

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1959

A Historical and Political Study of Antipater, the Idumean, Who Established a Political Dynasty in Palestine

Neil R. Schmidt

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_schmidtn@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schmidt, Neil R., "A Historical and Political Study of Antipater, the Idumean, Who Established a Political Dynasty in Palestine" (1959). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 599.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/599>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

A HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL STUDY OF ANTIPATER,
THE IDUMEAN, WHO ESTABLISHED A POLITICAL
DYNASTY IN PALESTINE

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Historical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

by

Neil R. Schmidt

June 1959

Approved by:

G. A. Thiele
Advisor

W. J. [unclear]
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE PERSIAN ANTIPODES	5
III. ANTIPODES BEFORE HIS TIME FOR A JEROME HISTORY	11
IV. ANTIPODES BEFORE THE FOUNDATION OF THE PERSIAN EMPIRE	17
V. THE TIMES AND DYNASTY OF ANTIPODES	21
VI. ANTIPODES'S DYNASTY IN SWAZILAND, ZULULU, AND	24
VII. ANTIPODES'S RELATIONS IN SWAZILAND AND ZULULU	30
VIII. ANTIPODES BEFORE HIS TIME FOR THE PERSIAN EMPIRE	43
IX. ANTIPODES'S PERSONAL LIFE LEADS TO SUCCESS	53
X. CONCLUSION	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY	63

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE HISTORICAL STAGE IS SET FOR ANTIPTATER	5
III. ANTIPTATER BEGINS HIS PLAN FOR A JEWISH DYNASTY	11
IV. ANTIPTATER BUILDS THE FOUNDATIONS FOR HIS DYNASTY UNDER ROMAN RULE	17
V. CAESAR ENTERS PALESTINE AND ANTIPTATER'S DYNASTY CRYSTALLIZES	24
VI. ANTIPTATER'S DYNASTY IS ESTABLISHED, THREATENED, AND SEALED	31
VII. POLITICAL MANIPULATIONS IN INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS	39
VIII. ANTIPTATER GROOMS HIS SON FOR THE JEWISH THRONE	49
IX. ANTIPTATER'S PERSONALITY LEADS TO SUCCESS	55
X. CONCLUSION	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY	63

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose and Organization	1
Limitations of the Study	2
II. THE HISTORICAL STAGE IS SET FOR ANTIPATER	5
General Political Setting	5
The Specific Political Setting	6
The Advent of Antipater the Idumean	7
The Hazy Heritage	9
III. ANTIPATER BEGINS HIS PLAN FOR A JEWISH DYNASTY	11
Flight, Aid, Ascendence	11
Rome's Arrival Stops Antipater's Ascendence	13
Before Pompey Antipater Regained Ascendence	14
IV. ANTIPATER BUILDS THE FOUNDATIONS FOR HIS DYNASTY UNDER ROMAN RULE	17
Jerusalem Falls to Pompey in 63 B.C.	17
The Conditions of Surrender	17
Antipater Maneuvers Through Insurrections and Political Intrigues	19
V. CAESAR ENTERS PALESTINE AND ANTIPATER'S DYNASTY CRYSTALLIZES	24
Antipater Against Caesar	24
Antipater Aids Caesar	25
Caesar Aids Antipater	29
VI. ANTIPATER'S DYNASTY IS ESTABLISHED, THREATENED, AND SEALED	31
Dynasty Established	31
The Dynasty Threatened	33
The Dynasty Sealed	36
VII. POLITICAL MANIPULATIONS IN INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS	39
Antipater's Task as an Idumean	39
Antipater's Shield Against the Jews	41
Antipater and Hyrcanus	45

Rome's Affairs Effect the World	46
Favor Sought and Won	47
VIII. ANTIPATER GROOMS HIS SON FOR THE JEWISH THRONE	49
Herod's Apprenticeship	49
Herod Reflects His Training	51
The Imperfect Reproduction	53
IX. ANTIPATER'S PERSONALITY LEADS TO SUCCESS	55
Qualities of Leadership	55
The Underrated Politician	59
X. CONCLUSION	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY	63

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Organization

Biblical students and scholars everywhere know that a working knowledge of the history between the Testaments is indispensable in understanding the conditions of the New Testament era. Few scholars would deny that in order to fully appreciate the significance of the events which took place in the New Testament, one must first be aware of the events which took place before Christ was born. For this reason, many scholars have delved into this four hundred year history in an effort to dig out the pertinent historical facts which would shed light on the conditions which existed in Palestine and the Roman world at the time of Christ. As a result, there are many fine histories of the Maccabean era, the Ptolemaic regime, and the advent of Rome in world politics. In addition, these scholars have presented detailed histories of the men they felt played a significant role in shaping the historical background of the New Testament era. Thus it is that we of the modern world are familiar with such men as Matthias Maccabee, Ptolemy, and Herod the Great. But most historians have not felt that Antipater, the father of Herod the Great, warranted a detailed study. In fact, most historians completely overlooked this man when they portrayed the history between the Testaments. It is true that Antipater is mentioned, but only in so far as he provided a brief background for his son Herod. As a result, students quite naturally receive the impression that Antipater is of

little, if any, significance in shaping the history of the Jews before the time of Jesus Christ.

This thesis, however, contends that a knowledge of Antipater and his politics are vital for a full understanding of the history before and during the time of the New Testament. Thus the aim of this paper is to sketch the historical and political events of Antipater's life in an attempt to prove that he was not only an important man of his times, but also that as an unrivaled politician, he was very instrumental in shaping the whole political tone of the periods before and after the birth of Christ. In order to do this, the thesis will be divided into two main segments. The first segment, chapters two to six, will give the history of this Idumean and describe how he founded his dynasty in Palestine. In the second segment, the thesis shall describe the political genius, theories, and practices which made Antipater an important influential figure in the period of history we are studying. It should be noted that the first segment of this thesis will present Antipater's history in a chronological survey, while the second part will be organized to present topical discussions of the political maneuvers by which Antipater attained his goal as ruler of the Jews. After the life and political manipulations of Antipater are known, it will become evident why this man is vital to any understanding of the New Testament world.

Limitations of the Study

When one studies the history between the Testaments it becomes evident that there is a multiplicity of historical facts which were significant to this period. An authority of this period will soon note that

this thesis is only presenting a small portion of the four hundred year history. This thesis confines itself to the period in which Antipater was actively engaged. As a result we shall only present the facts which occurred between 76 B.C. and 43 B.C. It is important that the reader remember that even in this thirty-three year span we are only interested in those facts which pertain to Antipater and his political life. Many of the events which occurred during this time are important, but do not fit into the scope or purpose of this thesis. This thesis has deliberately omitted any material which does not directly deal with Antipater and his political significance. Therefore it is essential that the reader not only focus his mind on the specific period of Antipater, but also that he is fully aware of our limited concern which centers around Antipater's political endeavors.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the historical sources from which this paper derived its facts were somewhat limited. The primary source for the historical data used in this thesis was Josephus. Although there are other histories of this period which were written by contemporaries of Josephus, none of them really gave an accurate picture of Antipater. Even Josephus left much to the imagination. Nevertheless, since Josephus is a recognized source, and because he was a Jew himself, I chose to regard him as the primary source of this thesis. The thesis will duly note the few occasions where Josephus and his contemporaries are in disagreement. Due to the fact that even Josephus' history is spotty in places, I have taken the liberty of quoting the conjectures and opinions of later historians not only when they substantiate Josephus, but also when they oppose the ancient historian. In order to insure conciseness, this thesis shall use the abbreviation Antiquities

throughout the paper whenever referring to the following work: Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, in The Complete Works of Josephus (New York: Bigelow, Brown & Co., Inc., n.d.), II. In addition, Wars shall be the abbreviation for the following work: Josephus, Wars of the Jews, in The Complete Works of Josephus (New York: Bigelow, Brown & Co., Inc., n.d.), III. Finally, the references to Josephus are not listed according to page numbers, but according to book, section and chapter designations. The Roman numerals reveal the book classification, while the subsequent numbers refer to the section and chapter classifications respectively.

Since 586 B.C., when the Jews returned from the Babylonian captivity, to about 103 B.C., when Hellenistic Macedonia prevailed, the Jews had been under many different types of government. The patriotic Jews groaned under this yoke of foreign rule and domination. With the rise of Hellenism, the Jews once again realized their innate nationalistic desire for self-government. This Maccabean era was based on the high priestly rule which was part of the Mosaic heritage. From 103 B.C. to 70 B.C., the nation of Judah was ripped and torn by internal wars and strife. During the interval between the death of John Hyrcanus in 104 B.C. and the advent of the Romans, the sword of sectarian hate severed the way and shaded the horizon of the nation's future. To the death of Alexander in 323 B.C., Israel's history is written in blood and characterized by feuds, factions, border wars, despotic, and class.²

¹ A. N. S. Jones, The History of Judah (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908), pp. 71-2.

² See G. H. Gress, History of the Jews (London: A. & C. Clark, Ltd., Gresham Square, 1918), p. 77.

CHAPTER II

THE HISTORICAL STAGE IS SET FOR ANTIPATER

General Political Situation

Antipater, like every human being, steps into a history which is quite different from any other history. One cannot isolate him, but rather must deal with him as he was in his peculiar historical setting. Consequently, a brief summary of Jewish history is in order.

Since 538 B.C., when the Jews returned from the Babylonian captivity, to about 163 B.C., when Mattathias Maccabee revolted, the Jews had been under many different types of government. The patriotic Jews groaned under this yoke of foreign rule and domination. With the rise of Mattathias, the Jews once again realized their innate nationalistic desire for self-government. This Maccabean era was based on the high priestly rule which was part of the Maccabean heritage. From 163 B.C. to 76 B.C., the nation of Judah was ripped and torn by internal wars and strifes.¹ During the interim between the death of John Hyrcanus in 104 B.C. and the Advent of the Messiah, the cloud of sectarian hate covered the sky and shaded the horizon of the nation's future. To the death of Alexander in 76 B.C., Israel's history is written in blood and characterized by feuds, factions, border wars, despotism, and vices.²

¹A. H. M. Jones, The Herods of Judaea (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), pp. 7ff.

²Rev. G. M. Grant, Between the Testaments (London: A & C Clark, Ltd., Soho Square, 1918), p. 79.

The Specific Political Situation

At the death of Alexander Jannaeus in 76 B.C., the throne went to his wife Alexandra instead of passing to Hyrcanus and Aristobulus who were Jannaeus' sons. An unusually talented woman, Alexandra followed her late husband's advice and allied herself with the Pharisees. The Pharisees had been persecuted by her husband, but since Jannaeus realized his wife would need aid in controlling the nation, he had advised her to seek the assistance of this popular party. The switch from Sadducees, which had been the royal favorites, to the Pharisees proved successful and Alexandra reigned prosperously for nine years. During this time the Pharisees exerted much influence and grew in strength. This fact is noteworthy since anyone wishing to be of any political influence in Judah would either have to be kindly disposed to the Pharisees or destroy them. Destruction could not be the answer, for the power of the Pharisees was the power of the masses. The Pharisee party was the party of the people.³

One might wonder why Alexandra or Salome would be chosen to rule instead of the male heirs Hyrcanus and/or Aristobulus. The answer lies in the character of the two sons. Hyrcanus, the eldest and in line for the crown, was without energy, inoffensive but rather incapable, indolent and, according to Josephus, "unable to manage public affairs and delighted in a quiet life."⁴ In addition, Hyrcanus II was a ready tool for any energetic and intelligent man. Nevertheless, Salome made this

³Antiquities, Book xii, 15, 5 to 16, 5.

⁴Ibid., Book xiii, 16, 1.

Hyrcanus high priest because he was the elder of the sons. On the other hand, Aristobulus was the image of his father. He was bold in enterprise, theatric in attitude, and somewhat barbaric in nature. Allying himself with the Sadducees, he attempted to usurp his mother's authority and gain control of the kingdom. But before the situation resulted in open rebellion, Alexandra died in 69 B.C. She left to her sons a heritage of future political strife.⁵

On the death of Alexandra the two brothers immediately engaged in a civil war. The first battle, which took place around Jericho, saw the defeat of the legitimate heir Hyrcanus. Fleeing to Jerusalem, Hyrcanus was forced to surrender. This is understandable in light of the fact that a goodly portion of Hyrcanus' army had deserted to Aristobulus after the Jericho disaster. Aristobulus and Hyrcanus then came to an agreement. Hyrcanus was to remain high priest and retain the family wealth; Aristobulus was to be the ruling power with the title of king. For three years this agreement held, and many historians feel that this peaceful alliance would have been permanent if not for one man's entrance into the historical arena. It is at this point of Jewish history that Antipater became known.⁷

The Advent of Antipater the Idumean

Now between this peaceful amnesty existing between the brothers appears a man who "by birth was an Idumean, and one of the principals

⁵Martin Noth, The History of Israel (London: A & C Black, 1953), p. 389.

⁶Antiquities, Book xiv, 1, 2.

⁷Rev. C. M. Grant, op. cit., p. 83.

of that nation on account of his ancestors and riches, and other authority to him belonging."⁸ He is called "a certain friend of Hyrcanus" and a very rich and seditious man. In addition, it seems that he and King Aristobulus did not get along with one another. The cause for this enmity was supposedly "on account of his (Antipater's) good will to Hyrcanus."⁹ Antipater had his own plans and the independent Aristobulus did not fit into them. As a result the three year peace between the brothers was not the best condition as far as Antipater was concerned. Aristobulus, who disliked Antipater, was the king and the wrong man with whom to have strained relationships.

It is noteworthy to remember that Antipater was an Idumean. This tribe was synonymous with the Edomites who, in turn, were the descendants of Esau. In 300 B.C. the Edomites were driven from their homeland in the area of Petra by the Nabataeans. Forced to migrate to the Southwest of Palestine, they extended north into Palestine as far as the well-known city of Hebron. Thus it would seem that this tribe was called Edomites when they inhabited the region west of the Dead Sea. Later, when living to the south and east of the Dead Sea, they were called Idumeans. In addition, both tribes were given the general name of Arabians. In 126 B.C. John Hyrcanus conquered the Idumeans and forcibly converted them to the Jewish faith through the rite of circumcision.¹⁰ Just as the Iturean and Nabataean converts were regarded with suspicion and contempt by the

⁸ Wars, Book i, 6, 2.

⁹ Antiquities, Book xiv, 1, 3.

¹⁰ Joseph P. Free, Archaeology and Bible History (Wheaton, Illinois: Van Kampen Press, 1950), p. 276.

Jews of the "old state," even so the Idumean converts were not considered to be of true Jewish blood and thus somewhat lower than the true Jews.¹¹ This is a handicap of which Antipater and his sons were continually reminded by the Jews of Judah.

The Hazy Heritage

The accepted version of Antipater's heritage is that he was the son of a wealthy Idumean, who had been appointed "strategos" (satrap or governor) of Idumea during the reign of Alexander Janneus. This is the accepted version, but there are other accounts which state that Antipater's father was a true Jew and descended from the principal Jews who first returned from the Babylon captivity. Josephus denies the truth of this statement since it was written by the court historian of Herod the Great, the son of Antipater.¹² Other ancient sources maintain that Antipater was of Nabataean descent and as a youth was carried as a slave to Idumea. Again, it is stated that Antipater was an Idumean, but that his father was poor. All these accounts carry the tinge of prejudice. Yet the most reliable sources and historians maintain that Antipater's father was a wealthy official of Idumea and that Antipater received this public position and personal wealth as his heritage.¹³

One of the reasons for the discrepancies concerning Antipater is that both he and his father had the same name. The name "Antipater" is the

¹¹A. H. M. Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

¹²*Antiquities*, Book xiv, 1, 3.

¹³Emil Schurer, *A History of the Jewish People* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1924), I, 314.

Greek or gentile derivation of the Jewish or Hebrew "Antipas." Thus the subject of this paper can be called by either name.¹⁴ This can become confusing, and some historians have made the mistake of confusing the father, who died in 78 B.C., with the son, who first appeared in history in 69 B.C.¹⁵

In addition to the position and wealth, which consisted of vast herds and trade routes, Antipater had received enviable political contacts from his father. His father had made friends with the Arabians, Gazites, and Ascalonites. Utilizing his own subtle intellect and diplomatic talents, Antipater augmented these friendships with "many and large presents."¹⁶ These contacts proved to be invaluable for Antipater in his later political endeavors.¹⁷ Thus we see in Antipater a man who possessed the triangle of successful qualifications for political service: he was wealthy, intelligent, and he knew how to make friends.

¹⁴Antiquities, Book xiv, 1, 3.

¹⁵Heinrich Graetz, History of the Jews (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1941), II, 59.

¹⁶Antiquities, Book xiv, 1, 3.

¹⁷S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock and M. P. Charlesworth, editors, The Augustan Empire, in The Cambridge Ancient History (Cambridge: University Press, 1934), IX, 402.

CHAPTER III

ANTIPATER BEGINS HIS PLAN FOR A JEWISH DYNASTY

Flight, Aid, Ascendance

In 69 B.C., after Alexandra's death, Aristobulus seized the kingship of the Jews from his older brother Hyrcanus. Remembering that there was little love lost between Aristobulus and Antipater, it is not difficult to understand that the latter would promote a counter-revolution. During the three-year peace between the brothers, Hyrcanus had considerable association with the Idumean. Antipater reminded Hyrcanus of his legitimate heritage which his brother had arrogated. Continuing along this line Antipater charged that Aristobulus' friends were advising him to kill Hyrcanus. Hyrcanus was not convinced, preferring to maintain his supine, complacent attitude. This gentle disposition of Hyrcanus was hard to overcome, but essentially necessary if Antipater wanted a counter-revolution. After stirring up the more powerful Jews and secretly speaking behind Aristobulus' back, Antipater persisted in his efforts to persuade Hyrcanus that his life was in imminent danger. Finally Hyrcanus was convinced that he was in danger. When he was thus convinced, Antipater suggested that he flee to Aretas, king of Arabia, for protection. After sending Antipater to Aretas to insure that the Arabian king would not betray him, Hyrcanus, together with Antipater, fled from Jerusalem.¹

¹Antiquities, Book xiv, 1, 2-4.

Their destination was Petra, the capital of the Nabataean king.²

In 64/65 B.C. Antipater began to persuade his friend Aretas to assist Hyrcanus in confiscating the latter's kingship from his brother Aristobulus. By this time Hyrcanus was content to let Antipater negotiate for military assistance in his name. Thus empowered, Antipater agreed to restore twelve cities on the eastern side of the Dead Sea which Alexander Jannaeus had taken from the Nabataeans. This concession, however, could not be realized until Hyrcanus had conquered Aristobulus and was declared king. Both Hyrcanus and Aretas agreed to the conditions and an alliance was made. Thus it was that both Hyrcanus and Aretas, urged and promised by Antipater, invaded Judea to defeat Antipater's foe Aristobulus.³

The advancing army marched into Judea and defeated Aristobulus' army in battle. Just as Hyrcanus' troops had deserted to the enemy at the battle of Jericho, so now a good portion of Aristobulus' army joined the victorious army of Hyrcanus and Aretas. Aristobulus fled to Jerusalem where he prepared his last defense in the fortified temple area. When Antipater and company arrived at the city gates, much of the populace was for the victorious Hyrcanus. It looked as though Antipater's plan had worked. He had successfully led Hyrcanus to depose his brother. This meant that Antipater would rule the country in reality if not in name, for Hyrcanus would be king.⁴

²G. Frederick Owen, Abraham to Allenby (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Erdmans Publishing Company, 1939), p. 135.

³Antiquities, Book xiv, 1, 4; 2, 1.

⁴Martin Noth, The History of Israel (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1939), p. 390.

Rome's Arrival Stops Antipater's Ascendancy

But at this time, when Aristobulus was on his last leg, the hand of Rome stretched forth and completely altered the course of events, both for Antipater and Aristobulus. Pompey, the conqueror of the East, sent his legate M. Aemilius Scaurus to Damascus. Scaurus, hearing of the conflict at Jerusalem, went there to arbitrate the dispute. On his arrival, both factions vied for his favor through monetary gifts, each amounting to four hundred talents. The Roman legate decided to intervene for Aristobulus because he felt it was easier to eject the Nabataeans than to besiege a strong and powerful city like Jerusalem. In addition, Scaurus was not impressed with Hyrcanus' personality.⁵

Scaurus commanded the Nabataean king to withdraw his troops from the field and return to his country. Aretas obeyed the command, and together with Hyrcanus, fled to Petra. However, the flight was not quick enough for them to elude Aristobulus, who with a hastily gathered army, pursued them and routed the retreating army. In this battle Phalion, the brother of Antipater, was mortally wounded.⁶ Antipater's ambitions were smashed and Aristobulus was in the fore once again. But the failure of this first attempt did not stop Antipater, for he knew that there was still hope, and that this hope lay in Pompey's hands. Even in defeat Antipater realized that he who would be king of the Jews must first have recognition and assistance from Pompey.

⁵Antiquities, Book xiv, 2, 3.

⁶Ibid.

Before Pompey Antipater Regained Ascendance

In the winter of 64/63 B.C. Pompey arrived in Damascus where the deputations from all the eastern countries appeared soliciting boons and requests. Prior to this arrival, Aristobulus had sent Pompey a golden vine valued at five hundred talents, and known as the Terpule or "The Delight." This gift was to insure Aristobulus' claim, or so he imagined. In order further to insure his claim, Aristobulus sent his personal emissary, named Nicodemus, to Pompey. Hyrcanus, on the other hand, was represented by Antipater. Both of these delegates presented their claims, but Nicodemus made the mistake of accusing certain Roman officials of taking bribes. The accusation was directed against Gabinius and Scaurus. Now no ruler likes to hear about the fraudulent activities of his underlings, especially if they are true. Pompey was not the exception. Thus through poor representation, Aristobulus gained the disfavor not only of Pompey, but also of two men who would be increasingly important in eastern politics. Since he had some military conquests to promote around Damascus, Pompey postponed his final decision of the rival claims until the spring.⁷

Pompey returned to Damascus in 63 B.C. to give his decision on the supposed rights of the Judean princes. In addition to Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, there was present also a delegation which, speaking in the name of the Jewish nation, requested that both brothers be removed and that Judea be allowed to govern herself as a republic. The main arguments which Hyrcanus presented for his defense were that he was not only

⁷Ibid., Book xiv, 3, 1-2.

the legitimate heir, but that his younger brother was also given to revolt and violent actions. This line of argument looks like something Antipater might have devised. We must remember that Rome wanted peace in her colonies. In order to substantiate Hyrcanus' arguments, Antipater had persuaded one thousand of the more highly ranking Jews to back Hyrcanus' testimony. Not to be outdone, Aristobulus argued that Hyrcanus was not the right man to be king since he would allow the country to be taken over by someone who could mold Hyrcanus' inactive temper to his own ends. There is little doubt that this statement was directed against Antipater. Then Aristobulus brought forth his witnesses to fortify his testimony. These witnesses were young, brash, insolent, and much too pompous for Pompey's taste. The result of this hearing was that Pompey condemned Aristobulus' past belligerent actions and ordered both the brothers to return to their country and peaceably await his decision which he would render as soon as his Nabataean campaign was completed.⁵

Fearing that Pompey's decision would be against him, Aristobulus returned to Judea, and, gathering an army to safeguard his power, marched to the fortress of Alexandrium. The genuine claims of Hyrcanus, together with the controlling hand of Antipater who had favorably impressed the Roman legitimist in Damascus concerning his ability and obedience to Roman rule, made the outcome seem inevitable. This is especially true in light of the fact that Aristobulus was too pugnacious, quarrelsome and contentious to promise the Romans anything except a reign of unrest, revolts and open rebellion against Roman authority. Upon hearing of Aristobulus' movements, Pompey deferred

⁵Ibid., Book xiv, 3, 1-3.

his Nabataean campaign and led his army into Judea. On command of Pompey, Aristobulus surrendered Alexandrium. But then before he was secured, Aristobulus bolted again, fleeing to Jerusalem in a last attempt to reorganize resistance against Pompey.⁹

Naturally all of these overt actions against the power and authority of Rome were very detrimental to Aristobulus' cause. On the other hand, these same actions were extremely beneficial to Antipater and Hyrcanus. Had not Antipater warned Pompey of the younger brother's seditious character? Now Antipater was in a position where he needed but to wait for Pompey to dispose of his arch enemy and the man who stood in his way for full political power.

⁹Ibid., Book xiv, 3, 4.

CHAPTER IV

ANTIPATER BUILDS THE FOUNDATIONS FOR HIS DYNASTY

UNDER POMPEY'S ROMAN RULE

Jerusalem Falls to Pompey in 63 B.C.

After Aristobulus fled to Jerusalem to reorganize resistance, Pompey followed him to that city and demanded his surrender. Realizing the gravity and futility of the situation, Aristobulus offered to surrender himself and left his fortifications to confer with Pompey. But when Pompey had accepted Aristobulus' surrender, the issue was by no means terminated, for when Piso led Pompey's army to the city gates he was refused admission. It seems that Aristobulus' more courageous adherents within the city had closed the gates and were prepared for siege. When Pompey heard this he committed Aristobulus to confinement and directed the siege against Jerusalem himself. Meanwhile there was a battle being waged within the city between the followers of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus. The former were for resistance, but the latter wanted to admit the Romans into the city. As a result, the gates were opened, but the Temple area was fortified for siege by the followers of Aristobulus. It took Pompey three months to conquer this inner part of the city.¹

The Conditions of Surrender

During the siege of Jerusalem Hyrcanus had helped Pompey by hinder-

¹Major H. O. Lock, The Conquerors of Palestine Through Forty Centuries (London: Robert Scott Roxburghe House Paternoster Row, 1920), p. 54.

ing the rural Jews from giving assistance to Aristobulus. Consequently Pompey had officially appointed Hyrcanus high priest, although the title of king was denied to Hyrcanus and he was simply called "Ethnarch."² The Roman conqueror demanded an annual tribute of ten thousand talents. In order to lessen the possibility of another siege, Pompey commanded that the fortifications of Jerusalem and the other major cities be completely demolished. Judea was stripped of all the territories which the Maccabees had won. Consequently Hyrcanus ruled nothing save the narrow limits of the old kingdom of Judah. This somewhat deleted kingdom was approximately one-tenth of what Alexander Jannaeus had controlled. Finally, Scaurus who was the first provincial governor of Syria reorganized and created new political boundaries in Syria and Palestine. This meant that even the small area left to Hyrcanus was subject to Scaurus.³

Pompey had made certain that the Jewish kingdom would not be a menace to the peace and prosperity of Syria in the future. At least that was what he hoped this new reorganization would accomplish. Of special note is that in the resettlement of the Jewish territories, the Jews were cut off from the sea. All the seaports were taken away from Judah.⁴ Besides Rome, only one man had gained anything from the sequence of events. This man was Antipater. Aristobulus and his children were led captive to Rome, and even though the older son Alexander has escaped, he was nevertheless in Pompey's disfavor. Antipater had been of assist-

²Wars, Book 1, 7, 6.

³Antiquities, Book xiv, 4, 4-5.

⁴Martin Noth, The History of Israel (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958), p. 402.

ance to Pompey in the siege; and now since Hyrcanus was high priest, the real ruling power left in the hands of the Jews rested in Antipater's capable fingers. Thus the year 63 B.C. comes to a close with "Rome at the gate, the Idumean nigh to the throne."⁵

Antipater Maneuvers Through Insurrections and Political Intrigues

After Aristobulus' first defeat in 63 B.C., a very complex drama of insurrections and intrigues took place in Palestine. The principal actors were Aristobulus and his two sons Antigonus and Alexander. The former son was imprisoned with his father in Rome, and the latter was a fugitive since he had escaped from the Romans. In addition there were Antipater, Hyrcanus, and the Roman powers in the foreground. Roman officials were becoming very familiar with the word Palestine. It meant revolt to them, and was becoming recognized as the hotbed of the East. Time and time again the Roman lords had to apply the most severe measures to quiet the nationalistic fervor of this extremely patriotic people.⁶ With much difficulty and maneuverability, Antipater guided his future and that of the Jews in order to bring peace to the land and to fulfill the dream of his future dynasty. His task was threefold: to pacify Rome and hope to regain the land which Pompey had stripped from the Jews; to recapture in some measure a bit of the national independence which the Jews were so proud of; and finally, to further his own goal of forming a ruling dynasty in Judah.

⁵Rev. G. M. Grant, Between the Testaments (London: A & C Black, Ltd., Soho Square, 1918), p. 89.

⁶Wars, Book 1, 8, 1 to 9, 5.

When Pompey left Palestine, Antipater immediately began his work of political reconstruction. Scaurus, whom Pompey had left in charge of Syria, made an expedition against the Nabataeans in 62 B.C. When, however he was stopped at Petra, it was Antipater who arrived with corn and other necessary supplies. Antipater then offered his services as ambassador for the Romans and after he arranged suitable terms with the Nabataeans, the king Aretas made an alliance with the Romans. Both parties were quite satisfied. With little loss of time, the Idumean had revealed his fidelity and good intentions to both the Romans and the Nabataeans.⁷ Thus when Scaurus was relieved by Gabinus it is reasonable that this newly appointed governor would look upon Antipater with favor.

No sooner did Gabinus arrive and begin his official duty, than Alexander, Aristobulus' oldest son, gathered an army and forced Hyrcanus and Antipater out of Jerusalem. As soon as he was aware of this seditious action, Gabinus, with the cooperation of Antipater, defeated Alexander near Jerusalem. In this battle, a young legate by the name of Marcus Antonius was Antipater's companion-in-arms. A year or so later, in 56 B.C., Aristobulus and his younger son Antigonus escaped from Rome. Appearing in Judea, they started a revolt. Once again Gabinus, Antipater, and Marcus Antonius easily suppressed them. Both of the insurrectionists were sent back to Rome as captives.⁸

During the interim between the first attempt of Alexander and the

⁷Antiquities, Book xiv, 5, 1.

⁸Ibid., Book xiv, 5, 2 to 6, 1.

attempt of Aristobulus and Antigonus to regain the throne, Gabinius reorganized the religious community of Jerusalem. At this time all the political authority which Pompey had left in the hands of Hyrcanus was taken away. Although Pompey had taken away the title of king, he had left Hyrcanus as the political leader of all the areas of Palestine which belonged to the religious community of Jerusalem. Now, under Gabinius, Hyrcanus was confined entirely to his religious office and the religious community of Jerusalem was divided into five independent districts. All of these districts were placed directly under the provincial governor. This was the final step which Rome made in an attempt to placate the trouble spot of Palestine. Palestine was directly under Roman rule and surveillance.⁹

In 55 B.C. Gabinius went to Egypt to restore Ptolemy to his kingdom, which Archelaus had taken by force. At this time Antipater came to Gabinius, even though Gabinius' reorganization of Judea had deprived him of all the political powers which technically belonged to Hyrcanus. Antipater supplied Gabinius with provisions and food, men and money. In addition, he used his influence with the Jews at the garrison of Pelusium to allow Gabinius to pass through and travel to Egypt. During this time Alexander began another revolt in Syria. Gabinius sent Antipater to Syria in an attempt to avert further bloodshed. When, however, the attempt failed, Gabinius crushed Alexander at Mt. Tabor.¹⁰ Between 55/54 B.C. Gabinius settled the affairs in Jerusalem, which

⁹Ibid., Book xiv, 5, 4.

¹⁰Ibid., Book xiv, 6, 2-4.

Josephus mentioned "was agreeable to Antipater's inclination."¹¹ This shuffling of "affairs" refers to the fact that the fivefold division which Gabinius had formerly imposed upon the area of Jerusalem was now removed. Once again the whole area was placed under the jurisdiction of the high priest.¹²

The relationship between Antipater and Gabinius seems to have been a favorable one. If Gabinius could have stayed on as Governor of Syria for a few more years it would have been quite advantageous for Antipater. However, this was not the case, for Gabinius was evidently recalled to Rome and a man named Crassus became Governor of Syria. Crassus was a crude individual who cared little for the Jews or their feelings. He is the man who looted the Temple in Jerusalem. Contrasted with the diplomatic Pompey, who had left the Temple intact, Crassus presents a man who could and would incite the Jewish nationalistic cauldron to the boiling point. Fortunately for the Romans, Jews, and especially Antipater, Crassus was soon defeated and killed in his first major campaign against the Parthians.¹³

The next Roman to govern Syria was C. Cassius Longinus. Almost immediately after subduing the Parthians, he was forced to suppress a Jewish rebellion. The leader of the revolt was Pitholaus, who it seems had followed in Aristobulus' seditious practices. Thirty thousand Jews were taken captive when Longinus defeated Pitholaus at the Battle of

¹¹Ibid., Book xiv, 6, 4.

¹²Martin Noth, op. cit., p. 504.

¹³Antiquities, Book xiv, 7, 1-3.

Taricheae. Through these constant revolts, the Jews were steadily and uselessly throwing away their lifeblood against the irresistible Roman shield. Although Antipater delighted in the execution of Fitholaus, and even seems to have had a hand in bringing about his execution, he was not happy at the great loss of Jewish blood which continuously seeped away through these revolts.¹⁵

¹⁵Israel Goldberg and Samson Benderly, Outline of Jewish Knowledge (New York: Bureau of Jewish Education, 1931), III, 494f.

CHAPTER V

CAESAR ENTERS PALESTINE AND ANTIPATER'S DYNASTY CRYSTALLIZES

Antipater Against Caesar

In 49/48 B.C. Julius Caesar crossed the Rubicon and invaded Rome. His chief opponent was Pompey who was forced to flee to Epirus.¹ Since Pompey was still the chief power in the East, Antipater was placed in the position of nominally fighting against Caesar, even though they never did oppose one another in actual battle. Even if Antipater had been convinced that Caesar would have been victorious, he could not possibly have sided with Caesar until Pompey was dead. This is a recognized fact due to the political division of the Roman world. Pompey had accomplished many of his military victories in the East; it was due to his influence that the governors of the eastern provinces were appointed or rejected. His army was scattered over the entire eastern empire. Thus it would have been political, if not physical, suicide for Antipater to desert Pompey in his crisis. Thus Antipater was not in a position to choose his side, but rather was swept up in the magnitude of these two giants from Rome.

It should be noted that both Aristobulus and his son Alexander were killed during this time. Caesar had decided to use Aristobulus, who was captive in Rome, in his fight against Pompey. Aristobulus would have gladly accepted Caesar's request since it was Pompey who had divested

¹A. H. M. Jones, The Herods of Judaea (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), p. 26.

him of both his kingship and high priestly office. However, before Aristobulus departed for Judea, he was poisoned by Pompeians in Rome.² The method of extermination for Alexander was a bit different. Again on Pompey's orders, a man named Scipio beheaded Alexander for crimes committed against the Roman State. These crimes referred to the rebellious activity he had perpetrated in the past years in an effort to overthrow Antipater and Hyrcanus.³ Evidently Pompey had not felt it necessary to kill these two men prior to this time because of a certain amount of popularity the two men had in the minds of the Jews. That this popularity existed can be seen by the facility with which Aristobulus and his sons gathered armies in their nine years of battling against Antipater and the Romans. In addition Alexander had previously married one of Hyrcanus' daughters, and thus could lay claim to both the royal and priestly offices. Regardless of this popular sympathy Pompey, with his back to the wall, emptied his eastern domain of any potential enemies. Thus again one can see why Antipater "chose" to follow Pompey in opposition to Julius Caesar.⁴

Antipater Aids Caesar

Both Hyrcanus and Antipater continued to be on Pompey's side until his death in 48 B.C. Prior to his death, Pompey was conclusively defeated by Caesar in the Battle of Pharsalus. Although Pompey had

² Wars, Book 1, 9, 1.

³ Ibid., Book 1, 9, 2.

⁴ Rev. C. M. Grant, Between the Testaments (London: A & C Black, Ltd., Soho Square, 1918), p. 92.

attempted to escape, the cohorts of Caesar quickly caught and murdered him on the coast of the Egyptian Delta. After Pompey's death, Antipater switched his fidelity and began to plan how he could win the favor of the victorious Caesar.⁵

The first opportunity for Antipater to give aid to Caesar was in Egypt. Caesar had travelled to Egypt to repel the remnants of Pompey's army. When he arrived, the famed Roman general found that his troops and supplies were not sufficient to deal with the opposition. Consequently Caesar's position was dangerously desperate, for he stood to lose an important campaign. His dilemma was aggravated because of the distance between Egypt and his source of supplies which was now in Syria with his general Mithridates.⁶ Furthermore, Mithridates was forced to remain in Askelon since the Arabian sheiks who held the Pelusian Pass refused to allow the Roman army passage through to Egypt. It is at this decisive moment that Antipater arrived with three thousand armed Jews. This army was composed of Arabians and Syrians, both of whom had been persuaded by Antipater to join in the fight to aid Caesar.⁷ Antipater was able to influence the Arabians because shortly before he had married the daughter of an eminent family among these people.⁸ In addition, these particular Arabians were also Idumeans,⁹ and Antipater's

⁵Martin Noth, The History of Israel (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958), p. 406.

⁶A. H. M. Jones, op. cit., p. 27.

⁷Wars, Book 1, 9, 3.

⁸Ibid., Book 1, 8, 9.

⁹Antiquities, Book xiv, 8, 1.

father, as well as Antipater himself, had been governor of Idumea.¹⁰ In fact, it seems quite possible to assume that in the light of past performances, political connections, and the lack of historical data to the contrary, Antipater was still quite influential in Idumea. On the other hand, Antipater seems to have used a more negative approach with the Syrians, who after speaking with Antipater were very zealous to join him lest they "appear behindhand in their alacrity for Caesar."¹¹

With these added reinforcements Mithridates was able to besiege the city of Pelusian which controlled the pass. During the siege Antipater distinguished himself with his bold courage and fighting ability. The siege was successful and the hybrid army continued its journey to Egypt. Along the way Antipater induced the Egyptians of Jewish descent living in Orion,¹² which other historians deduce to be Heliopolis,¹³ not only to allow the army safe passage to Egypt, but also to join them in their crusade to aid Caesar in Egypt. This aid was attained when Antipater revealed some epistles of Hyrcanus who was respected by these Jews. The aid consisted of men, arms, provisions, and money. Now when the Jews in Memphis heard of this action they also decided to aid the Roman army. Manpower was the chief source of aid the Jews of Memphis contributed to the army.¹⁴

¹⁰Supra, p. 9.

¹¹Antiquities, Book xiv, 8, 1.

¹²Ibid.

¹³A. H. M. Jones, loc. cit.

¹⁴Antiquities, Book xiv, 8, 1.

On the Egyptian Delta the Mithridates/Antipater army participated in its first engagement in the Battle of the Jewish Camp. The battle lines were drawn, and both armies were divided into two segments. A pitched battle ensued with Antipater and Mithridates commanding the left and right flanks respectively. Mithridates was wounded and his command faltered, but Antipater led his men to quick victory and then proceeded to vanquish the Egyptians who were defeating Mithridates. The victory was complete. It is interesting to note that this man who is particularly noted for his diplomatic and political talents also possessed considerable military ability. This is true not only with regard to tactical maneuvers, but also to personal intestinal fortitude. In addition, while Mithridates was in all probability leading his own trained and seasoned Roman troops, Antipater only had a collection of untrained nomadic insurgents. Noting this, one can begin to appreciate the military achievement of Antipater. In support of this achievement, Josephus mentions that Antipater lost fifty men while Mithridates lost eight hundred men.¹⁵

Noting the contribution of Antipater and his native ability, Mithridates sent a glowing account of the battle to Caesar in which he openly stated that Antipater had been personally responsible for the victory. When Caesar heard this, he commended Antipater and decided to use his talents for the good of Rome. Thus it was that Antipater became the commander of Caesar's shock troops in the battles that followed in Egypt. Serving in this capacity, Antipater was wounded several times.

¹⁵Ibid., Book xiv, 8, 2.

Finally, Caesar brought the Egyptian campaign to a victorious conclusion.¹⁶

Caesar Aids Antipater

As soon as Caesar returned to Syria he revealed his gratitude for the aid given him by Antipater. Caesar conferred Roman citizenship upon him and gave him personal tax exemption. In addition, Hyrcanus was confirmed as high priest because of the assistance Antipater had given Caesar in Egypt.¹⁷

In the meantime Antigonus, the surviving son of Aristobulus, felt that this was a good time to catch Caesar's ear and brought his case before the ruler in Syria. Among the charges Antigonus presented against Antipater were the indictments of murder and the violent oppressive rule of Judea. The charge of murder referred to the deaths of his father and brother which Antigonus felt were connected with Antipater. Against such charges Antipater had little difficulty in defending himself, especially since the hearing followed Caesar's display of favor to Antipater mentioned above. Pointing to the past seditious activities of Antigonus, Antipater contrasted this with his own fidelity to the Roman cause.¹⁸ To illustrate his point, Antipater displayed some of the wounds he had accumulated while serving Caesar in Egypt.¹⁹ Caesar was convinced, Antipater was given more honor and Antigonus was sent

¹⁶ Wars, Book 1, 9, 4-6.

¹⁷ Ibid., Book 1, 9, 6.

¹⁸ Antiquities, Book xiv, 8, 4.

¹⁹ Wars, Book 1, 10, 2.

away emptyhanded.

After the "trial" of Antipater, Caesar conferred additional privileges upon Antipater, Hyrcanus, and the Jewish people. Hyrcanus was told that he was worthy of his high priestly office. Antipater was given the office of procurator or administrator of Judea, and either Antipater or Hyrcanus received permission to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. Josephus seems to contradict himself on which man actually received the permission to rebuild the city walls. At one time Antipater seems to have had the honor,²⁰ and at another time Hyrcanus seemed to be the man.²¹ In any event, Hyrcanus was confirmed in the hereditary office of high priest and was also appointed to the hereditary office of "ethnarch." These rights were to be valid also for Hyrcanus' sons. Immunity from military subscription and lenient tax regulations were awarded to the Jews. Much of the land which had been removed by Pompey in 63 B.C. was now returned, together with the seaport Joppa. The religious community of Jerusalem was granted the power of self-jurisdiction and freedom of worship.²² These are some of the most important concessions which Julius Caesar granted to the Jews in recognition of Antipater's service to Rome.

²⁰ Antiquities, Book xiv, 8, 5.

²¹ Jars, Book i, 10, 3.

²² Antiquities, Book xiv, 10, 2-6.

CHAPTER VI

ANTIPATER'S DYNASTY IS ESTABLISHED, THREATENED, AND SEALED

Dynasty Established

After Caesar left Syria to go against Pharnaces, Antipater set about arranging the country under the existing government. Almost immediately he began raising the walls of Jerusalem which had been destroyed in 63 B. C. Through threats and rational advice, Antipater pacified the riotous element in the land. The people could make the choice of peace and live in harmony with Hyrcanus and Antipater, or they could be given to insurrection. If the former decision was held, the people would find Hyrcanus and Antipater kind and amiable. If, however, the latter choice was maintained, the Jews would find Antipater, Hyrcanus, and the Romans hard masters and tyrants. Thus the people could choose between a severe or gentle procurator in Antipater; a tyrant or king in Hyrcanus; a friend or enemy in Rome.¹ This quick action by Antipater carried weight, for he was now the official Roman appointee in Palestine.

Since he was now in a position of official command, and since he was more secure in that position than ever before, Antipater began his move to introduce his two sons into the political arena. In this cause, Antipater not only made his eldest son Phasaelus governor of Jerusalem and its surrounding territory, but he also committed the administration of Galilee to Herod. This is an important step for Antipater who was

¹Antiquities, Book xiv, 9, 1.

aware of the fierce Jewish pride in the pure royal blood which the Jews desired in their rulers. Yet, regardless of the enmity, both nationalistic and personal, Antipater decided this was the time to introduce his most positive step in establishing his dynasty.²

History proves that Antipater's decision was a good one, for both his sons were gifted with uncommon administrative abilities. Both Herod and Phasaelus became active in their official duties and revealed many of the same attributes which had made their father the strongest political force in Palestine. Of the two sons, Herod was the first to reveal his ability. Galilee was noted for its zealous patriots and often the revolts which arose in the land originated among these people. At the time Herod began as governor, a band of brigands were overrunning Galilee and the neighboring parts of Syria. Realizing that this would be of advantage to him, Herod took steps to suppress the robbers. His attempt was very successful. Herod captured and executed Hezekiah who was the leader of the marauding band. When the Syrians and especially the Roman Governor of Syria, Sextus Caesar, heard of Herod's achievement, he was pleased and commended Herod for his prompt action. Since Sextus was a relation of Julius Caesar, the political advantage of Herod's move is quite evident.³

Meanwhile, the elder son Phasaelus was also making headway in and around Jerusalem. Because of his diplomacy, the people of Jerusalem came to regard Phasaelus as a fair and just ruler. Phasaelus was

²Ibid., Book xiv, 9, 2.

³Ibid.

meticulous in the administration of his public affairs. He saw to it that his actions remained honest and that no one usurped his authority. Consequently, the Jews bore this just man the good will only accorded to those highly esteemed.⁴ When we add this to Herod's activities in Galilee, it is not difficult to understand why the people as a whole held the chief administrator and sire Antipater in great respect. In fact, at this time Antipater had reached the zenith of his political career as far as the people were concerned. He was honored as only an absolute lord and king would be honored.⁵

The Dynasty Threatened

The power of Antipater and his sons aroused the displeasure of the different political factions in Jerusalem. This is not difficult to understand, for politically speaking, as long as Antipater was in power, the other parties and would-be-rulers were barely on the periphery of any political influence. Then again, the actions of Antipater's sons revealed two capable men who had proven their ability to retain the political ascendancy gained by their father. Consequently there was an attempt to decrease, and, if possible, to stop the growing popularity of Antipater. The plan was to strike at the sons and not at Antipater himself. These Jewish leaders did not relish the prospect of matching wits with Antipater who had more than once proved his mastery over them. After casting aspersions of embezzling at Antipater, the faction

⁴Ibid.

⁵Wars, Book i, 10, 5.

directed their main attack against Herod, who of the two sons, seemed to possess the greater ability to carry on his father's political career.⁶

Under pressure from these politicians, Hyrcanus summoned Herod to appear before the Sanhedrin. The charge against Herod was that in executing the brigands and their chief Hezekiah, he had abused the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin by taking a life without the consent of this "Supreme Council" of the Jews. Hyrcanus was told that this action revealed the ruling role which Antipater now possessed. It should be remembered that nominally Hyrcanus was "ethnarch" and high priest of the Jews, and as such should have been exerting the authority which Antipater in reality had been exercising.⁷ In addition to these arguments, the dissenters appealed to public opinion which was not really opposed to brigandage in Palestine. Since the time of Judas Maccabeus brigandage had a strong political color. In addition, many of the great national leaders against Rome after Maccabees had been brigands at one time or another. Consequently, Hezekiah had been somewhat of a national hero among the common people.⁸ Perhaps this sheds a little illumination upon the choice which the Jews made between Jesus and Barabbas at Gabbatha.⁹ Under such pressure, which was seasoned with the maternal wailings of the deceased robbers' parentage, Hyrcanus was induced to

⁶ Antiquities, Book xiv, 9, 3.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ A. H. M. Jones, The Herods of Judaea (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), p. 26.

⁹ Luke 23:17-19.

call Herod to trial before the Sanhedrin.¹⁰

Herod came, but with an air of dictatorial superiority which frightened the Sanhedrin. The outcome of the trial seemed inevitable. It was inconceivable to assume that this group, over which Hyrcanus exerted control, would execute the son of the unquestioned power in Palestine. Furthermore, Sextus Caesar had written to Hyrcanus demanding that Herod be acquitted. Thus Hyrcanus, desiring to keep his own position on amicable terms with Rome, made plans to exonerate Herod. But the Sanhedrin had been rejuvenated by the stirring speech of a man called Sameas and it looked as if the judicial body would demand a death sentence. Seeing that the verdict could be death, Hyrcanus advised Herod to flee Jerusalem. In anger Herod fled, and when he arrived in Damascus he was bent on revenge. His tool for vengeance was to be the Roman army of Coelosyria, which Sextus gave him to command on his return. Thus armed, Herod marched back to Jerusalem to seek his vengeance.¹¹

Such an action would permanently damage Antipater's position. Open warfare could only earn the people's disdain and Rome's displeasure. Consequently, Antipater reached Herod before he entered Jerusalem, and persuaded him against any overt action. Herod submitted to his father's will when he was reminded of the political implications, and after his temper had been appeased with the knowledge that his display of arms had frightened Hyrcanus, the Sanhedrin, and the people in general.¹² Thus

¹⁰ Antiquities, Book xiv, 9, 4.

¹¹ Ibid., Book xiv, 9, 4-5.

¹² Wars, Book 1, 10, 9.

conciliated, Herod returned to Galilee, and the attempt to overthrow Antipater and his sons failed shortly before success seemed certain.

The Dynasty Sealed

A new Roman governor appeared in Syria. Caesilius Bassus, a member of Pompey's party, raised a mutiny against Sextus Caesar, killed him, and took the governorship by force. The Caesarian troops were quickly marched and, together with Herod and Phasaelus whom Antipater had sent, marched against Bassus. This was in the year 44 B.C., the same year Julius Caesar was assassinated by Brutus and Cassius.¹³ Immediately after the assassination, Cassius fled to Syria, made an alliance between Bassus and the Caesarian army, and became the lord of the East.¹⁴ Cassius had come to Syria to raise money for the forthcoming battle against Octavian, Mark Antony, and Lepidos.¹⁵

The first demand Cassius laid upon the rulers was that they must increase their taxes. In this respect he especially oppressed Judea. Antipater apportioned the tribute of seven hundred talents and appointed his two sons and several of his worst enemies to collect the taxes. Herod collected his share in record time, and was commended by Cassius. However, others were not as zealous. As an object lesson, Cassius sold several cities into slavery when the tribute was not assembled by peaceful means. It is interesting to note here that Malichus, an enemy

¹³A. H. M. Jones, op. cit., p. 31.

¹⁴Antiquities, Book xiv, 11, 2.

¹⁵Israel Goldberg and Samson Benderly, Outline of Jewish Knowledge (New York: Bureau of Jewish Education, 1931), II, 498.

of Antipater who was below his allocated sum, was saved from death at Cassius' hand due to Antipater's intervention. Antipater had persuaded Hyrcanus to pay the difference between the collected and the assigned sum of money.¹⁶

As soon as Cassius left Judea Malichus seriously plotted the death of Antipater. The Idumean found out about this plot and fled beyond Jordan where he gathered an army and returned to Jerusalem. But Malichus denied any plot against Antipater. Although Antipater was content to let the situation remain an open issue, the Governor of Syria, Marcus by name, was not of the same mind. In fact, Marcus would have executed Malichus if Antipater had not mediated in his behalf.¹⁷ It is ironic that Antipater twice saved the man who seemingly instigated his assassination.

In 43 B.C. Antipater was poisoned. Hyrcanus was drawn unwittingly into the plot, since it was his butler who seems to have extended the "coup de grace" to Antipater.¹⁸ If the opposition against Antipater supposed that his death would stop his rule, they were sadly mistaken. Antipater had not groomed his sons for nothing; it was not for naught that he had made alliances with Rome and thereby grew stronger every year; he had seen to it that his sons received valuable political experience before he died. Thus it was that the death of Antipater actually sealed his dream of a ruling dynasty. The position of his

¹⁶A. H. M. Jones, op. cit., p. 32.

¹⁷Antiquities, Book xiv, 11, 3.

¹⁸Ibid., Book xiv, 11, 4.

sons was too strong to be destroyed. Antipater had planned and brought these plans to fulfillment, and the world would clearly see this fulfillment in his son Herod, called the Great.¹⁹ Josephus' epitaph for this man is, "and thus died Antipater, a man that had distinguished himself for piety and justice, and love to his country."²⁰

¹⁹Martin Noth, The History of Israel (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958), pp. 407f.

²⁰Antiquities, Book xiv, 11, 4. had found that this little nation was ever restless and constant in revolting against the Roman legions. The Jews still yearned for freedom from foreign rule. Time and time again, the Jews had fought for a hopeless cause with unshakable tenacity against the mightiest army in the world. Shortly after Antipater's death his career, Pompey subjected this nationalistic country to foreign domination. Remembering their past servitude, the Jews were everlastingly attempting to overthrow the hated foreigners and regain their political freedom. It was Antipater's task to pacify these people and govern them. What made this task more complicated was that the Jews regarded Antipater as one of the hated foreigners.¹ As far as the Jews were concerned, Antipater's Idumean lineage made him as bad as the Romans.² This attitude is still held today among Jewish historians, one of whom refers to Antipater as "the vampire of the nation."³

¹David Goldberg and Susan Benderly, Settling of Jewish Ancestry (New York: Bureau of Jewish Education, 1930), III, 491ff.

²ibid. 49-50.

³Herbert Goldhamer, History of the Jews (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1941), II, 59.

CHAPTER VII

POLITICAL MANIPULATIONS IN INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Antipater's Task As An Idumean

If Antipater was to fulfill his dream of a ruling dynasty it was essential that he be able to control his subjects. This was not an easy task, especially with the Jews. Rome had found that this little nation was quite radical and constant in revolting against the Roman legions. The Jews still yearned for freedom from foreign rule. Time and time again, the Jews had fought for a hopeless cause with unconquerable tenacity against the mightiest army in the world. Shortly after Antipater began his career, Pompey subjected this nationalistic country to foreign domination. Remembering their past servitude, the Jews were constantly attempting to overthrow the hated foreigners and regain their political freedom. It was Antipater's task to pacify these people and govern them. What made this task more complicated was that the Jews regarded Antipater as one of the hated foreigners.¹ As far as the Jews were concerned, Antipater's Idumean lineage made him as bad as the Romans.² This attitude is still held today among Jewish historians, one of whom refers to Antipater as "the vampire of the nation."³

¹Israel Goldberg and Samson Benderly, Outline of Jewish Knowledge (New York: Bureau of Jewish Education, 1931), III, 491ff.

²Supra, pp. 8f.

³Heinrich Graetz, History of the Jews (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1941), II, 59.

Realizing the magnitude of his task of reconciling the Jewish people to his rule, Antipater turned to other problems which he felt would in some degree lessen the people's enmity against him. Thus it was that Antipater used his talents to achieve good public relations with the neighboring tribal kings. In this way, Antipater hoped to use this foreign influence in an effort to help the Jews and thus gain their admiration and respect. These foreign relations would not only help him in peaceful negotiations for the Jews with their neighbors, but they would also help his cause with the Roman powers, and would in turn gain Roman favor for himself and the Jewish nation. Rome would be his key to success, but the good will of the Jews was essential for any lasting influence and success. Consequently, Antipater cultivated the friendship with the foreign powers that he had inherited from his father.⁴ Antipater especially fostered his relationship with the Nabataeans, also called Arabians and Idumeans. His own background helped his endeavors, and his marriage into Idumean nobility made his bond with the Idumeans an intimate one. Cypros was the name of Antipater's Idumean wife.⁵ Some historians feel that her Idumean nobility refers to the fact that she was the daughter of Aretas, king of the Arabians.⁶ This marriage took place somewhere between 65 B.C. and 69 B.C.

⁴Supra, p. 10.

⁵Antiquities, Book xiv, 8, 3.

⁶G. Frederick Owen, Abraham to Allenby (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Erdmans Publishing Company, 1939), p. 137.

Antipater's Shield Against the Jews

Although his relations with the Arabians would help him gain the respect of the Jews in some degree, the real shield which Antipater used both to defend himself against the Jews and also to gain their admiration was the high priest Hyrcanus. The Jews had a special regard for their high priest because of the honor attached to this hereditary position, and also because it symbolized the pure ruling line of the Jews.⁷ Antipater had little difficulty in subjecting the weak will of Hyrcanus to his own strong persuasive personality. The reason that Antipater picked Hyrcanus was that Hyrcanus was suited for his plans. Thus the choice was one of policy, not of fidelity. An alliance with Aristobulus would never bring Antipater's ambition to fulfillment, for the younger brother had too much of the same spirit and mind of Antipater, especially in that both wanted to rule. On the other hand, Antipater could manipulate the movements of Hyrcanus as he desired.⁸ Thus by advancing the power of Hyrcanus, Antipater would be advancing his own power. Hyrcanus was his choice and when Hyrcanus was on the throne, the Idumean would be the ruler. We have already mentioned how Antipater maneuvered Hyrcanus to break with his brother and thus ally himself with the Idumean.⁹ The whole process of moving Hyrcanus to action was masterfully accomplished by Antipater. In fact, some historians even feel that

⁷Genevieve Foster, Augustus Caesar's World (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949), p. 68.

⁸Supra, p. 6.

⁹Supra, pp. 11f.

Antipater had already negotiated terms with Aretas before Hyrcanus finally decided to seek his aid.¹⁰

Mention had been made of Antipater's political program and how he supported Hyrcanus' cause before Pompey at Damascus.¹¹ Already at that time Antipater successfully revealed his ability to cater to the Roman rulers. The results of Antipater's work with Pompey cleared the way for Hyrcanus to become the unchallenged high priest of Palestine. But the contenders for the Jewish throne, Aristobulus and his sons, continued to usurp Hyrcanus' authority. Antipater successfully maneuvered Hyrcanus through the following insurrections and intrigues with the result that both Aristobulus and his sons were outcasts while Hyrcanus was left with his position as high priest.¹² When Caesar entered the picture, Antipater won his confidence. As a result of Caesar's favor to Antipater, both Hyrcanus and the Jews received many beneficial concessions from Caesar.¹³ As far as the people were concerned, it was Hyrcanus who had earned these material blessings from Caesar. Antipater was content to leave it like this since he wanted the Jews to feel that they had achieved some degree of political success because of their beloved high priest. Consequently, the concessions received from Caesar did much to appease the Jews and lessened their hatred for the Idumean. The fact that Hyrcanus depended upon Antipater and publically avowed his friendship with the Idumean also did much to revise the Jew's animosity towards the foreigner. Although

¹⁰Israel Goldberg, *op. cit.*, p. 464.

¹¹*Supra*, p. 14.

¹²*Supra*, pp. 18f.

¹³*Supra*, pp. 29f.

he did not possess the political genius of Antipater, Hyrcanus was undoubtedly aware of the fact that his position as high priest depended on this Idumean. The very fact that he was high priest and retained that position was due to Antipater's activity with the Roman leaders. Thus by using Hyrcanus as a shield, Antipater began to change the Jew's hatred towards him.

Antipater also used Hyrcanus and his position as nominal ruler of the Jews to defend himself against the Jews. Although the Jews were prepared to accept advice and guidance in the name of their high priest, they were not ready to allow a foreigner like Antipater to rule them. Thus when Antipater was ready to launch his political organization in Judea after Caesar left Syria, he issued his orders in the name of Hyrcanus. We have mentioned that Antipater quieted the people after Caesar's departure by threats and promises.¹⁴ The fact that the Jews accepted his ultimatums was directly due to the fact that Antipater gave the orders as though he was merely acting as Hyrcanus' underling. Antipater issued many of his commands in Hyrcanus' name, as for example, when he persuaded the Jews in Egypt to aid Caesar in his Egyptian campaign.¹⁵ Although Antipater's ultimate aim is sole control of Palestine, he realized that the Jews would have to accept him regardless of Roman arms and assistance. It is for this reason that Antipater cultivated their pride in Hyrcanus, even though Hyrcanus and the other Jewish leaders knew who really made the policies. Josephus had no illusions regarding the political leader in Palestine at this time, for he states

¹⁴Supra, p. 31.

¹⁵Supra, p. 27.

that "Antipater himself settled the affairs of the country."¹⁶ Yet because Antipater pushed Hyrcanus forward as the national hero, the people were content and little by little the stigma of being an Idumean began to fade in the minds of the Jewish populace.

One might wonder why the Pharisees, who were the traditional leaders of zealous patriotism, had not exposed Antipater and excited public opinion against him as the real power behind the throne. The reason the Pharisees were quiet was due to the fact that Antipater had anticipated the problem and taken effective steps to render them helpless. We have mentioned in this paper that the Pharisees had received royal favor under Alexandra.¹⁷ After 76 B.C., the Pharisees were politically allied with the royal house of Judea. Antipater saw to it that Hyrcanus was regarded as the legitimate heir of the throne, and that Hyrcanus continued to favor the Pharisees. This, together with the fact that Aristobulus allied himself with the Sadducees, the hated rivals of the Pharisees, placed the Pharisees on the side of Hyrcanus. Since the rightful king and high priest was merely a puppet in the hand of Antipater, the patriotic Pharisees were paralysed when the Idumean built his dynasty in the name of Hyrcanus and with the aid of Rome. As a result the most patriotic party in Palestine had to forfeit the responsibility of representing the national cause against the Romans to the Sadducees. Now since the people had always looked to the Pharisees for guidance and since the Sadducees had been regarded as cold-blooded

¹⁶Antiquities, Book xiv, 9, 1.

¹⁷Suora, p. 6.

priests and "capitalists," the great body of Jews who loved the Mac-
cabean line and heartily hated the Roman invaders, were puzzled and
thoroughly confused. They were unable to offer a united front against
the Romans and the Roman protege Antipater.¹⁸

Antipater and Hyrcanus

From the beginning this paper has assumed that Antipater was the
real ruling power and that Hyrcanus was merely a tool of the Idumean.
There is, however, some disagreement on this point. The historian
Strabo portrayed Hyrcanus as being very active in the Egyptian campaign.
It would seem that Hyrcanus was an influential politician.¹⁹ Taking
their cue from this, some of the modern historians depict Hyrcanus as the
political genius who exerted his influence as high priest to motivate the
Jews to aid Caesar in his Egyptian campaign.²⁰ Josephus himself seemed
to have been confused concerning Caesar's motivation for favoring the
Jews in Palestine.²¹ Finally, the official decrees of Caesar and other
Roman leaders which give concessions to the Jews only mentioned the
name of Hyrcanus.²² Thus it would seem that perhaps Antipater was not
the real political genius that this thesis claims he was.

¹⁸ Rev. C. M. Grant, Between the Testaments (London: A & C Black,
Ltd., Soho Square, 1918), p. 92.

¹⁹ Antiquities, Book xiv, 8, 3.

²⁰ Martin Noth, The History of Israel (London: Adam & Charles
Black, 1958), p. 406.

²¹ Supra, p. 30.

²² Antiquities, Book xiv, 10, 1-26.

The solution of the confusion rests in Antipater's habit of issuing his policies in the name of Hyrcanus the high priest.²³ In addition, we must remember that Hyrcanus was the high priest and official ethnarch of Palestine. Antipater's genius is seen in the fact that although he was recognized as the political leader in Palestine, the people regarded him as the talented officer of Hyrcanus. Thus although Antipater dictated the policies, he did so through Hyrcanus and his office. When we realize this, it is not difficult to understand why Hyrcanus received the glory and honor ascribed to him by the ancient historians. On the other hand, the fact that the Jewish leaders attempted to disclaim Herod points to the fact that they were well aware of Antipater's position as the real ruler in Palestine.²⁴

Rome's Affairs Effect the World

In order fully to appreciate the task which faced Antipater, it is necessary to recall his relationship with Rome. Antipater was one of the first men to realize that Rome was in Palestine to stay and that any political success directly depended on the good graces of that nation. Realizing that Rome was the power with which to deal, Antipater formulated the policy which was the keystone of his success. This leading principle was to secure the favor of the Romans regardless of who was ruling in Rome. Although this principle is easy to understand, it was quite evident that it was difficult to carry out. At this time Rome

²³Supra, p. 43.

²⁴Supra, pp. 33f.

was entering the period of great internal conflicts and civil wars; and the commotions of this upheaval were bound to affect the history of the whole world, including the little country of Israel.²⁵ In the years after 63 B.C., the Roman lords were contending for the supreme power and the ruler of today could be the vanquished of tomorrow.²⁶

In these civil wars of Rome, the Idumean seemed to have had the fatal practice of being on the losing side. From the very beginning Antipater was placed on the wrong side of Rome. He had been with Hyrcanus and Aretas against Scaurus. Later on, he was allied with Pompey against Julius Caesar. Nevertheless, Antipater always managed to emerge successfully.

It certainly was neither from any chivalrous desire to aid the weaker side, . . . nor yet from want of shrewdness in judging as to which side would likely prove the stronger, that they (Idumeans) were thus endangered; but because circumstances always determined which side they were to take without permitting a choice. But if ill-fortune thus led them into danger, their own capacity always extricated them from it.²⁷

Favor Sought and Won

Following his policy of catering to the Romans, Antipater gained many benefits for himself and the Jewish nation. We have already mentioned the most important concessions which Caesar gave to the Jews and Antipater.²⁸ Several of these benefits directly aided Antipater's

²⁵ Martin Noth, *op. cit.*, pp. 400f.

²⁶ S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock and M. P. Charlesworth, editors, The Augustan Empire, in The Cambridge Ancient History (Cambridge: University Press, 1934), IX, 403.

²⁷ Rev. C. M. Grant, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

²⁸ Supra, pp. 29f.

plan to establish a ruling dynasty in Palestine. In the first place, the reduction of taxes, as well as the new laws concerning military subscription and worship which considered the Jew's pride and feelings, were well received by the Jews. Consequently, these laws accomplished quite a lot in pacifying the Jewish people. Once again the Jews were tangibly reminded of what Hyrcanus and Antipater had done for them; once again Antipater succeeded in lessening their animosity against his position as procurator of Judea.²⁹ Probably the most important thing given to the Jews at this time was the return of the seaport city Joppa. This has special significance because it meant that for the first time since 63 B.C., the Jews once again had a connection between Jerusalem and the sea.³⁰ Now the Jews would once again be able to trade on the world market and thereby regain a portion of their economic independence and stability.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰S. A. Cook, op. cit., p. 404.

CHAPTER VIII

ANTIPATER GROOMS HIS SON FOR THE JEWISH THRONE

Herod's Apprenticeship

When Caesar left Syria in 47 B.C., Antipater had already completed two important parts of his three point program for a ruling dynasty in Palestine. The first step had been to gain toleration from the Jews. This was now an accomplished fact. Secondly, through the Romans he had acquired all the aid and power he would need to establish his dynasty. The only thing that remained was to see that what he had done would be carried on after his death. It was for this reason that Antipater chose his son Herod, and groomed him in the subtle art of political science.

Antipater began Herod's public training by appointing him the governor of Galilee in 47/46 B.C. Of all the Jewish provinces, Galilee was the recognized trouble spot of the whole nation. Almost immediately Herod followed his father's principle of catering to Roman favor. Herod did this when he suppressed the marauding bands of robbers who did much of their raiding in the Roman province of Syria. This act gained him the favor of Sextus Caesar.¹ Being overzealous, Herod had forgotten that the second principle of success was in the Jew's toleration of the Idumeans. In executing Hezekiah and his band, Herod gave his enemies the opportunity to use public opinion against him and his father. It made little difference whether Herod had the right to execute the law-

¹Supra, p. 32.

less brigands; as far as we know he did have the power and authority to do this. Nevertheless, he had transgressed his father's principle in that he had paraded this power and authority publicly. As a result, the political enemies of Antipater pressured Hyrcanus to bring Herod to trial in Jerusalem.²

Unwittingly, Herod had upset the plans of Antipater. It was at this time that we see Antipater's guiding hand. In the first place, Antipater advised his son to attend the trial rather than give their enemies the opportunity to charge Herod with usurping Hyrcanus' authority. Antipater cautioned Herod not to take too large a force with him to the trial lest the Jews think he was threatening Hyrcanus. Herod disregarded this advice and entered Jerusalem more like a conqueror than a man about to be tried for his life. As a result, the Sanhedrin was ready to sentence him to death and would have done just that if Hyrcanus had not persuaded Herod to flee Jerusalem. One of the reasons Hyrcanus had aided Herod was that Sextus Caesar, the Roman Governor of Syria, had ordered him to secure an acquittal for Herod.³ It is interesting to note that at least one noted historian believes that it was Antipater who persuaded Sextus to write this letter to Hyrcanus.⁴

Herod continued his political instruction. Immediately after he fled from Jerusalem, Herod gathered an army and returned to Jerusalem to give Hyrcanus and the Sanhedrin a blood-bath. At this point Herod

²Supra, pp. 33f.

³Supra, pp. 35f.

⁴A. H. M. Jones, The Herods of Judaea (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), p. 30.

forgot his father's principle of keeping the favor of Rome regardless of personal pride and honor. The main reason Rome had backed Antipater was because he promised to keep the country in a state of tranquillity. Conversely, Rome had expelled Aristobulus and his sons because they were too belligerent. Thus Herod placed himself and Antipater in a dangerous position. As a result, Antipater hurried to Herod and explained the situation to him and advised him to wait for a more opportune time. Herod saw the error of his ways and submitted to his father's advice.⁵ If Antipater had not assisted, guided, and trained his son, Herod would have been defeated at the very beginning of his career. The advice and experience which Antipater gave his son during this time was the foundation upon which Herod would later establish his own rule in Palestine.

Herod Reflects His Training

The effectiveness of Herod's training in political science became evident immediately after Antipater's assassination in 43 B.C. During the months that followed Antipater's death, Herod walked a tightrope of political intrigue which ended in his appointment as king of the Jews in 40/39 B.C. by the Roman senate.⁶ In the years that followed, Herod again and again utilized the early political training which he had received under his father. The reign of Herod revealed that he had grasped his father's chief principle for any successful politician. This principle was that an aspiring leader must have the backing of the

⁵Supra, p. 35.

⁶Martin Noth, The History of Israel (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958), pp. 406ff.

Roman leaders if he was to be a success.

At Antipater's death, the kingdom of the Idumeans and Palestine fell to Herod both by virtue of his Jewish-Idumean descent and by the political successes of his father Antipater.⁷ At that time, Herod was helping Cassius against Mark Antony and Octavian. Furthermore, the surviving son of Aristobulus, Antigonus by name, revolted and attempted to seize the crown. But Herod defeated Antigonus and shortly afterwards appealed to Antony. Through Antony's influence Herod was appointed tetrarch of Galilee in 42 B.C. At that time Herod used money, logic and sentiment to gain Antony's favor. It is noteworthy that Herod reminded Antony of his past relations with Antipater. Among other things, this gained the aid of Antony.⁸ But Antigonus, having received military aid from Orodes I, king of Parthia, marched upon Jerusalem and conquered the city.⁹ Meanwhile Herod had left the area of Palestine and fled to Rome by way of Egypt. Using the influence which he had with Antony, Herod was proclaimed king of the Jews in 40/39 B.C. Mark Antony also supplied the troops by which Herod finally recaptured Jerusalem in 37 B.C. and began his reign as king.

Just as Antipater had found himself on the losing side in Rome's civil wars, so also Herod was twice pitted against the very men from whom he would gain his political power. The first instance was the war

⁷J. McKee Adams, Biblical Backgrounds (Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 317.

⁸Antiquities, Book xiv, 12, 1 to 13, 1.

⁹George A. Barton, Archaeology and the Bible (Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union, 1916), p. 136.

between Cassius and Mark Antony. After Cassius' defeat at Philippi, Herod appeared before Antony and won his support. In 30 B.C. Octavian conquered Mark Antony at the Battle of Actium. Herod had supported Antony. Nevertheless, as soon as Antony was defeated, Herod hastened to Rhodes to gain the favor of Octavian.¹⁰ Herod's main argument at that time was as follows:

But if thou wilt put him (Antony) out of the case, and only consider how I behave myself to my benefactors generally, and what sort of friend I am, thou wilt find by experience that I shall do and be the same to thyself: for it is but the changing of the names, and the firmness of friendship that I shall bear thee will not be disapproved by thee.¹¹

One must admire the adroitness of Herod who turned his services to Octavian's enemy in the past into an argument for Caesar's friendship for the future.

The Imperfect Reproduction

The life of Herod is well known and the recorded deeds of his life are depicted in detail. The preceding examples were mentioned to prove that Herod's political success was directly due to the fact that he followed Antipater's instruction. It is conceivable that Herod realized his father's influence, and perhaps this was the reason Herod built a city in the honor of his father, the name of which was Antipatris.¹²

Although Herod followed some of his father's teaching, it is also quite evident that he forgot much of Antipater's instruction. Herod

¹⁰ Martin Noth, *op. cit.*, pp. 410ff.

¹¹ *Antiquities*, Book xv, 6, 6.

¹² *Ibid.*, Book xvi, 5, 2.

forgot to be concerned over the feelings of the Jews. As a result of this forgetfulness, Herod was deeply and bitterly hated by the Jews.¹³ This hatred, however, was not caused by Herod's Idumean lineage as was the case with Antipater, but rather Herod was hated in a more personal way. Herod's rule was founded on terror, violence, and force. Since Rome was supporting him, Herod did not feel he would have to cater to the Jewish pride or fierce nationalism. When he did finally attempt to win their confidence it was too late. This neglect was without a doubt one of Herod's greatest political blunders, for although he ruled for a long time, the people of his realm grew to hate him more each year.¹⁴

In many ways Herod clearly reflected the political principles of his father. Yet, Herod was lacking in many of the qualities so outstanding in his father.¹⁵ Herod was pitiless, blood thirsty, impatient, just to mention some of the areas in which Herod fell short of his father. When one compares the character of Antipater with that of his son, one finds that Herod, whom historians called the Great, was only an imperfect and somewhat corrupted reproduction of his father Antipater.

¹³Ibid., Book xvii, 6, 6.

¹⁴Martin Noth, op. cit., p. 317.

¹⁵Infra, pp. 55ff.

CHAPTER IX

ANTIPATER'S PERSONALITY LEADS TO SUCCESS

Qualities of Leadership

The one dominating characteristic of Antipater's life was his ambition. From the beginning of his career Antipater set out to establish a ruling dynasty in Palestine. The vast magnitude of this task had already been described.¹ If this ambition had been Antipater's sole asset, he would have failed. But in addition to this unrivaled ambition, Antipater possessed the other abilities needed to fulfill his ambition. For example, Antipater was a master of intrigue.² One has but to follow his career from Salome's death to Caesar's advent to note this characteristic. He persuaded and induced, bribed and bought, flattered and extolled, plotted and planned, maneuvered and manipulated the most important and influential men of his time.³ In addition the Idumean never attempted to achieve the impossible. This sense of realities was evident from the first when he realized that Roman domination would be permanent. Time and time again, Antipater, on the brink of success, found that his plans were destroyed. Scaurus had aided Aristobulus, so Antipater went to Pompey. Gabinus' reorganization of Palestine de-

¹Suora, pp. 39f.

²A. H. M. Jones, The Herods of Judaea (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), p. 33.

³Suora, pp. 11ff.

stroyed his whole basis of power, yet he patiently supported the Roman governor, and in the end gained his regard. Pompey was defeated, Antipater went to Caesar. Thus in addition to this clear sense of reality, Antipater possessed what seemed to be an unlimited storehouse of patience. Biding his time until the opportunity was ripe for action, Antipater never attempted to push his advantage too far.⁴ One historian saw fit to describe him in the following manner:

The Edomite was the very embodiment of subtle, patient, and untiring energy. Passionless but ceaselessly active, outwardly pious but inwardly ruthless, gentle in manner but inflexible in will, he was a man to be reckoned with in an age when all things were possible to him who had a clear head, a strong hand, and a sharp sword.⁵

Yet even ambition with the aforementioned characteristics would not have enabled Antipater to fulfill his dream of dynasty. Antipater needed to possess the business and administrative ability to carry out his plans. That he had this characteristic can be seen in his relations with the Idumeans and his own personal wealth.⁶ Mention has been made of his military success.⁷ His military achievement clearly pictured his ability to organize and execute his plans effectively.

Two facets of Antipater's personality which were invaluable to him were his talents for reading the character of his friends and enemies, and his innate loyalty to his friends. It is true that the Idumean

⁴A. H. M. Jones, loc. cit.

⁵Rev. C. M. Grant, Between the Testaments (London: A & C Black, Ltd., Soho Square, 1918), p. 84.

⁶Supra, p. 10.

⁷Supra, pp. 26ff.

switched his political position from time to time. Yet at no time did he desert someone who had befriended him. Antipater sided with Caesar after Pompey died, not before. Perhaps this was due to the political situation already described in detail,⁸ and perhaps Antipater would have acted in the same way even if he would have had a free choice. This loyalty can also be seen in Antipater's relationship with Hyrcanus. Antipater had used Hyrcanus as an effective tool, and he could have gotten rid of him at anytime. Yet, Antipater continued to be courteous and kind to Hyrcanus until his death in 43 B.C.⁹ At a time when political friendships were as changeable as the weather, Antipater's loyalty to his friends reveal a refreshing and unique part of his personality. This loyalty revealed itself not only with Hyrcanus and the Romans, but also with the Arabian king Aretas as well as with his own sons Herod and Phasaelus.

Antipater was a shrewd judge of character. We see this characteristic portrayed already in 69 B.C. when the Idumean decided to support Hyrcanus against his younger brother Aristobulus.¹⁰ Before Pompey, Antipater had decided that the humble attitude of servitude would best serve his cause.¹¹ Before Caesar, Antipater had revealed his battle wounds which he had received in Caesar's service.¹² In negotiations

⁸ Supra, p. 24.

⁹ Antiquities, Book xiv, 9, 2.

¹⁰ Supra, pp. 8f.

¹¹ Supra, pp. 14f.

¹² Supra, p. 29.

with the Jews of Jerusalem and Egypt, Antipater had played the role of an underling to Hyrcanus.¹³ When training his sons, Antipater had given the most difficult task to Herod instead of the elder Phasaelus.¹⁴ In each case, Antipater had perceived the character of the people with whom he would deal, and then acted on his conclusions. He was successful in each case.

The one characteristic which was most unique in Antipater is often forgotten or bypassed by historians. This characteristic was his mercy and concern for human life. Throughout his life, Antipater displayed a noticeable merciful character. No massacres, assassinations or judicial murders are recorded when he was in authority. Josephus seems to completely overlook this facet of Antipater's character.¹⁵ What makes this such an outstanding characteristic is the fact that murders and assassinations had been and were in Antipater's time the accepted practice of the day. From 105 B.C. to the death of Alexander Jannaeus in 76 B.C., Jewish history had been written with blood. Jannaeus had introduced the cross into Jewish history by crucifying eight hundred Pharisees at one time.¹⁶ The Romans were butchering people throughout the world. Yet contrasted with such a bloody tradition Antipater was portrayed as a merciful man.

¹³Supra, p. 43.

¹⁴Supra, pp. 31f.

¹⁵A. H. M. Jones, loc. cit.

¹⁶Antiquities, Book xiii, 14, 2.

The Underrated Politician

Antipater is one of the great men in history who was never judged as being great by the historians. This man who had accomplished Herculean tasks was and still is despised, maligned or cursed for his actions.¹⁷ Josephus and most of the earlier historians mention Antipater merely to get at Herod's history. Modern historians usually overlook the man from Idumea and dwell on his son Herod. While volumes have been written about Herod, Antipater has barely rated passing comments. Although it is true that most historians briefly portray him as an able man, they overlook the vital part Antipater played in shaping the New Testament era. Two exceptions to this are:

Hateful as the family was to the Jews, it procured them the blessings of peace and a wider domination than the nation had enjoyed since the legendary splendours of the reign of Solomon. For five generations the family pursued a consistent policy of fidelity to Rome and Roman power, not to individuals but to the Republic.¹⁸

Antipater's achievement was extraordinary. Despite his Idumean birth he imposed himself on the Jewish people. Though hampered by their continual rebellions, he won the confidence and respect of the Roman government. And when his career was cut short by an assassin he had already won back for the Jewish kingdom its political integrity, and, in the vital port of Joppa, a small instalment of the territory it had lost.¹⁹

¹⁷ Heinrich Graetz, History of the Jews (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1941), II, 63ff.

¹⁸ F. J. Foakes Jackson, Josephus and the Jews (New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1930), pp. 9f.

¹⁹ A. H. M. Jones, op. cit., p. 35.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

The death of Antipater in 43 B.C. did not end the Idumean's political influence in Palestine. The political ideas of Antipater and his method of gaining political power sprouted forth time and time again in the succeeding history of the Jews. This resurgence of his influence was due to two major factors. In the first place, Antipater's political ideas were sound and they worked. Secondly, Antipater taught them to Herod who utilized them throughout his reign as king of the Jews. The rulers who succeeded Herod also used the same policies which Antipater had originated during his own political career.

Antipater's policy of submission to Roman authority in order to gain political power is evident throughout the New Testament. Rome was still the world power, and as long as the rulers in Palestine had Roman support, they could continue to govern the Jews. For this reason both Herod and his sons made a special point of catering to Rome. Of course, the patriotic Jews despised this attitude, especially when they felt that the rulers infringed upon their rights in order to obtain Roman favor. Antipater had alleviated this hostility by gaining political concessions for the Jews from the Romans. Thus the Jews had received exemption from the Roman army; their tax laws were relatively lax; they were allowed religious freedom. These concessions were still in effect at the time of Jesus Christ and gave the Jews a somewhat unique and coveted position throughout the world. In such a way Antipater had managed to pacify the nationalistic fervor of his subjects. Yet Herod had failed. The reason

for this failure was that Herod realized too late the importance of Jewish toleration and acceptance. Although Herod tried to gain the favor of his subjects, he never succeeded. Yet these attempts to gain their favor are connected with the New Testament. Such things as the building of the Temple, the new cities, the recovery of Jewish land were accomplished by Herod in an attempt to gain popularity with his subjects. Nothing seemed to satisfy the Jews. Consequently both the rulers and their Roman lords bent over backwards in an effort to appease these Jewish patriots. We can see evidences of this in the New Testament, as for example, at the trial of Jesus.

In the last chapter, we noted the characteristics, abilities, and actual achievements of Antipater. When a comparison is made between Antipater and Herod on the basis of these facts, the conclusions inevitably favors Antipater. Constrasting this with the attitude of the historians, we begin to wonder why Antipater was neglected. Historically, there is little doubt that Antipater was a political giant. Even the limited account of his life reveals the shrewdness and native talents of this Idumean. Yet he was and is neglected. Perhaps the reason rests in the shortness of his actual reign as ruler. Perhaps he is forgotten due to the fact that he was never actually crowned as king. But the purpose of this paper was not to answer the "why," but rather to establish the historical fact that Antipater was truly an important figure in the history between the testaments, and that he really did influence the political tone and policies of the New Testament era. The foundations which Antipater laid down were used both by Herod and his sons until the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. The fact that

the rulers after Antipater were not as successful in applying these principles merely points once again to the greatness of the Idumean. Thus it is evident that the political policies instigated by Antipater outlived the man who originated them, and continued to influence the policies of Palestine through his children and grandchildren even during the time of the Messiah.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Josephus. Antiquities of the Jews. Vol. II in The Complete Works of Josephus. Books xii-xvi. New York: Bigelow, Brown & Co., Inc., n.d.

Josephus. Wars of the Jews. Vol. III in The Complete Works of Josephus. Book I. New York: Bigelow, Brown & Co., Inc., n.d.

B. Secondary Sources

Adams, J. McKee. Biblical Backgrounds. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, c.1934.

"Antipater," The New International Encyclopedia. I. Edited by Daniel Coit Gilman, et al. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1902.

Barton, George A. Archaeology and the Bible. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union, c.1916.

Cook, S. A., F. E. Adcock, and M. D. Charlesworth. The Roman Republic. Vol. IX in The Cambridge Ancient History. New York: Macmillan Co., c.1932.

———. The Augustan Empire. Vol. X in The Cambridge Ancient History. Cambridge: University Press, c.1934.

Finegan, Jack. Light from the Ancient Past. London: Oxford University Press, c.1946.

Foster, Genevieve. Augustus Caesar's World. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c.1949.

Free, Joseph P. Archaeology and Bible History. Wheaton, Illinois: Van Kampen Press, c.1950.

Glazer, Rabbi Simon. History of Israel. III. New York: The Star Hebrew Book Co., 1930.

Goldberg, Israel, and Samson Benderly. Outline of Jewish Knowledge. III. New York: Bureau of Jewish Education, 1931.

Graetz, Heinrich. History of the Jews. II. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1941.

- Grant, Rev. C. M. Between the Testaments. London: A & C Black, Ltd., Soho Square, 1918.
- Jones, A. H. M. The Herods of Judaea. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.
- Lock, Major H. O. The Conquerors of Palestine Through Forty Centuries. London: Robert Scott Roxburghe House Paternoster Row, 1920.
- M'Clintock, Rev. John and James Strong. "Antipater," Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. I. Pp. 276ff.
- Noth, Martin. The History of Israel. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958.
- Owen, G. Frederick. Abraham to Allenby. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1939.
- Radin, Max. The Jews Among the Greeks and Romans. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1915.
- Schurer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People. II. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924.