

# The Bible Student.

CONTINUING

## The Bible Student and Religious Outlook.

Vol. II., New Series.

JULY, 1900.

Number 1.

It is not without significance that the chapter on Holy Scripture stands

**The Vital  
Question for  
Bible Students.**

first in the Westminster Symbols. Its position indicates the fundamental relation existing between one's doctrine of Scripture and the other articles of his faith. Perhaps the most vital question at present confronting the student of the Bible is—What think you of the Scriptures themselves? Our attitude towards the Book can hardly fail decisively to affect our attitude towards its several statements. Unquestionably one who regards it as a *revelation of the mind of man* concerning himself, the world, its author, its origin, and its destiny, may still find the Bible an interesting, and even a very important book. But, obviously, he will, in the very nature of things, take up towards it an attitude wholly different from one who esteems it to be a *revelation of the mind of God* upon these several points. Even as a record of what men have believed concerning God, and what duties they have conceived themselves as owing to God, the Bible will always occupy a conspicuous place in the history of the development of the human mind, and partic-

ularly of the so-called religious instincts of man.

Viewed in this light, however, the Bible at once takes its place alongside of other similar

**An Effect to be  
Considered.**

records. Its statements are at once stripped of the element of finality—except for those who think that in religious matters the human mind reached the acme of its development some two thousand years ago. Further, its statements will have only a relative value, and command only a qualified assent and reverence. A stream cannot rise higher than its source. If the Bible be a revelation of the minds of its various authors, it will command assent and reverence only in proportion as we may esteem its several authors to have been qualified to deal with the large and intricate problems that they have assumed to handle. We may at our pleasure, add to, subtract from, modify, or even wholly set aside what they have to say. We would, of course, do this with that courtesy of phrase that is characteristic of our advanced and cultured age; but to expect us to refrain from doing it, would be to require us to lay aside that intellect-

pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount."

---

## THE HERODS.

PROFESSOR A. C. ZENOS, D. D., CHICAGO, ILL.

### I.

#### THE FOUNDING OF THE HOUSE OF HEROD.

The history of Israel furnishes some striking illustrations of the rise and fall of dynasties. Besides the house of David with its nearly four centuries of uninterrupted rule in Judea, it brings into view the houses of Omri and Jehu in Israel and the Hasmoneans in the inter-Testamental period. All of these seem to follow closely the law of the development, ascendancy and decline of dynasties, so familiar to the student of secular history. But more remarkable than any of them is the instance of the house of Herod.

#### EARLIEST BEGINNINGS.

Of the earliest known head and representative of this family there are contradictory reports. One historian, Nicholas of Damascus (*Jos. Ant.* xiv., i. 3), who lived at the court of Herod the Great and was undoubtedly anxious to place his master in the best possible light before the Jewish people, asserted that "Herod's ancestors were of the stock of the Jews that came back from Babylon." On the other hand, Justin Martyr alleges (*Dial.* c. 52) that they were Philistines living in the city of Ashkelon, and another Christian historian, Julius Africanus (quoted by Eusebius *H. E.* I., viii., 11), embellishes the account by the addition of details to the effect that Herod's great-grand-father was a temple slave in the Philistine temple at Ashkelon, and that certain robbers from Idumea, having attacked the temple, carried off his little son Antipater (Herod's grand-father), and as the temple authorities were not able to ransom the child, he was brought up as an Idumean. The truth probably lies between these two reports, one of which was invented to glorify Herod, and the other to discredit him. In other words, the family was most likely an Idumean family of respectable standing. In any case Josephus,

followed by all the best historians, has represented the dynasty as Idumean, or "half Jew." Idumea was conquered and subjugated by John Hyrcanus towards the end of the second century B. C., and with other citizens of repute, Antipater, the first of that name, adopted Judaism by submitting to the rite of circumcision. Alexander Jannaeus somewhat later (between 100 and 80 B. C.), appointed him military governor of Idumea. Further than this we have no information regarding this first Antipater, except, perhaps, that he was also called Herod (Julius Africanus. II., xxix.) Whether he passed under both names or was so called by mistake later, the name of his illustrious grand-son being transferred to him, it is not certain. In any case it is the son of this Antipater, who is known under no other name than that of Antipater, that looms out prominently in history as the founder of the dynasty.

#### ANTIPATER.

The second Antipater succeeded his father either immediately or after a short interval as governor of Idumea. At first he does not seem to have shown himself deeply interested in Jewish affairs. He acted as a semi-independent prince, entering into relations with the Arabs of Petra, whose king, Aretas III., was famous for his love of Western life and civilization. When, however, the death of Alexandra Salome in 69 B. C., brought on the contest between the two weak brothers, Aristobulus and Hyrcanus II., Antipater perceived that his opportunity had come for obtaining and wielding larger powers than his barren and rocky Idumea had afforded him thus far. Accordingly, he entered into friendly relations with Hyrcanus II. (confessedly the weaker of the two brothers), on the ground, it is to be presumed, that he could more easily use him to further his own ends than he could Aristobulus. Upon the death of Alexander, Aristobulus had broken out in a rebellion against Hyrcanus, who had assumed the crown in Jerusalem, and in a decisive battle, fought near Jericho, he had defeated his brother and supplanted him as king and high priest. Antipater's scheme involved the restoration of Hyrcanus to his rightful place. To this end, by repeated insinuations of danger to his life, he persuaded this weak prince to flee to Petra and put himself under the protection of Aretas. Working now from the other end of the line, so to speak, he induced Aretas to

restore Hyrcanus to his kingdom in Judea upon condition that when restored he should give back to the Arab prince the cities wrested from him by Alexander Jannæus. Up to this point this scheme worked successfully. Aretas began his campaign against Aristobulus, compelling him to entrench himself within Jerusalem and submit to a siege. Pending this siege, however, Pompey and the Romans arrived on the scene. Aretas raised the siege and fled to Petra, and both Hyrcanus and Aristobulus sought to enter into alliance with Pompey. The Roman first espoused the cause of the latter, but on being persuaded that he was treacherously dealt with, he appointed Hyrcanus to the high priesthood, abolished the kingdom and placed the country under Roman rule.

Antipater was not slow to see that his only chance for continued influence in Syria lay in winning the favor of the Romans. Accordingly he sought by arts characteristic of him, to obtain their friendship. Conciliating in succession Pompey, Cæsar and Antony, he managed to hold a position in the front ranks throughout the years of tumult and rapid changes that now followed in Roman affairs. So successful was his policy that Cæsar even formally conferred on him the title of friend, together with the right of Roman citizenship and exemption from taxation. A state of stable equilibrium was finally reached with Hyrcanus as high priest and Antipater as procurator of Judea.

What Antipater had been planning for over a score of years was thus attained. He became the real sovereign of Judea and began the work of reconstruction. His two sons, Phasael and Herod, were appointed respectively governor of Jerusalem and prefect of Galilee. The walls of Jerusalem were rebuilt and peace and prosperity seemed fully restored, and although Antipater held the title of procurator only, and his sons were simply deputy governors under him, the Idumean dynasty was apparently established. The people treated them with respect and deference, due to persons of royal rank.

Herod, especially, beginning his public career at the age of twenty-five, at once distinguished himself as a firm-handed and strong ruler. A band of fanatics led by a certain Hezekiah were infesting the northern part of the province. He at once proceeded to capture and put to death the disturbers of the peace.

In Jerusalem Phasael became exceedingly popular, but no

sooner were political troubles apparently settled than the real difficulty in Judaism made itself felt. This was the deadly feud between the Pharisees and Sadducees. The Pharisees could not overlook or forgive the fact that the new dynasty was not of Israelitish origin. They went as far as to reproach Hyrcanus for compromising with the usurper. They declared Herod's execution of Hezekiah an illegal act, because the Sanhedrin had not been called upon to pronounce judgment in the case. They summoned the young prefect for a trial before the Sanhedrin. Herod obeyed the summons, but took the precaution to go before the supreme court at the head of a strong military force. Meanwhile the Roman legate to Syria instructed Hyrcanus, who was to preside over the Sanhedrin in his capacity of high priest, that Herod must be acquitted by all means. The trial turned out to be a farce. The Sanhedrin voted Herod not guilty, with the exception of one member, a Pharisee, who declared that he should have been punished with death, and warned his associates that the day should come when Herod himself would convince them of their error in letting him go now. Yet, though acquitted, Herod dared not linger in Jerusalem.

Meanwhile a new change came over Roman affairs. Cæsar was assassinated and the triumvirate established. Cassius refused to recognize the authority of the new government, and in order to carry on his war against the triumvirs, extorted from the province a tribute of seven hundred talents, which Antipater and his sons had some difficulty in levying. But when it was paid, he promised if successful in his war, to bestow the royal dignity on the family.

Pending these troubles, however, Antipater was poisoned. The circumstances have never been clearly understood, but the evidence points to a certain Malichus as the assassin. This man had conceived the idea of supplanting Antipater as the power behind the throne with Hyrcanus. Whatever the truth may be on this point, Malichus, if he was the criminal, was promptly punished, being assassinated by Herod's hirelings. Thus the first stage in the history of the Herodian dynasty was reached. Antipater had set the pace, so to speak. He had taught his sons the secret of success. How well Herod used the key thus given him by his father, we shall see in the sequel.

# The Bible Student.

CONTINUING

## The Bible Student and Religious Outlook.

Vol. II., New Series.

AUGUST, 1900.

Number 2.

Two schools of theology have been for some years contending for the supremacy, variously styled, the Old and the New, the Traditional and the Modern, the Conservative and the Progressive. The contest is in some important respects different from any which the history of doctrine records. The student of ecclesiastical history is familiar with the doctrinal controversies which form the staple of its contents; he is struck with their sharply defined statements so precise and distinct, he is impressed with their narrow limitations, each emphasizing in most instances a single issue, and that issue defined with the microscopic clearness of a minute cameo. In this latest controversy there is nothing whatever of that distinctness which makes the old controversies so clear and simple, and which renders alignment *pro* or *con* as easy as the discrimination of day from night; on the contrary, there has been a vagueness and indefiniteness which has been at times oppressive, and which for a long period was as helpful to the advocates of the New as it was embarrassing to the defenders of the Old. The

programme of the former seemed for the most part to be a wholesale fault-finding with past and present doctrinal systems, lightened with large promises and vague prophecies of much improvement; its dominant note was discontent, and every dissatisfied soul by virtue of simple unrest felt drawn to a party whose voice was protest, whose mission was reform, and whose weapon was criticism. As the discontented and the dissatisfied are ever a great multitude, this new school speedily secured a large following; its discussions found ready readers, its periodicals enlisted at once strong support, and writers sprang up on every hand with objections to formulate and theories to advance. Every such writer, whatever his views, was enrolled as a member of the school, and his voice swelled the chorus of criticism, while his influence added to the prevalent unrest which it emphasized and illustrated. This feeling of unrest was aggravated and an impression of great strength enhanced by the fact that the new party found its recruits and representatives in all churches, and sometimes among men not marked by extreme reserve nor restrained by excessive

stroyed; so Tyre, and Babylon and Assyria and Egypt.

With respect to Korah and his companions we have the positive testimony that the children were not destroyed. Achan's family would be the only exception in the whole Bible. But if Achan's family without any participation in his crime was destroyed for that crime, then we have the blank contradiction of the most faithful, conscientious and intelligent companion and follower of Moses, Joshua, who professed and commanded the exact fulfilment of Moses' law, turning a base hypocrite in the face of the whole people. and becoming a monster of cruelty in direct opposition to the law. The safer conclusion is, If the children were destroyed it was because they were equally guilty with their father. If they were not guilty they were not consumed with their father. In this conclusion, the law, the literature and the characters of the men concerned agree. On the opposite conclusion, they are all at sword's points against each other.

If I have given a correct representation of the statement of the Old Testament, the Hebrews believed in and worshipped God, their Father, tenderly merciful and ready to favor, slow to anger, mighty in loving kindness and truth; pardoning all guilt to those who sought Him; but punishing with the worm that never dies and the fire that is never quenched those who determinately and persistently hate him. And this is also the conception of God in the New Testament.

---

## THE HERODS.

PROFESSOR A. C. ZENOS, D. D., CHICAGO, ILL.

### II.

#### HEROD THE GREAT.

When Antipater died, his two sons, Herod and Phasael, were left in charge of the two great sections of the country, Judea and Galilee. They remained in these respective positions through the disturbance occasioned by the unsuccessful effort of Antigonus (called also Mattathias), the youngest surviving son of Aristobulus, to regain the throne of his ancestors. When Antony came to Syria, he confirmed the two brothers in their offices, and within two years of this settlement an event took place which was

to give another turn and another complication to the whole situation. This was the incursion of the Parthians (40 B. C.). An irresistible horde from beyond the Euphrates known under this name and led by their King, Pacorus, took possession of Syria and furnished the occasion of the new effort on the part of Antigonus Mattathias to re-establish the Hasmonean dynasty. Jerusalem was captured by the invaders. Phasaël was taken prisoner and put into a dungeon, where, to avoid further disgrace, he committed suicide. Herod beat a hasty retreat to the east of the Dead Sea and thence through a round about route betook himself to Rome. Here he entered his complaint against Antigonus and made a plea ostensibly for his brother-in-law, the young Aristobulus. In answer to his plea, the Roman senate in a conjunction with Antony and Octavius made him King of Judea.

For the next three years (40 to 37 B. C.) Herod's whole task consisted in getting possession of the kingdom thus bestowed on him. It was a hard task, but he proved equal to it. In order to obtain a presumptive right, valid in the sight of the Jews, as well as the real title already bestowed on him by the Romans, he married the grand-daughter of Hyrcanus, Mariamne. Instead of proving a source of strength to him, however, this step only resulted in the introduction of an element of strife into his household. Herod's sister, Salome, resented the air of superior nobility with which the wife of Herod treated her and lost no opportunity of poisoning her brother's mind against the whole house of the Hasmoneans. Thus the King was led to a series of crimes that have blackened his memory through all subsequent ages.

First of all, Aristobulus, brother of Mariamne, was made high priest, upon the urgent recommendation of his mother, Alexandra. But the popular approval of this appointment so alarmed Herod and roused his jealousy that he caused the young man to be drowned at a bath. Then the aged Hyrcanus was put out of the way, in spite of the immense debt of gratitude under which he had put both Herod and Antipater by his valuable services in promoting their ambitions. Next Mariamne, though passionately loved by Herod, was put to death on account of jealousy, and finally Alexandra, the mother of Mariamne, who perhaps had been the prime object of Salome's hatred, and that not without reason, fell as the last victim.



Another family had distinguished themselves during the brief ascendancy of Antigonus Mattathias (40 to 37 B. C.). They were called "the sons of Baba." These, too, Herod desired to put out of the way, but a rich Idumean, Costobar, gave them secret asylum in his own domains. Herod's sister, Salome, married Costobar and for a time kept the secret of the whereabouts of the sons of Baba. Having tired of her husband, however, she betrayed him and with him his protégés, and they were all put to death. Thus every possible rival and source of opposition to him being removed, Herod settled down to the undisputed sway over his kingdom, some twelve years from the beginning of his reign.

Historians generally concur in Renan's estimate of Herod when he calls him "a lion whom one admires for his massive throat and his thick mane, without expecting any moral sense from him." His ruling motive was the lust for power. He would have ruled any other nation and country with equal pleasure to himself. Judea happened to be the most natural field for the exercise of his passion. For Judea he had no more attachment than for any other part of the world. Its distinctive feature—ethical religion—was and remained an unknown quantity to him. He respected and enforced the forms of its religion. He knew nothing of its inner life and spirit. Himself "a half Jew," he compelled those who married his daughters to be circumcised. He refrained, at least at the beginning of his reign, from protruding images on his coins and monuments, but he lived as a Greek, associated with Greeks, erected pagan temples outside of Palestine, despised the high priests, violated the most sacred prescriptions of Pharisaism and in a thousand other ways showed his preference for Hellenism and undertook to Hellenize Judaism. To realize his ideals in this direction, he instituted a series of public works which in splendor had not been equalled since the days of Solomon. He built an amphitheater, a theater and a hippodrome to celebrate games in honor of Augustus. These were richly decorated, but scrupulously free from statues and images. There were, it is true, suits of armor, mounted on wooden blocks in the amphitheater, and this roused some feeling among the Jews, but Herod personally went down with the zealots that protested against them, took off the

armor from the blocks and showed them the ridiculousness of their protest.

In this amphitheater games in honor of Augustus were to be celebrated every five years, and to witness these, crowds were summoned from all parts of the realm, as well as from neighboring cities and provinces. Outside of Jerusalem Herod erected temples to Augustus at Caesarea, Samaria, Panium and Batanea. In Jerusalem, beside the public structures already named, Herod erected a magnificent palace for himself with adjacent parks full of trees and basins of water and towers for wild pigeons. He also repaired and strengthened the fortifications and named them after his kinsfolk and favorites. These were the famous towers of Phasaël, Mariamne, and Hippicus and Antonia. Samaria, which, under the Hasmoneans, was held in contempt and ill-treated, he took under his special charge. He enlarged and beautified it and settled six thousand colonists in it; in honor of Augustus, whose surname translated into Greek was Sebastus, he renamed it Sebaste. In addition to the great cities already existing in Palestine, he gave to that country a new center and capital in Caesarea. This was indeed at once his original idea and his masterpiece. It was designed first of all to gratify Augustus and win permanent favor with him, and secondly to provide the country with a suitable harbor. It was destined in the course of a century to supplant Jerusalem as the ruling city of the realm. Other cities favored and embellished by Herod were Antipatris, Phasaëlis and Jericho, whose citadel he renamed Cypros, after his own mother. In the country at large he established a line of strongholds, naming the chief ones among them Hyrcania, Machaerus and Masada. Not content with all these marks of royal grandeur in his own estates, he made gifts to cities in foreign parts, especially Ashkelon, Acra, Tyre, Sidon, Byblos, Berytos, Tripolis, Damascus, Antioch, Rhodes, Athens and Sparta. In each of these he erected a monument as a token and memorial of his friendship.

But to the pious Jew, the supreme public work of Herod was a great and glorious temple that was to take the place of that built by Zerubbabel five centuries earlier. The undertaking was bold and at the same time politic. Its colossal proportions and its magnificence astonished natives and strangers alike. It was

begun in the year 19 B. C. and had been forty-six years in process of erection when Jesus predicted his own death and burial, so thoroughly misunderstood by the Jews (John ii. 20). Though the temple service was never interrupted during the reconstruction, no part of Zerubbabel's structure was left standing; and though the chief and necessary parts were finished within eight years, the building was not absolutely completed until 63 A. D. Seven years later it was destined to be torn up from the foundations.

The Hellenism of Herod was evinced in still another feature of his reign, the cultivation of Greek learning. His own children were educated under the care of Greek tutors and fitted to move in the imperial society of Rome. Herod himself had as a constant companion the historian and man of letters, Nicolas of Damascus, a peripatetic philosopher. It is probably from this writer's universal history, in 142 books, that Josephus derived much of his information regarding Herod. Inasmuch as Herod himself had never had any Greek training, it was undoubtedly a great help to him in his efforts to pass as a man of culture to have such a character at his court. It is in fact stated that Nicolas instructed him in rhetoric, history and philosophy, and that Herod took delight in the companionship of the learned man.

In matters of internal administration, Herod's policy was fully in keeping with his attitude towards the embellishment of the country. At any rate, order prevailed throughout the whole realm and conspiracies and disorders were promptly put down, criminals banished and commerce and agriculture were placed upon a sound and healthy basis.

Herod the Great has been surnamed the "Second Solomon." Inasmuch as he advanced the prestige of the Jewish people among the heathen by his grand conception of his royal task and furthered the embellishment of the realm with magnificent monuments, in the erection of which he lavishly spent incredibly large sums of money, he was undoubtedly like the glorious son of David. He approached the outward type and image of Solomon more closely, perhaps, when he became, like Solomon, a temple-builder, and still further, he was like Solomon in that the source of his troubles, especially of the cloud that darkened the last part

of his life, was the adoption of polygamy. It is true, however, the evil consequence in the case of Solomon appeared in the form of religious corruption and polytheism, whereas in that of Herod they worked out a series of jealousies and suspicions which drove the distracted and failing monarch into insane deeds of cruelty to his own children. Herod had married ten wives and begotten fifteen children. It was natural that intrigues and conspiracies should be formed among these, looking to the promotion of one or another into the direct succession to the throne. It is not necessary to pursue to their details these plottings. The sons of Mariamne, Aristobulus and Alexander, because of their Hasmonean ancestry, fell first victims in these domestic troubles. Antipater, the first-born son of Herod, after having been imprisoned for some time, was also put to death five days before the decease of his own father. Altogether Herod's last days were dark indeed. His natural dread of death was great. Even old age, to which most men yield so naturally, was grievous to him. Josephus informs us that he attempted to disguise the fact by dyeing his hair. As if to leave him no room to ignore his approach, the grim spectre made himself felt in a premonitory disease at the same time loathsome and painful. These circumstances only aggravated his cruelty. Upon a premature report of his death, some fanatics destroyed the golden eagle that he had placed on the gable of the temple as a mere artistic finial. They were seized and burned alive. Finally the tyrant gave orders that all the leading citizens of Jerusalem should be gathered together in the hippodrome and put to death as soon as he had expired, in order that there might be genuine grief at his funeral. The scheme failed, and he died unwept in the year 4 B. C.

It was, perhaps, a few months before this event that he had ordered the massacre of the children at Bethlehem. Though there is no account outside of the Gospel narratives of this deed of cruelty, the multitude and heinousness of his other bloody deeds makes it easy to believe that the record is literally true. The absence of extra Biblical reports of it is no doubt due to its apparent remoteness from political life and comparative insignificance in view of the many more flagrant acts of bloodshed perpetrated by him.

# The Bible Student.

CONTINUING

The Bible Student and Religious Outlook.

Vol. II., New Series. SEPTEMBER, 1900.

Number 3.

If we would know how Paul felt about the gospel of the grace of God, by which he was saved, we could not do better than go to "the great thanksgiving" with which he opens the Epistle to the Ephesians. The Epistle to the Ephesians is, of course, not singular in beginning with a thanksgiving to God. That is Paul's customary method of beginning his letters. But it is, perhaps, singular in the marvellous richness and fervor of the thanksgiving with which it begins. And this is perhaps due to what we might have thought an entirely unimportant circumstance. The Apostle was accustomed to draw the theme of his thanksgiving from the special conditions and attainments of those he was addressing. But, unlike his other letters, this was addressed neither to an individual friend and fellow-worker, nor to a separate church with its special circumstances fresh in the Apostle's mind. There was in this case, therefore, no particular subject of thanksgiving, peculiar to the person or church addressed, pressing in on the Apostle's mind and requiring mention. He was thrown back on what was common

to Christians, to thank God for in behalf of his readers. And that is as much as to say he was thrown back on the great fundamental theme of the Gospel. Now Paul's fervor always rises when he is face to face with the first principles of the Gospel.

What Paul returns thanks to God for here is nothing less than the salvation in Christ.

**The Trinitarian** And with what magnificence of diction as well as depth of feeling and comprehensiveness of view he deals with it! The salvation in Christ involves naturally the saving action of the whole Triune God: and it is easy to make out a Trinitarian distinction in the parts of this long ascription of praise to God for His salvation. Many expositors have, therefore, so divided it. And in any event it is useful to note that there is described to us here the loving activity of God the Father in salvation (in verses 3-6),—of God the Son (in verses 7-12),—and of God the Holy Spirit (in verses 13-14). This successive adduction of the work of the persons of the Trinity in salvation would seem, however, only an inevitable incident of any full description of the process of salvation, for in it

our *means*, will be punished. Matth. xxv. 30; Luke xvi. 20-31; xix. 26; xx. 16.

D. There are some interesting teachings concerning the *Poor*. I. They are to be *socially honored* as invited guests, and hospitably entertained in our homes. Luke xiv. 12-14, 21-24; Matth. xxii. 9, 10. II. The godly poor, represented by the beggar Lazarus at the rich man's gate, are *heirs* to the glories of *heaven*. Luke xvi. 20-22. III. He makes the *preaching* of the gospel to the *poor* the last and *crowning proof* of His Messiahship. Matth. xi. 5; Luke iv. 18; vii. 22. IV. The poor may make *larger proportional contributions* to His cause than the rich. Mark xii. 41-44; Luke xxi. 1-4.

E. Christ's *personal* relations to Wealth. I. He *destroyed wealth*, the possession of which was a sin in the Jew that held it. Matth. viii. 32; Mark v. 13; Luke viii. 33. He sacrificed wealth for a higher, spiritual good. Matth. xxi. 19; Mark xi. 14. II. He refused to decide *titles to property*. Luke xii. 13, 14. III. He was *dined* by one rich man and *buried* by another; these were the only helps He received from the wealthy. Luke xix. 2-7; Matth. xxvii. 57-60; Mark xv. 43-46; Luke xxiii. 50-53; Jno. xix. 38-42. IV. He was *betrayed for thirty pieces of silver*. Matth. xxvi. 14-16; Mark xiv. 10, 11; Luke xxii. 3-6; Jno. xiii. 2; xviii. 2-5. V. Though He was the living bread and made all things, He was *dependent* on others for His food and had no home of His own. Jno. i. 3, 10; vi. 48; Matth. viii. 20; xxvii. 57-60; Mark vi. 3; xiv. 62; Luke ii. 7, 24; viii. 3; ix. 58; Jno. xix. 26, 27.

These are the teachings concerning Wealth of Him who spake as never man spake.

---

## THE HERODS.

PROFESSOR A. C. ZENOS, D. D., CHICAGO, ILL.

### III. THE LATER HERODS.

#### ARCHELAUS.

The first wife of Herod the Great was Doris, a woman of the people, married to him perhaps before he had begun to aspire to

royal dignity. The issue of this marriage was one son named in honor of Herod's father, Antipater. In his earliest known will Herod designated this son as his sole successor. But as has already been narrated, Antipater was proved guilty of conspiracy, sentenced and executed during Herod's last days. The next in order of succession should naturally have been the sons of Mariamne, Alexander and Aristobulus. Had either of these been fortunate enough to reach the throne and maintained himself on it, the blending of the Hasmonean and Herodian families would have been immediate and complete, and some of the hostility of the stricter Jews to the Herods would have been removed. But as already intimated, Alexander and Aristobulus, like their elder brother Antipater, fell victims to their father's suspicion and jealousy. Besides, in none of his three wills did Herod designate either of them as his successor. In fact, the wills of Herod left the question of succession in such an unsatisfactory condition that the next rightful heirs in order, Archelaus and Antipas, went to Rome, each to make his claim before Cæsar. A deputation of Jews also hastened with the request that they might be rid of the rule of the Herods altogether. The contest ended in the settlement of Archelaus as the ethnarch or ruler of Judea, Samaria and Idumea, while Antipas was given Galilee and Perea, and to Philip was assigned Trachonitis and Iturea. It is undoubtedly this journey of Archelaus to Rome that furnishes the basis of the parable in Luke xix. 11 seq.

Archelaus was probably the worst of all the younger Herods, and his reign of nine years was characterized by mismanagement, cruelty and tyranny. Little is known in detail of his deeds, but they were such as to incite the people of Judea and Samaria to complain to Augustus, whereupon Archelaus was summoned to Rome, and his case being investigated and the charges against him proved, he was banished to Gaul and passed out of Jewish history. His dominions were ruled by Roman procurators until 41 A. D.

#### ANTIPAS.

In contrast with Archelaus, Antipas proved a successful ruler. The territory given him by the settlement of Augustus was a hard one to govern, but he administered it satisfactorily and, fol-

lowing his father's example, engaged in works of building, founding the city of Tiberias on the sea of Galilee.

In the New Testament narrative he is brought to the foreground through his relations with John the Baptist. He had been married, it appears, to the daughter of Aretas, the Arab king of Petra. But falling desperately in love with Herodias, the wife of his brother Philip, he determined to divorce his own wife and marry her. The plan became known to the daughter of Aretas, who at once fled to her father for protection, leaving her husband to enter into the adulterous union with Herodias. In what terms John the Baptist denounced this marriage and how he suffered the consequences, is too well known a story to need repetition here (Mt. xiv. 1; Mk. vi. 14; Lk. iii. 19).

Antipas' marriage to Herodias proved to be the source of other evil consequences in his life. Aretas made war on him and inflicted a severe defeat. A little later Herodias prevailed on him to go to Rome and demand of the Emperor Caius the title of King. This step aroused the jealousy of Agrippa, who preferred charges against Antipas, in consequence of which he was banished to a little town in the Pyrenees. Here he spent the remainder of his days in humiliation and distress. The only source of comfort he could have had in these troubles was the faithfulness of Herodias, who cheerfully shared and supported him in them.

Antipas is known in the New Testament as Herod, the Tetrarch," or simply Herod. He is frequently alluded to. When the reputation of Jesus as the miracle worker reached him, he declared that it was John the Baptist raised from the dead (Mt. xiv. 1; Mk. vi. 14; Lk. ix. 7). It was he that Jesus designated "that fox," referring to his well known cunning. According to Luke, this Herod took part in the examination of Jesus immediately before his trial and death (Lk. xxvii. 7-15).

#### PHILIP.

The third of the sons of Herod the Great to receive a portion of his kingdom was Philip, who, like Antipas, bore the title of "tetrarch." The territory assigned him in the settlement lay to the north and east of Galilee, and was inferior, both in historical importance and in the amplitude of the revenues it yielded, to that of either of his two brothers. Nevertheless, it satisfied Philip's



ambition, and furnished him enough employment during his long and uneventful reign of thirty-eight years.

Josephus gives a vivid picture of Philip in the following words: "He was moderate and peaceful in his rule, and spent his whole life in his country. He went out with only a small retinue, always taking with him the throne on which he might sit and judge. Whenever he met any one who had need of him, he made no delay, but set down the throne wherever he might be and heard the case" (Ant. XXVIII., iv. 6).

He was the founder of Cæsarea Philippi and Bethsaida Julias. The non-Jewish character of his subjects enabled him to put the heads of Augustus and Tiberias on his coins without offending religious prejudice.

#### AGRIPPA I.

In the person of Agrippa the blood of the Hasmoneans seems to have reasserted itself to some extent. He was the son of Aristobulus, and grand-son of Herod the Great and Mariamne, thus in the fourth generation from Hyrcanus. His early days were spent in Rome. Though associated with members of the imperial household, at first he made no progress toward regaining his grand-father's domains. After the death of Tyberius, however, Caligula, with whom he had been intimate and whose accession to the throne he had predicted and worked for, bestowed on him the title of king, with the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias and various other honors. Later the tetrarchy of Antipas and the prefecture of Judea and Samaria were added, and he thus ruled over the whole territory of Herod the Great.

The policy of Agrippa was, however, in many respects the very opposite of that of his grand-father. He aimed to be a real Jew. When Caius planned to set up a statue of himself in the temple at Jerusalem, Agrippa boldly, though tactfully, persuaded him to abandon the project. Later, when the statue of Cæsar was erected in the Jewish synagogue of Dora, he persuaded the Roman governor of Syria not only to remove it, but also to punish those who had set it up. His own accession to the throne he signaled by offering all the prescribed sacrifices, and was in fact in every respect a strict observer of the ceremonial law. His influence, too, as a king, he used towards furthering Judaism. When his daughter Drusilla was betrothed to Epiphanes, son of

the King of Commagene, he persuaded his prospective son-in-law to be circumcised. It was his zeal for Judaism undoubtedly that actuated him in the attempt to nip the Christian Church in the bud by seizing the apostles James and Peter, and putting the former to death (Acts xii. 1).

The circumstances of his death are given in connection with the report in the book of Acts of the imprisonment and escape of Peter. He had occasion, it seems, to be displeased with the dependent people of Tyre and Sidon, and a deputation representing them came to propitiate him. Agrippa received them in the presence of a large assembly of people, he himself being arrayed in resplendent royal robes. As he addressed the people, they cried, "It is the voice of a god and not of a man," and because he accepted the idolatrous homage, he was smitten with disease and expired. A similar account, though in some respects incompatible with this, is given by Josephus. According to this historian, Agrippa was at Cæsarea presiding over games in honor of Cæsar. On the second day of the games he put on a robe of silver, wonderfully constructed. As the sun rose, the rays glanced and reflected from this robe, produced a striking effect. Cries at once came from the assembled multitude, ascribing to him divinity. Shortly afterwards he saw an owl sitting on a cord stretched above his head. He recognized it as an evil omen, was seized with pains and five days later expired.

#### AGRIPPA II. "THE LAST OF THE HERODS."

The second Agrippa was a youth seventeen years of age when his father died, and was declared at Rome too young to take up the burden of as large a kingdom as he would naturally have fallen heir to. In the course of a few years, however, he had sufficiently ingratiated himself with the imperial court of Rome to be given the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias, to which somewhat later Nero added Galilee and Perea.

In his attitude towards Judaism, Agrippa was anxious to perpetuate his father's policy. The Apostle Paul declares him an "expert in all customs and questions which are among the Jews." Rabbinical tradition not only bears out Paul's testimony in this respect, but gives instances of his efforts to proselyte some of the surrounding kings to Judaism. From his great-grand-father he

had evidently inherited the instinct of building cities and adorning those already in existence. The particular recipients of his munificence in this respect were Cæsarea Philippi and Berytus. It was during his reign that the temple was finished. It was during his reign also that the great Jewish war took place which ended in the demolition of the temple and the total extinction of Jewish independence. In this war Agrippa took sides with the Romans. His own position was guaranteed by them, and he lived to the age of 73, about 100 A. D.

#### SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HERODIAN DYNASTY IN BIBLICAL HISTORY.

If we now ask what in the Providential order of history was the function and work of this remarkable dynasty, the answer will be found chiefly in the following two items :

First. The reign of the Herods prepared the mind of true Israelites to abandon the hope of the restoration of the house of David to the kingdom. The dynasty was not only non-Davidic, but not even Israelitish; and the longer it remained in power the farther did the dynasty of David recede into the background, until at the time of Domitian the only representatives of it who could be brought before the Roman authorities were horny-handed laboring men. There were two possibilities always open, of course; either, first, that Jehovah should by a miracle or a social convulsion, overthrow the Idumean Dynasty, or, second, that the promises to Israel, generally known as Messianic, should be fulfilled in some other way than that in which they were expected to be fulfilled hitherto. Between these alternatives those of the saner mind in Israel would have little difficulty in choosing the latter. Upon this ground, when the supernatural character and work of Jesus Christ became clearly understood, there was no difficulty in accepting them as the fulfillment of ancient prophecy.

Second. The Herods were instrumental in bridging over the passage from the particularism of the Old Testament to the universalism of the New. This they did by favoring a moderate and wise conformity to the civilization of the West. As a dynasty they stand for the hellenization of Judaism. They gained their ascendancy by alliance with the pagan power of Rome. They maintained it by catering to the same pagan power.

For this they were hated by the more zealous portion of the Jewish nation and bitterly denounced by the Pharisees; and yet the leaven that was to leaven the lump found its way into Judaism; so that when Paul, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, appeared as the champion of the direct entrance of the Gentiles into the Church of Christ, he did not sow the seed into the soil altogether unprepared for its reception. The universal salvability of all men was not an unknown, though it may have been an unpalatable doctrine to the Judaizers of the Apostolic age. The regime of the Herods had measurably prepared the way for Paul. The effort to hellenize Judaism by violence under Antiochus Epiphanes was a disastrous failure. The effect in the same direction through the teaching of the Platonic philosophy by the Alexandrian Philo was also a failure. Politically the effort of the Herods must be recognized likewise as a failure, and yet it prepared the way for the grafting in of the universalistic principle of the Gospel.

If the Babylonian captivity transformed the kingdom of Judah into the Jewish Church, the Herodian usurpation prepared that Church for Christ and Christianity.

---

### THE WAY TO JERICHO.

PROFESSOR R. L. STEWART, D. D., LINCOLN UNIVERSITY, PA.

The historic roadway, which for more than three thousand years has connected Jerusalem with Jericho, is literally "the *Way of the Wilderness*." It enters the wilderness of Judea at the very outskirts of the town of Bethany, and emerges from it on the eastern end of the Jordan plain, hard by the foot of the Tell, which marks the site of the ancient city of Jericho.

The distance between Jerusalem and Jericho, as the road goes, is a little short of seventeen miles. Its general direction is northeast, but it takes advantage, as far as possible, of every available glen, and torrent-bed, and depressed ridge, along the line of its rugged course. There are but few places, therefore, where a change in the road-bed would be practicable; and, as a matter of fact, the broad carriage road, by which tourists now go down to the plain, is merely a widening out, and a filling up of washed out