

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. III.

APRIL, 1899.

NO. 2.

Doctrinal Theology.

COSMOLOGY.

(Continued.)

ANTHROPOLOGY.

God created man in his own image.¹⁾ The creation of man was a part, the closing part, of the six days' work of creation. On the day of which the inspired record says, "And the evening and the morning was the sixth day,"²⁾ God, according to the same account, created man.³⁾ Man is not a product of spontaneous generation, not a result of a long continued process of evolution, but a distinct work of God, made at a definite period of time, and not a rudimentary work, but a complete and finished work.⁴⁾ This work of God was from that first day of its existence *man*, not a cell, a microbe, a saurian, an ape, but man, created according to the will and counsel of God. It was the triune God who said, "*Let us make MAN*,"⁵⁾ and God created MAN.⁶⁾ As the human individual, even in its embryonic state is at all times essentially human, so the human race never passed through a state of brute existence or through

1) Gen. 1, 27: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

2) Gen. 1, 31.

3) Gen. 1, 27.

4) Gen. 2, 1. 2.

5) Gen. 1, 26.

6) Gen. 1, 27.

Historical Theology.

THE CENSUS IN THE DAYS OF HEROD.

And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed. And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria. And all went to be taxed, every one into his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; because he was of the house and lineage of David: to be taxed with Mary his espoused wife.¹⁾ This passage from the gospel according to St. Luke has given rise to an extensive literature, exegetical and historical, not only in commentaries on the third gospel and in comprehensive historical works, but also in the form of monographs, large and small. In some of these treatises a vast amount of historical and critical erudition has been massed together, and there is perhaps no position,

NOTE. — It is understood that when we speak of years Before Christ (B. C.) and After Christ (A. D.) we give the figures according to the Dionysian era, which is based on the supposition that Christ was born in the year preceding the year 1 of that era. It is furthermore understood that our present purpose is not to ascertain the precise year in which Christ was born, which may be differently determined according as the relative dates of Herod's death, the building of the temple, the accession of Tiberius, and other epochal events, may be differently determined. We deal with the statements of Luke as he makes them. For numerous details which we have left unnoticed in this treatise we refer the reader to Dr. Ramsay's recent work, "*Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?*"

1) Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, ἐξῆλθε δόγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου, ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. Αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου. Καὶ ἐπορεύοντο πάντες ἀπογράφεσθαι, ἕκαστος εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν. Ἀνέβη δὲ καὶ Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρέτ, εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, εἰς πόλιν Δαυὶδ ἧτις καλεῖται Βηθλεὲμ, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατρὸς Δαυὶδ, ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαρίας τῇ μενηστευμένῃ αὐτοῦ.

possible or impossible, which has not been occupied by some one among the many who have busied themselves with the questions clustering around this text. It may be said with some safety that no text of equal compass has been more destructively dealt with from historical points of view and with historical arguments than these statements of St. Luke. In fact there is not one single detail in the entire passage, the historical truth of which has not been either called into question or flatly denied. It has been denied that Augustus ever ordered a census of the whole Roman empire. It has been denied that even if such a census had been ordered in the days of Augustus it would have included a census of Palestine, which, it is said, was not under the authority of Augustus but an independent kingdom. It has been denied that the census here referred to was the first of a series. It has been denied that it was made at the time when Jesus was born. It has been denied that this census was made under Cyrenius. It has been denied that the birth of Jesus occurred while Cyrenius administered public affairs in Syria. It has been denied that a Roman census would have caused everyone to go into his own city. It has been denied that a Roman census would have induced Mary to appear at the place of enrolment together with her husband. It has been denied that Christ was born at Bethlehem. And finally it has been denied that Luke ever made any of these statements at all, the entire second chapter of his gospel and the greater part of the first being declared an interpolation. And it is remarkable that several of these denials are found in the learned treatises of such as earnestly endeavored to refute the arguments of others who assailed the truth of Luke's narrative. Thus Dr. Ph. E. Huschke, for many years the leading man in the Breslau Synod, says in his work on this subject: "*Wie also die Kriegführung mit der Zeit immer mehr von dem Persönlichen zu dem Materiellen herabgestiegen ist, so haben auch die Feinde des Christenthums in neuester Zeit zur Artillerie und Minirkunst ge-*

griffen; sie haben den Versuch gemacht, mit dem Boden der evangelischen Geschichte den darauf ruhenden Glauben mit einem Mal in die Luft zu sprengen und den Raum, den bisher geschichtlich lebendige Gestalten einnahmen, mit dem Pulverdampf des Mythos zu erfüllen. . . . Da nun die Vertheidigung sich naturgemäss nach dem Angriff richtet, so kann dem hier in Frage stehenden ohne Zweifel auch wieder im Einzelnen—obgleich dies nicht die einzige Art der Vertheidigung ist—wirksam entgegengetreten werden. In den folgenden Blättern soll dies hinsichtlich eines Punktes geschehen, auf dem die zerstörende Kritik besonders gesicherte Lorbeeren errungen zu haben glaubt, und der sich deshalb besonders dazu zu eignen schien, als ein *instar omnium* behandelt zu werden.”¹⁾ And yet the author says: “Lucas sagt: Ἀπὸ τῆς ἡ ἀπογραφῆς πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου, das im Allgemeinen so, wie die Vulgata und Luther übersetzt haben, scheint verstanden werden zu müssen: ‘Haec descriptio prima facta est a praeside Syriae Cyrino,’ oder: ‘Diese Schatzung war die allererste, und geschah zu der Zeit, da Cyrenius Landpfleger in Syrien war.’ Dieser Sinn steht aber mit der Geschichte im Widerspruch, wie sich aus folgender Zusammenstellung der wichtigsten einschlagenden Thatsachen ergeben wird.”²⁾ The Lutheran Commentary says: “Quite a number, including Uscher, Calovius, Storr, Tholuck, Huschke, and Wieseler, evidently trying to meet a chronological difficulty, translate: ‘This taxation (or enrolment) occurred sooner than (or much earlier than) Quirinus.’ . . . The difficulty arises from the fact that the time when Quirinus was governor of Syria was about ten years later—6 to 11 A. D.—than the accepted time of Jesus’ birth. In view of this some do not hesitate to say that Luke was mistaken and is here in

1) “Ueber den zur Zeit Jesu Christi gehaltenen Census.” Breslau, 1840. pp. VI f.

2) Ibid. pp. 59. 60.

error. . . . Doubtless our difficulty in determining this difficulty arises from our ignorance, not from our author's." ¹⁾

There is not, however, in our day any necessity for confessing ignorance concerning the historical evidence whereby Luke can be shown not only to be historically correct in all his statements, but even that this passage from the third gospel furnishes a key for the understanding of certain historical matters, some of which have but recently come to the knowledge of secular historians.

The first statement in Luke's narrative of the birth of Christ is this: 'Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, ἐξῆλθεν δόγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου, ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, it came to pass in those days there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled. The days of which the evangelist speaks are the days of Herod, the king of Judaea.²⁾ And he says that at some time during the reign of king Herod, which began *de jure* during the 184. Olympiad, or, B. C. 40, and ended B. C. 4, there appeared a decree of Augustus, ordering an enrolment of the πᾶσα οἰκουμένη, the whole Roman empire. It should be noted that the form employed by Luke is not ἀπογραφῆναι or ἀπογράψασθαι, but ἀπογράφεσθαι, not the aorist but the present tense. That Luke, or the Holy Spirit, knew what he was about when he employed this form is to us no matter of doubt; but it is substantiated by the fact that in the fifth verse, where a special act or process of enrolment is signified, he uses the aorist, ἀπογράψασθαι. As distinguished from the aoristic infinitive, which denotes a single, definite occasion, the present infinitive indicates a lasting or stationary arrangement, a continuous action, an established order of things, or an act or process which is to be repeated.³⁾

1) Baugher, Annotations on the Gospel According to St. Luke. 1896. pp. 35 to 37.

2) Luke 1, 5. Matt. 2, 1.

3) Thus the aorist is used Matt. 19, 3. Mark 14, 31. Acts 4, 16; the present infinitive Acts 16, 21; 5, 29. Luke 16, 13; al.

What the author says is not that Augustus at a certain time ordered a certain census to be once made in a certain year, but that at a certain period the emperor issued a decree whereby he established a system of enrolments to be regularly made throughout the Roman world. That at some time such a series of enrolments was introduced was known in the second century to Clement of Alexandria, who speaks of the time *ὅτε πρῶτον ἐκέλευσαν ἀπογραφὰς γενέσθαι*, when they first ordered enrolments to be made, and says that this was *ἐπὶ Αὐγούστου*.¹⁾ Of course it might be said that Clement in these statements follows the authority of Luke, to whom he refers in the context; and perhaps he does, as many have done before and after him and as we do to-day. But if he did he certainly understood Luke as we do, taking him not to speak of a single census, but of a series or system of enumerations first begun in the days of Augustus.

The question then is: Have we any evidence besides that of Luke and of sources depending on Luke, of a permanent system of regular numberings in the Roman empire, extending from the time of Herod to a later period of history? This question, ten years ago, would have been answered in the negative, and even our interpretation of the words of Luke might have been hooted down as unwarranted and fanatical by those who have accustomed themselves and others to look upon Luke as ignorant of Greek grammar as well as Roman history. The situation, however, has undergone a thorough change in the last decade of the century now drawing to its close. In 1893 a remarkable discovery was announced, nearly contemporaneously, by three different scholars, Kenyon, Viereck, and Wilken,²⁾ a discovery which,

1) Strom. I, 22.

2) Not theologians. We have been for years accustomed to find the contributors of historical evidence in favor of the credibility of Luke and other biblical writers among non-theologians, men who are not *a priori* determined that the historical statements of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are at least suspicious and probably wrong.

taken together with historical evidence previously known, reveals a system of enrolments made at regular intervals of fourteen years and extending in a continuous line from the reign of Augustus to A. D. 230. The newly discovered evidence consists, not in secondary statements made by some early historian, or in an inscription of doubtful origin and reliability, but in a multitude of original enrolment papers made out by heads of families and delivered to the proper officials from eighteen-hundred to upward of two-thousand years ago. These original documents were found among the papyri recovered from the rubbish of Egyptian graves and ruins. They are throughout essentially alike in form and contents, stating the names of the officers with whom they were filed by the parties who made them out, their places of residence, giving even the part of the house and yard occupied, the names and ages of the members of the household, including even boarders and lodgers, and the year in which each census was made. The returns are made out in Greek, and the very words employed by Luke, ἀπογράφειν and ἀπογραφή, are used in these papers throughout. The enumerations to which the papers about which we are particularly concerned belong are termed ἀπογραφὰὶ κατ' οἰκίαν, household enrolments. The periodic years covered by these census returns are A. D. 230, 216, 202, 174, 160, 146, 132, 118, 104, 90, 76, 62 and 20; other sources, to be specified later on, supply the enrolments of the cyclical years A. D. 48, 34, 6 and B. C. 8 or 9. This gives us a continuous series of enrolments extending, at regular intervals of fourteen years, from the year A. D. 230 back to the enrolment in which Jesus was numbered and which, as shall be shown, was for certain reasons delayed in Palestine to a later year.

From these household enrolment papers we must distinguish another kind of census returns found among the Egyptian papyri, which, like our annual tax returns, give the valuation of the taxable property of those by whom the

returns were made. It thus appears that in the Roman empire there were regular periodic enrolments in cycles of fourteen years, answering to our ten-years-cycles in the United States census, and valuations answering to our annual reports and valuations for the assessment of taxes. The words ἀπογράφειν and ἀπογραφὴ are used also in the papyri of the latter class. Hence as far as these words are concerned Luke might refer to either the household enrolments or to a tax census proper. But the circumstances of the case at issue clearly indicate that the occasion which caused Joseph and his wife to go to the place which was the ancestral home of the family was not a tax valuation but a numeration of the families or, as the papyri give it, an ἀπογραφὴ κατ' οἰκίαν, a household enrolment.

That for upward of two hundred years there existed under the Roman emperors a regular system of enrolments can no longer be questioned. But to bear out Luke by corroborative historical evidence in still another point we must answer the question, Who inaugurated and established this system of enrolments? Was it Augustus, as Luke says? Clement of Alexandria, in the second century, expressly says it was Augustus. But Clement may again have relied on the authority of Luke. If he did he certainly treats Luke's statement as out of controversy, finding no cause of modifying what he evidently takes as an acknowledged historical fact, that at the time of Augustus not only a single census was ordered but orders were issued that thenceforth there should be regular ἀπογραφαί. But we can very well do without the testimony of Clement, a man of considerable historical learning. If, as the papyri show it to be, these enrolments were a permanent measure of Roman policy, it is *a priori* probable that it was inaugurated by Augustus, the great organizer of the Roman empire. It is, furthermore, remarkable that the series of fourteen-years-cycles, if carried backward but a few steps from where the earliest papyrus hitherto discovered leaves it, over the periods as-

certained from other sources, will lead us step by step, over the cyclical years A. D. 6 and B. C. 9 to the year B. C. 23, the year in which Augustus obtained the tribunician power and from which, in all the inscriptions, his imperial rule is dated. Besides, we know from the papyri that the system was regularly carried out in Egypt, and we know that Augustus paid very particular attention to Egyptian affairs. And now, here is Luke expressly stating what without his statement would be of a probability little short of certainty. Even if Luke were silent on this point the question would be perfectly in order, If Augustus did not introduce this system of enrolments, who in the world did? And if an explicit statement like that of Luke were to-day discovered, not in Luke but on some stone slab from the ruins of an Asiatic city, or on a papyrus scrap without the name of any author, it would doubtless be received as valuable and conclusive testimony to a most reasonable assumption and published in all the next issues of historical periodicals the world over.

This point being also settled, we proceed to the next question. Was the system of household enrolments established by Augustus designed for the whole Roman world? That is what Luke says: *Ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην*. The Egyptian papyri are, strictly, conclusive evidence only for the enrolments made in Egypt. Why were not similar census papers preserved in other parts of the empire? We answer, simply because, owing to its peculiar climate with its continually dry atmosphere, Egypt is the country where those ancient papyri were preserved at all, while in other countries with less favorable climates they were naturally destroyed, turned into dust, by the disintegrating influences to which they were exposed. The only *libellus* whereby a Christian suspect in the days of Decius, a certain Aurelius Diogenes, established his heathen or apostate character, proving that he had offered sacrifice, was also brought from Egypt and discovered by Dr. Krebs in Berlin, in 1893. Does

this mean that no *libelli* were written in other parts of the empire, or that the Decian persecution was restricted to Egypt? We know better from Cyprian's treatise *De Lapsis* and other sources. And, likewise, we know from Luke and other sources that the enrolments first ordained by Augustus were not restricted to Egypt but carried out in other parts of the empire.

The fifth periodic year in the course of the fourteen-years-cycles was A. D. 48. In that year a census was held in Italy. This was not a mere valuation for the assessment for taxes, but a household enrolment, and one of a series; for when a citizen of Bononia, Fullonius, had in this census under Claudius given his age at 150 years, the emperor had the statement verified from the returns of earlier enrolments.¹⁾ Concerning the census taken fourteen years earlier, A. D. 34, we learn from Tacitus²⁾ that it caused an insurrection in Cilicia Tracheia, a dependency of Syria, and the governor of Syria, Vitellius, sent the legate Trebellius with 4000 legionaries and auxiliary forces to quench the disturbance. The census for the cyclical year A. D. 6 was, according to Josephus, made by Quirinius in Syria, where he was governor from A. D. 6 to 9, and an inscription discovered and rediscovered in Venice gives the name of the officer, Aemilius Secundus, who, "*jussu Quirini*," by order of Quirinus, made the census of the city of Apameia, enrolling 110,000 persons. Huschke says the tombstone bearing this inscription has disappeared. So it had, and the inscription was for years considered a forgery made to bolster up Luke; but the demolition of a house in Venice led to the rediscovery of a part of the slab and its inscription.

But now we come down to the census which concerns us most. The periodic year which this enrolment was to cover, according to the fourteen-years-cycles, was the year

1) *Collatis censibus quos ante detulerat . . . verum apparuit.* Plinius, Nat. Hist. VII, 49. Cf. Tacitus, Ann. XI, 25.

2) Ann. VI, 41.

9 B. C., and, as the time for the taking of a census was, as a rule, at the end or soon after the expiration of the cyclical year, the numération taking in the children of the year 9 would have been the year 8 B. C. In that year, or in the year before, Titius, governor of Syria, was succeeded in that office by Sentius Saturninus, who again was succeeded in 7 B. C. by Quinctilius Varus. And now we find in the book written against Marcion by Tertullian, a Carthaginian lawyer, who for a time lived in Rome, the occasional remark that "at this time enrolments were made under Augustus in Judaea by Sentius Saturninus.¹⁾ This statement is very remarkable in various ways. It is clear that Tertullian can not, in saying what he says, have followed Luke, for he seems rather to contradict him. Luke says nothing of Sentius Saturninus, but names Quirinius as the officer during whose administration the census was made in Judaea. And yet Tertullian speaks of the enrolment during which Christ was born, whose contemporaries, he says, might have searched out his family from these returns.²⁾ How can this discrepancy be reconciled? Very simply in one respect, and not at all in another. Tertullian was familiar with the system of enrolments introduced by Augustus, as every lawyer of his day certainly was. It took him only a few moments to figure back from one of the enrolments of his own time to the periodic year 9 B. C., and any list of the governors of Syria would give him Sentius Saturninus as the governor of that period, if he had any need of inspecting it. Tertullian, dealing with Marcion, who had stricken the opening chapters of Luke from his gospel,³⁾ meets him on secular ground in this point, not following, but, at least apparently, at variance with, the statement of Luke. But according to both Luke and Tertullian there

1) Sed et census constat actos sub Augusto nunc in Judaea per Sentium Saturninum. Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem*, IV, 19.

2) Apud quos genus eius inquirere potuissent. Tertullian *ibid*.

3) Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* IV, 7.

was an enrolment in Syria in or soon after 8 B. C., when the returns of the period beginning with 9 B. C. were in order.

Thus, then, we have the independent testimony of several respectable witnesses to show that the periodic enrolments ordained by Augustus were not restricted to Egypt but extended over other parts of the empire in Europe and Asia. Thus Luke is seen to be in full agreement with history, or rather, other reliable historical evidence agrees with the testimony of Luke when he says that "there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled."

But Luke continues: *Αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου*, *this enrolment was made first while Quirinius was administering Syria*, or in other words, of this series of regular numberings the first was the particular census which was taken while Quirinius was in charge of Syria. The next question then is: When was Quirinius in charge of Syria?

Among the thousands of historical remnants of early days preserved in the Lateran museum at Rome there is a fragment of marble which was found near Tibur in 1764 and bears part of an inscription which, in its complete form, must have contained the leading data of the public career of a noble Roman, a contemporary of Augustus, whom, as the title "*Divus*" applied to Augustus indicates, he must have survived, and during whose reign he administered public affairs in Syria, having also been proconsul in Asia, a conqueror who was for his achievements rewarded with two *supplicationes* and the pomp of triumphal honors. The part of the inscription which contained the name of this man is lost; but for various reasons it appears that the only personage to whom all that is said in what remains of the inscription can apply is Publius Sulpicius Quirinius, who was governor of Syria A. D. 6 to 9 and, according to Strabo, conquered the Homonadenses, a warlike tribe in the moun-

tain regions between Phrygia, Cilicia and Lycaonia, a feat for which he was entitled to the honors mentioned in the inscription. This inscription, in a restoration, runs as follows:

*Legatus pro praetore Divi Augusti Syriacas legiones obtinens bellum gessit cum gente Homonadensium quae interfecerat Amyntam Galatarum regem, QUA REDACTA IN POTESTATEM Imp. Caesaris AUGUSTI POPULIQUE ROMANI, SENATUS dis immortalibus SUPPLICATIONES BINAS OB RES PROSPERE ab eo gestas, et IPSI ORNAMENTA TRIUMPHALIA decrevit, PROCONSUL ASIAM PROVINCIAM OPTINUIT, legatus pr. pr. DIVI AUGUSTI ITERUM SYRIAM ET PHOENICEN provinciam optinens regnum Archelai in provinciae formam redegit.*¹⁾

From Josephus²⁾ we know that Quirinius was governor of Syria after the banishment of Archelaus. This was A. D. 6, ten years after the death of Herod, who died in 4 B. C. During this administration, from A. D. 6 to 9, Quirinius conducted a census in Syria, the census also mentioned by Gamaliel³⁾ in his address to the synedrium. But this can not be the census of Luke 2, 1 ff., since that was in the days of Herod.⁴⁾ We must, therefore, enquire after an earlier administration of Quirinius in Syria. The tiburtinian inscription, if, as we assume, it speaks of Quirinius, ascribes to him a second term in that province, ITERUM SYRIAM, etc., and we naturally ask, When had he served his first term of public service in Syria? We know that Saturninus succeeded Titius in 9 B. C., and was again succeeded by Varus in 7 B. C. in the governorship of Syria, and that Varus was in office till after the death of Herod in 4 B. C. This leaves no room for a first administration

1) The capitals indicate the parts of the inscription preserved, the italics, the parts supplied.

2) Ant. Jud. XVII, 13. XVIII, 1. XVIII, 2.

3) Acts 5, 37.

4) Luke 1, 5; 2, 1. Matt. 2, 1 ff.

of both the internal and external affairs of Syria for Quirinius during the time of Herod's reign. On the other hand the inscription shows that its hero was rewarded by twofold triumphal honors earned before his second administration of Syria, honors which were awarded to chief commanders who by armed conquest established the Roman rule in conquered territory. It was just such a task as the subjugation of the Homonadenses, an enterprise which might well occupy a Roman army in the campaigns of two years, whereby a Roman general might secure the insignia of a double triumph. And now, Strabo, the geographer of the Roman world, expressly tells us¹⁾ that Quirinius subdued the Homonadenses, a warlike people in the wild mountain regions of the Taurus, who, beside their capital city, according to Pliny, held 44 fortified towns. Again, Tacitus expressly says that in consideration of this conquest he was awarded the *insignia triumphi*,²⁾ and that all this was after the consulate of Quirinius and before he was made the tutor of Gajus Caesar. The pacification of the South Galatian districts adjoining the Syrian province by Cornutus Aquila was, according to the evidence of coins and inscriptions and other sources, going on about 6 B. C., and the efforts to subdue and punish the Homonadensian mountaineers, whose territory extended into the Galatian province, by the commander of the imperial forces in Syria, most probably went hand in hand with those operations. It was at this time that the great public roads and a chain of fortresses were built, which were to facilitate the movements and strengthen the position of Roman armies in these subdued districts. Now, there is no reason whatever to prevent the assumption that, while, according to Strabo and Tacitus, Quirinius was the military *legatus Augusti* in Syria, conducting the conquest

1) Geogr. Lib. XII.

2) Expugnatis per Ciliciam Homonadensium castellis insignia triumphii adeptus. Ann. III, 48.

of the Homonadenses, another representative of the emperor was in charge of the civil affairs of the province. Thus, in later days, while Mucian was governor of Syria, Vespasian was in charge of the military operations in Palestine, and Tacitus calls him *dux*,¹⁾ which in Greek would be ἡγεμὼν, and in this capacity he was, as Tacitus also indicates, *legatus* of the emperor. Again, during the governorships of Ummidius Quadratus and Cestius Gallus in Syria, Corbulo, "who for so many years had been acquainted with the soldiers and the enemies," was the military commander in the operations against the Parthians and Armenians.²⁾ Thus also it appears that Quirinius was in charge of the military affairs in Syria while Sentius Saturninus or Quinctilius Varus was the civil governor of that province and while the first of the enrolments of Augustus was in process in Judaea. In this capacity Quirinius, the *dux* or ἡγεμὼν, was *legatus Augusti*, just as the civil governor with whom he shared the administration of the province, though being in charge of the military affairs only. And thus the words of Luke: Ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου, fully apply to Quirinius in the position described.

From what has already been said it is not difficult to decide which of the two governors named was associated with Quirinius in the administration of Syria. We know from Tertullian what would be fairly certain without him, that the census for the periodic year 9 B. C. was made in Syria under Sentius Saturninus, who was in office from 9 to 7 B. C. His successor, from 7 to 4, was Quinctilius Varus, a man without large military experience and, therefore, not very well prepared for an arduous military task as the war with the people in the wilds of the Taurus and the strategic regulation of frontier regions would prove to be.

1) Syriam et quattuor legiones obtinebat Licinius Mucianus. . . . Bellum Judaicum Flavius Vespasianus (ducem eum Nero delegerat), tribus legionibus administrabat. Hist. I, 10.

2) Tacitus, Ann. XV, 23 ff.

Thus we will hardly go wrong when we assume that Quirinius was military governor of Syria while the internal affairs of the province were administered by Quinctilius Varus. That Luke should specify this period by naming Quirinius and not Varus as the ἡγεμὼν in Syria during the closing years of Herod's reign in Judaea is easily explained. Quirinius was a name well and honorably known throughout the empire. He had triumphed in Rome, laden with military honors. He was entrusted with the tutorship of an imperial prince under exceptionally difficult circumstances. He was the husband of a lady who had been engaged to another imperial prince, and his divorce suit after twenty years of married life with Domitia Lepida was for a time a *cause célèbre* in Roman society.¹⁾ Besides, the administration of Quirinius was probably shorter than that of Varus; for the Cilician war was probably in 6 and 5 B. C., and at the death of Herod in 4 Varus was in military command himself, putting down the troubles arising after Herod's death. And thus Quirinius was among all the public men available most appropriate for a precise determination of the time when the census was taken in Judaea, and thus Luke's statement is that of a precise and most judicious historian.

But why was not the population of Palestine enrolled under Sentius Saturninus? This question, too, can be satisfactorily answered.

It was a difficult thing to hold a public position at all under Augustus, and it was a difficult thing to hold a public position at all in the land of the Jews; but the most difficult position conceivable in those days was that of a king of the Jews under Caesar Augustus. And this was the position of Herod when the census for the cyclical year 9 B. C. was to be taken. That the system of enrolments was not inaugurated as a measure of universal application throughout the

1) Tacitus, Ann. III, 23. 48.

empire as early as 29 B. C., immediately on the accession of Augustus to the tribunician power, is not only clear from the explicit statement of Luke, but would be a reasonable assumption without such information. Universal measures of public policy are not introduced at haphazard by so careful a ruler as Augustus was. Household enrolments were probably originally an Egyptian institution of long standing, as old papyri seem to show. But when the first period of fourteen years in Augustus' principate were over, the emperor, by a decree, ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, made this a general measure for all parts of the empire. Palestine, too, was a part of the empire. Herod, the king, was a subject of Augustus, and bound to obtain the emperor's sanction for important acts. An apparent neglect of this duty in his invasion of Arabia brought down upon him the anger of Augustus, who, among other hard things, wrote to Herod, that, having formerly treated him as a friend, he would thenceforth use him as a subject.¹⁾ What better opportunity than the census could the emperor find to make good his word? Herod, a subject, his people, subjects—thus would they appear in the census returns. But the census might mean more than that for Herod. It might mean serious trouble in Palestine. The king had always endeavored to pick his way between Scylla and Charybdis, a jealous sovereign and a proud and headstrong people, chafing under the Roman yoke. What if that yoke should now be made to weigh more heavily on Jewish necks? We know and can understand that Herod sent an embassy and another to Rome in those days, and still another before he succeeded in regaining the emperor's favor.²⁾ The first and second embassies did not even gain a hearing, and the presents they bore were rejected. It is probable that they had orders to ask for a suspension of the census in Palestine. If they

1) Γράφει πρὸς τὸν Ἡρώδην, τάτε ἄλλα χαλεπῶς, καὶ τοῦτο τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τὸ κεφάλαιον, ὅτι πάλαι χρώμενος αὐτῷ φίλῳ, νῦν ὑπηκόῳ χρήσεται. Joseph. Ant. XVI, 15.

2) Joseph. Ant. XVI, 15—17.

had, they failed of success. The census was delayed, but could not be obviated. Other parts of Syria had been enrolled under Sentius Saturninus in 8 B. C. Varus and Quirinius came, and with them a strong administration of Syria. The emperor, still relentless, must be obeyed; the census must be taken, and we learn from Luke that it was.

But we also learn in what manner the enrolment was made. To exasperate the Jews no more than necessary, Herod made the imperial census a numeration of the population of Palestine by calling the various families to their various homes, gathering them in family reunions in their ancient family seats. Thus did he sugar-coat the bitter pill. To Augustus it mattered little how the households were grouped, provided they were all there and the returns complete. In a small country like Palestine Herod's plan was feasible without affecting the reliability of the census. That the Romans readily adapted their political measures to provincial peculiarities is well known. Thus was the first census delayed to the time of Quirinius' administration, probably to 6 B. C., but finally made, quite consistently with all the prevailing circumstances, in the manner described by Luke. Thus was the decree of Caesar Augustus obeyed in the land of the Jews. Thus all the people of that territory *went to be taxed, every one to his own city*. Thus did Joseph, the head of a household, come to Bethlehem, the city of David, being of the house and lineage of David, to be enrolled with Mary, his expoused wife. For the scepter was departed from Judah.

A. G.
