

dian no more denoted a sect of religion than the names Cæsarean or Pompeian. Carpozivius is of opinion, that they were servants,² domestics, and friends of Herod; and the leaven of Herod, which our Lord cautioned his disciples to beware of, Mark viii. 15; was not so much any particular system of religious opinions, as a contempt of all religion. But though this opinion is founded on the Syriac version, which renders the name *Herodian* by the phrase *the servants of Herod*, it does not seem to agree with the character given of the Herodians in the Gospels. From Matt. xvi. 12, it appears that the caution to beware of the leaven of Herod, was not a caution against the practices, but against the doctrines of the Herodians. The leaven of Herod indeed, in this sense, will apply to the collectors of the taxes for the Romans, who no doubt inculcated the lawfulness of paying tribute to Cæsar, which is the other opinion proposed by Jerome. Nevertheless, as our Lord himself taught the lawfulness of those taxes, we cannot imagine this was the tenet he cautioned His disciples against, under the notion of the leaven of Herod. The passage in Matt. parallel to Mark viii. 15, will, if I am not mistaken, lead us to a better account of the Herodians. For what Mark there terms *the leaven of Herod*, is called by Matthew, chap. xvi. 6, *The leaven of the Sadducees*. Hence we learn who the Herodians were, about whom so many disputes have arisen. It seems Herod the Great endeavoured to overturn the principles of the ancient and true religion, that he might establish a system more agreeable to his tyranny. This was the doctrine of the Sadducees, which he zealously espoused, because setting men free from the dread of a future state, it left them at liberty to pursue what they took to be their interest, by any method they pleased. *Herodian*, therefore, was but another name for such sort of Sadducees, as maintained the expediency of submitting to the innovations introduced by Herod and the Romans. For it may be easily thought

that those who favoured Herod, and the powers who supported him, were generally of this sect. At the same time, all the Sadducees were not Herodians, some of them being friends to the liberties of their country, and by consequence shewing little of that complaisance towards the reigning powers, for which their brethren were so remarkable. And this accounts for the distinction between the Herodians and Sadducees, found Matt. xxii. 16, 20. Of the nature and number of the innovations introduced by Herod, and with what temper they were received by the Jews, the reader will be able to judge who looks to Josephus. Ant. c. 11, *fine*

It is highly probable, therefore, that the Herodians were a sub-division or branch of the Sadducees. For to use the words of Dr. Lardner: "From the time that prophecy ceased among the Jews, new sects were continually arising. There were two disciples of Antigonus Sochaus, that were the authors of two new sects: Sadoc of the sect of Sadducees; Baithos, or Bathus, author likewise of a new sect which had its name from him, and which is mentioned in the Gemara, though not in Josephus. There was likewise, at this time, a division in the sect of the Pharisees; some following Hillel, and others Shammai. The followers of Judas of Galilee, were at first but a small portion of the Pharisees; in time they almost swallowed up all the other parties. Josephus, who so often says that the sects of the Jews are three, once or twice calls Judas of Galilee, the leader, or head of a fourth sect. The reason of his not distinguishing these from the rest was, I imagine, because they differed from the Pharisees, only in some few particulars. So that one and the same writer, who has professedly reckoned up the Jewish sects, according to different ways of considering them, makes sometimes more and sometimes fewer. Much more may two different writers, though they write professedly of this matter, which the Evangelists have done.