fifteen years, but this must be an error, for otherwise Herod could never have reached the age of seventy.

2. That Herod's regnal years began on 1 Nisan.
3. That Herod died after 1 Nisan in 4 B.C., and that Josephus reckoned the odd day or two of the new year as a full regnal year.

The first assumption converts the fraction of a year into a whole, while the last two make a couple of days count as a year.

In support of his first assumption he quotes the interval between the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 and its capture by Herod and Sosius in 36 B.C. given by Josephus as twenty-seven years. But as he presupposes his own date, 37, for Herod's capture, he is able to argue that the period should have been twenty-six years, and therefore that Josephus has reckoned inclusively. The argument is manifestly circular and invalid. In both of the other examples he cites, he also assumes his own dates for Herod's accession. Against this there is the overwhelming evidence adduced above that Josephus reckoned reigns by the accession-year rule, and that the interval between the two captures of Jerusalem was actually twenty-seven years.

To support his view that Herod's regnal years began in Nisan and that the first few days of this month would have been counted as a full year, Schürer quotes Rosh Hashanah I, 1 in the Talmud. It is true that by either accession-year or non-accession-year reckoning the first few days of the new year would count as a full year, but unfortunately the statement that the new year for kings was 1 Nisan is supported only by a fallacious argument purporting to show that Solomon's regnal years began in Nisan. It has been clearly demonstrated by E. R. Thiele[1] that not only did Solomon's regnal years begin on 1 Tishri, but so also did those of all the kings of Judah down to Zedekiah. The cuneiform record of the Babylonian capture of Jerusalem in 597 B.C. confirms this in the case of Zedekiah. It is there stated that the city was taken and a new king (Zedekiah) appointed in the month Adar.[2] If the new year for Jewish kings had been on 1 Nisan, as it was for Babylonian kings, then Zedekiah's first year would have begun on 1 Nisan, 597, and would have been identical with Nebuchadrezzar's 8th year. But this is impossible because Zedekiah's 10th and 11th years are equated with Nebuchadrezzar's 18th and 19th (Jer. xxxii. 1 and 2 Kings xxv. 2 and 8). It follows that Zedekiah's first year did not begin until Tishri 597, so that the second halves of his 10th and 11th years would overlap the 18th and 19th years of Nebuchadrezzar.

If, then, the reigns of Solomon and the kings of Judah are to be regarded as a precedent for Herod's regnal years, we must reject

[1] E. R. Thiele, Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings, pp. 31 f.
[2] D. J. Wiseman, Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings, pp. 33 and 73.

Schürer's theory that they began in Nisan, and even if they did begin in Nisan there is no evidence that Herod died in that month. We find, then, that Schürer's chronology allows Herod a reign of only thirty-six or thirty-three years, not thirty-four as Josephus requires.

### Synchronisms with Roman History

At several points it is possible to synchronize dated events in Herod's reign with known dates in Roman history. But before this can be done, it is necessary to know whether Herod's regnal years, as given by Josephus, have been calculated from his appointment in Rome, or from his overthrow of Antigonus three years later. According to Schürer's chronology Herod's first year began when he overthrew Antigonus, supposedly in the middle of 37 B.C., and on that basis agreement can be achieved between the dates given by Josephus and dates in Roman history. There is reason to believe, however, that Josephus did not regard this as the official beginning of Herod's reign, but counted from his appointment in Rome, for throughout the chapter recording Herod's activities after his return from Rome, and before he captured Jerusalem, he repeatedly calls Herod 'the king'.[1]

This view is supported by Herod's coins. It has been pointed out by B. Kanael that coins always express conditions de jure and not de facto, so that in this case they would be dated from Herod's legal appointment in Rome, and not from his taking possession of Jerusalem.[2] But the peculiar fact is that of all the coins of Herod's reign, only those of the 3rd year are dated, and furthermore, appear to commemorate some event of great importance. This could only have been the capture of Jerusalem, for in the 3rd year after that event nothing of any consequence is known to have happened. The conclusion is that Herod, in minting these coins, wished to emphasize that he had already been king three years when he captured Jerusalem, and that his regnal years must be reckoned accordingly.

Assuming, then, that Josephus regarded Herod's appointment in Rome late in 39 B.C. as the time of his accession, and that he applied the accession-year rule with the new year on 1 Tishri, Herod's first regnal year ran from Tishri, 38 to Elul, 37 B.C. According to Schürer's non-accession-year system, on the other hand, counting Nisan years from Herod's capture of Jerusalem, Herod's first year ran from Nisan, 37 to Adar, 36 B.C. It will be seen, therefore, that the six months, Nisan to

[1] Ant. xiv. xv (390 ff.).
[2] Jewish Quarterly Review, vol. xlii (1951/2), pp. 261 ff.

Elul, 37 B.C. would be in Herod's first year by either system of reckoning. Similarly throughout Herod's reign events falling in the summer half year would be dated in the same regnal year by either system, and consequently synchronisms with Roman history would be unaffected.

The three events principally concerned are (a) an earthquake before the battle of Actium (2 September, 31 B.C.) in Herod's 7th year;[1] (b) the expedition of Aelius Gallus in 24 B.C.[2] for which Herod provided 500 men in his 13th year,[3] and (c) Herod's announcement in his 18th year of his intention to rebuild the temple;[4] this can be dated from the visit of Augustus to Syria in 20 B.C.[5] All these remain valid under the revised chronology. As regards the earthquake, Josephus says this occurred 'in the early spring'. If this means before 1 Nisan, then Schürer's chronology falls, for it would have been in Herod's 6th year by his reckoning.

Regarding the rebuilding of the temple, however, there is one statement that cannot be reconciled with Schürer's chronology. In *The Jewish War*[6] Josephus gives the date of Herod's start on this work as the 15th, not the 18th year of his reign. It was pointed out some time ago in this Journal that this contradiction could be explained if Josephus had used two sources, one dating events from Herod's appointment in Rome, the other from his capture of Jerusalem.[7] The revised chronology allows this explanation, but on the basis of Schürer's chronology the 15th year must be summarily rejected as an error.

### Herod's Successors

One of the chief reasons for supposing that Herod died in 4 B.C. is that his sons who succeeded him appear to have begun their reigns in that year. Thus Archelaus, ruler of Judea and Samaria, was banished in A.D. 6/7 after a reign of ten years; Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, who died in A.D. 39 or 40, reigned, according to coin evidence, forty-three years, while Philip, tetrarch of Iturea, died in the 20th year of Tiberius, A.D. 33/34, after a reign of thirty-seven years. This kind of indirect evidence, however, can be misleading, and has often been a cause of error in the case of the kings of Israel and Judah. On several

1 Ant. xv. v. 2 (121).
2 Ant. xv. ix. 1 and 3 (299 and 317).    5 Dio, liii. 29. 3.
3 Dio, liv. 7. 4-6.    6 War i. xxi. 1 (380).
4 J.T.S., vol. xxxvi (1935), pp. 25 f.    7 War i. xxi. 1 (401).
5 J. Finegan, Handbook of Biblical Chronology, § 431.
6 Dio, lv. 27. 6; Ant. xvii. xiii. 2 (342).
7 E. Schürer, History of the Jewish People, vol. ii, pp. 36 f., n. 45.
8 Ant. xviii. iv. 6 (106).

occasions, when a king appointed his son as co-regent, the son's reign overlapped the father's by several years. It appears that Herod did the same thing at least in the case of Antipater, for in testifying to Varus about him he said, 'to whom I have in a manner yielded up my royal authority while I am alive'.[1] Likewise Antipater in his reply said, 'I was king already . . . you proclaimed me king in your lifetime'.[2] Antipater was deposed for the murder of his uncle Pheroras, tetrarch of Galilee, and was later executed. Most of the kingdom was then given to Archelaus, but it is not clear how long this was before Herod died.

After Herod's death Archelaus declared, with false humility, that he was not properly king until his succession had been confirmed by the Roman emperor. He went to Rome where his enemies brought self-contradictory charges against him, arguing at one moment that Herod had not appointed him king until he was already demented on his death-bed, at another that 'he had long exercised royal authority'.[3] The latter may well be nearer the truth, but without any precise chronological information it is difficult to give a time-table. The following outline would account for the stated reigns of Archelaus and Antipas:

4 B.C. Pheroras, tetrarch of Galilee, was murdered by Antipater and succeeded by Antipas, whose reign of forty-three years ended in A.D. 39/40. Later Antipater's plot was discovered and Archelaus nominated as king in his place, his reign of ten years ending in A.D. 6/7.

3 B.C. Antipater, residing in Rome, was not informed for seven months that he had been charged with murder,[4] and when at last he did return to Palestine his journey was not at all hurried. It would be late in the year before he was brought to trial before Varus, governor of Syria. Even then Herod hesitated to pass sentence, contenting himself with only sending a report to Rome.[5]

2 B.C. As a result of intercepting Antipater's correspondence further conspiracies came to light and, after more procrastination, Herod sent more ambassadors to Rome[6] who returned only a few days before his death in January 1 B.C. At some time during this year Herod tried to disinherit Archelaus, but his last will shows that this was only temporary.

We still have to account for Philip who, according to Josephus, died in the 20th year of Tiberius after he had reigned as tetrarch for thirty-seven years.[7] The context shows, however, that this is almost certainly

1 War i. xxxii. 2 (625).    5 War i. xxxii. 3 (631-2).
2 War ii. ii. 5 (30); Ant. xvii. ix. 5 (238).    6 War ii. iii. 5 (26).
3 Ant. xvii. iv. 3 (80); War i. xxxi. 1 (606).    7 War ii. iii. 5 (33).
4 Ant. xvii. v. 7-8 (134-45); War i. xxiii. 6-7 (641-5).    8 Ant. xvii. v. 7 (233).
5 Ant. xviii. iv. 6 (106).

an error. It seems that a figure has been dropped, and that the text should probably read 'the 22nd year of Tiberius. The chapter in question begins by telling us that Vitellius, 'a man that had been consul', became president of Syria and visited Jerusalem at the time of the Passover. Vitellius was consul in A.D. 34, so he could not have arrived in Jerusalem until the spring of 35, before going on to Antioch. During that year we are told that he engineered a war to drive the Parthians out of Armenia. In the following year he met Arrabanus, King of Parthia, on the Euphrates and negotiated a peace.[1] It was about this time, we are told, that Philip died. Now if he reigned thirty-seven years ending in A.D. 36, his reign must have begun in 1 B.C., the year that we have already found to be that of Herod's death, following which Philip was made tetrarch by the emperor Augustus in Rome.

Now the 20th year of Tiberius ended in August 34, while Vitellius was still consul in Rome, so this date cannot be right. The 22nd year, however, would be correct, and in this connection F. Riess[2] quotes the Franciscan Molkenbuhr[3] as saying that he had seen early copies of Josephus, one a Parisian copy dated 1517 and another Venetian copy dated 1481, in which the text reads 'the 22nd year of Tiberius'. If this could be verified, it would not only clear up a difficult passage in Josephus, but make it difficult to argue from this text that Herod died in 4 B.C.

## Conclusion

Josephus provides a great deal of chronological material regarding the reign of Herod, but owing partly to errors and partly to ambiguities, it is possible to correlate all the data with two quite different chronologies. Some of the evidences that have been regarded as conclusively in favour of 4 B.C. as the date of Herod's death, such as the lunar eclipse, are seen to be entirely neutral. There are, of course, weaknesses on both sides, but it is submitted that Schürer's dates for the accession of Herod in 40 or 37 B.C. cannot be upheld, and since it is impossible to accept parts of both chronologies, the whole of his chronology must be rejected. If, as seems likely, Herod's accession was one year later, this would lead to the conclusion that he died in January, 1 B.C.

W. E. FILMER

[1] *C.A.H.* x, pp. 748 f.; *Ant.* xviii. iv. 2–5 (88–105).
[2] F. Riess, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*, p. 54.
[3] *Dissert. critica de anno quo n... Christus est natus* (Monument, 1788), p. 135.

---

## 'ECSTATIC UTTERANCE' (N.E.B.)?

IN 1 Cor. xii–xiv the New English Bible has 'ecstatic utterance' or a similar phrase using the word 'ecstatic' for what is commonly known as speaking in tongues. In so translating, the N.E.B. reflects an almost universal view that at least in 1 Corinthians (if not in Acts) speaking in tongues or glossolalia means 'the broken speech of persons in religious ecstasy' either in 'antiquated, foreign, unintelligible, mysterious utterances' or in 'marvelous, heavenly languages'.[1] The primary concern of translators should be to convey the intended meaning of the writer. In the present case—whether or not the glossolalia described in the New Testament was indeed similar to the ecstatic speech found in Hellenistic religions and possibly in Old Testament prophetism—the Apostle Paul does not look upon or describe the phenomenon as 'ecstatic utterance', but as the miraculously given ability to speak a human language foreign to the speaker. That this was Paul's view was briefly argued by J. G. Davies in the *Journal* some years ago.[2] Many older commentators who accepted the miraculous element in the Bible at face value and who wrote before the rise of the history-of-religions approach argued for this position. But the N.E.B. translation and the agreement of practically all modern commentators on the ecstatic interpretation call for a restatement of the opposite viewpoint with considerably more argumentation than Davies supplied.

At the outset there is presumptive evidence that Paul as well as Luke viewed tongues as bona fide foreign languages. First, throughout the New Testament and Greek literature generally, *tongue* frequently refers to meaningful human speech, that is, language currently used by part of the human race. Although *glōssa* could mean archaic or mysterious (e.g., oracular) expressions, to say that the word became a technical term for such expressions is an overstatement. The use of the term for understandable language far exceeds its use for obscure speech, especially in biblical Greek. According to the concordance of Hatch and Redpath, *glōssa* occurs about thirty times in scattered places throughout the Septuagint in the sense of normal language. There are similar references in the New Testament. Outside of the passages in question (Acts, 1 Cor.) biblical Greek contains only two examples of *glōssa* with

[1] Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, 1957), s.v. *glōssa* 3².
[2] *J.T.S.* N.S. iii (1952), pp. 228–31. Davies put too much weight on the argument that Luke makes Pentecost reverse Babel, so that Luke must mean tongues as foreign languages.