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PREFACE

UNDERSTANDING that a certain criticism implied a sort of challenge to

apply my theory of Luke's character as a historian to the Gospel, I

took what is generally acknowledged to be the most doubtful passage,

from the historian's view, in the New Testament, Luke 2:1-4. Many would

not even call it doubtful. Strauss (in his New Life of Jesus) and Renan

dismiss it in a short footnote as unworthy even of mention in the text.

This passage, interpreted according to the view which I have maintained

-- that Luke was a great historian, and that he appreciated the force

of the Greek superlative (in spite of the contradiction of Professor

Blass and others) -- gave the result that Luke was acquainted with a

system of Periodic Enrollments in Syria, and probably in the East

generally. I looked for evidence of such a system; and it was offered

by recent discoveries in Egypt. The confirmation afforded to Luke was

explained in the Expositor,

April and June, 1897. Realizing better in subsequent thought the

bearings of the Egyptian discovery, I have enlarged these two articles

into an argument against the view that Luke sinks, in the accessories

of his narrative, below the standard exacted from ordinary historians.

At the risk of repeating views already stated in previous works, the

second chapter attempts to put clearly the present state of the

question as regards the two books of Luke, without expecting others to

be familiar with my views already published.

The names of those scholars whose views I contend against are hardly

ever mentioned. The scholars of the "destructive" school seem to prefer

not to be mentioned, when one differs from them. I have learned much

from them; I was once guided by them; I believe that the right

understanding of the New Testament has been very greatly advanced by

their laudable determination to probe and to understand everything, as

is stated on p. 33; but I think their conclusions are to a great extent

erroneous. It might, however, be considered disingenuous if I concealed

that the weighty authority of Gardthausen, the historian of Augustus,

is dead against me, p. 102.

My best thanks are due to Professor Paterson, who has discussed many

points and cleared up my views in many ways; to Mr. B. P. Grenfell, who

read the first proof of chapter 7, and enabled me to strengthen it;

and, at last, to Mr. F. G. Kenyon; to Mr. A. C. Hunt; to Mr. Vernon

Bartlett; and to Mr. A. Souter.

The language of the book has profited much by my wife's care in

revision.

It would be impossible -- and only wearisome to the reader if it were

possible -- to trace the origin of every thought expressed in the

following pages. Where I was conscious, at the moment of writing, that

I was using an idea suggested by another, I have said so; but as

regards the New Testament, one learns in the course of years so much

from so many sources that one knows not who is the teacher in each

detail.

The relation between the almost identical solutions of the Quirinius

difficulty, proposed nearly simultaneously by M. R. S. Bour and myself,

is explained in chapter 11.

W. M. RAMSAY.

POSTSCRIPT. -- I hear, Oct. 2, that Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt have

found a household-enrollment paper a little older than AD. 50. The date

is lost, but the same officials are mentioned in it as in a document of

the 6th year of [Tiberius], where the names of Claudius and Caligula

are impossible. Hence the paper belongs to the census of AD. 20, and

proves conclusively my theory as to the origin of the Periodic

Enrollments from Augustus. Much of the argument in chapter 7, printed

when the Periodic Enrollments were traced with certainty only as far

back as AD. 92, is now confirmed so completely, that part of it is

hardly necessary.
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PART 1

IMPORTANCE OF THE PROBLEM
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CHAPTER 1

LUKE'S HISTORY: WHAT IT PROFESSES TO BE

AMONG the writings which are collected in the New Testament, there is

included a History of the life of Christ and of the first steps in the

diffusion of his teaching through the Roman world, composed in two

books. These two books have been separated from one another as if they

were different works, and are ordinarily called "The Gospel according

to Luke" and "The Acts of the Apostles". It is, however, certain from

their language, and it is admitted by every scholar, that the two books

were composed by a single author as parts of a single historical work

on. a uniform plan. After a period of independent existence, this

History in two books was incorporated in the Canon, and its unity was

broken up: the first book was placed among the group of four Gospels,

and the second was left apart.

Professor Blass has pointed out a trace of this original independent

existence in the famous manuscript which was presented by the Reformer

Beza to the University of Cambridge. In that manuscript the name of

John is spelt in two different ways, the form Joanes being almost

invariably used in Luke and Acts, and Joannes in the Gospels of

Matthew, Mark and John. [1] That slight difference in orthography leads

us back to the time of some old copyist, who used as his authority a

manuscript of the History of Luke, in which the spelling Joanes was

employed, and different manuscripts of the other Gospels containing the

spelling Joannes. Probably the spelling Joanes was that employed by the

original author; and it is adopted in Westcott and Hort's edition

throughout the New Testament, except in Acts 4:6 and Revelation 22:8.

This historical work in two books is attributed by tradition to Luke,

the companion and pupil of Paul. We are not here concerned with that

tradition. Since all scholars are agreed that the same author wrote

both books, we shall use the traditional name to indicate him merely

for the sake of brevity, as it is necessary to have some name by which

to designate the author; but we shall found no argument upon the

authorship. Like Professor Blass, I see no reason to doubt the

tradition; but those who do not accept the tradition may treat the name

Luke in these pages as a mere sign to indicate the author, whoever he

may be.

The point with which we are here specially concerned is the

trustworthiness of this author as a historian. Many facts are recorded

by him alone, and it is a serious question whether or not they can be

accepted on his sole authority.

This is a subject on which there prevails a good deal of

misapprehension and even confusion of thought. There are many who seem

to think that they show fairness of mind by admitting that Luke has

erred in this point or in that, while they still cling to their belief

in other things, which he and he alone, records, on the ground that in

those cases there is no clear evidence against him. But it must be said

that this way of reasoning is really mistaken and unjustifiable: it

refuses to make the inference that necessarily follows from the first

admission.

While human nature is fallible, and any man may make a slip in some

unimportant detail, it is absolutely necessary to demand inexorably

from a real historian accuracy in the essential and critical facts. We

may pardon an occasional instance of bias or prejudice; for who is

wholly free from it? But we cannot pardon any positive blunder in the

really important points. If a historian is convicted of error in such a

vital point, he ceases to be trustworthy on his own account; and every

statement that he makes must gain credit from testimony external to

him, or from general reasons and arguments, before we accept it.

Especially must this be the case with the ancient historians, who as a

rule hide their authorities and leave us in the dark as to the reasons

and evidence that guided them to formulate their statements. There may

be -- there always are -- many facts which the poorest chronicler

records correctly; but we accept each of these, not because of the

recorder's accurate and sound judgment in selecting his facts, but

because of other reasons external to him. If there is in such a

historian any statement that is neither supported nor contradicted by

external evidence, it remains uncertain and is treated as possibly

true, but it shares in the suspicion roused by the one serious blunder.

If we claim -- and I have elsewhere in the most emphatic terms claimed

-- a high rank for Luke as regards trustworthiness, we must look fairly

and squarely at the serious errors that are charged against him. If the

case is proved against him in any of these, we must fairly admit the

inevitable inference. If, on the other hand, we hold that the case is

not proved, it is quite justifiable and reasonable, in a period of

history so obscure as the first century, to plead, as many have done,

that, while we cannot in the present dearth of information solve the

difficulty completely, we are obliged, in accordance with our

perception of the high quality of the author's work as a whole, to

accept his statement in certain cases where he is entirely

uncorroborated. These must for the present rank among the difficulties

of Luke. There are difficulties in every important Greek author, and

each difficulty is the scholar's opportunity.

But it must be the aim of those who believe in the high character of

Luke's History, to discover new evidence which shall remove these

difficulties and justify the controverted statements. The progress of

discovery has recently placed in our hands the solution of one most

serious difficulty and the justification of one much controverted

statement; and the following pages are written with the intention of

showing what is the bearing of this discovery on the general question

as to the historical credibility of Luke.

The whole spirit and tone of modern commentaries on Luke's writings

depend on the view which the commentators take on this question. In

some cases the commentator holds that no historical statement made by

Luke is to be believed, unless it can be proved from authorities

independent of him. The commentary on Luke then degenerates into a

guerrilla warfare against him; the march of the narrative is

interrupted at every step by a series of attacks in detail. Hardly any

attempt is made to estimate as a whole, or to determine what is the

most favourable interpretation that can be placed on any sentence in

the work. There is a manifest predilection in favor of the

interpretation which is discordant with external facts or with other

statements in Luke. If it is possible to read into a sentence a meaning

which contradicts another passage in the same author, that is at once

assumed to be the one intended by him; and his incapacity and

untrustworthiness are illustrated in the commentary.

But no work of literature could stand being treated after this fashion.

Imagine the greatest of pagan authors commented on in such a way; any

slip of expression exaggerated or distorted; sentences strained into

contradiction with other passages of the same or other authors; the

commentary directed to magnify every fault, real or imaginary, but

remaining silent about every excellence. There have occasionally been

such commentaries written about great classical authors; and they have

always been condemned by the general consent of scholars. Even where

the bias of the commentator was due to a not altogether unhealthy

revolt against general over-estimate of the author under discussion,

the world of scholarship has always recognized that the criticism which

looks only for faults is useless, misleading, unprogressive, and that.

it defeats itself, when it tries to cure an evil by a much greater

evil. Scholarship and learning sacrifice their vitality, and lose all

that justifies their existence, when they cease to be fair and

condescend to a policy of "malignity".

In this discussion it is obviously necessary to conduct the

investigation as one of pure history, to apply to it the same canons of

criticism and interpretation that are employed in the study of the

other ancient historians, and to regard as our subject, not "the Gospel

according to Luke," but the History composed by Luke. The former name

is apt to suggest prepossession and prejudice: the latter is purely

critical and dispassionate.

In estimating the character and qualities of an author we must look

first of all to his opportunities. Had he good means of reaching the

truth, or was his attempt to attain thorough knowledge of the facts

made in the face of great difficulties? An historian ought to give us a

statement of his own claims to be received as trustworthy, or an

estimate of the character of the evidence which he had at his disposal.

Luke has not failed to put clearly before his readers what character he

claims for his history. He has given us, in the prefatory paragraph of

his Gospel, a clear statement of the intention with which he wrote his

history, and of the qualifications which give him the right to be

accepted as an authority. He was not an eye-witness of the remarkable

events which he is proceeding to record, but was one of the second

generation to whom the information had been communicated by those "who

were from the beginning eye-witnesses and ministers of the word". The

simplest interpretation of his words is that he claims to have received

much of his information from the mouths of eye-witnesses; and, on

careful study of the preface as a whole, it seems impossible to avoid

the conclusion that he deliberately makes this claim. Any other

interpretation, though it might be placed on one clause by itself, is

negatived by the drift of the paragraph as a whole.

Thus Luke claims to have had access to authorities of the first rank,

persons who had seen and heard and acted in the events which he

records. He makes no distinction as to parts of his narrative. He

claims the very highest authority for it as a whole.

In the second place, Luke claims to have studied and comprehended every

event in its origin and development, (parekolouthekoti anothen pasin

akribos) i. e., to have investigated the preliminary circumstances, the

genesis and growth of what he writes about. Exactness and definiteness

of detail in his narrative -- these are implied in the word anothen:

investigation and personal study implied in the word parekolouthekoti:

tracing of events from their causes and origin -- implied in anothen:

such are the qualities which Luke declares to be his justification for

writing a narrative, when many other narratives already were in

existence; and he says emphatically that this applies to all that he

narrates.

The expression used clearly implies that Luke began to write his

narrative, because he was already in possession of the knowledge gained

by study and investigation; as he begins, he is in the position of one

who already has acquired the information needed for his purpose. This

is implied in the perfect parekolouthekoti. The rendering in the

Authorized and the Revised Version does not bring this out quite

clearly: from the English words -- "it seemed good to me also, having

traced the course of all things accurately from the first, [2] to write

unto thee in order" -- one might infer that the study and tracing of

the course of events was resolved upon with the view of writing the

history. But in the Greek that meaning would require the aorist

participle. With the perfect participle the meaning must be "as I

already possess the knowledge, it seemed good to me, like the others,

to write a formal narrative for your use."

On this point, I am glad to find myself in agreement with Professor

Sanday, who refuses to assume that Luke "began with the intention of

writing a history, and accumulated materials deliberately in view of

this intention all through his career". We cannot assume that, for the

author, by implication, denies it. But we may safely assume that he had

both the intelligent curiosity of an educated [3] Greek, and the eager

desire for knowledge about the facts of the Saviour's life, natural in

a believer who rested his faith and his hopes on the life and death of

Christ.

Possibly some one may say that it is assuming too much when I speak of

the author as an "educated" Greek. But any one who knows Greek can

gather that from the preface alone. No one who had not real education

and feeling for style could have written that sentence, so well

balanced, expressed in such delicately chosen terms, so concise, and so

full of meaning.

In the third place, Luke declares his intention to give a comprehensive

narrative of the events in order from first to last (kathexes soi

grapsai). This does not necessarily imply a chronological order but a

rational order, making things comprehensible, omitting nothing that is

essential for full and proper understanding. In a narrative so arranged

it stands to reason that, in general, the order will be chronological,

though of course the order of logical exposition sometimes overrides

simple chronological sequence (see chapter 10). Further, it is involved

in the idea of a well-arranged History that the scale on which each

event is narrated should be according to its importance in the general

plan.

Finally the account which Luke gives is, as he emphatically declares,

trustworthy and certain (hina epignos . . . ten asphaleian). His

expression indubitably implies that he was not entirely satisfied with

the existing narratives. He does not, it is true, say that explicitly;

he utters no word of criticism on his predecessors, and he declares

that they got their information from eye-witnesses. But his expression

distinctly implies that he considered that some advance was still to be

made, either as regards completeness, or as regards orderly exposition

of the facts, or as regards accuracy. In all probability the fault in

the existing narratives which Luke had especially in mind was their

incompleteness. They embodied the tradition of eye-witnesses and

ministers of the Word "from the beginning" (ap' arches), which seems to

imply "the beginning of the preaching of the Word". We have to think of

narratives in the form of the Gospel of Mark, with the opening: "the

beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ" -- narratives that commence

with some such stage as the baptism. In contrast to these narratives

Luke claims to trace the whole series of events from their origin, i.

e., from the higher or preliminary stage out of which they were derived

anothen).

It seems beyond doubt that, in speaking of the origin, Luke has in view

the narrative which he proceeds to give of the birth and early days of

the Savior. Therein lay the most serious addition that he made to the

narratives of his predecessors; and for that addition in particular he

claims the same high character as for the narrative as a whole: he has

it from firstclass authorities -- exact, complete and trustworthy (see

chapter 4).

In view of the emphatic claim which Luke makes, that his whole

narrative rests on the highest authority and is accurate and certain,

it is obvious that we cannot agree with the attitude of those scholars,

who, while accepting this whole History as the work of the real Luke,

the follower and disciple and physician and intimate friend of Paul,

are wont to write about the inadequacy of his authorities, the

incompleteness of his information, the puzzling variation in the scale

and character of his narrative according as he had good or inferior

authorities to trust to. The writer of the preface would not admit that

view: he claims to state throughout what is perfectly trustworthy.

It may be allowed, consistently with his own claim, that his

information was not everywhere equally good and complete. Thus, for

example, he would naturally have heard much more about the facts of the

Savior's life, than about the events of the few years that followed

upon his death: attention would be concentrated on the former, and the

latter would be much less thought about or inquired into. But this view

cannot be carried far without coming into contradiction with the

profession of the preface. And, above all, those who admit that the

Luke of the Epistles, the friend and companion of Paul, was the author

of this History must not attempt to explain the account given by Luke

of important events in Paul's life, such as the Apostolic Council (Acts

15, by the supposition that the author was not acquainted with Paul's

account of the facts and character of that most critical event. He who

had been Paul's companion during the stormy years following that

Council, when its decision was the subject of keen debate and rival

interpretations, must have known what were Paul's views on the subject.

It is important to note that Luke in this preface distinguishes between

the written accounts and the tradition of the eye-witnesses (kathos

paredosan hoi autoptai). So far as the actual word tradition, or

Paradosis, goes, it might, and in many cases does, refer to written

narrative; but in the present case the logic of the passage clearly

implies a pointed distinction between tradition and written narrative.

There existed when Luke wrote, on the one hand, oral tradition from

eye-witnesses, and, on the other hand, many narratives written by those

who learned from the eye-witnesses and put the tradition in literary

form; but there were as yet no written narratives composed by

eye-witnesses. This inference is drawn by Professor Blass, and is

distinctly implied in Luke's preface. Luke may have known Mark's

Gospel, and probably used it; but he did not know the other two

Gospels.

There can only be one conclusion, when the terms of Luke's preface are

duly weighed. Either an author who begins with a declaration such as

that had mixed freely with many of the eye-witnesses and actors in the

events which he proceeds to record, or he is a thorough impostor, who

consciously and deliberately aims at producing belief in his

exceptional qualifications in order to gain credit for his History. The

motive for such an imposture could hardly be mere empty desire to be

considered a true narrator. The man of that age, who was deliberately

outraging truth, felt no such overpowering passion for the distinction

of having attained abstract truth in history. He must have sought to

put on the semblance of truth and authority in order to gain some end

by conciliating belief in his narrative; he must have desired to gain

credit in order that his party or his opinions might triumph. They who

declare that the author belonged to a later age are bound to prove that

there was some such intention in his mind.

Hitherto every attempt to show that the historian had such an aim in

view has ended in complete failure. With regard to Book I., the Gospel,

the attempt is ludicrous; the narrative is so transparently simple and

natural that hardly any amount of prepossession could read into it such

aims. With Book II., the Acts, we are not here concerned. Elsewhere I

have tried to show what a single eye the author has in that book to the

simple statement of facts as they actually happened; it seems to me to

be almost as transparently simple and natural as the Gospel.

No rational theory, such as would for a moment be admitted in regard to

an ordinary classical author, has ever been advanced to account for the

supposition of deliberate imposture in the claims to credit advanced by

Luke. If the author was an impostor, his work remains one of the most

incomprehensible and unintelligible facts in literary history. One can

imagine, for example, that Peter was written by a person who was so

filled with the conviction that he was giving the views of his master,

Peter the Apostle, as to express the letter in Peter's name; the case

might seem to him (from a mistaken point of view) to be not wholly

unlike the expression of the old prophets, "thus saith the Lord". That

is a conceivable and rational hypothesis, though whether it be true or

false we cannot say, and need not now inquire. No such rational

hypothesis has yet been advanced to account for Luke's far more

elaborate, and therefore more deliberate, imposture.

But this abstract and rather intangible argument must yield to the

demonstration of hard facts. So much we freely grant. Now it is

asserted that the historian whom we are studying has been guilty of

such serious and gross blunders, when he touches on matters of general

history, that his information cannot have been so good as he pretends,

and therefore he must be claiming too much when he arrogates such an

authoritative character for his History. We shall feel bound to accept

that argument; and, if the blunders are demonstrated, we must accept

the necessary inferences and abandon our championship of his accuracy

and trustworthiness. But let us first examine the demonstration.

We cannot investigate in this volume every "blunder" that is charged

against Luke; but we shall treat one rather fully. If I may judge both

from personal feeling, from conversation, and from many books, the

"blunder" which most contributes to rouse prejudice against him as an

historian, occurs at the very beginning, in that same episode on which

he evidently lays such stress in his preface -- the story of the Birth

of Christ. In this story the enrollment or census of Palestine in the

time of Quirinius is a critical point; and the doubt whether any such

census as Luke describes was made, is the cause of important and

far-reaching results. It is declared to be a blunder, or rather a

complication of blunders; and if that be so, the entire story must be

relegated to the realm of mythology, and the writer who mistakes fable

for fact, and tries to prop up his mistake by an error of the grossest

kind, can retain no credit as an historical authority.

In conclusion, we shall briefly refer to one or two other typical

so-called "errors" in Luke.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1] Exceptions -- one in Luke, two each in Matthew, Mark and Acts,

seven in John.

[2] Better "from their origin".

[3] Expositor, Feb., 1896, p. 90.
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CHAPTER 2

THE DESIGN AND UNITY OF LUKE'S HISTORY

AS has been stated, a historian may make a slip in some detail without

losing claim to be trustworthy: no man and no historian is perfect. But

he must not found his reasoning upon the error. Facts that are

fundamental in his argument must be free from slip or fault. There must

be no mistake on a critical point.

If we consider Luke's design, we shall see that the "error" which forms

our subject affects the very life-blood of the work and the atmosphere

in which the story moves. But every great work of literature like

Luke's History must be reinterpreted by each new age for itself; and it

is more useful to describe what views are now held as to the plan and

design of that History, than to sketch the design.

The consummate literary skill shown in Luke's work must impress every

reader, who allows free play to his sense of literary effect. We feel

that in this work we have to deal with an author who handles his

materials freely and with perfect mastery. The unity of style and

treatment in the narrative, its dramatic character, varying according

to the country and the action and the character of every speaker, so

Greek in Athens, so "provincial" in the Roman colonies Lystra and

Philippi, so Hebraic in Galilee or by the Jordan, and so Lukan

everywhere -- this character and individuality, shown in numberless

ways, make it clear that the author was no clipper-up of fragments from

other writers, no mere scissors-and-paste editor of scraps, no mere

second-hand composer, dependent on the accidental character of his

"sources," according to the elaborate and somewhat pedantic theories

that have been fashionable recently in Germany, but are already

becoming discredited there. Only a person who has blinded himself to

literary feeling by the strength of a fixed prejudice, could fail to

perceive the literary quality of this History, and to infer from it the

real unity of the work.

When a commentator on the text of Luke, observing that Luke "can be as

Hebraistic as the Septuagint and as free from Hebraisms as Plutarch,"

and that "he is Hebraistic in describing Hebrew society," and Greek in

describing Greek society, refrains from expressing any opinion as to

whether this result is attained "intentionally or not," that is a very

proper reserve for a commentator to maintain. He is not called upon to

determine in the preface to a commentary whether this varying character

has been given intentionally to the work by its author, or has remained

attached to it by chance, according as the character of the different

documents on which Luke depended continued to exist in his completed

work. But the literary judgment will not hesitate. Luke is so

completely master of his materials, and handles the Greek language with

such ease and power, that he must have intended to give his work the

literary qualities which are observable in it. A rational criticism

must always assume that an author intended to attain that delicately

graduated effect which in fact he has attained.

But the interval which separated the historian from the events which he

records is an important element in estimating his design. Great

literary power may tell against his trustworthiness, by helping him to

hide the poverty of his materials; and that view has been maintained as

regards Luke by writers of the type of Baur, Zeller and Renan. They

argued that Luke was an able and beautiful but not very well-informed

author, who lived long after the events which he records, at a time

when all actors in those events had died, and when accurate knowledge

of facts was difficult to acquire. In addition to the skillful

arguments by which they showed up a series of internal discrepancies

and improbabilities, the apparent discordance between the narrative

(especially in the second book) and the general scheme and character of

Roman Imperial administration in the Eastern provinces, seemed to many

to weigh heavily against the idea that the book embodied a really

trustworthy account of events.

In the picture of Christian history during the first century, according

to the accepted interpretation of Luke's History, there was no apparent

relation between the development of Christian influence and the

existing facts of the Roman empire. The modern writers who professed to

found their views upon Luke, after a few picturesque paragraphs about

Roman proconsuls and armies and the march of the Roman eagles, plunged

into Christian history, and the reader saw nothing more of Rome except

when a Gallio or a Sergius Paullus obtruded himself on the scene with

something of the air of a bad actor equipped in ill-fitting Roman

dress. The life of the empire was wanting: that consisted, not in

eagles and proconsuls, but in order and organization, and in the

development and Romanisation of society.

Those who studied Roman history first of all, and Christian history

only in a secondary degree, were inevitably driven to the conclusion

that a work, upon which was founded such a lifeless and spiritless

picture of part of the Roman world in the first century, could not be a

product of that century, but must have originated at a later date, when

the life of the time described was no longer understood.

But a most important part of Luke's Second Book is concerned with Asia

Minor and Greece; and any one who has gone through the long, slow

process by which in recent years the lost history of Asia Minor has

been in some degree recreated by the work of a number of scholars, and

their studies Luke without prepossession, must observe, that his

references to those lands have a marked and peculiar individuality -- a

certain matter-of-fact tone -- which is utterly unlike the vague style

of a later author, narrating the events of a past age with the purpose

of showing their bearing on the questions of his own day. One feels

that, in all that concerns Asia Minor, Luke is treating real facts with

thorough knowledge.

As knowledge of Asia Minor grew, one perceived that Luke's statements

explained some most obscure problems by setting in a new light the

evidence that had long seemed unintelligible. Luke takes us right into

the midst of the political development of central Asia Minor, when

Roman organizing skill was treating one by one the successive problems

of government amid a semi-Oriental population, regarding some districts

as still too rude to be Romanised, and placing them under the educative

care of dependent kings, treating others as already worthy of the honor

of being incorporated in the Roman empire as fractions of a great

province, and fostering among them a spirit of pride in the Imperial

connection and contempt for the extra-provincial barbarians.

It is a difficult thing to revivify and rearrange the details of that

magnificent political work; and in some respects I erred in my first

attempt [4] to recreate the picture of the Imperial scheme for

Romanising the inner lands by gradually building them up into a great

Roman province called Galatia. But the errors (though vexatious to

myself as I gradually came to see more clearly) were not so important

as to disturb materially the truth of the picture in its general

effect. It had been given me, through intense longing after truth, to

catch the main outlines correctly, and to understand that Luke's brief

references to the state of central Asia Minor plunged the reader into

the heart of the conflict between Graeco-Roman forms of life and the

amorphous barbarism of a Phrygian and Lycaonian population. In that

state of the land, to be Phrygian or Lycaonian was to be unenlightened

and non-Roman, to be Roman was to be a loyal member of the province

Galatia. Such a state of things could not have been conceived or

understood by a writer of the second century, when Rome had long been

supreme over the whole of Asia Minor, and when the opposition between

the contending ideas, Roman or Galatic on the one hand, native (i.e.,

Phrygian, Pisidian, etc.) and non-Roman on the other, had ceased to be

a real force in the country.

But if this view which opened gradually before us was correct, then we

had to abandon the current, generally accepted opinion, which. admitted

no Roman conceptions in the terms relating to geography and political

classification in Acts, which saw, for example, in the "Galatic

Territory," not a Roman province, but the country where Attalus, King

of Pergamos, had confined the Galatae or Galli about 230 BC. We must

regard Paul as a Roman, using Roman terms and forms, just as he

accepted the Roman classification and system of administration.

As it happened, this implied and necessitated a radical revolution in

the interpretation of the book of Acts and of early Christian history

as a whole. It meant that the connection and the conflict between

Christianity and the Roman State did not begin in the second century,

as was the almost unanimous opinion of the greatest authorities during

the halfcentury preceding 1890 (when Neumann's book carried back the

beginning to the reign of Domitian, AD. 81-96). It meant that the

conscious and recognized relations between the New Religion and the

Roman Administration began when Barnabas and Saul stood before the

Roman proconsul of Cyprus, when the latter, hitherto junior and

subordinate to Barnabas, took the lead, and the supposed Hebrew wise

man named Saul stood forth as the Greek Paul and impressed the Roman

governor by declaring the principles of the new Catholic, world-wide

religion. It meant that the first important step in the spreading of

this Catholic religion was made, when Paul and Barnabas crossed Taurus

from the secluded and unimportant Province Pamphylia, into the

important Province Galatia -- the province which embodied all that was

Roman in Central Asia Minor, the province in which the Roman element

was involved in the sharpest antagonism to the rude ignorance of an

Oriental, priest-guided, ritual-loving native population -- and planted

their feet on the great highway of intercourse between the East and the

West.

Further, it now began to grow clear that some of the discrepancies

which had been the mainstay of Baur's and Zeller's argument, were due

to the stereotyped misunderstanding of the Roman side of early

Christian history, Both the general character and many details of that

history were distorted, when contemplated through the medium of the

dominant theory.

The life of the early Church lay in constant intercommunication between

all its parts; its health and growth were dependent on the free

circulation of the life-blood of common thought and feeling. Hence it

was first firmly seated on the great lines of communication across the

empire, leading from its origin in Jerusalem to its imperial center in

Rome. It had already struck root in Rome within little more than twenty

years after the crucifixion, and it had become really strong in the

great city about thirty years after the apostles began to look round

and out from Jerusalem. This marvelous development was possible only

because the seed of the new thought floated free on the main currents

of communication, which were ever sweeping back and forward between the

heart of the empire and its outlying members. Paul, who mainly directed

the great movement, threw himself boldly and confidently into the life

of the time; he took the empire as it was, accepted its political

conformation and arrangement, and sought only to touch the spiritual

and moral life of the people, while he always advised them to obey the

existing Government and conform to the existing laws of the State and

of society, so far as they did not lead into direct conflict with

Christian principles.

But the formerly accepted interpretation of the Second Book of Luke's

History carried Christianity away into eddies and backwaters of the

ocean of Roman Imperial development, and placed there the scene of the

first great conflict between Judaistic provincialism and the world-wide

Pauline conception of Christianity. It was blind to the true character

of Paul's work, which sought to spiritualize the life and educative

development of the empire by affecting the main currents of its

circulation and intercommunication; and it tried to distinguish the

lines along which the new thought spread from the lines along which the

life of the world was throbbing.

The dominance of that interpretation produced a position, the analogue

of which still exists in respect of some other questions. That theory

led straight into a series of difficulties, for which no rationally

satisfying solution could be found; and the scholars who treated Luke's

History were divided broadly into two classes. Some saw so clearly the

unity, the power and the personal quality in the work, that they

refused to be led astray by the serious difficulties in which they were

involved on certain points. Others realized so strongly the

difficulties, that they formed their judgment from them alone and

ignored the quality of the History as a whole.

The progress of discovery is indubitably tending to show that the

scholars of the former class were, on the whole, in the right; but this

should not blind us to the immense service rendered by those of the

other class, who kept the difficulties clear before the world's

consciousness.

Moreover, it must be admitted that the scholars who judged by literary

feeling and the general quality of Luke's History, were not always wise

in their treatment of the difficulties. Instead of frankly

acknowledging that the difficulties were inexplicable in our present

state of knowledge, they sometimes attempted by ingenious special

pleading to minimize them, and then claimed that the difficulties were

solved. Their vigorous perception of the central and most important

fact, viz., the first-hand directness of Luke's style, made them so

thoroughly convinced that the difficulties must be explicable, that

they were almost blinded to the strength of the arguments against them,

and sometimes thought they had explained difficulties, when they had

merely shut their eyes to them.

The result was that those who, like myself, had been accustomed only to

classical Greek, and were too young to appreciate fully the literary

quality of a writer in such an unfamiliar form of Greek, and who were

determined to understand clearly and precisely every step in reasoning,

were repelled by what seemed to us to be pure prejudice and

unwillingness to admit reason, and were driven violently over to the

opposite side; and it was a long and slow process to work back again to

the side against which we had acquired such a strong prepossession.

In such a state of mind it was natural to rest for a time in a theory

of double authorship, that Luke's History was partly excellent and

partly second-rate (as I was almost inclined to do while writing The

Church in the Roman Empire). One could feel that Luke's Second Book was

characterized by such singular accuracy in all details bearing on the

society and the political organization of the Eastern provinces, that

the author's expression in many places could not have been framed

without first-hand knowledge, and that his point of view was distinctly

of the first century, or rather the pre-Domitianic type, as

distinguished from that which was produced by the persecution of

Domitian.

But, on the other hand, parts of the History seemed to involve

insoluble difficulties and discrepancies.

Hence, while no distinct theory was stated in my treatise, yet the

language used in it sometimes pointed towards a theory of dual

authorship.

But such ideas were utterly inconsistent with the unity of plan, the

vigorous controlling intellect which revealed itself throughout Luke's

work; and the impossibility to stand still in such a halfway position,

clinging to rival and inconsistent views, became rapidly manifest. It

was not possible to introduce maturer views into the book already

published, even in a new edition; for the sole merit that it possessed

lay in its being perfectly unprejudiced and unfettered by any theory as

to the composition of Luke's History. After forming a definite opinion

about that History as a whole, it was no longer possible to write as if

one had no opinion. Therefore, the book had to remain as it was, with

its defect of being not self-consistent in respect of Luke, since the

want of systematic unity was the guarantee of its being the

unprejudiced effort of a mind groping for truth.

It became more and more clear that it is impossible to divide Luke's

History into parts, attributing to one portion the highest authority as

the first-hand narrative of a competent and original authority, while

regarding the rest as of quite inferior mold. If the author of one part

is the real Luke, or any other person standing in similar close

relations with the circle surrounding the apostles (particularly Paul),

then that same person must be the author of the whole, and must have

brought to bear on his whole work the same qualities which made one

part so excellent. It may be that he found it more difficult to feel

perfectly at home in the Palestinian part of his narrative than where

the scene lies in the Aegean lands. It may be that in the parts

intervening between the Resurrection or the Ascension (with which many,

probably all, of his written authorities ended) and the beginning of

Paul's personal recollections, he found it harder to obtain perfectly

satisfactory knowledge. But we cannot lay much stress on these causes

of diversity in character. The History must stand as a whole, and be

judged as a whole. If one part shows striking historical excellence, so

must all; if any part shows a conspicuous historical blunder, we must

be very suspicious of a theory which attributes surpassing qualities to

another part.

In regard to the Second Book of Luke, my arguments are set forth

elsewhere, [5] and, while I feel conscious how imperfectly they have

been stated, and how much better the work ought to have been done, I

have nothing of consequence either to retract or to modify, though much

might be added. After three years more of study, Luke appears more

clearly than ever to me as one of the great historians.

Such a view is unfashionable; and there is in some quarters a

disposition to regard it even as a crime and a personal affront to the

distinguished scholars who have thought differently. It is true that I

have advocated a view diametrically opposed to their judgment, and

that, if I be right, they have erred in a critical question of the

utmost importance and interest. But I have not sought to give the

discussion this personal application. It is not a crime to differ from

another scholar as to the date and quality of any of the disputed

classical works; and my desire has been to proceed in regard to Luke on

the same lines as in the questions of extra-Biblical scholarship. One

of the scholars whom I reverence most deeply in all Europe differs very

strongly from my judgment as to the authority of the Peutinger Table,

but the difference makes no change in my profound respect and

admiration for him, and none in the great kindness which he has always

shown to a beginner like me. Similarly there is no reason why Luke's

authority as a historian should not be treated as a justifiable subject

for discussion. I entertain, and have always professed, great

admiration for many scholars whose opinions I dispute on some points of

Christian history, and from their learning I have gained much.

It is a more serious evil that a disposition is sometimes shown to

terrorize the investigator by the array of learned opinion on the

opposite side, and to treat it as the necessary mark of a reasonable

scholar in this subject, that he should be always searching for and

finding proofs of the late date, and inaccuracy, and composite

character of Luke's History. It is comforting to certain minds to have

some one whose opinions they can accept implicitly; and it would almost

appear that a few of our English scholars attribute to the German

commentators on the Bible that inerrancy which our parents or

grandparents attributed to the text. They set up an idol, and condemn

as an impious iconoclast him that sees the idol's feet of clay, even

while he reverences the image.

But in matters of scholarship it is not safe to follow implicitly any

scholar, however great he may be; and we appeal to fact and reason

against the dogmatism which seeks to close the case, refuses to admit

further argument, and brands as an "apologist" any defender of Luke's

character as a historian.

Not long ago it was reckoned by many as essential to a respectable

scholar that he should pooh-pooh Luke as a second-century writer. Now

we are permitted, on the highest German authority, to date him in the

first century. We are permitted also to speak of certain parts and

scenes in the Second Book of his History as showing marvelous accuracy

and great power of conceiving and setting before the reader a life-like

picture of what actually occurred. But we are not permitted to infer

that he is a trustworthy historian, and that the presumption is in

favor of his accuracy, even in cases, where no clear external evidence

corroborates his statements.

We might ask whether it is a probable or possible view that the author

can be so unequal to himself, that in one place he can show very high

qualities as an accurate historian, and that in another place, when

dealing with events equally within the range of his opportunities for

acquiring knowledge, he can prove himself incompetent to distinguish

between good and bad, true and false. He that shows the historic

faculty in part of his work has it as a permanent possession.

The power of vivid conception and accurate description in concise,

wellchosen, pregnant language, which Luke admittedly shows in some

passages, proves that he could estimate correctly the comparative

importance of details, select the essential points, and skillfully

group them. An author fixes a standard for himself at his best, and is

most unlikely to sink below it. The true critic will recognize this,

and will not rest satisfied till he has traced the same qualities

throughout the work. That method of studying Luke has not yet been

consistently employed in the light of modern historical, geographical

and antiquarian knowledge. The attempt to carry it out consistently

will be stigmatized by those who dislike its results as pedantic

insistence on minute points of language and mere "Mikrologie"; but it

must be made in the face of such prohibition.

On this subject there are only two alternatives. It grows more and more

clear that compromise -- such as is common among those by whom it is

esteemed fair-minded to accept as much as possible from the results of

the destructive school -- is impossible. The mind that is really

logical and self-consistent cannot admit part of the so-called

"critical" view -- what ought to be called the uncritical view -- and

yet on the whole cling to the belief in real Lukan authorship. Luke's

History is of such a strongly marked character what are called the

"gaps" or omissions in it are so distinct, or, in other words, the

proportion of the parts in it is so peculiars -- the insistence upon

some facts and the summary dismissal of others with a bare word forms

so prominent a feature of the work -- that either the author had a

distinct idea of plan and purpose and comparative importance, according

to which his whole narrative was ordered and guided, or he was not the

real Luke.

Occasionally it is possible, with some plausible and deceptive show of

reason, to maintain that the length at which some incident is narrated

is due merely to the author's possessing exceptionally good sources of

information about it. Take for example, the long description of the

voyage From Philippi to Caesarea. That description is given in the

words of one who was present on the ships. It therefore rests on

authority of the highest character; and it might plausibly be

maintained that the exceptionally excellent nature of the information

led the author to devote an exceptional amount of space to it.

But if a believer in the Lukan authorship of the History attempts in a

consistent way to carry out that theory, he is led into hopeless

contradiction. Situations at which the real Luke must have been present

are dismissed in the curtest way or omitted altogether, while others in

which he was not present are described at great length. If the author

so carefully chronicles the progress past Chios, and Samos, and Cos,

and Rhodes, and Myra, and Cyprus, for the sole reason that he was

present and knew what happened, why should he, after describing so

carefully and minutely the progress of the Gospel in Corinth and

Ephesus, or its comparative failure in Athens, which he had not seen,

sum up in a word the two years in Rome, where he was present -- years

which must have been so full of important events and impressive

preaching? Why should he omit the two years' residence in Caesarea,

except as regards two isolated scenes, and describe so much more fully

the previous twelve days' residence there? Why should events in which

Paul and Luke were both keenly interested, and as to which they must

have known each other's views -- why should such events be narrated at

great length by Luke, and in a way which shows, on the accepted

interpretation, utter ignorance of Paul's views?

No answer has ever been given to these questions. In truth, he who

admits that theory must., if he is logical, go on, like Professor

Harnack and Professor McGiffert, to deny that the real Luke was the

author.

But it is at once the special strength and the peculiar weakness of

English scholarship that, even when it makes a mistake, it shrinks with

a healthy and saving instinct from carrying out the mistake to

extremes; it is not consistent with itself where to be consistent means

to go further astray. With its practical sense it gains the chief

result -- truth in the main. It returns to the right path when its

course is becoming clearly divergent; and often it returns before it

has erred so far from the true path as to become completely conscious

of its wandering. Hence, it disapprovingly regards him that

remonstrates with it for its want of consistency, on the ground that

"he hunts down the statements of his opponents into what seem to him to

be their consequences". In this country we are, perhaps, too apt to

think that a scholar is responsible only for what he has explicitly

stated, and not for the logical consequences of his views.

On the other hand, it is at once the strength and the weakness of

German scholarship that it is thoroughly and remorselessly logical,

that it carries out its views with steadfast and unwavering

consistency, that it works out every theory to its consequences, that

it is always conscious where it has gone, and is never untrue to

itself, even though it thereby sacrifices the real object of its

pursuit. When it goes wrong it demonstrates its own error with absolute

conclusiveness, for it never works round out of the straight line back

towards the true path.

A good example of the attempt at compromise and of the illogicality of

such an attempt, is found in the main subject of our investigation --

Luke's story of the birth of Christ and the first enrollment of

Palestine.

The attack directed against the credibility of that episode has been

strong, confident, almost triumphant in its tone. [6] The defense has

been rather timid and hesitating; the introduction of Quirinius's name

has been abandoned almost universally as a demonstrated blunder; and

even the reality of the "First Enrollment" has been championed by

Luke's advocates in a very reluctant and half-hearted way.

But to make even one of these concessions is practically and logically

to abandon the case, so far as Luke's character as a historian is

concerned. He who says that "Luke is in error in the name of

Quirinius," admits that, even when Luke had learned a fact from some

authority, he could not keep himself free from a huge blunder in

stating it.

Beyond all doubt, the suspicion entertained about Luke's History is due

to the belief that, when he touches on general history, his references

are usually demonstrably false, as contrary to historical record, and

are rarely or never conclusively supported by other historians. He is

the only Evangelist who has attempted to place his narrative in its

proper relation to contemporary history; and when he tries to do so,

almost every one, even most of his defenders, admit that he cannot do

it without making errors.

It is generally admitted that (as Canon Gore puts it) "the

chronological data in Luke 2 and 3 were supplied by himself and not by

his sources". Luke gives us the result of his own investigations into

the historical surroundings of the life of Christ. But if his

investigations were of such a character that he confused the census of

8 BC. with that of 6-7 AD., and imagined that Christ was born "in the

days of Herod the King," during a census held about ten or eleven years

after the death of Herod -- when Herod was king, and yet when a Roman

viceroy was organizing the new province of Palestine -- of what value

were his investigations, or his ideas about past history, or his

evidence? [7] What should we think of the historical qualities of a

modern author who began an account of the life of Hereward the Wake by

confusing between Edward the Confessor and William the Conqueror? The

one case would be no worse than the other. The first attempt that the

author makes to connect his subject with contemporary history shows

hopeless ignorance of that history.

It is no wonder in these circumstances that Luke's History has fallen

under suspicion so strong that the case in its favor has been generally

considered weaker than that in favor of any other important book in the

New Testament. When I ventured, in defiance of the general verdict, to

argue that Luke is a real historian -- and "the first and the essential

quality of the great historian is truth" -- even so conservative and so

friendly a scholar as Professor Sanday found that my "treatment of Luke

as a historian seems too optimistic".

But it is an essentially inconsistent position to fancy that we can

accept three-fourths or nine-tenths of what Luke says as true, and

reject the rest. Destroy a historian's credit in one critical point,

and there remains naught.

The confounding of one census with another in this case would be one of

the serious things, which condemn the would-be historian as hopelessly

incapable of accuracy or sound historical judgment. His statements

cease to have any value in themselves; we can in each case only seek

for a source, and estimate the probability of the statement by the

authority of the source, after subtracting the likelihood of some other

blunder having been made by Luke in using his source.

To judge how seriously this blunder affects the author's character, how

inevitable are the inferences which the logical mind must deduce from

the blunder, we must glance at two preliminary points which will form

the subject of chapters 3. and 4.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[4] The Church in the Roman Empire, Pt. 1.

[5] Both in the pages of the Expositor in many separate articles, and

in St.Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen.

[6] See chapter 5.

[7] There are other impossibilities upon impossibilities which have

often been stated, and are repeated in chapter 5.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CHAPTER 3

LUKE'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE ROMAN WORLD

The reign of Augustus, as is well known, is enveloped in the deepest

obscurity. While we are unusually well informed about the immediately

preceding period of Roman history, and for part of the reign of his

successor, Tiberius, we possess the elaborate and accurate, though in

some respects strongly prejudiced account of Tacitus, the facts of

Augustus's reign have to be pieced together from scanty, incomplete and

disjointed authorities.

Moreover, obscure events in a remote corner of the Roman world can

never even in the best attested periods be expected to come within the

purview of Roman history. Such events are preserved to us only by some

accidental reference or some local authority; and it is unreasonable to

cast doubt on the local authority, either because he relates what is

not related by the Roman historians, or because he regards things from

a different point of view, and sees them in different perspective, and

applies to them a very different scale of importance.

The real value of these accidentally preserved local authorities is

that they do not give the Roman point of view, but enable us to

contemplate part of the Roman world, as it was seen by non-Roman eyes.

What would we not give for a review of Caesar's Gallic campaigns by a

leading Gaulish Druid or chief, or for a criticism of Agricola by the

chief bard of Boadicea or of Galgacus? Tacitus, indeed, has expressed

the views of Galgacus, but we feel that it is Tacitus, not the British

chief, that speaks.

We should, undoubtedly, find in the words of the Gaul or the Briton a

very different view from the official justification and. Apologia for

his career published by Caesar, or the panegyric composed by Tacitus.

We should certainly have considerable difficulty in reconciling the

opposing authorities, and in striking a balance between the discrepant

judgments and statements as to facts. But it would be sheer unreason to

set aside as mere invention every assertion of the Gallic or British

authority, which could not be established on Roman authority.

Reasonable and sound criticism will apply the same standard to Luke's

history. It will not demand that he, a Greek of the wider Greek world,

as distinguished from the narrower country of Greece proper, should

look at everything through Roman spectacles, and express everything

precisely as a Roman would do. It will rate his value all the higher,

because he has not done that -- because he shows us how Roman things

were looked at by one who was not a Roman. It will be prepared to find

differences of expression and description, even when the Greek and the

Roman are looking at the same historical fact. To estimate Luke fairly,

it will ask what was his attitude towards the Roman world. In answer to

this question, one might say much; but even a brief chapter may be of

some use.

On the whole, Luke's view has in essentials a strong Paulinistic

character. He was disposed towards the Imperial government and

political institutions very much as Paul was, and as the wider Greek

world in general was. He accepted unreservedly the existing facts of

society and organization. But there was a difference between them.

Paul, as a Roman himself, spoke from the Roman point of view. Though he

was a citizen of Tarsus and from that point of view a member of the

Greek world, his Roman citizenship overrode his Greek citizenship, and

he had beyond all doubt been educated from infancy to understand his

position as a Roman. [8] His point of view is clearly and emphatically

Roman. Those who talk of Paul as a mere Jew are blinding themselves to

his real position and to the character of the Graeco-Roman world in his

time.

But Luke's point of view was not the same. Luke is throughout his work

a Greek, never a Roman; and his statements must be estimated

accordingly. Before criticizing, we must make sure that we understand

rightly; and we shall never understand rightly, unless we begin by

sympathizing with the writer and the tone of his work.

Luke then speaks of things Roman as they appeared to a Greek. The

Greeks never could quite understand Roman matters; even the mysteries

of the Roman system of personal names were as puzzling to almost all

Greeks as they are to a modern school boy or college student. [9]

Hence, for example, in the remarkable scene at Paphos (Acts 13:9), it

is difficult to feel any confidence whether or not Paul disclosed

himself to Sergius Paullus in his Roman character. If he did so, it is

clear that his Roman name ought to be given. Strictly taken, Luke's

language at this point implies that Paul showed himself only as a Greek

traveler and philosopher to the Roman proconsul; and, on the whole,

this seems perhaps most probable. But that must be gathered from the

career of Paul as a whole; and it would not be safe to infer it from

the fact that Luke gives the alternative name in its Greeks not in its

Roman form. Paul did not, perhaps, develop his idea of Christianity for

the Roman empire quite so early.

Luke, indeed, does not distinctly mark any further stage of

development; but to Luke the great antithesis -- Gentile and Jew --

quite obliterated the lesser distinction between Roman citizen and

Roman provincial, when the provincial was a Greek. What power lay in

the Roman name, the thorough Greek never comprehended; and hence Luke

has never disclosed to us the fact -- which is beyond all doubt -- that

Paul had a Roman name. Had it been clearly present in the consciousness

of all modern scholars that Paul must have been either Gaius Julius

Paullus or something of that style, many things that have been said

would have been better said, or left unsaid. Yet it is as certain as

anything can be, that a Roman citizen necessarily had a Roman name,

that Paul could not have revealed himself to the magistrates at

Philippi or to Claudius Lysias, and that he could not have appealed to

the emperor, except by virtue of his Roman name, which he must have

stated openly.

Owing to the failure of a Greek to comprehend Roman names and their

importance, we have no clear record about this important side of Paul's

career. Luke sees him only in two aspects, as "Hebrew or Graeco Roman":

he never sees him as "Greek or Roman". [10]

As a preparation for the study of Luke's History, one ought to become

familiar with the remains of the Greek used in the cities of the wider

Greece, [11] to understand as far as possible the ideas of the people

among whom Luke grew up, and to appreciate the way in which they

rendered or misrendered Roman things. We shall then begin to appreciate

better Luke's meaning and his standard as a historian. It is true that

he regularly uses the popular phraseology, and not the strictly and

technically accurate terms for Roman things; [12] but he is decidedly

more accurate in essentials than the ordinary Greek, even the official

Greek, of the Eastern cities. He never is guilty of the blunders that

puzzle the epigraphist in Asian or Galatian inscriptions.

It has often been remarked that Luke wrote for a public ignorant of

Palestine, its customs and its language, and familiar with the

surroundings of Graeco-Roman life in the great cities of the empire. He

explains to his readers Semitic names and terms; he describes the

situation of Nazareth and Capernaum as cities of Galilee, of Arimathea

as a city of the Jews, of the country of the Gadarenes as over against

Galilee, and he even tells the distance of the Mount of Olives and of

Emmaus from Jerusalem.

Now contrast with these explanations the allusions to the cities of the

Greek and Italian lands. The fact that Syracuse and Puteoli and Rhegium

are named without any geographical explanation might perhaps be

explained from their fame and importance. Syracuse was one of the

greatest Greek cities; Puteoli was the great harbor for passengers by

the sea voyage to Rome from the East; and Rhegium was situated at a

very striking point on the voyage. Similarly, while he explains the

position of Philippi and Perga, Myra and Lystra, he assumes that the

situation of Athens, of Corinth, and of Ephesus is familiar to his

readers. He thinks that the coasts of the Aegean Sea need no

explanation, or that the general character of the voyage sufficiently

explains the position of Troas, Cos, Miletus, Caesarea and Ptolemais.

The relation of Cenchreae to Corinth (Acts 18:18) is also taken as

familiar. But the most striking case occurs as the travelers approach

Rome. The author assumes that the Market of Appius and the Three

Taverns are familiar points on the road, which Paul must traverse

between Puteoli and Rome. Instead of telling their distance from Rome,

he uses them as actual measures of distance to show how far the

brethren came forth from Rome to welcome Paul.

Too much stress should not be laid on reasoning so slight as this.

There is not enough of evidence to justify full confidence. But, so far

as it goes, it suggests that Luke wrote for an audience which knew the

environs of Rome and Corinth far more intimately than the country round

Jerusalem and the Sea of Galilee. And, on the whole, it is on the great

lines of communication leading from Syria and Asia to Rome that most

knowledge is assumed.

Further, Luke sometimes adapts incidents to the comprehension of his

readers by expressing them in terms which, though not a literal

description of the original facts, approximate to the general sense and

are more readily intelligible to the Western reader. An excellent

example of this is found in Luke 5:17-20, as compared with Mark 2:1-4.

MARK 2:1-4

And when he entered again into Capernaum after some days, it was noised

that he was in the house. And many were gathered together, so that

there was no longer room for them, no, not even about the door � and he

spake the word unto them. And they come, bringing unto him a man sick

of the palsy, borne of four. And when they could not come nigh unto him

for the crowd, they uncovered the roof where he was [13] and when they

had broken it up, they let down the bed whereon the sick of the palsy

lay.

LUKE 5:17-20

And it came to pass on one of those days, that he was teaching; and

there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come

out of every village of Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem: and the power

of the Lord was with him to heal. And behold, men bring on a bed a man

that was palsied' and they sought to bring him in, and to lay him

before him. And not finding by what way they might bring him in because

of the multitude, they went up to the house-top, and let him down

through the tiles with his couch into the midst before Jesus.

Here it is obvious that Mark gives the incident in the more exact way.

The house was a humble erection, with a flat roof of earth or other

material, which was easily destroyed and as easily replaced. The

bearers took advantage of this; mounting on the roof, they broke it up,

and let down the couch through the hole which they thus made.

A modern writer might have explained all this to his readers. But Luke,

although he interprets a single Semitic word occasionally, would not

spare time and space enough for a more elaborate description of

details, which were, in his estimation, unimportant. His readers were

familiar with a different kind of house, covered with tiles, and having

a hole (impluvium) in the roof of the principal chamber (atrium), where

the company would be assembled. To turn aside from his proper subject

and describe differences of architecture would have distracted

attention from the really important facts. As has been often pointed

out, [14] Luke never describes such features, but leaves his readers to

imagine for themselves from their own knowledge the surroundings amid

which his story was enacted.

Accordingly, he preserves all the essential features -- the dense crowd

preventing access to the Master by the proper approach the taking of

the bed with the sick man in it up on the roof the letting down of the

bed through the roof before the Savior's eyes. But he does not tell

that the bearers broke a hole through the roof. A tiled roof, such as

his readers were accustomed to, is strong; a hole cannot easily be made

through it; and when it is broken, it is a long and expensive operation

to repair it. It would seem unnatural that a hole should be violently

made in such a roof; and Luke leaves his readers to apply their own

knowledge, and to understand that the bearers let the man on his couch

down through (the opening in) the tiles.

Matthew, again, regards all these details about the manner of bringing

the man as unimportant, and omits them. Corresponding to Mark 2:2-4 and

Luke 5:18, 19, he has only these words, 9:2:" And behold they brought

him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed". It was only the words and

acts of the Master that he considered worthy of space. Luke and Mark

and Matthew all say that Jesus, "seeing their faith," told the man that

his sins were forgiven. He saw that the man had the same "faith able to

receive cure and salvation" as the lame man at Lystra, Acts 14. But

Luke and Mark explain how the special circumstances made evident the

faith of the bearers and the man, while Matthew leaves the reader to

gather from Jesus' words, that he saw some special evidence of faith in

the case before him, Matthew relates the story as one long familiar;

and it would not be thoroughly intelligible to us without the proof of

eager faith which Luke and Mark relate. The latter stand on an earlier

stage than Matthew.

We notice that Luke's account here is not suited to a Greek house, but

only to a Roman house. The Greek house was of totally different

construction from the Roman; and, if Luke had been writing primarily

for a public resident in the great Greek cities of the Aegean lands, he

would probably have either related the incident in its original

Palestinian form, or imparted to it a turn that would suit the style of

house usual in those cities. It happens, fortunately, that we can

illustrate and prove this point by a series of analogous cases.

The Roman comic dramatists, Plautus and Terence, adapted Greek plays to

the Roman stage, modifying the plot and incidents in some respects to

suit the tastes and the knowledge of a Roman audience. When some

incident in the Greek play turned on a peculiarity in the structure of

a Greek house, the Roman playwright often modified the facts, so as to

suit the style of house that was familiar to his audience. Thus, a

Greek dramatist wrote a play called "The Braggart," in which the

relation between two lovers is discovered by a slave resident in the

neighboring house. In adapting this play, Plautus describes this

discovery in the form that the slave, pursuing an ape which had escaped

from his master's house, clambered over the roof of the atrium of his

neighbor's house, and in this way was able to look through the hole in

the roof or impluvium into the atrium, and saw the lovers sitting side

by side.

As Lorenz has observed, [15] this could not have been the form which

the incident had in the original Greek play. The Greek house had no

atrium with its impluvium, nor anything corresponding to it. The

ordinary house in the Greek cities contained an open court or aula, to

which access was gained by a passage leading from the front door. This

court was surrounded, sometimes simply by the house walls, sometimes by

a narrow stoa or portico, [16] resting on the house walls and supported

inside by columns. The covered chambers of the house opened off the

back of this court, and the part of the mansion which contained these

chambers was usually of one or, at most, two stories and covered by a

flat roof. As the houses in these Greek cities were usually built close

together, divided from one another by the house wall (which was common

to both), it was easy to look from the flat roof (or from the windows

of the upper story) of one house into the court of the next; and thus

the slave in the Greek play saw the lovers in the aula of the

neighboring house. In this same way Thekla at Iconium sat at a window

in the house of her mother Theokleia, and heard Paul preaching in the

court of the house of Onesiphorus, her neighbor. See note 2 at the end

of this chapter.

Luke uses even the Roman form of expression. The regular term for "the

roof" (regarded from the outside) was in Latin "the tiles"; [17] but in

Greek the collective singular form "the tiling" was used. [18] Luke

speaks after the Roman fashion, and says that they let the sick man

down "through the tiles" (dia ton keramon). by which he implies the

roof of Roman style. In a similar way, Terence in the Phormio, 707,

speaks of a snake as having "fallen from the tiles (i.e., the roof)

through the impluvium," expressing the same meaning in a fuller way.

In a review in the Theologische Litteraturzeitung, 1897, p. 534, Dr.

Johannes Weiss says: "When Mark writes they uncovered the roof, and

when they had broken it up, they let down the bed, ' but Luke on the

other hand says they let him down through the tiles, ' the former

thinks of the Palestinian style of building, while the latter thinks of

the roof of the Graeco-Roman house". This expresses practically the

same view which has been advocated in the preceding pages, but the word

Graeco-Roman seems to require modification. Luke writes with a view to

the Roman house alone; and his language would not suit the Greek style

of house.

Luke must have adapted his expression to suit either a circle of

readers, or more probably the single reader, Theophilus, for whose

instruction he composed his History; and, in giving to his narrative

the form seen in 5:20, he evidently felt that Theophilus was used to

the Roman and not the Greek house architecture. Taking this in

conjunction with the use made of the Market of Appius and the Three

Taverns, we find a distinct probability that Theophilus was a citizen

of Rome.

Moreover, Theophilus is addressed by an epithet, [19] which, under the

empire, was peculiarly appropriated to Romans of high rank, and which

became during the second century a technical title indicating

equestrian (as distinguished from senatorial) rank. Examples are

numerous in the Imperial Greek inscriptions; and those who have made

themselves familiar with the usages of Roman and provincial life under

the empire, will recognize the high probability that Luke uses this

adjective in 1:4, as in every other place (Acts 23:26, 24:3 and 26:25)

[20] to indicate the official (probably equestrian) rank of the person

to whom he applies it.

Luke, then, was adapting the form of his narrative either to a single

Roman or to a Roman circle of readers. The frequency and emphasis with

which he mentions matters that are specifically Roman must impress

every reader.

In regard to Roman officials of high rank, the favorable judgment which

they always pass on Christ and on his followers is so marked a feature

of Luke's work, that it must have been prominent before his mind.

Luke mentions formally the charge which the Jews vainly made, that

Jesus had been guilty of disloyalty and treason against the Roman

emperor, 23:2. John mentions it very informally (John 18:30). [21]

Matthew and Mark are silent about the nature of the charge. Luke

records the thrice repeated judgment of Pilate acquitting Jesus of all

fault before the Roman law; John mentions the acquittal once in similar

terms; Matthew represents Pilate as disclaiming all responsibility for

his death, but not as formally pronouncing him innocent of all fault.

In Luke's Second Book this feature is still more marked. The Imperial

officers stand between Paul and the Jews to save him from them. The

Proconsul of Cyprus was almost converted to Christianity. The Proconsul

of Achaia dismissed the Jews' case against him as groundless before the

law. Festus, the Procurator of Palestine, found in Paul nothing worthy

of death -- he had difficulty in discovering any definite charge

against him, which he could report in sending him up to the supreme

court of the empire. Even Felix, another Procurator, one of the worst

of Roman officials, was affected by Paul's teaching, and to some extent

protected him, and did not condemn him, though to please the Jews he

left him in prison.

Among inferior Roman officials, Claudius Lysias, Julius, Cornelius,

even the jailer in the colony of Philippi, were friendly to the

Christians, or actually joined them. In the few cases in which the

magistrates of a Roman colony took action against Paul, their action is

shown to have been in error (as at Philippi), or is passed over in

silence and the blame is laid on the jealousy and hatred of the Jews

(as at Pisidian Antioch and Lystra). The praetors of Philippi scourged

Paul, but they apologized, and confessed they had been in the wrong.

The magistrates of the Greek cities, like Iconium, Thessalonica and

Athens, were far more severe against Paul than those of Roman colonies.

[22]

Even the publicans, those hated instruments of a taxation after the

Jewish and Romanising style, are far more kindly treated by Luke than

by Matthew or Mark. Compare, for example, the "publicans and sinners"

in the house of Levi or Matthew. Both Mark and Matthew designate the

company by this name; but Luke calls them "publicans and others," and

confines the more opprobrious phrase to the mouth of the scribes

(Matthew 9:10; Mark 2:15; Luke 5:29, cp. 7:34). Luke alone sets the

publican and the Pharisee over against one another as good and bad

types, 18:10. It is true that several sayings of Christ in favor of

publicans are given also by Matthew and Mark; they were too

characteristic to be omitted; but Luke has more of them.

It is not unconnected with this character in his work that Luke records

with special interest the acts and words of Christ implying that the

Gospel was as open to the Gentiles as to the Jews. Similar examples are

found in all the Gospels, because no one who gave a fair account of the

teaching of Christ could omit them; but in Luke they are more numerous

and more emphatic. [23]

It has been, however, pointed out, as a proof that such examples cannot

be relied on, that Luke omits entirely the story of the Savior's visit

to Phoenicia, including the case of the Syrophoenician woman whose

great faith was commended. But in that story occurs the saying, "I was

not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel," Matthew

15:24; and in view of such sayings as Luke -- and Luke alone -- records

in 4:25-27 (see Luke 24:47 paralleled by Matthew 28:19, and Mark

16:15), the historian might doubt whether the incident was not likely

to give a mistaken impression of the Savior's mission. As to the

passing in silence over a visit to Phoenicia, it is pointed out below,

[24] that Luke deliberately refrains from describing the journeys and

movements of Christ.

It is, therefore, plain on the face of Luke's History, that he has

taken pains to connect his narrative with the general history of the

empire, and that he has noted with special care the relations between

the new religion and the Roman state or its officials. Elsewhere I have

tried to show that Luke thought of his work, from one point of view, as

"an appeal to the truth of history against the immoral and ruinous

policy of the reigning emperor; a temperate and solemn record by one

who had played a great part in them of the real facts regarding the

formation of the Church, its steady and unswerving loyalty in the past,

its firm resolve to accept the existing Imperial government, its

friendly reception by many Romans, and its triumphant vindication in

the first great trial at Rome. The book was the work of one who had

been trained by Paul to look forward to Christianity becoming the

religion of the empire and of the world, who regarded Christianity as

destined not to destroy but to recreate the empire. [25]

In such circumstances it is obvious that the historian was bound to be

specially careful that his references to matters of Roman history, and

especially his first reference -- the subject of this study -- were

accurate. But the accusation which we have to meet is that it grossly

misrepresented the character of Roman procedure, and was inaccurate in

fact. If the accusation is right, any Roman citizen who possessed even

a small knowledge of the facts of administration must have seen the

gross inaccuracy at a glance. How, then, does it happen that, while the

circumstances of the birth of Christ were closely scrutinized by the

opponents of Christianity and subjected to much misrepresentation and

many charges of falsification, no one in Roman times seems ever to have

discovered the inaccuracies which many modern inquirers imagine to

themselves?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

NOTE 1

Professor Blass in his welcome book, Philology of the Gospels, 1898, p.

19, declares that the epithet kratistos in Luke's language, had no such

force as we find in it, but was merely "the ordinary one in epistolary

and oratorical style, when the person addressed was in a somewhat

exalted position". As examples, he quotes Paul's address to Felix and

Festus, who were both Roman officials of equestrian rank! These are two

of the many instances on which the proof rests that the title was

peculiarly appropriated at that period to Romans of rank. The same

scholar refers, further, to the examples quoted by Otto in his edition

of the Epistle to Diognetus, p. 79 ff. (53 ff.). I cannot consult this

book, but Otto considers that Diognetus was the philosopher, the friend

and teacher of Marcus Aurelius, and the emperor might well raise his

teacher to equestrian rank, as Septimius Severus raised Antipater, the

teacher of his sons, to the much higher dignity of the consulship; and,

if Otto's identification be accepted, we may regard the epithet as a

proof that Diognetus was honored by his imperial pupil Galen [26]

addresses kratiste Basse, also a Roman of rank. Longinus addresses

Postumius Terentianus, Plutarch speaks of Fundanus, and Artemidorus of

Cassius Maximus by the same epithet, in all cases undoubtedly employing

it in the technical imperial sense. Epaphroditus, to whom Josephus

dedicated his Jewish Antiquities and Life, is a more doubtful case; but

the dedication implies that he was a man of influence in Rome, and

though obviously a freedman (on account of his name), he probably had

been honored with equestrian rank by his imperial patron. The

Aphrodisius whom Galen addresses as kratiste and philtate in his

Prognost. (Kuhn, vol. 19), is also uncertain; Galen, however, lived

amid high society in Rome.

I have always conceded that Greeks were not invariably accurate in

using Latin titles and technical terms, such as optimus (translated

kratistos); but the above examples show how often the technical and

accurate sense is found in Greek. But Professor Blass has his mind so

fixed on Greek literature, of which he is one of the first exponents in

Europe, that he sometimes omits to notice Roman facts.

The usage in Theophrastus, of course, lies apart from our subject and

belongs to an earlier period of society. Even Horace's optimus, used of

Octavius and Quinctius, is pre-imperial, though both men were persons

of rank in Rome, and therefore conform to our rule.

NOTE 2

In the Acts of Paul and Thekla Paul was preaching in the house of

Onesiphorus en meso tes ekklesias (or without the last two words): is

the last word a later alteration of the originalaules? In the Armenian

version Paul preached in the house of Onesiphorus in a great assembly,

and Thekla sat at a window which was close to their roof.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[8] Much might be said on this subject; but it belongs to a study of

Paul's life, and the proofs are found at intervals throughout his

career. The subject is touched upon several times in St. Paul the

Traveller, e.g., pp. 30 f., 225, 315.

[9] The difficulty of being accurate about Roman personal names might

be illustrated plentifully even from the books of distinguished modern

classical scholars, an unpleasant topic from which I refrain.

[10] I should now be inclined to modify lines 6, 12, 16 of St. Paul the

Traveller, p. 83, so as to eliminate the word "Roman". Except in those

143 lines, the scene is there described on Paul's Greek side, as I

think is right.

[11] Canon Hicks in Classical Review, 1887, pp. 4, 42; Deissmann,

Bibelstudien, 1895, and Neue Bibelstudien, 1897. See also Expository

Times, Oct., 1898, p. 9.

[12] St. Paul the Traveller, pp. 30 f., 111, 135, 255, etc.

[13] Literally, "they unroofed the roof".

[14] e.g., St. Paul the Traveller, p. 17.

[15] See the introduction to his edition of Plautus, Miles Gloriosus,

p. 11.

[16] In that case the court was called peristylium.

[17] Tegulae: see Brix's note on Plautus, Miles Gloriosus, 156.

[18] keramos: see Pollux, 7., 162; Aristophanes, Clouds, 1127;

Thucydides, 2., 4, etc.

[19] kratistos See Note 1 at the end of chapter 3.

[20] See Note l at end of chapter 3.

[21] "If this man were not an evildoer, we should not have delivered

him up unto thee".

[22] The subject of this paragraph is more fully treated in St. Paul

the Traveller, p. 304 ff.

[23] Alford quotes 4:25-27, 9:52-56, 10:33, 15:11 ff., 17:16-18, 18:10

ff., 19:5,9.

[24] See Chapter 10 ff.

[25] St. Paul the Traveller, p. 309 f.

[26] De libr. suis (Kuhn, vol. 19.).

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CHAPTER 4

IMPORTANCE IN LUKE'S HISTORY OF THE STORY OF THE BIRTH OF CHRIST

IT needs no proof that Luke attached the highest importance to this

part of his narrative. That Jesus was indicated from the beginning as

the Messiah -- though not a necessary part of his life and work, and

wholly omitted by Mark and only briefly indicated in mystical language

by John -- was a highly interesting and important fact in itself, and

could not fail to impress the historian. The elaboration and detail of

the first two chapters of the Gospel form a sufficient proof that Luke

recognized the importance of the central incident in them.

Further, the author must have regarded this part of his work with

special interest, and been impelled to work it up with peculiar care,

on account of the authority on which it rested; and he takes some pains

to show his reader what was the authority.

The beautifully told story of Luke 1, 2, is an episode of family

history of the most private character. The facts could be known only to

a very small number of persons. If Luke had the slightest trace of

historical instinct, he must have satisfied himself that the narrative

which he gives rested on the evidence of one of the few persons to whom

the facts could be known. It is not in keeping with the ancient style

that he should formally name his authority; but he does not leave it

doubtful whose authority he believed himself to have. "His mother kept

all these sayings hid in her heart;" "Mary kept all these sayings,

pondering them in her heart;" (Luke 2:19 and 51) those two sentences

would be sufficient. The historian who wrote like that believed that he

had the authority of the Mother herself.

But those two sentences are not the only indications of the source

whence Luke believed his information to come. Some facts intimately

concerning Elizabeth are mentioned in 1:24 and 41; and the narrative

carefully explains how these facts became known to Mary, 1:36 and 41

she had been told. But it is never stated that facts intimately

concerning Mary were mentioned by her to Elizabeth. The narrative has

the form which is natural only if Mary is understood to be the

authority throughout: she simply states what concerned herself, while,

in what concerned Elizabeth, she not merely states the facts, but also

explains that she has first-hand authority.

Moreover, what concerned Mary is expressly said to have remained

secret, known to herself alone and pondered over in her own heart. It

would be a contradiction that this secret of her heart should be the

property of others to tell about her. The historian, by emphasizing the

silence and secrecy in which she treasured up the facts, gives the

reader to understand that she is the authority.

It is a different thing when we read, 1:65 f., "these sayings were

noised abroad throughout all the hill country of Judea. And all that

heard them laid them up in their hearts, saying, What then shall this

child be?" There a subject of notoriety, which deeply impressed the

whole district, is referred to. What is known to many is no secret, and

in fact is expressly said to have been a topic of conversation through

the country.

The people in the hill country of Judea knew about the marvelous

circumstances of John's birth, and talked about it, and wondered. But

at Nazareth nothing was generally known. Jesus had been born far away.

His parents brought him to Nazareth after some time had elapsed. Even

after Herod's death his shadow lay heavy on the land; and the parents,

being subjects of his son Antipas, were not likely to talk to their

neighbors about the old king's relations to the child and about the

prophecies of Simeon and Anna apart from the consideration that the

whole subject must have seemed too sacred for gossip. Mary did not

herself comprehend the things that had occurred. She kept them hid in

her heart, and apparently did not even tell her husband what was in her

mind. This child was not to be an unalloyed delight either to her

country or herself; he was "set for the falling and rising up of many

in Israel, and for a sign which is spoken against"; and for herself, "a

sword should pierce through her own soul". It was a dread and vague

future about which she pondered in the depths of her own mind, as "the

child grew and waxed strong, filled with wisdom". In that marvelous

picture, sketched in such simple and brief terms, only he that

deliberately shuts his mind against all literary feeling can fail to

catch the tone of a mother's heart.

In the description of the early days of John and of Jesus the reader

notices the woman's and the mother's feeling, watching the growth of

the two children, to whom and through whom so much had been promised.

As to John, "the child grew and waxed strong and was in the wilderness

(of Judah, the remote country of his birth) till the day of his showing

unto Israel". But about her own son there is an added touch of warmth,

"the child grew and waxed strong, filled with wisdom; and the grace of

God was upon him" (Luke 1:80, 2:40).

No one who judges on the ordinary canons of criticism which govern the

interpretation of ancient literature, can doubt that it is through

design, and not by accident, that there occur in the opening chapters

of Luke's History all these little touches, indicating so delicately

and so skillfully what authority he had to depend upon in the beginning

of his narrative. This is specially clear when we remember the

declaration made by the author in his preface, that he had investigated

from their origin the facts which he is going to narrate. After such a

preface, and with all the indications in the narrative, it is plain

that the historian either believed his statements to be based on the

authority of the Virgin Mary herself, or has deliberately tried to

create a false impression that such was the case. Is it a rational

supposition, is it psychologically possible, that any man who was

impressed with the sacredness of the subject which he is treating

should intentionally found his narrative upon such a falsehood as this

would be?

Understanding that Mary herself is the authority to whom Luke appeals,

we find that the passage becomes clearer, both as to what it states and

what it omits.

The origin of the narrative may possibly explain why Luke and Matthew

give such different accounts of the circumstances of the birth of

Christ. Matthew gives the public account, that which was generally

known during the Savior's life and after his death; and popular belief

has always some tendency to transform and adapt to moral purposes facts

that are much talked about. Luke gives from knowledge gained within the

family an account of facts known only to the family, and in part to the

Mother alone.

It is most probable that Luke had heard the story which Matthew gives,

and it would have been easy to fit this into his own narrative without

disturbing either account. But they did not rest on equal authority;

and Luke would not mix the two. What he had got was an account of the

miraculous birth and of the circumstances which had most deeply

impressed the Mother's mind with regard to the origin and mission of

her Child, while it was rather the relations of the Child to the old

king that had impressed themselves on the imagination of his followers.

In them Matthew read a fulfillment of prophecies about the Messiah. But

they had not similarly affected Mary's mind, and they were not among

the facts which she pondered over in her heart as pledges of the great

future that lay before this little Child.

Luke therefore confined himself to what he had on the highest

authority. So much he states in full detail; and the rest of the first

twelve years of Jesus' life he sums up in the brief expression, 2:40:

"He was filled with wisdom and the grace of God was upon him". Then

came a remarkable instance of the young Boy's awakening consciousness

of his own mission. He had been brought up by his Mother to think of

Joseph as his father; but suddenly he declared to her that his Father's

business lay in a different direction. Here, again, there was something

for the Mother's heart to ponder over, while her Son went on once more

in the natural development of a boy, "increasing in wisdom and stature

and in favor with God and man".

We can argue, then, with perfect confidence that Luke did not take the

narrative of the birth and childhood of Christ from mere current talk

and general belief: he had it in a form for which Mary herself was in

his opinion the responsible authority. What, then, was this form? It

must have been either written narrative or oral communication.

If it were written, the writer must have been either Mary herself or

some one who recorded her story so carefully and faithfully as to leave

full expression to Mary's own feelings.

That Mary herself wrote it seems highly improbable. We should not

expect that she had the literary interest or skill which might lead her

to wish to perpetuate the facts in her own formal narrative: it is more

probable, considering the circumstances of her position in youth, that

she would lack the power of setting down a story in written expression

with such rare art as to have the appearance of being perfectly

natural, even though she would be able to tell it well orally in

simple, natural, unstudied words. Moreover, it seems improbable that

she should desire of her own self to make public the facts which she

had kept so long hid in her heart. It is more natural to think that she

hardly ever spoke of them, except to the rare individuals whose

sympathy drew her on. The language, too, has a tone and character that

do not suggest a formal autobiographical narrative. It seems, if I may

venture to express my individual opinion, to be one of those which lose

from being recited in public; it is one to be read alone or in the

company of some perfectly sympathetic person, but which suffers from

the presence of any one who is not in perfect sympathy. It expresses

the heart of Mary; but in the form in which it was expressed to a

sympathetic heart, and not as prepared for publication.

It is more easily conceivable that some third person, intimate with

Mary and recognizing the importance of having an authoritative

narrative of these events, should have given literary form to an

account coming direct from her own lips. But this account must have

been either a part of a complete life of Christ one of those which Luke

refers to in his preface, 1:1, "repeated [27] according as they who

were from the beginning eyewitnesses or the word delivered the

tradition" -- or an independent narrative, ranking with the authority

of origin from Mary, and describing just so much as she was best able

to tell.

The existence of such an independent narrative, and the utter oblivion

into which it fell, if it ever existed, seem alike most improbable.

Moreover, suppose, for example, the author who gave it literary form to

have been John, in whose house she lived from the crucifixion till her

death, we must suppose that her words have passed through the modifying

influence of John's mind; thereafter John's words have passed through

the modifying influence of Luke's mind; and yet, after all this, they

continue to show clear and fresh the marks of their origin. The

narrative seems not to have passed through so many stages.

Further, the earliest followers of Christ seem to have been so entirely

occupied with his engrossing personality that they thought little or

not at all about his Mother. She hardly appears in three of the four

Gospels.

Matthew tells the story of the birth of her son in such a way that

Joseph is the prominent person, and Mary a mere adjunct. On the few

occasions on which she appears directly or indirectly, in Matthew and

in Mark "there is a sound of reproof in the words" which Christ uses to

her or of her: Matthew 12:46, 13:56 f., Mark 3:31 ff., Matthew 6:3 f.

They do not mention her among the women who watched in sorrow at the

crucifixion. It has been suggested that they omitted her name in this

scene, because it was obvious that she would be there; but no ordinary

reader of these two Gospels would gather from them that this was

obvious.

The tone which John's references to her convey depends mainly on the

interpretation of John 2:4. There the Savior says to her, according to

the almost universal interpretation, "Woman, what have I to do with

thee?" (ti emoi kai soi, gunai) in a tone of reproof and almost (it

might appear) of dislike, as is seen in the illustrative cases which

are usually quoted Matthew 17:19, 2 Samuel 16:10, 1 Kings 17:18, 2

Chronicles 35:21 and Judges 11:12. Is this the tone of the only

information that John gives about the woman who lived in his house from

the day of the crucifixion till her death? The more one thinks of it,

the more one hopes that Luther was right when he desired to take the

meaning, "what is that to me and to thee?" [28] The old Egyptian poet

of the fourth or fifth century, Nonnus, understood the words in that

way, for he slightly varies them in his metrical paraphrase, reading ti

emoi, gunai, ee soi aute; Professor Blass considers that Nonnus had

before him a MS. of the fourth Gospel in which he was read where all

now existing MSS. have kai, and argues that we should replace he in the

text. We should rather suppose that Nonnus (and probably the whole

Asian circle for whom the fourth Gospel was primarily intended)

understood the accepted text in the same sense as Luther advocated.

In all that part of Luke's History which is parallel with the common

tradition in Matthew and Mark, he mentions Mary only in the same way as

they do, and gives no more information about her than they have; and

like them, he does not mention her presence at the crucifixion. The

only additional allusion to her that he gives in the main body of his

narrative, is contained in the words of an unnamed woman, blessing her

who had given birth to such a son as Jesus (Luke 11:27) Accordingly,

considering the interest which Luke shows in Mary in the beginning of

the Gospel, and in Acts 1:14, where she is mentioned as being in

steadfast companionship with the Apostles, it seems probable that the

written authorities which he had before him told the story of the

Savior without referring except in the most casual way to his Mother.

It, therefore, seems unlikely that the first two chapters of Luke

depend on an older written narrative. The quality in them is too simple

and natural, they give too much of the nature of Mary expressed with

the art of Luke, to have passed through the mind of an intermediate

writer. And it is difficult to think that any such composition either

could have existed in Luke's time, or would have disappeared without

leaving a trace behind, if it had existed.

This result is diametrically opposite to the prevailing opinion. It is

generally assumed as specially clear, that we have in the narrative of

the birth and childhood of Jesus a translation from an Aramaic

narrative or from a series of Aramaic narratives. Instead of seeing

evidence of Luke's literary power in the variations of style in

different parts of his history, many scholars see only evidence of

difference in documentary authority. As if the person who wrote the

preface 1:1-4 could be blind to the complete change in style between

1:4 and 1:5! Or as if he were unable to put the story into his own

Greek, if he desired. It is clear as noon-day that the author

deliberately aims at the contrast in style between 1:1-4 and the

following verses.

But that there must be a number of separate documents underlying the

narrative of 1 and 2, which Luke translated, seems an even more

objectionable idea. Because there are three distinct statements about

the growth of John, of the infant Jesus, and of the boy Jesus, it is

assumed by some writers that these form the conclusions of separate

documents. The slight but significant differences between them, in

which I see evidence at once of literary art and of the natural

motherly feeling of Mary, are treated as being mere tag-ends of

separate narratives, which the author of this History had not art

enough to hide. He was so incapable of working separate authorities

into a unity, that he comes to three separate ends, because he had

three separate authorities before him.

"And the child grew and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts

till the day of his showing unto Israel," 1:80.

"And the child grew and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom; and

the grace of God was upon him," 2:40.

"And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and

man," 2:52.

But, in truth, these three sentences mark three stages in a continuous,

unified narrative, written with the finest feeling and art by a single

author of the loftiest literary power. They are a quite sufficient

proof to one who judges on literary grounds that this is not a

composite narrative, but the work of the same writer throughout.

If we are right in this view as to Luke's authority and as to the way

in which that authority reached him, viz., by oral communication, it

appears that either the Virgin was still living when Luke was in

Palestine during the years 57 and 58 -- which is quite a possible

supposition on the almost universally accepted assumption that she was

quite young when Jesus was born -- or Luke had conversed with some one

very intimate with her, who knew her heart and could give him what was

almost as good as firsthand information. Beyond that we cannot safely

go; but yet one may venture to state the impression -- though it may be

generally considered merely fanciful -- that the in, termediary, if one

existed, is more likely to have been a woman than a man. There is a

womanly spirit in the whole narrative, which seems inconsistent with

the transmission from man to man, [29] and which, moreover, is an

indication of Luke's character: he had a, marked sympathy with women.

Many other facts in his History show that character. Luke alone

mentions the "women which had been healed of evil spirits and

infirmities," who "ministered to him of their substance"; and he names

them: he was interested in themselves, in their gratitude to Jesus, and

in their reason for it (Luke 8:2).

He alone tells of the woman who wet Jesus' feet with her tears, and

wiped them with her hair, and kissed them, and anointed them -- her to

whom her many sins were forgiven, because she loved much. He does not

tell her name -- was it because she had been a sinner, and he would not

chronicle that fact about a definite person? or was his information

defective (Luke 7:36) [30] ?

He alone tells about the different characters of Martha and Mary of

Bethany, though he left much for John to add (Luke 10:38). Matthew and

Mark do not mention their names, but allude to Mary in an obscure and

almost inaccurate way.

He alone tells of the women of Jerusalem who followed him to his death,

bewailing and lamenting. All three synoptics mention the women who had

followed Jesus from Galilee, and stood watching the crucifixion afar

off, and how some of them watched where he was laid; but Luke alone

tells how they went away and prepared spices and ointments (Luke 23:27,

56).

He alone tells of the nameless woman in the crowd who blessed the

mother of such a Son as Jesus; possibly one of those to whom Jesus

afterwards said: "Blessed are the childless women, in those days that

are coming" (Luke 23:29 compare Luke 11:27).

Thus time after time, Luke is our only authority for the service and

ministration of women. He had the tender and sympathetic feeling for

women which seems to be quite in keeping with his surroundings in

Macedonia (where women occupied a place of so much more honor than in

Greece proper), and which makes him record so often in his second book

the part played by women in the diffusion of the new religion.

In the texture of the two opening chapters we find full justification

for the prominence that the preface lays upon this episode; and we

conclude that both the personal character of the author and the high

authority on which he claims to rest, would prompt him to lavish

special loving care on this part of his narrative and to avoid defacing

it by a serious blunder. If he made a blunder, as seems generally

admitted, that would be a sufficient refutation of the view which I

have maintained, that he was a great historian.

NOTE

Probably the most reasonable explanation of the remarkable

discrepancies between the four passages -- Matthew 26:6-13, Mark

14:3-9, Luke 7:36-50 and John 12:1-9 (cp. 11:2) -- is that there were

two distinct incidents: one occurred in the house of Simon the

Pharisee, and is described by Luke; the other occurred in the house of

Martha and Mary at Bethany, and is correctly described by John. Mark,

and following him Matthew, mix up the two and describe the incident as

occurring at Bethany in the house of Simon the Leper. They, do not name

the woman, and they merely say that she poured a box of ointment over

the head of Jesus. The attempts to harmonize John with Mark and Matthew

fail completely. John, who says that "they made him a supper there and

Martha served," obviously places the meal in Martha's house: it seems

quite absurd to suppose that she would be serving in the house of

Simon. There is an obvious intention on John's part to correct the

current account, as seen in Matthew and Mark, and at the same time to

illustrate the character of Martha as described by Luke 10:38.

Similarly, inasmuch as the current account placed the incident two days

before the last supper, John pointedly says it occurred "six days

before the Passover".

Probably, Mark originally fell into error from treating two separate

incidents, each perhaps only reported in part to him, or in part

forgotten by him, as being one and the same incident. From one incident

he caught that it had occurred in Bethany, and from another that it

occurred in the house of Simon: accordingly he begins "while he was in

Bethany in the house of Simon the Leper, as he sat at meat". It must

remain uncertain whether Luke's Simon the Pharisee is the same person

as Mark's Simon the Leper, or (as seems on the whole more probable) the

incident narrated by Luke occurred in the north, near the Sea of

Galilee, in the house of Simon the Pharisee, and Mark, connecting the

incident at once with Bethany and with Simon, put it in the house of a

Simon who lived in Bethany and was or had been a leper. It would be

obviously impossible that the feast should be held in the house of one

who was a leper; and it seems not very probable that it would be held

in his house, if he had ever been a leper.

It must be confessed that there is some temptation to follow the Roman

tradition, and treat the Lukan incident as the same with the Johannine.

Luke is vague as to the locality, though it is most natural to

understand that it occurred in the north. But the decisive argument

lies in the moral of the tale. The reason why any incident was

remembered by the disciples lay in the lesson which the Master had

deduced from it. The features which drew forth the lesson in Luke are

precisely those which are most difficult to reconcile with John. To

identify the two incidents, it becomes almost necessary to suppose that

the features on which the moral hinges are errors on Luke's part. Now I

should be quite ready to admit that Luke had made mistakes about

various points, provided they were not essential to the moral; but

those are precisely the points that are vital, and give vitality to the

whole incident. Matthew and Mark are reconciled with John by assuming

that they have erred in the accompaniments; but in the vital details

they agree with him. To identify Luke and John requires that the vital

details are false in one or the other.

The considerations advanced (see chapter 11) ff., if correct, would

entirely disprove the identity of the Lukan and the Johannine incident.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[27] On the sense of anataxasthai see Blass, Philology of the Gospels,

1898, p. 14 f.

[28] Dr. E. Nestle in the Expository Times, 1898, p. 332.

[29] For Eastern feeling read Lady Duff Gordon's Letters from Egypt.

[30] 7:36 ff.: See Note at end of chapter.
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PART 2

SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CHAPTER 5

THE QUESTION AT ISSUE

NEITHER Mark nor John mentions where Jesus was born. Mark 1:9 says:

"Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized of John in the

Jordan". In John 1:45 Philip speaks of him as "Jesus of Nazareth, the

son of Joseph"; and in Acts 10:38 Peter mentions "Jesus of Nazareth".

These expressions obviously do not imply that Mark, or John, or the

author of Acts considered Nazareth to be the place of Jesus' birth.

They merely show that Nazareth was universally considered to be the

abode of his parents, the place which had been his home, coming from

which he had appeared before the world. Similarly the expression, "son

of Joseph," used by Philip in John 1:45, cannot be taken as indicating

John's own opinion, but merely as showing the current belief.

Again, John 7:40, 41, quotes the opinions expressed in Jerusalem about

Jesus: some of the multitude said: "This is of a truth the prophet":

others said: "This is the Christ": but some said: "What, does the

Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the scripture said that the Christ

cometh of the seed of David and from Bethlehem?"

These are the popular sayings, and it is obvious that they are arranged

to form a climax; but the last, which is really the strongest

recognition of Jesus as the Messiah, gains all the more emphasis

because it has the form of an objection to him. He was the Prophet: He

was the Christ: He fulfilled all the prophecies about the coming of the

Christ. The irony, which makes the objectors unconsciously bear such

emphatic witness in his favor, might have been expected to be clear and

impressive to every rational mind. But there is no blindness so

complete as that of the historical critic with a bad theory to

maintain; and the critics of this class actually quote this passage as

a proof that John did not believe that Jesus was born in Bethlehem.

Would they be consistent, and maintain also that John did not believe

him to be of the seed of David, though that was indubitably the

accepted doctrine of the early Church, as is attested by Paul, Romans

1:3 and 2 Timothy 2:8, as well as by the Synoptics?

But the two points mentioned by the objectors must go together. They

who quote 7:41 as a proof that John did not know the second point must

infer also that John did not know the first. Every Christian reader of

John's Gospel would recognize the irony involved in the first point,

for he knew the doctrine set forth by Paul and the Synoptics. He would

therefore necessarily recognize that the second point was also

ironical.

Accordingly, every scholar who judges literature on literary grounds

will recognize that the writer of the fourth Gospel assumes such

perfect familiarity in his readers with the story of the birth in

Bethlehem, that not merely must he be ranked among the witnesses to it,

but he must have written at a time when this belief was a part of

recognized Christian teaching; and it is probable that this will be

urged by some scholars as a proof that the fourth Gospel springs from a

much later period, after the story as given by Matthew and Luke had had

time to become a fundamental part of Church doctrine.

But a remarkable feature in the Gospels, at least of Matthew, Luke and

John, is that they assume in their readers such a background of

knowledge about the life of the Savior. They are written for the use of

persons who were already Christians, and who already had the life of

Jesus in their minds as the foundation of their faith. None of the

Gospels is intended to be a formal biography: their completeness is

moral and spiritual and not historical:" [31] they are, in reality,

Gospels. But the facts of the life of Jesus were fundamental in the

Gospel, and from that point of view each Gospel had to present a record

of facts, actions and words sufficient to bear the structure of faith

which had to rest upon it. But John, in particular, assumes that his

readers know the facts recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, and his work

is an unintelligible phenomenon in literature unless this is

recognized.

Now Matthew and Luke agree that Jesus was born in Bethlehem. Matthew

2:6 points out that this place of birth was the fulfillment of the

prophecy that the Ruler of Israel was to be born there. Yet they are

also fully aware that Jesus was considered by the world to be a native

of Nazareth, and that he had been brought up from infancy in that city.

Matthew 2:23 again sees in the up-bringing at Nazareth the fulfillment

of another prophecy. How, then, do they account for the general

oblivion of the real place of birth?

Matthew begins with the birth of Jesus. He tells nothing about any

previous connection of his parents with Nazareth; but says that they

retired to Nazareth while the Child was still an infant, being in fear

of the reigning King of Judea. If Luke's History had not been

preserved, it would have been unhesitatingly concluded on the authority

of Matthew that the parents of Jesus had never lived at Nazareth until

after the birth of the Child. And though Matthew does not explicitly

assert that, yet it is hard to think that he could have expressed

himself as he has done, if he had known that the parents had their

original home in Nazareth.

Luke goes farther back, in accordance with his profession to have

studied all things from their origin. He mentions that both Joseph and

Mary resided at Nazareth. He tells that they made frequent visits to

Jerusalem, and that the mother had relatives there or in the

neighborhood; and he explains what was the cause that led them to make

a brief visit to Bethlehem at such a moment that Jesus was born there.

Luke does not indeed say explicitly in so many words that the visit was

intended to be a mere temporary one; and this has led some commentators

to suggest that there may have been an intent on the part of the

parents to change their residence to Bethlehem. But the cause stated in

John 2:4, 5, implies a mere temporary visit; and the language of Luke

2:39 shows that after the brief visit they returned to their own city,

Nazareth, and implies that this had always been their intention.

The occasion of this short visit to Bethlehem is thus described by

Luke. In accordance with the orders of the Roman Emperor, Augustus,

there was made an enrollment, or numbering, of the population of

Herod's kingdom; and this was made according to households and tribal

descent and local tribal connection, so that those Hebrews who were not

residing in the proper city of their tribe and family were obliged to

go to their city in order to be enrolled there.

Further, it seems to be implied that the wife, as well as the head of

the house, had to go to the proper city (or for some reason felt it a

duty to go), so that the household as a whole might be numbered in the

tribal and family center.

Joseph, then, with Mary, his wife, went to his proper city, Bethlehem,

to be numbered there among his own people, "because he was of the house

and family of David".

It has been maintained by many scholars in modern times that the census

is either a fiction or a blunder; that the circumstances connected with

it, which Luke relates, are contrary to history; and, in short, that

the story is unhistorical and impossible, not in one way merely, but in

several. It is asserted as unquestionable that the sole germ out of

which the story has developed is the fact, recorded by Josephus, that

about AD. 6-7 there was made a census and valuation of Palestine, the

first and the only one which the Romans held in that country; and that

Luke has transferred this census, with the officer, Quirinius, who made

it, to a different period about nine or twelve years earlier, when it

was for various reasons impossible that any census could have occurred.

It has been urged with triumphant certainty as established on

incontrovertible evidence that the whole story of chapter 2, with all

its pathetic and romantic incidents, is a mere fiction, destitute of

even as much historical foundation as most historical novels possess.

It is asserted as a demonstrated truth that the story contradicts the

established facts of contemporary history; and that any one who accepts

the ordinary canons of historical reasoning must relegate the whole

talc of the birth of Christ to the realm of imaginative fiction. Nor is

it only the extreme school of critics that reject the talc as an

invention. Many of those scholars who thoroughly accept the

trust-worthiness of the Gospel narrative as a whole abandon the attempt

to defend this incident, and either pass by on the other side, or

frankly admit that it is at least in part erroneous, a mixture of

Dichtung und Wahrheit.

Against the trustworthiness of this narrative the following are the

main lines of argument: --

1. It is declared to be a demonstrated fact that Augustus never ordered

any general "Enrollment," or census, to be made of the whole Roman

world. Gardthausen, the latest historian of Augustus, speaks most

emphatically on this point. He goes even so far as to declare that it

is inconsistent with Augustus's aims to attribute to him any such

intention: he quotes the words of Luke, and then adds that, for the

emperor's plans, a general census of the empire was neither necessary

nor suitable. [32]

The eminent German scholar here displays a familiarity with Augustus's

intentions and the limits of his aims, which is quite unjustified by

the scanty evidence accessible to us. Such assumption of the right to

pronounce negative judgments is not the spirit in which the history of

Augustus ought to be written, and such a wild statement as this shows a

momentary loss of the historic instinct, which enables a writer to

distinguish between legitimate inference and loose imagination. It is

one of the places in Gardthausen's work where a regret rises strong in

every reader's mind that Mommsen [33] has never found opportunity to

write the history of that period.

In truth, the distinguished historian of Augustus was not justified in

asserting more than that no evidence was known to him corroborating

Luke's statement as to Augustus's intentions. It will be my aim to show

that evidence was in existence, apparently unknown to Gardthausen,

which affords some confirmation of Luke's assertion; and establishes

it, when Luke's words are properly translated, on a basis of high

historical probability.

2. Even if Augustus had ordered a census to be made of the whole

empire, it is maintained that such a census would not have extended to

Palestine, which was an independent kingdom and not subject to the

orders of Augustus.

There is a mixture of truth and error in this line of argument. It will

be our aim to demonstrate that, while the application of the Roman

census by Roman officials to Herod's kingdom could not be accepted as

credible, yet Luke does not speak of any such application. The argument

is founded on a false interpretation. Luke nowhere asserts or implies

that the census was made by a Roman official. He states that the birth

of Jesus occurred in the days of Herod the King of Judea, and in the

country over which that king ruled: compare 1:5 and 2:4. He merely

mentions the Roman officer, Quirinius, for purposes of dating according

to the ancient style, employed generally before eras and numbering of

years had come into literary use, just as he mentions various kings and

priests in 3:1, 2 for the same purpose. He assumes that his readers

would appreciate the fact that the census in the territory of King

Herod was conducted under the immediate orders of the king himself.

Further, Luke certainly understands that Herod's kingdom was a part of

the Roman world, and that Herod was bound to obey orders issued by

Augustus in respect of numbering the population of the Roman world.

We shall have to show -- what no one except a theological critic with a

theory to maintain would dream of denying -- that Herod's kingdom was a

part of the Roman world; that it was not independent, but ought rather

to be styled a "dependent state"; and that any tendency on the part of

such dependent kings to disregard their duty of submission to the

general principles of Roman policy was sharply repressed by the

emperors.

3. Even if a census had been held in Palestine, it is asserted that

there would have been no necessity for Joseph and Mary to go up from

Nazareth to the city of Bethlehem, inasmuch as a Roman census would be

made according to the existing political and social facts, and would

not require that persons should be enrolled according to their place of

birth or origin. The Roman method necessarily was to count the

population according to their actual residence. It is, however, an

essential point in Luke's story, that it should explain how the son of

a resident in Nazareth came to be born in Bethlehem, and thus fulfilled

the prophecy that the Messiah was to be born in that city. Hence it is

contended that Luke's fiction is doubly erroneous, for even if it were

true it would not lead to that journey, which is the critical point in

the history.

There can be no doubt that in the Roman census the existing facts were

recorded, and that any disturbance of the existing distribution of

population would defeat the purpose and impair the value of the census.

Therefore, if the census which Luke had in mind were one carried out

purely after the Roman method, it would not furnish the explanation

which is the prime reason for mentioning the census. That must be

freely conceded.

But, far from asserting that this census was carried out strictly after

the Roman method, Luke explains at the outset that it was made on a

different principle, not merely by households (as the Roman method [34]

required), but also at the same time according to descent and stock,

that is by tribes. It will be our aim to show why this modification of

the Roman method was necessary for Herod in his peculiar position: he

disguised the Roman and foreign character by the additional requirement

that the census should be tribal and thus less alien to the national

feeling.

4. It is maintained that no census was ever held in Judea until AD.

6-7, on the ground that that "great census" (Acts 5:37) is described by

Josephus as something novel and unheard of, rousing popular indignation

and rebellion on that account.

We freely concede that the attempts which have been made to find in

Josephus any allusion to an earlier census held under Herod have

failed. They have been directed on the wrong lines they have been made

with a view to discover signs of such a knowledge of the finances of

Palestine as would imply a formal Roman census and valuation made under

Herod.

We also fully acknowledge that the earliest census and valuation of

property made after the Roman fashion in Palestine took place, as

Josephus says, in AD. 7. It is a necessary part of our case that a

totally new departure was made in that year; and that the novel,

unheard-of, and anti-national proceeding roused indignation and

rebellion. In all that Josephus is thoroughly right. But the census of

Herod was tribal and Hebraic, not anti-national. It was wholly and

utterly unconnected with any scheme of Roman taxation; and it was

conducted by Herod on strictly tribal methods. It roused little

indignation and no rebellion; and therefore gave no reason for Josephus

to notice it.

It is plain too how great an extent these four arguments against the

"Enrollment" hang together, and depend on a false character ascribed to

the operation. When Luke's narrative is looked at from the proper point

of view by the true historical and sympathetic judgment, with the

intention, not of picking all possible faults, but of understanding in

the best light the testimony which he gives, we shall see that his

evidence explains satisfactorily a peculiarly obscure episode in Roman

provincial history. And we shall find that in one more case the

progress of discovery in Egypt has set in a new light the problems that

seemed insoluble to our predecessors, and made perfectly clear what was

obscure to them.

In addition to these four closely connected arguments, another of a

different character is advanced.

5. It is affirmed that Quirinius never governed Syria during the life

of Herod, for Herod died in 4 BC. and Quirinius was governor of Syria

later than 3 BC. and probably in 2 or 1 BC. Therefore a census taken in

the time of Quirinius could not be associated with the birth of a child

"in the days of Herod, King of Judea".

The conclusion of Mommsen, of Borghesi, and of de Rossi, that Quirinius

governed Syria twice, has been generally accepted by modern scholars.

Quirinius went to govern Syria for the second time in AD. 6. The proof

that his first governorship of Syria fell as late as the year 2 or 1

BC. is incomplete, depending on an estimate of probabilities; and it is

founded on the assumption that a statement made by Suetonius is

inaccurate. We shall try to show that the decided balance of

probabilities is in favor of his having held command in Syria before

Herod died. In the present defective state of the evidence, one cannot

go further than a probable statement.

The propositions which we seek to defend are only probable. The

evidence is too scanty to demonstrate any of them in such a perfectly

conclusive fashion that the most prejudiced minds must be convinced.

But how many of the "facts" of ancient history are demonstrated beyond

all reach of cavil and dissension? Every one who has studied the

foundations of ancient history knows that most of our knowledge is

founded on a balance of evidence, often a very delicate balance; and,

if there were any strong motive to make it worth while fighting the

case, almost any detail in ancient history can be called in question.

What I am concerned to maintain is that all our positions are the most

probable issue of the scanty evidence, and that some of them rest on

testimony, outside of Luke's writings, which in ordinary historical

criticism is reckoned sufficient justification, while the others are in

themselves quite natural, and there is practically no evidence against

them, so that Luke's authority should be reckoned as sufficient to

establish them.

The possible views with regard to the present question seem to reduce

themselves to three: --

1. The story of the birth of Christ, as given by Luke, is so suspicious

and encumbered with so many difficulties that it is as a whole

incredible.

2. The story is true.

3. The main part of the story is true, but the reference to Quirinius

is wrong, and the incident occurred ten to fourteen years before his

census. It is possible to cut out the verse about Quirinius, which is a

mere date added by Luke, and leave the story otherwise complete; but

all the rest hangs together, and if one detail be false, everything is

affected.

As to the third alternative, besides the general considerations already

urged, see to what a dilemma it reduces its supporters! They

acknowledge that the date is added in error by Luke. The rest they hold

to be true, because Luke learned it from some other authority not so

inaccurate as himself. After discrediting Luke, they proceed to accept

everything that is most difficult to believe in his History. But, when

the channel through which the story reaches us is unworthy of belief,

everything that comes through the channel is discredited; the story has

in truth not a leg to stand upon except Luke's personal authority as a

safe and trustworthy judge of truth and weigher of evidence. Those who

first discredit Luke's personal authority, and then attach credibility

to his story, are far less reasonable and critical than they who accept

the whole.

Obviously, the truth of the story in Luke 1, 2, can never be

demonstrated. There will always remain a large step to be taken on

faith. A marvelous event is described in it. They only will accept it

who, for other reasons, have come to the conclusion that there is no

adequate and rational explanation of the coming of Christianity into

the world, except through the direct and "miraculous" intervention of

Divine power.

But it is highly important to show that the circumstances with which

Luke connects this marvelous event are true, and that, in things which

can be tested, he does not fall below the standard of accuracy demanded

from the ordinary historians.

Again, those who hold Luke's statement about the enrollment to be a

mere blunder ought to give some explanation of the way in which the

blunder originated. It is generally stated as an explanation that Luke

was dependent on Josephus for the facts of general history which he

mentions; and that, as he found in Josephus an account of "the Great

Enrollment" made by Quirinius in AD. 6-8, he erroneously connected this

enrollment with the birth of Christ.

In discussing this suggested explanation, I shall lay no stress on the

steadily growing consensus of opinion that all attempts to prove the

dependence of Luke on Josephus have failed, and that Luke's work was

composed before Josephus's work on Jewish Antiquities was published;

for it is possible to maintain that the error was made through

confusion and misunderstanding of some other historian's statement.

Luke, who was not born when the events in question occurred, was

dependent on some earlier authority or other for his knowledge of the

Roman circumstances which he mentions; and the possibility of error

arising must be admitted.

But it is necessary to realize clearly how much is involved in the

assumption that such an error was made. It is implied not merely that

Luke misplaced that important event -- fundamental in the Roman

organization of Palestine -- "the great census"; but also that he

distorted the character of that census, which was, beyond all doubt,

conducted on the Roman system without the slightest regard to tribal

connection, and that he used this distortion of the census to explain

why a family belonging to Nazareth came to be present in Bethlehem.

Such a series of blunders of a very gross type cannot have been mere

slips or mistakes due to ignorance. They bear on their face the

character of deliberate invention. They have been concocted for a

purpose, viz., to lend verisimilitude to the tale that Jesus was born

in Bethlehem. But a tale which is buttressed by such shameful

falsifications loses all claim on our belief. And what can we say about

a historian who concocts such a series of inventions? What condemnation

could be too strong for his shameful conduct? What words too sharp to

characterize his imposture?

I put the question to any reasonable person: Is it consistent with

human nature that a writer who claims to be earnestly setting forth the

simple facts should begin with so impudent a series of fabrications?

Can any reasonable judge believe that the author who wrote the rest of

the two books could be guilty of such deliberate deception?

Another explanation may perhaps be offered, viz., that Luke did not

himself invent the connection between the birth of Jesus and this

fraudulent census, but that he incautiously adopted a series of errors

which had either grown in popular tradition or been invented by some

older writer.

In the first place, we reply, oriental tradition does not take this

character: it does not invent such a circumstantial historical setting,

whose aim is to work an incident into a place in Roman Imperial

history. The census would obviously have been introduced here, not by

popular fancy, but by the calculated invention of a person trying to

give plausibility to a fiction.

Secondly, Luke's work has all the appearance of being the first attempt

to show the place which early Christian history occupied in the general

history of the empire: the author is evidently taking the Gospel from

his earlier authorities, and on the ground of his own historical

inquiries stating its place in Roman history, a subject in which his

Jewish authorities took no interest: probably, therefore, he is not

dependent on older Christian writers for his statements about the

census This is, I think, generally admitted.

Thirdly, Luke devotes much care to the relations of early Christianity

to the Roman state; it was easy for him to acquire correct knowledge as

to the Roman census; and, if he allowed a statement on that subject to

find a place in his book, he makes himself responsible for it in the

fullest sense.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[31] Westcott, Gospel of St. John, p. 78.

[32] Ein allgemeiner Reichscensus war dazu weder nothig noch

zweckmassig are his exact words (Augustus und seine Zeit, Part 1., vol.

2., p. 923).

[33] I do not mean to imply that Mommsen has shown any disposition to

accept Luke's evidence on this point. On the contrary, he dismisses it

as a mere mistaken inference from Josephus.

[34] On this see chapter 7.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CHAPTER 6

LUKE'S ACCOUNT OF THE ENROLLMENT

LUKE wrote for readers belonging to the civilized Graeco-Roman world;

and he conceived the History which he presented to his readers as

occupying a place in the general history of the Roman world. He often

speaks of "the world"; but to him "the world" was strictly the Roman

world, and any order issued by Augustus affected the whole world, as he

says in 2:1. Accordingly, at important stages in the action, he inserts

a few brief notes, just sufficient to show the position of his subject

in the general history of the empire.

The most important of these notes is contained in the following words,

2:1-4, which we give according to the Revised Version:

Now it came to pass in those days, there went out a decree from Caesar

Augustus that all the world should be enrolled. This was the first

enrollment, made when Quirinius was governing Syria. And all went to

enroll themselves, every one to his own city. And Joseph also went up

from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea, to the city of

David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and

family of David -- to enroll himself with Mary his wife.

It might seem hardly necessary to state that in this passage of Luke

the term "world," oikoumene, must be understood as the "Roman world,

and not the entire earth with all its inhabited lands. But some modern

scholars actually charge it as an error that this passage makes an

order of Augustus effective throughout the whole earth, whereas the

order would have no force except in the Roman empire. Accordingly we

must point out that in several places Luke uses the same term "world"

when he obviously is speaking only of the Roman empire. To the citizens

of the empire all the rest of the earth often passed out of mind; and

when they spoke of the world their view was restricted to the Roman

world. So, for example, Demetrius, the silversmith of Ephesus, spoke

about the State-Goddess Diana, "whom all Asia and the world

worshippeth," i.e., to worship whom the whole province Asia and the

Roman empire send their representatives and their crowds of visitors.

Again, Paul and Silas were accused before the magistrates of

Thessalonica because they had "turned the world upside down"; the

accusers were not thinking of the disturbance of order among the outer

barbarians, but only in many parts of the Roman empire. Similarly, any

ordinary rational interpretation will recognize that Luke 2:1 speaks of

the order of Augustus as issued for the whole Roman empire.

What was the extent of "the world" or "the Roman world," of which Luke

speaks?

It included, of course, Italy and the organized Roman provinces. But,

further, Luke evidently considered that it included the dependent

kingdoms, such as Judea, for he describes this order as being carried

out in the kingdom of Herod. That such was his point of view seems not

to be appreciated by the scholars who ridicule the whole episode; and

hence they think that he contradicts himself, when he speaks as if this

order extended to the kingdom of Herod.

The question then arises whether it is justifiable to regard these

dependent kingdoms, Judea and others, as forming part of the Roman

world.

This question Strabo, writing about AD. 19, answers emphatically in the

affirmative. In the last chapter of his Geography he gives a

description of the Roman empire as it was when he was writing about AD.

19. He describes it as extending over the entire coasts of the

Mediterranean Sea, and he expressly includes in it the western part of

the African coast (Mauretania) which was ruled by King Ptolemy, who had

just recently succeeded his father Juba II. Some parts of this empire

are, he says, governed by kings, while part is in the form of

provinces. There are also subject to the Romans certain dynasts, [35]

and chiefs, and priests: and these live according to certain national

laws. He distinguishes this whole empire, containing these various

territories and governments and provinces, from the non-Roman and

barbarian world. He declares that in the part of the empire which is

directly under the authority and power of the emperor there are not

merely Roman governors of three grades sent from Rome by himself, but

also kings, and dynasts, and native officials of lower degree.

Strabo uses several expressions which show how completely he considered

these kingdoms to be part of the Roman world. He defines the entire

complex of territories as "the possessions of the Romans," ta touton;

he speaks of sumpases choras tes hupo Rhomaiois; and he describes how

the Romans. obtained them, prosektesanto.

Moreover, it is impossible to suppose that Augustus, when he defeated

Mark Antony, abandoned the suzerainty which the latter had certainly

exercised over many lands, and gave away to independent kings what had

once belonged to Rome. The eastern parts of Asia Minor had been treated

by Antony as subject to his own absolute authority. When he pleased, he

set up a king over part of them; when he chose, he degraded the king.

But whoever was the king, Antony claimed from him contributions and

military service; and they all sent or led their troops to swell the

army of their supreme lord at Actium. It would be irrational to suppose

that Augustus, who claimed to be the champion of Rome against Antony,

abandoned great territories which Antony had held to be under Rome.

We cannot, therefore, doubt that Strabo expresses the view held by

Augustus and by all Rome, that the territory ruled by these dependent

kings was part of the Roman empire. They were subject kings, and not

free from the suzerainty of Rome.

Appian [36] describes the subject kings whom Antony appointed,

including Herod, as paying tribute. We cannot doubt that the same was

the case under Augustus. The empire did not abandon its claim to gain

something from these kings; and Augustus would not gain less than

Antony had gained. On the other hand, it seems to have been left to the

discretion of the native rulers to govern and to collect revenue

according to native customs and laws. Strabo, in his final chapter;

distinguishes between the provinces, to which governors and collectors

of taxes were sent from Rome, and the countries subject to Rome, but

governed by native princes according to native laws.

Further, Strabo on p. 671 describes the intention of the Romans in

setting up these subject kings. He is speaking of Cilicia Tracheia, but

he expresses the Roman theory as it was applied generally. Some of the

subject countries were specially difficult to govern, either on account

of the unruly character of the inhabitants, or because the natural

features of the land lent themselves readily to brigandage and piracy.

As these countries must be either administered by Roman governors or

ruled by kings, it was considered that kings would more efficiently

control their restless subjects, being permanently on the spot and

having soldiers always at command. But the history of the following

century shows how, step by step and district by district, these

countries were incorporated in the adjacent Roman provinces, as a

certain degree of discipline and civilization was imparted to the

population by the kings, who built cities and introduced the

Graeco-Roman customs and education.

It appears, therefore, that when Luke counts the kingdom of Herod part

of "the Roman World," his point of view agrees with the ideas expressed

by Strabo and held generally in the empire.

The decree of Augustus which Luke mentions is commonly interpreted as

ordering that a single census should be held of the whole Roman world.

This is not a correct interpretation of Luke's words. He uses the

present tense (apographesthai pasan ten oikoumenen), and he means that

Augustus ordered enrollments to be regularly taken, according to the

strict and proper usage of the present tense. What Augustus did was to

lay down the principle of systematic "enrollment" in the Roman world,

not to arrange for the taking of one single census.

It deserves notice that Malalas, who took the false sense from Luke and

describes Augustus as ordering that a single enrollment should be made,

unconsciously changes the expression and uses the aorist [37] where

Luke uses the present tense. Similarly, when Luke tells that Joseph

went up for enrollment on one definite occasion, he uses the aorist

(anebe and apograpsasthai).

Thereafter the text of Luke proceeds naturally: "This was the first

enrollment, while Quirinius was administering Syria; and all persons

proceeded to go for enrollment each to his own city". Here the

presential tenses (apographesthai and eporeuonto) are necessitated by

the sense: all persons, individually and severally, repaired to their

proper cities for their respective enrollment. In the series of

enrollments, which were inaugurated by the orders of Augustus, the

first was the one with which the story is concerned; and Joseph, like

the rest, went up from Galilee out of the city of Nazareth into Judea,

to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the

house and family of David.

From this passage, then, it appears that Luke's conception of the

procedure in the Roman empire was as follows: Augustus ordered a

systematic numbering to be made in the empire. This system of numbering

went on for a time, or more probably permanently, and hence the "first"

of the series is here defined as the occasion on which the story turns.

We may assume unhesitatingly that, if any such system was inaugurated,

it would be periodic, recurring regularly either once a year or after a

definite term of years.

It is not stated or implied by Luke that the system was actually put

into force universally. The principle of universal enrollments for the

empire was laid down by Augustus; but universal application of the

principle is not mentioned That point was a matter of indifference to

Luke. What he implies, indubitably, is that the system was put into

force in Syria, for it would be quite irrational that he should speak

as he does, unless declare that Luke refers to a hitherto unsuspected

fact in the methods of Imperial administration.

But, if our interpretation of Luke's words is correct, we must frankly

admit that his credit as a historian is staked on this issue: there was

a periodical numbering or enrollment in the Syrian province, and Christ

was born actually during the time when the first enrollment of the

series was being made in Palestine.

We observe that Luke knew about more than one "enrollment" or census

(to use the strict Roman term). In 2:2 he speaks of a certain census as

"the first"; in Acts 5:37 he mentions the census," i.e., the great

census, meaning the epoch-making census taken about AD. 7, when Judea

had just been incorporated in the Roman empire as part of the province

of Syria. According to the proper and accepted canons of interpretation

in ancient literature, he must be understood in these expressions to

distinguish between the first census and the great census. In an

ordinary Greek writer the distinction would be unhesitatingly drawn.

Why should some scholars assume that Luke thought there had been one

single census, as to the date of which he was in a the system had been

in force for a time, at least, throughout the Syrian lands. Further, it

is not easy to admit that Luke could have used these words, unless the

system had come into permanent use.

We conclude, then, that if Luke's authority is trustworthy, there must

have prevailed during the first century a system of numbering the

population at periodic intervals in the Syrian province, and probably

elsewhere in the Eastern lands, or even in the whole empire.

If one had ventured ten years ago to draw this conclusion from the

words of Luke, it would have been regarded as a reductio ad absurdum of

his statement. The idea that such a system could have existed in the

East, without leaving any perceptible signs of its existence in

recorded history, would have been treated with ridicule as the dream of

a fanatical devotee, who could believe anything and invent anything in

support of the testimony of Luke. But now such revelations of order and

method in the Roman Imperial Government, unmentioned and unheeded by

historians, have resulted from epigraphic and archaeological

investigation, that it is no longer so hazardous to state of utter

confusion, when he uses language which in the simple and natural

interpretation indicates two different census? A scholar should never

start by assuming that the author whom he is interpreting is wrong; but

to say that Luke in these two passages refers to one and the same

census, is to fasten an error upon him at the outset, by disregarding

the distinction indicated in his words.

Clement of Alexandria evidently understood the words of Luke in the

same way as we have interpreted them. He speaks of the occasion when

first they ordered Enrollments to be made. [38]

It is hardly possible to avoid inferring from these words of Clement

that he knew of some system of enrollments, either in the empire as a

whole, or at least in the province of Syria. His use of the plural and

of the word "first" force this inference upon us.

Further, we shall find in chapter 7 that Clement, as residing in Egypt,

was familiar with the Egyptian system of periodic enrollments. He could

hardly avoid writing with this system in his mind, and his words imply

beyond a doubt that he thought of some system of enrollments in

Palestine. I do not see how any fair and unprejudiced critic can fail

to conclude that Clement, rightly or wrongly, believed that the same

system of periodic enrollments was maintained in Egypt and in Syria.

Again, Clement expressly says that the system of enrollments in Syria

began with the one at which the birth of Christ occurred. Luke in all

probability was his sole ultimate authority for connecting the birth of

Christ with the first enrollment, he, no doubt, saw the statement also

in other authorities, but they in their turn probably got it, whether

immediately or ultimately, from Luke. But it is not so certain that

Clement had no other authority than Luke for his belief that the system

began in the reign of Augustus. He knew the system from his own

experience in Egypt. It had recurred there regularly throughout his own

life, and long before his time. It must have been a matter of common

knowledge in his time what was the origin of the system. We are, I

think, fully justified in quoting Clement as believing that the system

of enrollments which he saw round him in Egypt, and which he thought or

knew to be also practiced in Syria, began from Augustus and was made

according to the, orders of Augustus.

A suggestion has been made that the Indictional Periods of fifteen

years, which formed so important a feature in the administration of the

later Roman empire, began to run from the census of Quirinius. On this

theory the first census was taken in the year 3 BC. as the beginning of

the first Indictional Period. But it can be shown positively that the

Indictional System did not prevail under the early empire. The

Indictions are an invention of the fourth century; and not merely are

those periods unknown in earlier time, but a contradictory system

existed. [39] Moreover, it is not easy to bring the evidence as to the

duration of Herod's reign into consistence with the theory that he

lived till 3 BC.

Our whole theory is based on the determination of the periodical

enrollment system in the early empire; and for this fortunate discovery

we are indebted to the wonderful progress of research in Egypt during

the last few years.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[35] This title was given to certain princes, e. g., those who ruled

Ketis in Cilicia Tracheia.

[36] Bell. Civil., 5., 75.

[37] hoste apographenai pasan ten hup' auton genomenen gen kai hen

proen eichon Rhomaioi, Malalas, p. 226.

[38] hote proton ekeleusan apographas genesthai, Strom., 1., 21, 147.

[39] Mr. Grenfell notes, "it is absolutely certain that the indictions

began in A. D. 312, and not before," as is shown by one of the Rainer

papyri.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CHAPTER 7

ENROLLMENT BY HOUSEHOLDS IN EGYPT

RECENTLY, three different scholars announced about the same time, and

independently of one another, the discovery that periodical enrollments

were made in Egypt under the Roman empire, and that the period was not

of fifteen years, as in the later system of indictions, but of fourteen

years. The same Greek term is used in the Egyptian documents and in

Luke to indicate the census: they were called "Enrollments,"

Apographai.

Mr. Kenyon of the British Museum had slightly the priority in briefly

declaring that these "Enrollments" obeyed a cycle of fourteen years;

but Dr. Wilcken followed him within a month or two with an elaborate

paper, and shortly afterwards Dr. Viereck with another, discussing

their period, nature and purpose. [40] The three papers are the

authority for what is here stated on the subject.

The facts relating to the "Enrollments" in Egypt are deduced from the

actual census papers, many of which have been found (usually in a more

or less fragmentary condition). The census was always taken after the

end of the year to which it belongs; thus, for example, a census paper

dated in the end of the year AD. 90-91 contains a statement of the

facts required for the enrollment of 89-90, and so on. The purpose

evidently was to include in each enrollment all children born before

the end of the first year of the census period, which we shall

henceforth call the periodic year. All dates in these documents are

given according to the Egyptian way of reckoning; and the Egyptian

year, which began on the twenty-ninth day of August, was at the basis

of the whole census system in Egypt. It is proved that enrollments were

made for the years ending in the summer of AD. 90, 104, 118, 132 and so

on till 230. An enrollment also took place under Vespasian, but its

date is not fixed by the evidence. There can, however, be no doubt that

Dr. Viereck is right in placing it for the year 75-76. [41]

Though the Egyptian year was employed, the census was carried out by

Roman officials, and formed part of the Imperial system of

administration.

It was the habit of the Romans in the East to adapt their arrangements

to the custom of the country. They did not force the natives to adopt

the Roman system of arranging the year and the months, but rather

modified their practice to suit the native year, using an Asian year in

the Province Asia, an Egyptian year in the Province Egypt, and so on.

As the beginning and end of the years varied greatly in different

Eastern provinces -- all, however, being now solar years, like the

Roman -- we shall throughout these pages speak of the Roman year; and

the reader will understand that in each province it has to be

translated into the native year there employed. Censorinus mentions, as

was to be expected, that the years of the Imperial system -- anni

Augustorum -- were counted from the first of January: they differed in

this from the years of any individual emperor's reign, which during the

first century were usually reckoned from the day on which the reign

began, though during the second century the habit of reckoning them

from the first of January became general.

Accordingly, instead of mentioning the enrollment for the Egyptian year

falling in AD. 89-90, we shall call it the enrollment for the Roman

year AD. 90. The periodic years, then, are as follows: BC. 23, BC. 9,

AD. 6, 20, 34, 48, 62, 76, 90, 104, 118, 132, 146, 160, 174, 188, 202,

216, 230, 244, 258, 272, 286, 300, 314, 328.

In every case, of course, the actual enumeration began after the

periodic year was ended, though the enumeration is called in the

documents the enrollment of the past (periodic) year. Usually the

enrollment paper is dated late in the following year; people were

allowed to make their declaration at any time during the following

year, and as human nature will have it, most people delayed until the

year was approaching its end.

It appears, therefore, that already under Vespasian a system of

periodical enrollments was the rule of Roman administration in Egypt.

The existing documents establish its existence from AD. 76 to 230; but

the failure of documents attesting its previous or subsequent existence

affords no evidence that it began under Vespasian or ended under

Alexander Severus. The preservation of papyri is so accidental and

precarious, that imperfection and lacunae are the rule in every

department which they touch upon. We must be grateful for the light

they throw on any subject, but it would be absurd to reason, because no

fragment of papyrus has been found to attest a fact, that therefore the

fact did not occur. The argument a silentio, always a dangerous one, is

especially dangerous where papyrusfragments are concerned.

On this point Mr. Grenfell writes: "I should admit that the argument a

silentio cannot yet be used as regards the first century after Christ.

About the second and third centuries it is, however, worth something,

and also, I think, about the Ptolemaic period." The silence of the

papyri about the period before AD. 76 therefore constitutes no argument

that the periodic enrollments began in that year.

At the last moment Mr. Grenfell, in a letter dated 12th Sept., 1898,

brings to my knowledge, and the courtesy of the discoverer permits me

to mention, that Mr. Kenyon has found, and is on the point of

publishing in the forthcoming volume of the Catalogue of British Museum

Papyri, a document [42] which mentions the enrollment for the eighth

year of Nero, AD. 61-62. Mr. Kenyon thinks that it implies also still

earlier enrollments. This important discovery will be regarded as a

strong confirmation of the theory set forth in the following pages, and

printed before I heard of the new evidence. The only argument that

could be brought forward against the theory lay in the silence of the

papyri; and already that silence is broken for part of the period.

[Enrollment of AD. 20, see Preface]

The question, then, must be put -- at what time and through whose

organizing initiative is the Roman series of enrollments likely to have

been begun? The answer to that question is not doubtful. We may appeal

with confidence to the students of Roman history, and put the question

in this way. We find that under Vespasian a system of periodical

enrollments formed a fundamental part of the government of Egypt: these

enrollments gave a basis on which a statistical account of the

population according to households and place of residence at the

beginning of each period could be drawn up. Whom should we expect to

have introduced the system?

In the first place every one who has studied the history of Roman

provincial administration would reply that Augustus was, in all

probability, the originator of this Roman system in Egypt. Any

important part of Egyptian administration which was in existence under

Vespasian is probably as old as the organization of the country by

Augustus. It is well known with what peculiar and jealous and minute

care: he regarded that country. No Roman of senatorial or equestrian

rank was permitten, even to visit it without special leave from the

Emperor. It was considered as the granary of Rome; and it was regulated

in the most careful way so that its harvests should be reserved for

Roman needs, and its resources should be always calculable and certain,

as far as care and forethought could make them so.

It is unnecessary to do more than briefly refer to those facts touching

the policy and intentions of Augustus which have been skillfully

collected and marshaled by a long succession of writers on this subject

-- his general survey of the whole empire: the rationes imperii, "a

sort of balance sheet published periodically": the libellus or

breviarium totius imperii, a compendium of useful statistics about the

kingdoms, the provinces, the allies, etc.

These show how carefully and methodically Augustus organized his

splendid machinery of government on the basis of accurate, minute and

complete knowledge of everything that concerned the subject peoples,

and make it probable that the system of periodic enrollments, which

alone rendered a complete statistical account of those peoples

possible, originated from him, and formed part of his plan of Imperial

administration.

In the second place, the system of periodic enrollments is likely to be

as old as Augustus, because it probably rested on a pre-Roman

foundation. Every year's discoveries strengthen the proof that the

organization of Egypt was brought to a very high degree of perfection

long before the Romans entered the country, and increase the

probability that the germ or even the complete form of almost every

detail of administration was found by Augustus already in existence in

Egypt, and was merely adapted by him to Roman needs.

Mr. Grenfell notes that the silence of the Ptolemaic papyri about

Household-Enrollment -- constitutes an argument against its being an

institution of the Ptolemaic period; whereas valuation papers of the

class (described later in this chapter) are found not infrequently

under the Ptolemies. There must, however, have been in that period some

kind of numbering (as Wilcken thinks). Papyri are found c. BC. 3000, "a

kind of census list of a household," naming the head of the house,

resident female relatives, slaves, and young male children. [43] Two

Apographai of unusual character. occur, [44] resembling the

Household-Enrollment papers more than the Valuation papers, and dated

BC. 19 and 18, before the Periodic Household-Enrollment system was

organized.

The probability remains that Augustus originated a new system in Egypt

of Periodic Enrollment-by-Households, developing some previously

existing system of numbering the population.

In the third place, as we saw in the preceding chapter, Clement of

Alexandria believed that the system of enrollments originated from

Augustus; and he expresses the general opinion held in Egypt at the end

of the second century.

In the fourth place, chronological reasons suggest that the enrollments

come down from the organization of Augustus, because the cycle leads us

back to the year BC. 23, from which dates the Imperial rule of Augustus

in the most formal and complete sense. The Roman emperors, beginning

from Augustus, reckoned the years of their reign according to their

tenure of the tribunicia potestas, which constituted them "Champions of

the Commons"; Augustus received the tribunician power on 27th June, BC.

23; and the number of years in his Imperial title is reckoned

invariably in all later inscriptions from that date. The Coincidence

that the EnrollmentCycle was arranged according to the official years

of Augustus's reign, is conclusive in favor of the view that Augustus

inaugurated the system of periodical enrollments.

This coincidence, also, shows with almost complete certainty that the

Fourteen-Years'-Cycle was not devised in Egypt, or for Egypt alone. Mr.

Grenfell points out to me that in Egypt the reign of Augustus was

invariably reckoned from the taking of Alexandria, the first year being

considered to begin on 29th August, BC. 30; and there is not a trace of

any other reckoning of his reign in the country. Had the

Enrollment-Cycle been an Egyptian matter simply, it is in the last

degree improbable that it would have been arranged according to the

years of the tribunician power.

On the other hand, that was the natural system in general Imperial

matters. It was the only method of reckoning which was known

universally throughout the empire: it was employed in every official

statement of the Emperor's title: it was sometimes used even in dating

private inscriptions. [45]

The use of this epoch, further, proves in all probability that the

Enrollment was, as Luke says, actually held first for the year BC. 9.

It could not be devised until after the reign began, for the epoch was

unknown until the epoch-making event had occurred; and, after it had

occurred, no time remained to arrange all the details for an Imperial

enrollment for the current year. Hence we find a different style of

enrollment paper used in Egypt in the years BC. 19 and 18.

We see also why the Egyptian year 24-23, and not 23-22, was taken as

that correspondent to the Roman year 23. Augustus's reign began during

the Egyptian year 24-23, two months before the end of that year on 29th

August. Thus the reign of Augustus began officially in the Egyptian

year BC. 24-23. On the other hand, in any country where the year began

in the spring, the official year 1 of Augustus would be the year BC.

23-22; and the year 15, which was the first periodic year, would be BC.

9-8.

These reasons justify the reasonable confidence that Augustus arranged

a system of periodical "enrollments" in Egypt. As the system is fixed

according to the year BC. 23, in which the fully formed constitutional

Principate was organized and the reign of Augustus in the official

reckoning began, the arrangement of this system must have taken place

later than that year. The system of enrollments must therefore be

distinguished from the operation called by Marquardt [46] the

provincial census, which began to be taken in Gaul in BC. 27.

The latter operation was intended to form the basis on which the

taxation of the provinces of the empire should be regulated. It was

repeated from time to time throughout the period of the empire, and was

an essential part of the orderly working of the Imperial

administration. That taxation should be proportionate to wealth was a

Roman principle, and without frequent revaluation of property it was

impossible to secure a fair apportionment of taxation. Augustus fully

recognized the vast importance of making correct valuation of property

in the provinces, as securing both fair taxation and a more lucrative

revenue for the State.

Such enumeration and valuation of property was confined, as a rule, to

Roman provinces, and was often made as soon as any new province was

incorporated in the empire. Such, for example, was the case in

Palestine when Quirinius, in his second Syrian governorship, made that

country part of the empire. The novel proceedings on that occasion, and

the strict inquisition into value of property, brought vividly home to

the Jews that they were now wholly reduced to servitude under a foreign

power, and led to much disorder and rebellion. The name census was used

by the Romans to denote this characteristic institution. In modern

usage the term census denotes the periodic numbering of the people,

without valuation of property. In this study we use the terms

"valuation" or "rating" and "enrollment".

But the system of periodic enrollments in Egypt is quite different from

the system of rating and valuation. The latter system also existed in

Egypt; many census papers are preserved among the papyri, and Wilcken

gives several examples of them on pp. 231-240 of the article which we

have quoted above. These valuations seem to have been made annually;

[47] and it is often stated in the papers that the census is taken

according to the orders of the governor of the province. They contain

an enumeration and precise definition of all property in land, houses,

and live stock [48] belonging to the enumerator, often also a statement

whether the property is free from debt or mortgage, and often an

estimate of the money value, of the whole. Where there is no estimate

of value, it is understood that the value is unchanged from previous

valuations and can be found in the older official registers.

The same verb apographomai is used in both kinds of papyri, and both

operations seem to have been termed Apographai. But the periodic

enrollment papers are distinguished by other criteria besides the want

of statistics about property and money value; they are dated according

to the year of the reigning emperor, and contain no reference to the

orders of the governor; they state accurately and exactly which

periodic enrollment they are intended for; and they always use the

phrase "Enrollment-by-Household", apographe kat' oikian. These periodic

enrollments according to the Four-teen-Years'-Cycle [49] were therefore

closely connected with the existing households, and served as basis for

an enumeration of the total population. This operation obviously

corresponds much more closely than the other kind of Egyptian census to

the "enrollment" alluded to by Luke; and we shall therefore always

allude to it as the enrollment system, or, more accurately,

enrollment-by-household.

The enrollment papers were filled up and sent in to the proper official

by the heads of households. In the enrollment paper, the householder

specified the house, or part of a house, which belonged to him; he

declared that he was formally enrolling himself and his family for the

house-to-house enrollment of the past year, twenty-eight of the Emperor

Commodus, or whatever else the case was. But, if the owner did not live

in the house himself, he enrolled only the tenants; if he kept lodgers,

he enrolled himself, his family and the lodgers. He gave a complete

enumeration of all the individuals who lived in the house, children,

relatives, etc. In one case, twenty-seven persons are enumerated in one

paper by a householder. No statement of income or of the money value of

the house is given in the enrollment papers.

Thus, according to our theory, the nature of the case led the Romans to

adopt a double system, which presents a remarkable analogy to our

modern methods. We have an enumeration of the people every ten years,

the census: the Romans numbered the people every fourteen years. We

have an annual making up of the valuation roll, and an annual system of

income tax returns. The Romans, likewise, found it expedient to require

annual valuation of property; but they did not require any estimate of

annual income, for they, like the United States, arranged their taxes,

not according to income, but according to property.

The intention of this system of enrollment by households has been

investigated by Wilcken. It furnished a complete enumeration of the

population of Egypt; both provincials and resident Romans had to fill

up their enrollment papers and send them in to the proper official. The

papers not merely furnished the total numbers of the population; they

were also useful in allotting the various burdens of public service,

and especially they facilitated the conscription; and finally they gave

information which aided in levying the poll-tax, determining the

classes of persons who were free from the tax, and the date at which

each male became of age to pay it (fourteen), or reached the age of

exemption (sixty). [50]

According to Marquardt, 2., p. 199, a poll-tax was levied by the Romans

only in countries where it had been customary from ancient times, or

where there was for the time no survey of property available to furnish

a standard for a more rational kind of tax. He is disposed to consider

the tributum capitis in the province of Syria as not a poll-tax, but a

tax on those engaged in an industrial occupation; but Wilcken seems

clearly right in regarding the Syrian tax as a poll-tax, exactly

similar to the Egyptian poll-tax.

Thus the Egyptian documents, and the inferences founded on them by

comparison with other evidence, have revealed two most important and

hitherto unsuspected facts.

(1) In some parts at least of the empire the enrollment and numbering

of the population according to their households was a distinct and

separate process from the census and valuation, which previously was

considered to be the only properly Roman kind of census.

(2) The enrollment by households took place periodically, according to

a cycle arranged according to the years of the reign of Augustus in

Imperial, but not in Egyptian, reckoning. Probably this system was

introduced later than 18 BC.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

NOTE

Papyrus Br. Mus. CCLX. is a poll-tax register of AD. 72-3, based on the

Household-Enrollment of 61-2; and references to older poll-tax

registers are made, which imply previous Enrollments. In fact the

register is part of an existing system of some standing. [The

Household-Enrollment of AD. 20 has just been discovered: see Preface].

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[40] Kenyon in Classical Review, March 1893, p. 110; Wilcken in Hermes,

1893, p. 203 ff.; Viereck in Philologus, 1893, p. 219 ff. There is a

short supplementary paper by Wilcken in Philologus, 1893, p. 563.

[41] Confirmed by Mr. Kenyon's new discovery.

[42] CCLX. 78, 79, and CCLXI. 31, 32.

[43] F. Ll. Griffith, Law Quart. Rev., 1898, p. 44 f.

[44] Grenfell, An Alex. Erotic Papyrus, etc., Nos. 45 and 46.

[45] See e.g. Varia 2. in Classical Review, Oct., 1898.

[46] Rom. Staatsrecht, 2., p. 212 f.

[47] Mr. Grenfell notes, "for seem to have been' you might say were':

there are hundreds of instances to show it".

[48] Mr. Kenyon notes, "returns of live stock are separate".

[49] The Romans, who counted both initial and final years in each

period, would have called it a Fifteen-Years'-Cycle; it was held in

years 1, 15, 29, etc. We call that a Cycle of fourteen years.

[50] So Kenyon writes correcting Wilcken's published statement. In

Syria women, as well as men, paid; and the age was fourteen for men,

twelve for women, until sixty-five, Ulpian, Dig., L. 15, 3.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CHAPTER 8

THE SYRIAN ENROLLMENT IN 8 BC

IN the preceding chapter we have seen that, in all probability,

Augustus inaugurated a series of enrollments in Egypt. Now, according

to Luke, Augustus laid down the principle that "enrollments" should be

made over the whole Roman world; and this assertion stands on a very

different level of probability from that which it occupied before the

Egyptian discovery. If Luke be wrong, his error has been to extend over

the whole Roman world a practice which Augustus established in Egypt.

Every one must see that such an extension is not likely to have been

made without some justification by the author of Acts, whoever he was.

If there is anything certain about him it is that he had neither

connection with Egypt nor interest in it, and that he was entirely

uninfluenced by Alexandrian thought or Egyptian ideas; he even omits

from his Gospel the incident of the flight into Egypt, which a writer

connected with Egypt would be most unlikely to do. Such an author is

not likely to have known about institutions peculiar to Egypt; and, if

he thinks that the system of periodical enrollments, which existed in

Egypt, was also found in other parts of the Roman world, there is a

strong presumption that such was the case at least in those parts of

the world which were best known to him. The reasons stated above,

chapters 6 and 7, confirm this presumption.

Other considerations, also, prove that some attempt was made in Syria,

whether systematically or sporadically, to number the population Such

enumerations can be traced back to the reign of Augustus and to the

government of Syria by Quirinius.

An inscription, which was long the subject of keen controversy and was

condemned by Mommsen and many others as a forgery, [51] was recently

found to be genuine, when half of the long-lost stone on which it was

engraved was rediscovered in Venice. In that inscription, which records

the career of Q Aemilius Secundus, a Roman officer, who served under

Quirinius when governor of Syria, it is mentioned that by the orders of

Quirinius he made the "census" of the population of Apameia,

enumerating 117,000 citizens. The emphasis laid on the number suggests

(though it does not demonstrate) that the numbering of the total

population was the chief object of the Apamean "census"; in that case

it would correspond to the periodic enrollment by households in Egypt

rather than to the annual valuation.

The inscription leaves it uncertain whether the Apamean numbering

occurred in the first or second administration of Syria by Quirinius.

He is called legatus Caesaris Syriae, without iterum, but there was no

need for expressing in the inscription that he had held the government

of Syria on two separate occasions. Our opponents, who hold that there

was only one census under Quirinius, are justified in maintaining that

this inscription refers to a numbering of the population of Syria, made

by Quirinius in AD. 7 concurrently with his census and valuation in

Palestine. We, on our side, are, for a different reason, bound to

maintain that Quirinius ordered this enrollment of Apameia (and of all

the other states of Syria) to be made in AD. 7, as will appear in

chapters 9 and 11.

Again, Suidas mentions that Augustus numbered the population of the

territory that belonged to the Romans, and it was found to be 4,101,017

men (andres). It is obvious that Suidas did not simply invent this

number, but had access to some other authority besides Luke (whom he

quotes in one of the two places [52] where he refers to this

enumeration of the Roman world). The question is how far any confidence

can be placed in that other authority. Had he real knowledge at his

command?

The number seems so small as to be absurd. Josephus [53] gives the

population of Egypt, Alexandria excepted, as 7,500,000. Adding 500,00

as the population of Alexandria, we have the total Egyptian population,

8,000,000. But, according to Suidas, the population of the entire Roman

world would not be much more than 21,000,000. Probably the populous

countries of Syria and Asia Minor alone contained more than 21,000,000

inhabitants, though we must remember that no slaves were counted in the

enrollments.

The most probable supposition is that Suidas is giving an inaccurate

account of the total of Roman citizens. A numbering of Roman citizens

was three times made by Augustus -- 28 BC., 8 BC. and 14 AD. -- and the

total was in each case between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000. The liability

of numbers to corruption is exemplified in the result of Augustus's

first 80 census. The Latin text of the Monumentum Ancyranum, expressed

in Augustus's own words, gives the total as 4,063,000, but the Greek

translation gives 4,603,000, while Eusebius has it as 4,164,000. In the

third census, Eusebius probably gave the correct total; but Jerome in

his Latin version and the Armenian translator have both gone wrong in

rendering Eusebius's words. Suidas, finding this total in Eusebius,

took it as representing the total population of the empire, instead of

the sum of cives Romant, an error which was easily made after the time

of Caracalla, when all free citizens of the empire were cives Romani.

Further, like Jerome, he misunderstood the numbers in Eusebius.

Syncellus gives the total in still another form.

Thus Suidas, when we trace him back, is found to have been using a

distinct and good authority, but to be misunderstanding and

misrepresenting it. He throws no light on Luke's statement.

Further, there is a certain amount of positive evidence that

"Enrollments" according to the Fourteen-Years'-Cycle were made in Syria

and elsewhere. According to Luke, the first enrollment was made a few

years BC. in the unknown year of Christ's birth, which is variously

fixed, and must have been somewhere between 8 and 3 BC.. On the system

that obtained in Egypt, the year 9 BC. would be the beginning of the

second period; and the scanty evidence that exists about the general

survey of the empire, shows that any enrollment according to the Cycle

is not likely to have been made until the beginning of the second

period. We find, then, that the year 8 BC. was the one in which the

first "enrollment" would naturally begin to be made, if a Cycle was

observed; for this enrollment was intended, as has been stated already,

to include all children born in 9 BC. Now Tertullian declares that an

"enrollment" was made by Sentius Saturninus, who was governor of Syria

from about 9 to 7 BC. It is obvious that Tertullian did not make this

assertion on Luke's authority, nor with the intention of bolstering up

Luke. On the contrary, it has always been a serious problem how his

statement can be reconciled with Luke's words. It can hardly be doubted

that Tertullian was aware of the discrepancy between his own words and

those of Luke; but he remains true to his own principle that "this

world's things must be tested by its own documents". [54] He had the

authority of Roman documents that Sentius Saturninus was the governor

in question; and he prefers to follow "this world's documents". The

discrepancy with Luke would not trouble him; his belief was too

robust-to be affected by trifles of that kind; but whether or not he

understood how the apparent discrepancy arose, he at any rate followed

his Roman authority in this detail.

Tertullian's procedure was probably this: he knew that an enrollment

period fell in 9 BC. which was the first enrollment; and Roman

authorities, either official documents or historians, showed him that

Sentius Saturninus was governor of Syria at that time. The only other

alternative seems to be that he investigated Roman documents, and found

evidence that a census of Syria had been held by Saturninus. In the

former case he was aware of the Fourteen-Years'-Cycle; in the latter

case he knew of a census of Syria about 9-7 BC. and in either case he

is an important yet independent witness in favor of Luke, so far as

concerns the reality of a Syrian enrollment about 9-7 BC.

We must observe that it was possible for any one living in the first or

second or third century to discover for himself the facts about any of

these early enrollments, if he were willing to take a little trouble

and show a little care. Accurate observation, registration and

preservation of all facts formed the basis of Roman Imperial

administration. We know from Pliny [55] that the facts obtained at

every census were so carefully preserved that in 48 AD. Claudius could

verify from the records of earlier numberings the statement, which a

citizen of a small Italian town made about his age; and there can be no

doubt that similar careful preservation was the rule everywhere, as is

proved in Egypt. Abundant material existed on which, the historian who

was willing to take trouble could base an accurate narrative of facts.

With an author of ordinary ability and care, serious error could hardly

arise except from intention to mislead; though, of course, a slip in

some unimportant detail may be made by any man, however careful, and

probably none are free from them, not even Mommsen himself, whose grasp

of detail is so marvelous.

The discrepancy between Tertullian, who seems to connect the birth of

Christ with the enrollment of Saturninus, and Luke, who connects that

event with the enrollment of Quirinius, will engage our attention in

chapter 11. For the moment our purpose is to show that the Egyptian

enrollment periods were observed in Syria and elsewhere. But the

existence of such a discrepancy is the conclusive proof that Tertullian

had good evidence to trust to. He would never have contradicted Luke as

regards the name, unless he had obtained the fact on undeniable

authority.

In the same year 8 BC.., in which "enrollments" seem to have been made

in Syria and in Egypt, Augustus, as he mentions in his official review

of his own life, made a census and found that the total number of Roman

citizens in the whole empire was 4,233,000. A similar numbering of

Roman citizens had been made by him in 28 BC.

The fact that Augustus's first two enumerations show an interval of

twenty years forms no argument against our theory of a

Fourteen-Years'Cycle. The first enumeration was made before the plan

was initiated, and the second, the initiation of the plan, was fixed

according to the epoch of 23 BC.

At any rate, 8 BC. was a marked year in the administration of the city

of Rome. In that year, Augustus gave Rome a new municipal organization,

dividing it into regions and quarters; and in a certain class of Roman

city inscriptions, it is reckoned as the year 1 of an epoch which

remained in use for a time. It was not an Imperial epoch; it was merely

used in dating some documents connected with the new Roman municipal

system, and the year I did not agree with the first of the

Fourteen-Years'-Cycle, but was taken at, the: first year in which the

new municipal system was actually in existence.

The next periodic year was 6 AD. and the enrollment would, therefore,

naturally be taken in the following year, 7 AD. Quirinius was governor

of Syria for the second time in 6 and the following years; and he held

"the great census" and valuation of Palestine, as Josephus records.

Judea was now incorporated in the empire, administered by a Procurator,

and connected with the Province Syria; and a complete set of statistics

of the new territory was required as the basis of the Roman

organization. "The great enrollment" might, it is true, be plausibly

explained as due merely to the necessities of administration in a newly

incorporated part of the empire. But it is, at least, an interesting

coincidence that it should tally with the beginning of a new Cycle.

Moreover, it is practically almost certain that Quirinius made a

numbering of the population of Syria in 7 AD. as we have gathered from

the inscription of Aemilius Secundus, previously qouted. The natural

inference from the known facts is that two operations, one

corresponding to the Egyptian periodic enrollment and one corresponding

to the Egyptian annual census and valuation, occurred in Palestine in 7

AD.; and that the periodic enrollment at least, if not the other also,

was made throughout the province of Syria.

The Cycle beginning 6 AD. seems not to have been observed by Augustus

himself in Rome. It is well known that, as he grew old and feeble, his

administration became more lax. Possibly, as Luke declares, he intended

in 9 BC. to begin a series of "enrollments" for the empire; but, if he

had that intention, the idea was too great for the time and was not

fully carried into effect. The administrative machinery of the empire

was not as yet sufficiently perfect and smooth-working to be able to

carry into regular execution such a great idea; and Augustus postponed

the next numbering of Roman citizens, until Tiberius was associated

with him in the government, when 4,937,000 Roman citizens were

numbered, 14 AD. Dion Cassius indeed mentions that in 4 AD. Augustus

made a partial census; but that would be two years too early; and, as

Mommsen and others have shown, Dion Cassius's account of the various

numberings made by Augustus is wrong in almost every case, and his

assertion about a census in 4 AD. cannot be credited on his sole

authority. Mommsen, therefore, rejects it as an error of Dion's. [56]

The next periodic year fell in 20 AD.; but no evidence survives to show

that it was observed in any part of the Roman empire. Perhaps after the

numbering of Roman citizens in 14, it was considered unnecessary by

Tiberius to hold another in 20; and our authorities hardly ever mention

any numberings except of cives Romani.

The following census period began with 34 AD.; and it would appear that

the numbering was held in the Province Syria in 35, as was usual. This

we gather indirectly from the fact that an attempt was made by King

Archelaos to enforce a census after the Roman style in his kingdom of

Cilicia Tracheia. Now this kingdom was always considered as a

dependency of the Province Syria; [57] and, when any Roman interference

in its affairs was needed, the Syrian governor marched an army into the

Tracheiotis. Archelaos's attempt, therefore, implies that the census of

Syria was taken in 35, and was observed also in the dependent kingdom

of Tracheiotis. It may be regarded as obviously true that Archelaos

acted under Roman orders, for the imposition of a Roman custom on the

free Cilicians, as if they had been inhabitants of a Roman province,

was a curtailment of his rights, which he was not likely to initiate of

his own accord, and which a monarch would not allow except under

compulsion. But nations which were not thoroughly Romanised strongly

objected to the census as a mark of subjection to the foreigner and as

a serious step forward in the process of Romanising their country. King

Archelaos was considered by his subjects to be weakly helping to impose

on them the Roman yoke with his own hand. Disturbances broke out among

the Kietai, [58] the leading people of Cilicia Tracheia; and, after the

power of King Archelaos had proved insufficient to quell their,

rebellion, the presence of Roman troops was required; and finally, in

36 AD. Vitellius, the governor of Syria, sent an army to his aid.

As in "the great enrollment" of Palestine in 7 AD., there was made in

Cilicia in 35 AD. both a numbering of the population and a valuation of

their property. A simple numbering of the people might not be felt so

grievous, but a valuation of property seemed to be the beginning of

incorporation in a province.

Some scholars understand that the census among the Kietai was held

because they had been subjected to the Roman authority and incorporated

in the province. But Tacitus distinctly states that they were subject

to Archelaos, and continued to hold out against his troops. His

language is quite explicit, and could be misinterpreted only through

prejudice. Moreover, if the Kietai had been incorporated in the

province, that would show even more conclusively that an enrollment of

the province was made in 34-5 AD.

The next periodic year fell in 48; and Tacitus mentions that the

Emperor Claudius held a census of the Roman citizens in that year, and

numbered 6,944,000. He was personally engaged as censor in the

operations at Ostia in the middle of October, 48 AD. The individual

householders recorded their age in these numberings, just as they did

in the Egyptian enrollments, for Pliny mentions that a citizen of

Bononia stated his age as 150; Claudius thereupon ordered that his

record in previous census should be examined, and his statements were

found to be consistent. [59] This fact, mentioned incidentally by

Pliny, proves that several census had previously been taken, and

suggests that there was a system and a definite plan in the

enumerations. No one who considers the method of the Romans and the

orderly character of all their work, will regard it as probable that

the taking of these general numberings was left purely to the caprice

of the emperor. Some plan and order must have been aimed at, though the

weakness or caprice of the emperors might occasionally disturb the

order. The existence of some underlying plan is inexorably demanded;

and if the plan which existed in Egypt was not common to the whole

empire, one asks what was the plan elsewhere, and why the empire

followed separate plans in different regions.

Claudius evidently made his numbering a few months too early, before

the periodic year was ended.

The succeeding census period, beginning in 62 AD. is not known to have

been observed in any part of the Roman world except Egypt (where Mr.

Kenyon's new discovery has revealed it); and the Subsequent one, 76 AD.

was anticipated in Italy by two years, for Vespasian and Titus held the

censorship in 73 and 74, [60] and made all enumeration of Roman

citizens.

These facts, most of them only slight in themselves, establish in

conjunction a strong case that the periods of the Egyptian enrollments

were frequently coincident with the holding of census in some other

parts of the empire; and thus the presumption is strengthened that the

Egyptian Fourteen-Years'-Cycle has its root in a principle of wider

application. This brings us very near to Luke's statement that Augustus

laid down a general principle of taking census of the whole Roman

world. The supposition that his statement is true has now ceased to be

out of keeping with extra-scriptural evidence. On the contrary, Luke's

statement supplies the missing principle which holds together and

explains and makes consistent all the rest of the evidence. When Luke's

evidence is held correct, the other recorded facts fall into line with

it, and are seen to be the working of one general principle. Though

weakness sometimes failed to carry out the principle, and though in

other cases the time was anticipated a little, yet the recorded facts

show a clear tendency to conform to the Cycle.

In a number of cases nothing except the census of Roman citizens is

recorded. Almost all Romans, with characteristic Roman pride, regarded

a census of the subject population as beneath the dignity of historical

record. Augustus himself, in that famous record of his achievements,

which is commonly known as the Monumentum Ancyranum, mentions only his

census of Roman citizens. Distinct evidence exists that the first and

second periodic enrollments were carried out in Syria; but the Emperor

thought them unworthy of notice in his review of his services to the

State. Similarly it is only by indirect inference, through the accident

that a rebellion was provoked, that we learn of the fourth enrollment

in Syria. The Romans of that period did not agree with our estimate of

what was most important in their history; and we must be very chary of

drawing negative inferences merely from their silence. Evidence about

the details of the Augustan system of provincial administration had

almost completely perished, until inscriptions began to reveal a few

isolated facts.

Hence the silence of Augustus about the scheme of an Imperial census

affords no argument against his having projected such a scheme. In his

review of his career, Augustus says nothing about the reorganization of

the. provincial administration (which, to our judgment, is almost the

most important fact in his career); he mentions nothing about the

provinces except the colonies which he founded in Pisidia, Gallia,

etc., and the colonies are mentioned simply because they were

settlements of Roman citizens. He therefore could not, ill accordance

with his own plan, mention the scheme of numbering the subject

population; he only speaks of the numbering of the Romans. Moreover,

the principle of periodic enrollments appears not to have been,

perhaps, carried out completely, and could not claim a place in the

list of the emperor's achievements.

The most important fact is that we have clear evidence, quite

independent of Luke, that the first, second and fourth periodic

enrollments were observed ill the Province Syria. The evidence for the

first is Christian, and is therefore commonly set aside, except when

the "critical" -- or rather uncritical -- theologian desires to bring

out that these Christians don't even agree with one another: then he

quotes Tertullian.

The evidence for the second. periodic enrollment in Syria lies in the

chance preservation of an inscription, ill which a Roman officer

recorded his service at Apameia; but this evidence was long discredited

as a forgery, made in modern times by some person who wanted' to

illustrate Luke, and pretended to have copied the inscription from a

stone. The demolition of a house in Venice revealed the stone, and

justified the inscription.

The evidence for the fourth periodic inscription is, found in Tacitus.

Had the authority been a mere Christian, his words would have been

ridiculed and disregarded.

But three occurrences are sufficient to show what was the law of

recurrence. If the other evidence is enough to suggest that some system

was recognized in Syria, then the three dates show that the

Fourteen-Years'-Cycle was the system which was followed there.

Further, we observe that in all three cases it is only by a mere

accident that we learn about the occurrence of a census -- a casual

reference in Terullian's disputation against a heretic: the chance

preservation of an inscription in Venice: the fact that a disturbance

in a dependent kingdom was too serious for the king's strength, and

required the intervention of the Roman arms, and thus rose to the level

of dignity required for mention in Tacitus's Annals. The ordinary class

of inscriptions on stone does not mention events of this kind, except

through an occasional chance, as, e.g., that some private: individual

was specially concerned with the taking of a census (like Aeimilius

Secundus). But we cannot expect many such chances, as have preserved

the memory of the three enrollments in Syria.

In Syria there existed the same reasons which are considered by Wilcken

to have required the periodic enrollment by households in Egypt. In

both countries there existed a poll-tax (which was not a general Roman

institution): conscription and imposition of various burdens in the

State service were common to all parts of the empire: hence the

periodic enrollments would enable the machinery of government to work

with much greater ease and certainty in Syria.

Any rational and scholarly criticism must accept the conclusion: There

was a system of periodic enrollment in the Province Syria, according to

a Fourteen-Years'-Cycle (in the modern expression --

Fifteen-Years'-Cycle in the Roman form), and the first enrollment was

made in the year 8 BC. (strictly the Syrian year beginning in the

spring of 8 BC.).

The fact that there exists no evidence of such frequent taking of

census in Syria, as we suppose, constitutes no disproof of our theory.

The evidence has perished. Twenty years ago no one dreamed to what a

degree of minuteness and perfection the registration of inhabitants,

property and values in Egypt was carried by the Romans. The evidence

seemed to have perished. Now the graves and rubbish-heaps of Egypt have

begun to give up their evidence; and our knowledge of Roman provincial

administration has entered on a new stage. But elsewhere we cannot hope

for such discoveries as in Egypt, for other climates are too moist to

allow paper to survive. But the analogy of Egyptian administration is a

strong argument as regards Syria; and, if Augustus instituted periodic

enrollments in Egypt, the evidence of Luke, implying that he ordered a

similar system in the whole empire, and that the system was carried

into effect in Syria, has every probability in its favor and will be

accepted by every candid historian.

We have the evidence of Justin Martyr [61] a native of Syria, writing

about 150 AD., that the tabulated information gathered from the

periodic enrollments of the province was preserved, and might be

consulted by any who doubted the evidence of Luke. Writing to the

emperor, the Caesars, the senate, and the people of Rome, he tells them

that they can learn the facts regarding the birth of Christ from the

registers made under Quirinius. It is obvious that Justin had not

himself consulted the registers. He merely knew that they existed and

might be consulted. The facts he takes from Luke, and challenges all to

disprove them by appeal to the registers.

Similarly Tertullian [62] appeals to the letter of Marcus Aurelius, in

which he had informed the senate of the important service rendered by

Christian soldiers in the German war. He had not seen the letter

himself, but he knew that all such documents addressed to the senate

were preserved, and challenged his readers to consult the letter for

themselves.

It would be quite fair to quote Tertullian as evidence (if any evidence

were needed) that such Imperial letters were preserved in official

records; and similarly it is quite fair to quote Justin as evidence

that the registers of the Syrian enrollments were preserved and might

be consulted by those who wished.

Mr. Kenyon writes that natives of Egypt refer to previous enrollments

as evidence of relationship, etc. Josephus, Vit., 1., apparently is

quoting similar enrollment-registers, when he speaks of the evidence

for his family history.

Justin himself had no desire or need to consult the registers in order

to be convinced. It was quite enough for him that Luke recorded the

facts; and he asked no further evidence. As to questions of date and

officials he felt no interest. Perhaps he may have interpreted Luke's

words as referring to Quirinius's second government of Syria in 6-7

AD.; but he styles him procurator of Palestine, which does not suit

that or any office held by him, for the procuratorship was an

equestrian position, while Quirinius was of senatorial rank. But it

tended to convince the Romans that the Gospels as a whole were true, if

these little details were found to be correctly stated; and therefore

he challenges his readers to verify them for themselves.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[51] Absolutely the only reason for thinking it to be a forgery was

that it mentioned the census of Quirinius, and therefore seemed to give

some support to Luke. But as this might be the historical census of

Quirinius in AD. 7, the support was very slight and indirect; and, if a

forger were inventing a support for Luke, he would hardly be content

with such a small result for his work. See Mommsen in Ephemeris

Epigraphica, 4., p. 588, on the rediscovery of the stone.

[52] Suidas, s. vv.Apographe and Augoustos.

[53] Bell. Jud., 2., 16, 4.

[54] De uis enim instrumentis saecularia probari necesse est (de Cor.

7).

[55] Nat. Hist., 7., 48 (159).

[56] Mommsen, Monum. Ancyran., ed. 2., p. 37.

[57] Strictly the province was termed Syria et Cilicia et Phoenice.

[58] Tacitus, Annals, 6., 41, and Wilhelm, Arch. Epigr. Mittheilungen,

1894, p. 1 ff.

[59] Tacitus, Annals, 9., 25, 31; Suetonius, Claud., 16; Pliny, Nat.

Hist., 7., 48 (159).

[60] Beginning April 73 (according to Chambalu, de magistrat.

Flaviorum, quoted by Goyau, Chronologie de l'Emp. Rom., s. a.) their

office lasted eighteen months. See Pliny, Nat. Hist., 7., 49 (162).

[61] Apolog., 1., 34. Felix, governor of Egypt, is mentioned in it, and

he governed Egypt about 150.

[62] Apolog. 5.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CHAPTER 9

KING HEROD'S ENROLLMENT

THE first enrollment in Syria was made in the year 8-7 BC., but a

consideration of the situation in Syria and Palestine about that time

will show that the enrollment in Herod's kingdom was probably delayed

for some time later.

Herod occupied a delicate and difficult position on the throne of

Judea. On the one hand he had to comply with what was required of him

by the Imperial policy; he was governing for the Romans a part of the

empire, and he was bound to spread western customs and language and

civilization among his subjects, and fit them for their position in the

Roman world. Above all, the prime requirement was that he must maintain

peace and order; the Romans knew well that no civilizing process could

go on, so long as disorder and disturbance and insecurity existed in

the country. Herod's duty was to keep the peace and naturalize the

Graeco-Roman civilization in Palestine.

On the other hand, he must soothe the feelings and accommodate himself

to the prejudices of the jealous and suspicious people whom he

governed. He could not hope to keep the peace among them, unless he

humored their prejudices. They hated and despised Roman ideas, and they

were intensely attached to their own customs. Their customs had all a

religious foundation, and they could not comply with foreign

requirements without doing violence to their deep-rooted pride of

religion and their lofty contempt for the pagans by whom they were

surrounded. Everything Roman was to them a heathen abomination; and, if

Herod seemed to them to be forcing on them anything Roman, insurrection

was almost certain to follow. But it was absolutely necessary to

prevent insurrection, which was likely to make Augustus quite as angry

with him as with the insurgents.

On the whole, Herod had been successful in his ambiguous position. He

built many fortresses and many cities of the Graeco-Roman type, with

temples of the Graeco-Roman gods, beginning with the god incarnate, the

emperor himself, whose refusal to accept Divine honors was not very

much regarded in the eastern lands. That was the approved method of

spreading the Graeco-Roman civilization. The "city" was originally a

Greek creation, and every city tended towards the cosmopolitan type of

the Roman empire. Education, luxury, commerce, imitation of western

manners, dislike for the national and "barbarian" manners, use of the

Greek language, were encouraged in the crowded and feverish line of

cities; and the national piety and the national exclusiveness found it

more difficult to maintain themselves in their old strength.

But Jerusalem was left still Hebrew in spite of the theater and

amphitheater and fortress called Antonia, which Herod built. There was

really a double life in the ancient city, and Herod put on the

appearance of fostering both. If he adorned the city with splendid

buildings after the Greek fashion, he also was careful to rebuild the

Jewish Temple with far greater magnificence than of old. He would show

himself a true king of the Jews. He pretended to conform to the Jewish

Law, and did so in some matters of form and ceremony. He refused to

permit his sister Salome's marriage with the Arabian Syllaeus, unless

the latter conformed to the Jewish law.

Herod never entered the holy place, as Pompey did. He allowed the

religious ritual free play. He never attempted to prevent any of the

priestly ceremonial. He never assumed to himself ally of the priestly

functions. When the temple was being built, only the priests were used

in constructing the sanctuary, so that the holy place might never be

profaned by any other than a priest's foot or hand. He avoided heathen

emblems and devices on his coins and on the buildings of Jerusalem. He:

permitted the Sanhedrin to continue during his reign, and to exercise a

shadow of its ancient power doubtless only in religious matters, and

subject, doubtless, to constraint from the ever-present thought of what

would be the result to themselves, if they did anything that Herod

disliked.

Thus Herod kept up the appearance of maintaining national feeling, of

defending the Jewish cause against all foreigners, and of respecting

national ideas and prejudices. He governed his action on the natural

and obvious principle. He did not attempt to force the Jews to do

anything that was distinctly non-national and non-Jewish; he maintained

their religious ceremonial, and refrained from obtruding on them

personally anything that was offensive to them. The theaters and other

pagan abominations were for the accursed heathen; but the Jews could do

as they pleased about such unholy things. They tolerated Herod, and he

did not outrage them. [63]

But, in spite of all his care to comply with the Roman requirements,

towards the end of his life Herod fell into disgrace with Augustus. He

had made war on the Arabians; and Syllaeus, the Arabian minister, who

was in Rome, obtained the ear and the confidence of Augustus, and

persuaded him that Herod had made war on his own authority without

Roman permission. Augustus was very angry, and wrote to Herod that,

whereas hitherto he had treated the Jewish king as a friend, he would

henceforth treat him as a subject. [64]

The time when this letter was written is, uncertain. Schuerer is

inclined to date it in 8 BC., probably rightly. Lewin, Fasti Sacri, p.

109, places it in 7 BC.

These emphatic words, coming from an emperor whose words were always

well weighed and weighty, soon bore fruit in action, as we may be

certain. Nothing is related by Josephus as to the exact form that the

Roman action took; but he tells very emphatically how much Herod was

embarrassed by the loss of Augustus's favor. In one point, Luke comes

to our aid. He shows that Herod was ordered to consider that the recent

orders for an enrollment in the Province Syria applied also to his

kingdom and must be obeyed.

A probable conjecture places at this point the oath of fidelity to the

Emperor, which the whole Jewish people was ordered to take, and which

6000 Pharisees refused. It is natural that, when the king was degraded

to the rank of a subject, his people should be constrained to take the

oath of allegiance to Caesar, in place of the oath to Herod which they

had formerly taken. [65] It was the practice under the empire that all

subjects, both Romans and provincials, should swear allegiance and

fidelity to the Emperor. In later time, under Trajan, the oath was

taken every year on the anniversary of the Emperor's accession, but it

is uncertain when this custom was introduced. The words which Josephus

uses would seem to imply that the oath to Caesar was taken and refused

only once; [66] and the occasion is implied to have been towards the

end of Herod's life.

The two acts, the oath and the enrollment, obviously form part of the

new policy of Augustus towards Herod, though we need not go so far as

to suppose that the two were one (as some scholars have done), and that

the oath was taken as part of the ceremony of enrollment.

Incidentally, we may notice as a masterpiece of irrationality and

uncritical prejudice, the reflection which Strauss makes about the oath

of allegiance to Augustus imposed on the Jews. "That this oath, far

from being a humiliating measure for Herod, coincided with his

interest, is proved by the zeal with which he punished the Pharisees

who refused to take it." [67] Naturally, Herod had to punish the

refusal as an act of treason. If he did not do so, any one of his

enemies could ruin him by reporting the fact to Augustus. Moreover,

there were so many Roman officials in Syria that the omission to punish

the recalcitrants could not be kept from their knowledge, and every

official was in duty bound to report the omission to his superiors or

to the Emperor. The punishment, however, was very mild: a fine was

inflicted on the whole 6000 recalcitrants, and was paid by the wife of

Herod's brother Pheroras. Subsequently, the ringleaders were put to

death; but that was not on account of their refusing the oath, but

because they were disobedient and disrespectful to Herod himself on a

later occasion.

Herod was, naturally, unwilling to accept this mark of servitude and

degradation in rank without making an effort to avoid it. He would,

doubtless, request time; and he would have little or no difficulty in

obtaining leave from the Roman governor, Saturninus, to postpone the

numbering, until he had sent an embassy to Rome. Herod had formerly had

great influence with Augustus; he might become powerful again; and the

Roman officials had no reason to refuse compliance with such a

reasonable request for temporary delay. Herod could represent with

perfect truth that the imposition of a Roman census in Palestine would

offend the prejudices of the Jews, and endanger the peace of the

kingdom. Moreover, the crafty king knew well how to make his requests

acceptable to Roman officers, who were almost invariably accessible to

bribery.

Further, according to Josephus, Herod's case was a good and strong one,

and Syllaeus was a false accuser. After Saturninus had come to Syria as

governor, in succession to Titius (probably in the summer of 9 BC. [68]

), long negotiations went on in his presence between Herod and

Syllaeus; an arrangement was made between them; it was afterwards

broken by Syllaeus; Herod again complained to Saturninus, and was

authorized to make war on the Arabians.

Incidentally, we notice that both the accusation that Herod had made

war without Roman sanction, and the defense that he had been authorized

by the governor of Syria, show how far he was from being an independent

king.

It is, therefore, natural and probable that a postponement of the

enrollment should have been granted to Herod; and, although our

authorities merely say that an embassy was sent, and give no

information as to the exact message, yet we may fairly assume that it

was intended both to soothe the anger of Augustus and to beg for

exemption from the enrollment, on the ground that this was likely to

rouse the religious feeling of the Jews and cause disturbance and

insurrection.

The embassy was sent to Rome, but it was not received in audience, and

it returned without effecting anything. Augustus, of course, knew in a

general way what instructions had been given to it, and he did not

think that Herod had been sufficiently humiliated. Perhaps Herod's case

was not quite so good as Josephus represents it, and there was

something to be said on the Arabian side of which we are not informed.

Augustus must assuredly have received the reports of Saturninus the

governor, and of Volumnius his own procurator; but he still continued

stern and unforgiving to Herod.

In these circumstances the delay granted to Herod in regard to the

enrollment was not extended, and, as we may suppose, he was called upon

to obey the emperor's orders. He sent a second embassy to Augustus,

which was, in all probability, commissioned not, as before, to request

exemption from the enrollment, but to announce his submission and to

promise unconditional compliance. This embassy was much more favorably

received, and returned from Rome successful; but Herod was evidently by

no means completely pardoned or restored fully to favor. When once

Augustus's anger had been roused at the Jewish monarch's assumption of

too great freedom, it was far from easy to appease it entirely, and

impossible to eradicate the effect produced on his mind.

The succession to Herod's kingdom was subject to the sanction of

Augustus [69] He could not punish his own sons without formally

accusing them before a council of his relatives and the Roman officers

of the province. [70] He had to send embassy after embassy to Rome to

obtain the sanction of Augustus for his intended acts. He could not

punish his guilty son Antipater without getting special leave from

Augustus. In fact his kingdom was treated ostentatiously as an outlying

part of the province, in which nothing of any consequence could go on

without the Roman sanction.

Luke's statement that the enrollment was applied to Palestine is

therefore in perfect accord with the situation as revealed by Josephus

during the last years of the life of Herod. The question that remains

is: In what year was the enrollment made in Palestine?

The year which was generally observed in the southern part of the

Province Syria and perhaps followed by Josephus in his history, began

in the spring. [71] In Syria, therefore, the periodic year was probably

9-8 BC. and the actual numbering would take place in the year 8-7 BC.

The recital of events which has just been given will prove that the

numbering in Palestine could not have occurred so early as the year

8-7, ending 17th April, 7 BC. A consideration of the character of the

enrollment will bring us to a more precise result.

Herod was naturally eager to avoid giving to the enrollment an entirely

foreign and non-national character Such a character both accentuated

his own humiliation and was more liable to rouse the ever-wakeful pride

and jealousy of his Jewish subjects. Obviously, the best way to soothe

the Jewish sentiment was to give the enrollment a tribal character and

to number the tribes of Israel, as had been done by purely national

Governments.

The Roman officials would not be likely to object to this form of

enrollment. Provided Herod obeyed the orders of Augustus that an

enrollment must be made, it would be entirely in accordance with the

spirit in which these subject kingdoms were treated, that the manner of

making the enrollment should be left to the discretion of the

responsible authority, viz., the king. Moreover, the marvelous success

of Roman provincial administration was due to the skill and tact with

which the officials accommodated themselves to the prejudices of the

subject population; and this was clearly a case in, which Jewish

susceptibilities might be taken into account as regards the manner of

numbering. The people was well known to be stubborn and unyielding in

its religious ideas; and, with rare exceptions, Rome humored its

religious prejudices.

In his work on the relations between the Imperial law and the National

law, Dr. Mitteis has shown how much the Roman law was affected in the

Eastern provinces by national law and custom. [72] In those countries

Rome was brought in contact with an old civilization and a settled

system of Greek law; and it did not seek to force on them its own law,

as it did on the barbarous countries of the West. Similarly, the Roman

governor of Syria was not likely to dictate the precise fashion in

which the numbering of Palestine must be carried out.

Moreover, we have already seen that the prime consideration in the

Imperial system of administering the provinces was to avoid disturbance

and sedition. Augustus and the later emperors emphatically inculcated

this principle on their lieutenants in the provinces. Herod could with

perfect justice show that tribal numbering was the form which would

tend most to peace and order in his kingdom.

Herod's method in governing his kingdom was, as we have seen, to humor

the Jews, and to accept the distinction which they proudly drew between

themselves and the heathen. Must we not, then, suppose that he would

employ the same method in his enrollment? Owing to the care with which

the Jews preserved their family records and pedigrees, all true Jews

would know what was their family and their proper city according to the

ancient tribal system, even though they might have been forced by

circumstances to change their abode. This seems to have suggested the

mode of enrollment which Luke describes a mode which would mark off by

a broad clear line the true Jews from the mongrel population of

Palestine. All who claimed to be Jews were to repair to the proper city

of their tribe and family. The rest of the population, who were

probably much more numerous, would be counted according to their

ordinary place of residence.

My friend, Professor Paterson, to whom I am indebted throughout these

pages, points out that Augustus would specially desire an enrollment of

Palestine in order to have some clear idea what was the military

strength of the country. It was a troublesome district to rule.

Disturbances were always apprehended. There was obvious advantage in

knowing what was the exact strength of the possible rebels.

Moreover, the non-Jewish population was peaceable and well-affected to

Rome. The enrollment would obviously be much more useful, if in

distinguished accurately the rebellious from the peaceful element in

the population. The tribal enrollment furnished the means of gaining

this information. It might safely be concluded that all those who were

content to be counted as non-tribal would be loyal subjects of Rome.

The imposition of the oath of allegiance to Augustus would also furnish

a test, and the number of those who refused the oath was kept. Josephus

says there were more than 6000. He implies, not that this was an

estimate of the strength of the Pharisaic faction, but that those who

actually refused to take the oath were counted; and he says that they

were regarded as dangerous and likely to rouse war and disturbance.

[73]

According to Luke the tribal enrollment was made by ordering every head

of a household to repair for the numbering to the proper city from

which his family had sprung. Such a method would have been entirely

inapplicable in a large country. But, as the traveler rides across the

length of Palestine, it is vividly brought home to him that this was an

easy and short method in that land. The Romans, who required that

citizens should travel to Rome from the remotest part of Italy when

they wished to register their vote, would see nothing to object to, if

Herod consulted them as to his proposed scheme.

In the national character which Herod gave to his enrollment, probably,

lies the reason why Mary as well as Joseph went up to Bethlehem -- a

detail which would be so inexplicable if the enrollment had been

modeled after a Roman census. To go personally to the enrollment was

regarded as substantiating a claim to true Hebrew origin and family.

All they that went to their proper city were true Hebrews; and, as Luke

says, "all (i.e., all true Hebrews in Palestine) went to enroll

themselves, every one to his own city".

It is important to notice the force of the word "all" here. This is one

of many passages in Luke's History where the precise sense that should

be attributed to the word "all" or the word "they" may be, or has been,

a subject of controversy, and can be determined only from the whole

train of thought in the historian's mind. He that misconceives the

general thought underlying the whole passage inevitably misinterprets

"they" or "all"

For example, who are "they" in Acts 13:3? On the way in which that

question is answered hinges a controversy as to Church government. Who

are "all" in Acts 18:17? On the answer depends the whole sense of the

incident; but an answer is difficult, and depends on the general

conception in the reader's mind. Some say "all the Jews beat a

Christian": others say "all the Greeks beat a Jew". Similarly, who are

"us" in Luke 1:1? Professor Blass has recently answered that in his own

way. Many would give a different reply.

Accordingly, to understand "all" in Luke 2:3, one must put oneself at

the narrator's point of view. As we have seen, he conveys the

impression throughout the two chapters that he is giving the story of

Mary herself. To her "all" are the Jews: she thinks only of her own

people: the nonJewish population of Palestine is not embraced in her

view.

But, when such a plan of tribal numbering was adopted, the time of year

had to be carefully considered. In the first place the winter months

had to be avoided, during which traveling was often difficult, and in

which unfavorable weather might cause great hardship and even prevent

the plan from being carried out. As the day had to be fixed a long time

beforehand, it must have been fixed in the season when good weather

could be calculated on. In winter, weather might be good or it might be

bad, and at the best it would be cold and trying.

That a day was fixed by the authorities, and that it was not left to

the discretion of the people to go when they pleased (as in Egypt

people seem to have been permitted to send in their enrollment papers

at any time they pleased within the year), seems to follow from the

fact that Joseph and Mary traveled from Nazareth to Bethlehem at the

very time when the birth of the child was approaching. Moreover, the

advantages of the plan in ease and speed would have been sacrificed,

unless a day had been fixed for the numbering.

Further, it was urgently necessary that the time which was fixed should

not interfere with agricultural operations -- that it should not come

between the earliest date for the first harvest and the latest date for

finishing the threshing, and getting in the grain and the fine cut

straw from the threshing floors. [74] The harvest varied considerably

in different parts of the country, and reaping extended over about

seven weeks, beginning from the middle of April.

Taking these circumstances into consideration, we may say with

considerable confidence that August to October is the period within

which the numbering would be fixed. It is no objection to this view

that tradition places the birth of Jesus at Christmas. It is well known

that the tradition is not early, that it varies in different periods

and in different sections of the Church, and that the earliest belief

was different.

Lewin, in Fasti Sacri, p. 115, selects 1st August as the day and month.

Without laying any stress on the reasoning from the priestly periods by

which he reaches this precise and exact conclusion, we must attach

great weight to the argument which he founds on the fact that the

shepherds were watching their flocks in the open country by night. In

Asia Minor, at least, the pasturing of the flocks by night takes place

only during the hot season and not in the winter. The sheep will not

eat under the hot sun: they stand idly in a dense crowd in any place

where the semblance of shade can be found during the day, and during

the night they scatter and feed. In cold weather they seek food during

the day.

On this characteristic of the sheep is founded the rule, said to be

observed in Palestine, that the flocks were sent out after the Passover

and brought in about October before the "former rain".

Within that period, April to October, the day fixed for the numbering

must fall; and during that period April to July was required for the

reaping and garnering of the year's crop.

It seems unnecessary to do more than refer to the idle objection that

has been made: How were the shepherds numbered? There must always be

some people for whom the numbering is inconvenient, whatever be the

time at which it is fixed; and we need not trouble to inquire what was

the method adopted to meet the special case of the shepherds. That

inquiry belongs to the sphere of the archaeological student, who

studies the minutiae of the census system; but the historian, in his

more general view, must omit such details. No critic, who retains his

sober reason and does not yield to mere prejudice, would find any

difficulty in it.

After all, not a great deal of journeying to and fro would be required

for the enrollment. The remnant that could trace their origin to the

Ten Tribes must have been very small. The majority of the strictly

Jewish population was probably resident at that time in the southern

part of Palestine, though there was also a large minority scattered

over all the cities of the central and northern districts. A

considerable number of people would have to make journeys of one to

four days to their own city, and the same back again; but nothing

approaching to a general transference of population would be

necessitated.

For Herod's enrollment, then, there is open only the late summer of 7

or 6 BC. Unless we have omitted some important factor (which is, of

course, far from improbable, considering how scanty the evidence is),

the enrollment can hardly be brought down so late as 5 BC. and we have

seen that 8 BC. is excluded by other considerations.

Between the years 7 and 6 it is difficult to choose, so long as we

confine ourselves to the evidence outside of Luke, for that evidence is

insufficient to found a judgment upon, owing to the uncertainty of all

the dates connected with the question. It may be that the embassy which

was dismissed unheard by Augustus, returned so late that the necessary

preparations and notice could not be made in time for the autumn of 7

BC. and it is certain that Herod was by no means eager to hurry the

numbering. But these are mere vague presumptions.

Luke, however, gives additional information about the Savior's life,

which affords reasonable confidence that 6 BC. was the year of Christ's

birth.

NOTE

That a difference should be made in the treatment of Jews and non-Jews

in Palestine, is quite in accordance with Roman usage. For example,

after the rebellion under Hadrian, the Jews were forbidden to enter

Jerusalem.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[63] Dr. Schuerer well describes the ambiguous policy of Herod, Gesch.

d. Jud. Volkes, etc., 2., p. 327 f.

[64] palai chromenos auto philo, nun hupekoo chresetai, Josephus, Ant.

Jud., 16., 9, 3 (� 290).

[65] Schuerer, l. c., 1., p. 329; Josephus, 15., 10, 4.

[66] pantos goun tou Ioudaikou bebaiosantos di' horkon e men eunoesein

Kaisari . . . hoide ouk omosan. Josephus, Ant. Jud., 17., 2, 4. The

aorists imply a single occasion, not a regularly repeated custom.

[67] Life of Jesus, 1., p. 203.

[68] Some date his arrival as late as 8 BC. This would make the delay

in the enrollment of Judea all the more natural. He was succeeded by

Quinctilius Varus in 7. See Note 1 at end of chapter 11.

[69] Ant. Jud., 17., 3, 2 (� 53); 8, 2 (� 195).

[70] ton kata ten eparchian hegemonon Bell. Jud., 1., 27, 1.

[71] See Niese in Hermes, 28., 1893, p. 212 ff.; also see Notes at the

end of chapter 10.

[72] Reichsrecht und Volksrecht, Leipzig, 1891.

[73] ek tou prouptou eis to polemein te kai blaptein epermenoi, Ant.

Jud., 17., 2, 4 (41).

[74] See Mr. J. W. Paterson's excellent article on "Agriculture" in

Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible. On the use of the fine chopped straw

in the economy of the farm, see Contemporary Review, August, 1897, p.

237.
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CHAPTER 10

CHRONOLOGY OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST

LUKE 3:23 tells that Jesus appeared before the world as the teacher,

when he was about thirty years of age. Now it is a characteristic usage

in Greek to employ this vague expression, when there is no intention to

imply doubt as to the age: it lies in the genius of the language to

avoid positiveness in assertion, and to prefer less definite and

pronounced and harsh forms of statement. [75] It is unnecessary to

think that Luke was really doubtful what was the age of Jesus, whether

twenty-eight or thirty-two. His elaborately careful and precise dating,

3:1, 2, may be taken as an indication that he had good and accurate

information on the subject; that he "had investigated all the

circumstances accurately in their origin". But, like a true Greek, he

says "about thirty," where the less sensitive barbarian of our northern

island would use a rudely positive and definite number. The only doubt

that remains is whether Luke means in his thirtieth year, or when he

was thirty years old; and this doubt is resolved by the other facts

recorded by Luke, as we shall see. Jesus was thirty years old, when he

began his public career.

The precise statement is doubtless derived from the same authority as

the whole of the first two chapters (and perhaps also 4:16-30); and the

only reason for recording it is that it was given exactly by a

first-rate authority, and therefore helped Luke's readers "to know the

certainty concerning the things wherein they had been instructed". An

authority, who was really good on such a point, would know the exact

age, and Luke expressly declares his intention of setting down only

such facts as he had accurately and certainly on trustworthy authority.

Where his knowledge was only vague, he usually refrains from making any

statement.

If the birth of Jesus occurred in BC. 6, he became thirty years of age

in the second half of AD. 25, and his appearance as a teacher took

place within the year that followed. If his birth occurred in BC. 7,

the date of his appearance must be placed one year earlier, but we

shall find reason to reject that supposition.

Some time, but apparently quite a short time, before Jesus came forward

as a teacher, John the Baptist began to preach that the Messiah was at

hand; and Jesus was among the crowds who flocked to him to receive

baptism. Now, as Luke mentions, "the word of God came to John" in the

fifteenth year of the authority [76] of Tiberius Caesar. The date is

given very precisely and definitely; but, unfortunately, it is by no

means easy to say what year is meant by it.

It is often found that, where an ancient writer aims at making his

statement most precise and exact, his words lend themselves to several

interpretations. [77] What did Luke understand by the authority of

Tiberius? In the inscriptions of that emperor's lifetime, the years of

his reign are estimated according to the number of times that he had

received tribunician power. On that system his fifteenth year began on

27th June, AD. 13. Obviously Luke cannot intend that year.

Again, according to Velleius, the admirer and friend and faithful

follower of Tiberius, associated with him in nine years of warfare,

authority equal to that of Augustus in all the provinces and armies of

the empire was granted to Tiberius by the senate and people, on the

proposal of Augustus himself, before he returned to Rome to celebrate

his triumph over the peoples of Pannonia and Dalmatia. Now this triumph

was celebrated on

16th January, AD. 12, [78] therefore the decree of equal power must

have been passed before the end of AD. 11. Further, the language of

Velleius suggests that the decree was issued not long before Tiberius

returned, and it was so closely connected with his return that

Suetonius seems to place it after he reached Rome. But Velleius's

authority must be ranked superior in regard to such a point.

There can be no doubt that this was the event which Tacitus had ill

mind when he said that Tiberius had been created Collega Imperii during

the lifetime of Augustus (Annals, 1., 3).

It follows that the first year during which Tiberius held power as

colleague of Augustus with equal power in all provinces of the empire

coincided with the end of AD. 11 and the greater part of AD. 12, and

the fifteenth year with AD. 25-6. [79]

If Luke counted the years of Tiberius according to that system, all his

statements as to time in these early chapters are found to be

consistent and accurate. The first enrollment must have taken place in

autumn BC. 6. Jesus was thirty years old in autumn BC. 25. In the later

months of that year, when the fifteenth year of the Hegemonia of

Tiberius in the provinces had just recently begun (according to the

official usage [80] ), John appeared announcing the coming of Christ;

and very shortly thereafter Jesus came and was baptized by John in the

river Jordan. A month or two thereafter occurred the Passover on 21st

March, AD. 26 (Lewin, Fasti Sacri, p. 173).

The only reason for doubting whether Luke could have counted the years

of Tiberius on that system, is that it is never employed elsewhere in

reckoning the reign of that emperor. When his tribunician years are not

stated, his reign is always elsewhere counted from the death of his

predecessor, Augustus; and it is beyond dispute that he was not in any

proper and strict sense emperor until that time. But it seems not

impossible that his Hegemonia in the provinces might be counted from

AD. 11, when his authority began in them. Similarly, we saw that in

Egypt the reign of Augustus was reckoned, not from any date when he

became emperor in a strict and proper sense, but from BC. 30, when his

authority began in that country.

Further, Luke, the whole spirit of whose History stamps it as belonging

to the Flavian period, knew that the reign of Titus was counted from

the day when he was made the colleague of his father, Vespasian; and

thus he may have been led to apply to the time of Tiberius the

principle which was in current and official use while he was writing.

[81]

Now the only dates that are permissible for the crucifixion are AD. 29,

30 and 33. Different authorities vary between these three years. But,

as it is not possible to allow that more than four Passovers occurred

during the public career of Jesus, we are bound to the view that his

career extended from the time preceding the Passover of 26 till the

Passover of 29. The strength of the tradition that places the

crucifixion in 29 has been admirably stated by Mr. C. H. Turner in his

article on the "Chronology of the New Testament". [82]

But is this consistent with Luke's narrative? Does he permit the

supposition that four Passovers occurred within the period of Jesus'

teaching?

Luke does not refer to any Passover during that whole period except the

last. He was not interested in the relation of Jesus to the Jewish

feasts, and hardly alludes to the subject after the Passover that

occurred in the Savior's twelfth year. Hence we cannot expect from him

much direct evidence bearing on the Passovers during the teaching of

Jesus.

Moreover, Luke had little of the sense for chronology, the value of

which in clearly understanding or describing any series of incidents

had not been appreciated so early as the first century. Chronology,

too, was much more difficult when no era had come into general use,

when dates were commonly stated by the names of annual magistrates, or

the years of sovereigns, and when in Asia scores of different eras for

dating had just begun to come into use side by side with one another,

so that, even when one does find a date by a numbered year, it is often

a difficult problem to determine what era is used.

Want of chronological sense or interest may seem a serious defect in a

historian. But we are too apt to forget that Luke was not writing for

us, and that he was not even writing for posterity. He wrote for the

benefit of his own contemporaries. His work stands in the closest

relation to the time. That which seemed most important for the

requirements of the Church at the time was what Luke most desired to

record with absolute accuracy and trustworthiness. Abstract scientific

interest in the chronology of the Gospel did not exist among his

readers. What they were concerned with was its truth; and that was

gathered from the Savior's teaching, from his statements about himself,

and from the facts of his Birth, Death and Resurrection. These were the

points on which Luke's attention was concentrated in his first book.

Some authorities are disposed to think that Luke believed the whole

period of the teaching of Jesus to have been comprised within the

period of a little more than a year, lasting from shortly before one

Passover till the Passover of the following year. A widely-spread

opinion in the second and third centuries assigned that duration to the

Savior's ministry, but I can discover nothing to show that Luke shared

it. The opinion, probably, was the result of two causes. In the first

place, the notes of time in the Gospels are very slight and difficult

to fit together. In the second place, the saying about "the acceptable

year of the Lord" was easily misunderstood.

The memory of the earliest authorities, as a rule, was entirely filled

with the words and teaching of the Savior. Chronological order was

little thought of; and we should probably find that most of the

writings alluded to by Luke 1. I took the form of collections of

sayings and parables. The only events, probably, that were vividly

remembered in their historical aspect and apart from the doctrine

connected with them, were the series of actions comprised within the

last few days of the Savior's life. The sequence of these events was

indelibly stamped on the memory of all. [83] But the rest of the

tradition was a reproduction of past lessons and impressive sayings.

These were connected with certain localities; some were associated with

certain actions of the Savior or of those who were in his company. But

his numerous journeys great and small were not remembered in their

sequence. In this state of information, Luke evidently forbore the

attempt to describe exactly the movements of Jesus during the greater

part of the teaching.

In the beginning, indeed, he describes the sequence of Jesus' first

journeys. He tells how Jesus was baptized by John in Jordan, 3:21; and

he dates at that point the beginning of his teaching, 3:23. Then he

tells of the journey into the wilderness, i.e., the country south from

Jerusalem, and mentions that Jesus was actually in Jerusalem, 4:1-13.

Thereafter Jesus returned to Galilee and taught there for some time,

4:14, 15, after which he returned to Nazareth for a brief visit,

4:16-30. Being rejected and threatened with death at Nazareth, he came

down to Capernaum, 4:31.

The narrative during this stage touches that of the other Gospels at

occasional points; and one paragraph, 4:1-13, is perhaps founded on the

same ultimate authority as Matthew 4:1-11 (though with a difference in

order). No indication of the lapse of time is given; but some

considerable period is likely to have elapsed even in the events

implied in 4:15 alone.

But at this point, 4:31, begins a new section of the narrative. The

indications of movement for a considerable period are of the vaguest

kind. 4:42, He went into a desert place. 5:16, He withdrew himself in

the deserts.5:27, He went forth.6:1, He was going through the

cornfields, probably in May or June when the wheat was ripe but not

cut. 6:12, He went out into the mountain to pray. 6:17, He came down

with them. 7:1, He entered into Capernaum.7:1, He went soon afterwards

to a city called Nain (an episode peculiar to Luke). His return from

Nain is never mentioned, but 7:18 ff. probably belongs to the coasts of

the Sea of Galilee. 8:1, He soon afterwards went about through cities

and villages. 8:22, He entered into a boat (on the Sea of Galilee).

8:26, He arrived at the country of the Gerasenes, which is over against

Galilee. 8:38, He entered into a boat and returned. 9:10, He withdrew

apart to a city called Bethsaida. 9:28, He went up about eight days

after into the mountain to pray. 9:37, On the next day when they were

come down from the mountain, a great multitude met him (and here Mark's

reference to the green grass, 6:39, and John's to the abundant grass,

6:10, show that the time was spring).

In this part of the narrative, the lapse of time is hardly alluded to:

only the brief and vague indications just quoted are given. The marks

of locality, apart from those implied in the indications of movement,

are also very vague and elusive. 4:44, He was preaching in the

synagogues of Galilee. 5:1, He was standing by the Lake of Gennesaret.

5:12, He was in one of the cities.

This section of the narrative, 4:31-9:50, is as a whole (though with

some considerable exceptions) closely parallel to Mark and Matthew.

Great part of the section is evidently founded on an authority common

to them (though we expressly avoid stating any opinion as to the nature

of the connection between the three).

It is plain that though Luke, with his usual indifference to the

chronological aspect of history, does not properly mark the lapse of

time, yet this section must extend over some considerable period.

"Preaching in the synagogues of Galilee" is the sort of phrase by which

Luke sums up a considerable period; and the different movements,

mentioned or implied, vague as they are, together with the intervals

between them, demand time.

From 9:51 begins another new section describing the movement to

Jerusalem preparatory to the culmination of Christ's teaching there. In

10:38, as they went on their way, he entered into a certain village

(viz., Bethany); and in 11:1, he was praying in a certain place. In

this and the following chapters there continues the same vagueness.

Luke only makes it clear that the most advanced stage in the ministry

has begun, and that Jesus is moving gradually towards the south and is

affecting the southern half of Palestine. In 13:22, he went on his way

through towns and villages teaching and journeying on unto Jerusalem.

In 17:11, as they were on the way to Jerusalem, he was passing through

the midst of Samaria and Galilee. 8:31, We go up to Jerusalem. 18:35,

He drew nigh unto Jericho.19:1, He entered and was passing through

Jericho. 19:11, He was nigh to Jerusalem. 19:28 f., He went on before,

going up to Jerusalem (by the steep road from Jericho), and he drew

nigh to Bethany.

Then comes the entry into Jerusalem, where the rest of the narrative

has its scene.

With very slight exceptions, the section 9:51-19:28 is quite peculiar

to Luke, and has hardly any points of contact with any of the other

Gospels. But the same vagueness of place and time continues.

It is, however, clearly unnecessary and improbable that this section

represents, or was considered by Luke to represent, the events of one

single continuous approximately straight journey. The multitudes, the

towns and villages, the frequent repetition of the idea of progress

towards Jerusalem, imply a gradual advance of the circle of the

teaching towards the south and towards the center of Jewish religion

and the completion of his mission.

If, as I believe to be probably the case, Luke knew what was the

"certain village" of Martha and Mary, 10:38, but for some reason (about

which we need not speculate) avoided naming it, our view would be

raised to complete certainty, that in this section the historian is

describing a general movement southwards, accompanied and complicated

by many short journeys to and fro, up and down, "through towns and

villages teaching". If he is at Bethany in 10., and at Jericho in 18,

and in Samaria in 17, zigzag wanderings are clearly implied. But, as

many may prefer to consider that 10:38 has been put in false local and

chronological order by Luke through his ignorance that the "certain

village" was Bethany, we need not press an argument that is not

actually required for our purpose. Even without it the view which we

are stating as to Luke's intention in this section seems certain.

It is obvious, then, that Luke divides the teaching of Jesus, previous

to the final scenes in Jerusalem, into three stages. The first and

preliminary stage -- in the wilderness of Judah, in Galilee and in

Nazareth -- is very briefly recorded The second -- spent in Galilee or

the north continuously -- is described at much greater length: Jesus

had now become a famous teacher, and attracted many hearers and

followers. The third -- the extension of the sphere of influence over

central Palestine as Far as Jerusalem -- is described still more fully.

There is no attempt or intention to describe the movements of Jesus

exactly in the second and third stages.

Further, the second stage evidently lasted a Full year, For after it

has begun some time, we find ourselves in the month of May or June, and

at the end we are again in spring (as we know From Mark but not from

Luke).

The probability, then, is that roughly the three stages correspond to

the three years; and the memory of the witnesses retained very little

that was accurate and definite (except some important changes of scene

and journeys) during the preliminary stage, AD. 26, more about the

second, AD. 27, and still more about the third, AD. 28.

The first Passover, AD. 26 (John 2:13), falls about Luke 4:13, and the

year ends about 4:31. At the feast of this year, the Jews spoke about

the 46th year of the building of the Temple (John 2:20); and the 46th

year had begun shortly before they spoke. [84]

The second Passover, AD. 27 (John 5:1), falls about Luke 5. Then

follows the month of May, 6:1.

The spring of AD. 28 and the third Passover (John 6:4) must be placed

in Luke 9. The summer of this year, however, was still spent in

Galilee, according to John 7:1; but it is not inconsistent with this

statement that the third stage of Luke had already begun. The

characteristic of that stage was that Jesus had now set his face firmly

to go to Jerusalem, 9:51; but during it, he was still passing through

the midst of Samaria and Galilee, 17:11. The period in Luke's

estimation is rather one of firm and definite resolution than of bodily

movement continuously towards Jerusalem. The visit to the country east

of Jordan (Mark 10:1 and Matthew 19:1) certainly belongs to this stage.

That there was a strong tradition to the effect that the Savior

suffered at the age of thirty-three seems to follow from the agreement

of Hippolytus [85] and Eusebius and Phlegon. The latter, as is allowed

by Mr. Turner, was indebted to very early Christian authorities for his

information. It is true that both Eusebius and Phlegon place the

crucifixion in AD. 33, but this arises from their both depending on the

original Christian calculation which ultimately gave rise to the modern

era of the birth of Christ. This was wrongly calculated as early as the

second century; and, starting from that initial error, the

chronologists had to place the beginning of the teaching in thirty and

the crucifixion in thirty-three.

It is a strong confirmation of our result that it agrees with two so

ancient traditions, which are quite unconnected with one another and

evidently seemed to most of the ancients to be inconsistent with each

other.

Starting from a very different point of view from that of Mr. Turner,

and working on utterly diverse lines, we have reached nearly the same

conclusion that he reached. The only differences of importance are two:

--

1. I find myself obliged, on the principles of interpretation which I

have followed consistently throughout, to attach a distinctly higher

value than he does to Luke's statement as to the age of Jesus when he

began to teach.

2. Mr. Turner is inclined to think that Luke compressed the teaching

into one year; and he holds that the teaching in reality lasted only

for two years, interpreting John 5:1 as referring to some unnamed minor

feast. [86] This view cannot be disproved, but it seems to have nothing

to recommend it, and it introduces quite unnecessary discord between

the different Gospels. The chronological marks in the Gospels are so

slight that almost anything can be made out of them, if one is bent on

doing so. Hence there was in ancient time an immense variety of opinion

on this point. But in four independent accounts of one series of

events, a reasonable criticism will prefer the interpretation in which

all the various conditions are reconciled.

At the last moment, after this chapter is in type, Professor Paterson

reminds me that the result which we have attained agrees with the

celebrated calculation of Kepler, who fixed on the year BC. 6, because

in March of that year there occurred a conjunction of Jupiter, Saturn

and Mars, which would present a most brilliant appearance in the sky,

and would naturally attract the attention of observers interested in

the phenomena of the heavens, as were the Wise Men of the East.

I have no knowledge what is the value of Kepler's reckoning. Mr.

Turner, who knows much more about the matter, speaks only of the

conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, which occurred in, May, October and

December, BC. 7; and I presume that he would have mentioned the triple

conjunction (on which Kepler laid such stress), if he had accepted the

calculation, even though it does not suit the date 7-6, to which he

inclines. The coincidence, however, seems worthy of mention, but it is

not presented as an argument.

But, while we lay no stress upon it as an argument, the subject is so

interesting, and presents so many curious coincidences, that a few

paragraphs may profitably be devoted to it.

The conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the constellation Pisces,

according to a Jewish belief of some antiquity, [87] is the sign of the

Messiah's coming. If there existed some belief that the coming of a

King of the Jews was to be heralded thus, the occurrence of the

phenomenon would necessarily arrest the attention of the

astrology-loving priests in the East. Kepler's theory was, that just as

the conjunction in 1604 of Jupiter and Saturn, culminated in 1605 in

the conjunction of Jupiter, Saturn and Mars, and was followed by the

appearance of a new and brilliant star, which disappeared again after

about eighteen months, so in BC. 7 and 6, the exactly singular

conjunctions were followed by the appearance of a new star after the

triple conjunction, and that this was the star of Matthew 2:2.

Now the visit of the Magi obviously did not occur until more than forty

days after the birth of Jesus, [88] and may probably be placed during

the winter of BC. 6-5. Kepler's theory involves that they appeared

before Herod at this time, and informed him of the reason of their

coming. Herod thereupon consulted the Jewish priests, and heard from

them that the King was to be born in Bethlehem. He also questioned the

Magi privately, and learned the exact facts with regard to the

appearance of the star, and doubtless also with regard to the whole

phenomenon in the heavens. He would learn from the Magi that the

fateful conjunction first occurred in May of the year BC. 7. Then he

sent the Magi away to Bethlehem, and awaited news of their discovery.

When they did not return, he ordered all children under two years of

age in Bethlehem to be killed. The King might have been born at any

time after the first conjunction occurred; and that was at least

eighteen months ago. Therefore, in order to make sure, the order

included every child under two.

Now about this time, as Josephus mentions, [89] Herod was troubled by a

prophecy that the power was about to pass away from him and from his

family; and the Pharisees, from favor to the wife of Pheroras (who

promised to pay their fine), predicted that the succession would come

to her and her children. Obviously, the second part of the prophecy was

pure invention, due to partisanship; but the first part was almost

certainly connected with the Jews' deep-seated belief in the coming of

a new King, the Messiah. Lewin (whose arrangement of the events in the

last three years of Herod's life seems very good) places this event in

BC. 6; Schuerer dates it in 7. One or the other must be right. Herod

put to death the ringleaders of the Pharisees, with two of his own

personal attendants, and also all those of his own household that had

associated themselves with the prediction of the Pharisees.

There occurred therefore a number of deaths among the family and

attendants of Herod in connection with the belief in the coming of a

new King.

Now Macrobius, a pagan writer about AD. 400, says that when the news

was brought to Augustus that Herod, King of the Jews, had ordered

children under two years of age in Syria to be slain, and that among

them was a son of Herod's, the Emperor remarked, "It is better to be

Herod's pig than his son". [90] It is not probable that Macrobius was

indebted to a Christian writer for this story; [91] and, therefore,

probably the story of the Massacre of the Infants was recorded in some

pagan source. The execution of the conspirators in Herod's household

perhaps occurred about the same time; but among them there is not

likely to have been a son of Herod's. Only a few months before,

however, Herod had put to death two of his sons, and the remark of

Augustus may have been prompted by hearing successively of so many

barbarities, the execution of two sons, of a number of infants, and of

several of his own family and personal attendants.

While all these statements furnish only vague presumptions, yet they

certainly tend to show that much was going on of a remarkable character

about BC. 7-6, and they fit in well with both Luke and Matthew. If the

narratives of these two writers are true, they throw much light on

Josephus and Macrobius, and receive illustration and confirmation from

them.

But that which is most certain is that our non-Christian authorities

are most meager and fragmentary. It is the extreme of uncritical and

unscholarly procedure to condemn the Christian authorities because they

tell some things which are not mentioned in any non-Christian source.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

NOTE 1

The fifteenth year of Tiberius. There are various ways of counting the

years of an emperor's reign; and doubt often exists which way is

intended, when a date is given.

Luke might reckon the years of an emperor as beginning always from the

anniversary of the day on which power was conferred on him. That mode

of reckoning seems to have been always used by the emperors of the

first century. In that case the fifteenth year of Tiberius's rule in

the provinces began near the end of AD. 25, on the anniversary of the

day when he originally received collegiate authority in the provinces.

But that method was rarely, if ever, used by the general public or by

historians in the East.

There was, however, a different method which was usually employed by

many historians and chronologists, and was officially used by the

emperors of the second and third centuries. The first year of the

emperor was estimated to run from the day on which he assumed power to

the conclusion of the current year; then the second year of the emperor

began on the first day of the following current year.

If that reckoning was followed by Luke, we should have to inquire what

system of years he followed, whether he counted the years as beginning

on the Roman system from 1st January, or on the most usual Greek system

in the Aegean lands from 23rd September, or on a common Syrian system

from 18th April. [92] On these three systems the fifteenth year of

Tiberius might begin either 1st January, BC. 25, or 23rd September, 25,

or 18th April, 25.

But according to every system it will be found that the first Passover

of Jesus' teaching was the Passover of AD. 26: the only difference

which they make to the reckoning is that John's preaching might be made

to begin a little earlier on some than on other systems.

NOTE 2

It is unfortunate that, in his admirable article on the "Chronology of

the New Testament," Mr. C. H. Turner sometimes disregards the principle

admitted by most of the recent chronologists -- that when any event was

taken as an era, the years were not reckoned beginning from that day,

but the year 1 was reckoned as the current year within which the event

occurred, as for example in the Asian year beginning 23rd September,

the year 1 of the Actian era was the year ending 22nd September, B. C.

31, although the battle of Actium was fought as late as 2nd September,

31 (so that the year 1 of this era came to an end three weeks after it

began). This principle has been proved repeatedly in the last few

years, and many difficulties, formerly found in reckoning ancient

dates, disappear as soon as it is applied. Mr. Turner follows the old

method, that the year 1 runs for twelve months from the epoch-making

event (e.g., that the first year of Herod's reign lasted for 365 days

from the day of his accession, and so on). Thus he is beset by the

difficulties that result from it: e.g., he declares that Josephus

contradicts himself when he says that Antigonus died "on the day of the

Great Fast in the consulship of Agrippa and Gallus (BC. 37),

twenty-seven years to a day since the entry of Pompey into Jerusalem in

the consulship of Antonius and Cicero (BC. 63)". Josephus, indeed, has

admitted not a few faults and slips into his historical works; but it

is surely going too far to say that the two reckonings given in this

sentence contradict one another. There is no contradiction, if one

counts like Josephus. According to Mr. Turner's reckoning, the lapse of

twenty-seven years after (circa) 30th September, 63, brings us to 30th

September, 36, but it brought Josephus only to 30th September, 37; and

his two statements (made side by side in his text) agree exactly.

According to Niese in Hermes, 1893, p. 208 ff., Josephus in reckoning

the years under the Roman emperors employed a solar year of the Julian

type, but reckoned according to a Ty1ian (and perhaps common Syrian)

method so that the year began from I Xanthicus, 18th April. Josephus

also, as Niese holds, in order to avoid making the last year of one

emperor coincide with the first year of his successor, reckoned the

final year of each emperor as continuing, to the end of the current

year, and made the first year of his successor begin only on 18th April

following his accession. This was necessary if the years of the

emperors were to be used in a continuous chronological system. In this

way, the year 1 of Tiberius began on 18th April, AD. 15, and the year

22 continued to run till 17th April, AD. 37 (though the reign really

lasted from 19th August, A.D. 14, to 16th March, AD. 37, i.e.,

twenty-two years, six months, twenty-eight days). Similarly, the year 1

of Nero began only on 18th April, AD. 55, full six months after he

really began to reign.

Mr, Turner points out that Eusebius followed a similar (but not

identical) method, counting the years of every emperor from the

September after his succession.

Orosius either employed a reckoning of this character or was misled by

some authority who did so; and hence he makes the tenth year of

Claudius include an event that happened in 51, and we must suppose that

he means the fourth year of Claudius to be AD. 45, and the ninth, AD.

50 (see St. Paul the Traveller, pp. 68, 254, where I did not perceive

what was the explanation of Orosius's statements and called them

errors).

But it is clear that Josephus did not employ this kind of reckoning for

the Jewish rulers before Christ. It is more probable that he used

either the Jewish sacred year beginning 1st Nisan (usually some time in

March) or the Roman year beginning 1st January. For our purposes it

will make no difference which system we follow (though there are, of

course, many cases in which it might make the difference of a year);

and as it will be simpler to use the Roman and modern reckoning from

1st January, we shall show the dates on that system.

1. Herod's reign de jure began from a decree of the Senate passed in

the consulship of Domitius and Pollio BC. 40, during the 184th Olympiad

which ended at midsummer in that year. Year 1 of Herod's reign de jure

ended on 31st December BC.. 40: year 37 of Herod's reign de jure ended

on 31st December, BC. 4.

(If the decree was passed at a Senate meeting of 1st January or 1st

February, and the Jewish reckoning from 1st Nisan be followed, the

years of Herod's reign would all be carried back one year, so that the

year 37 would end on 18th April, BC 4; but it is improbable that the

decree was passed at these first two Senate meetings.) Herod died in

the thirty seventh year of his reign de jure, i.e., in the year BC. 4,

immediately before the Passover, and perhaps (as Lewin reckons) on 1st

April.

2. Pompey entered Jerusalem on the Great Fast about the end of

September, BC. 63. In reckoning from this event, year 1 is the year

ending 31st December, BC. 63; year 27 is the year ending 31st December,

BC. 37; Herod succeeded as de facto king on the same fast day,

twenty-seven years after Pompey entered Jerusalem, i.e., about the end

of September, BC. 37, in which year the consuls were Agrippa and

Gallus. Year 1 of Herod's reign de facto ended 31st December, BC. 37;

year 18 of Herod's reign de facto ended 31st December, BC. 29; year 34

of Herod's reign de facto ended 31st December, BC. 4.

Herod died in the year 34 of his reign de facto, i.e., in the year BC.

4. This agrees exactly with the previous result.

Now the Temple began to be built in the eighteenth year of Herod, i.

e.,BC. 20. In reckoning from this event (John 2:20), the Jews would

presumably count according to their own system of sacred years

beginning 1st Nisan. There is therefore a doubt what was the first year

of the building of the Temple. If the building began in January-March,

BC. 20, the first year would end at 1st Nisan 20, and would begin from

1st Nisan, BC. 21; but if the building began in April or later, the

first year would end at 1st Nisan in BC. 19. We take the latter as more

probable. Then the year 1 of the building of the Temple begins on 1st

Nisan, BC. 20; year 46 of the building of the Temple begins on 1st

Nisan, AD. 26.

The Jews disputing with Jesus at the Passover in the middle of Nisan

AD. 26 would therefore on their system of reckoning call it the 46th

year. "Forty and six years has this temple been in course of building

(and is still building)." [93]

It is apparent how many uncertainties are caused in ancient chronology,

through the variety of systems of reckoning the year, and other

variations in different cities. We have not indicated nearly all such

causes of doubt. For example, as M. Clermont Ganneau says, the Seleucid

era was reckoned from 1st October, BC. 312, but the era of Damascus was

reckoned from 23rd March of the same year.

NOTE 3

A different explanation of Luke's chronology may be approved by some,

and it therefore deserves a place here. I am not aware that it has been

advocated; but in all probability it has found some supporters, like

every other possible view on this subject.

It is founded on the theory -- which some think highly probable -- that

Luke considered the teaching of Jesus to have extended only over a

little more than twelve months, beginning shortly before the Passover

in one year and ending with the Passover of the following year. On that

theory one might interpret the fifteenth year of Tiberius's reign in

the usual way, from his assumption of power after the death of

Augustus, 19th August, AD. 14. If, as many historians did, Luke

reckoned the first year of Tiberius to end on 31st December, AD. 14,

and the fifteenth year to begin 1st January, AD. 28, the baptism of

Jesus would have to be placed early in that year, and the crucifixion

at the Passover of 29. If, on the other hand, he reckoned the first

year of Tiberius from 19th August, AD. 14, to 18th August, AD. 15, then

the baptism of Jesus would have to be placed early in 29, and the

crucifixion in AD. 30; but we have already set aside this supposition

as less probable.

According to this method of explanation it would be necessary to

suppose that in 3:23 Luke depended on an excellent authority, who knew

both the correct age when Jesus began his teaching and the fact that

the teaching lasted three years and a few months; but in 3:1-2 he

depended on his own reckoning, founded on his false impression that the

teaching lasted only one year and a few months. The fact would remain

clear and certain that the crucifixion took place in AD. 29, and the

teaching really began in the early spring of 26 (exactly as we have

placed them).

There seems to us to be no necessity for supposing this partial error

on Luke's part.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[75] The less definite form is strictly correct: Jesus was thirty years

and a few months, more or less.

[76] Hegemonia, hegemonia, is the word; on its sense see Chapter 11.

[77] Mommsen quotes a remarkable case in the Monumentum Ancyranum where

Augustus's desire to be precise and certain has exposed his statement

of a number to be interpreted in three different ways by different

writers.

[78] Prosopographia Imp. Rom., 2., p. 183; Mommsen, Staatsrecht, 2., p

1159.

[79] See Note at end of chapter 10.

[80] See Note at end of chapter 10.

[81] See Mr. Turner in Dr. Hastings' Dict. of Bible, 1., p. 406.

[82] In Dr. Hastings' Dict. of Bible.

[83] Yet compare John 12:1 and Mark 14:1. See Note at the end of

Chapter 4.

[84] See Note 2 at the end of Chapter 10.

[85] On Hippolytus see Mr. Turner's remarks, l. c. p. 413, col. 2.

[86] Reading "a feast" instead of "the feast" (heorte for he heorte).

[87] Mr. Turner says: "The statement of a medieval Jew, R. Abarbanel,

that the conjunction of these two planets in Pisces is to be a sign of

Messiah's coming, may perhaps have been derived ultimately from ancient

traditions known to the Chaldaeans".

[88] The ceremony in Jerusalem, Luke 2:22, could not have taken place

after the visit of the Magi, for the flight into Egypt must have

followed immediately on the visit.

[89] Ant. Jud., 17., 2, 4.

[90] Augustus must have uttered the witticism in Greek: the pun (hun

ehuion) is lost in Latin or English: see Macrobius, Sat., 2., 4.

[91] (1) The pagans of that time were strongly prejudiced against

Christians and not likely to quote them. (2) A Christian author would

have spoken about Palestine, not about Syria.

[92] See below, Note 2.

[93] See Mr. Turner on his p. 405.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CHAPTER 11

QUIRINIUS THE GOVERNOR OF SYRIA

WE come now to the last serious difficulty in Luke's account of the

"First Enrollment". He says that it occurred while Quirinius was

administering Syria.

The famous administration of Syria by Quirinius lasted from about AD. 6

to 9; and during that time occurred the" Great Enrollment" and

valuation of property in Palestine. [94] Obviously the incidents

described by Luke are irreconcilable with that date.

There was found near Tibur (Tivoli) in AD. 1764 a fragment of marble

with part of an inscription, which is now preserved in the Lateran

Museum of Christian Antiquities, as one of the important monuments

bearing on the history of Christianity. The inscription records the

career and honors of a Roman official who lived in the reign of

Augustus, and survived that emperor. He conquered a nation; he was

rewarded with two Supplicationes and the Ornamenta Triumphalia, i.e.,

he gorgeous dress of a triumphing general, with ivory scepter and

chariot, etc.; he governed Asia as proconsul; and he twice governed

Syria as legatus of the divine Augustus.

Though the name has perished, yet these indications are sufficient to

show with practical certainty (as all the highest authorities are

agreed -- Mommsen, Borghesi, de Rossi, Henzen, Dessau, and others),

that the officer who achieved this splendid career was Publius

Sulpicius Quirinius. His government of Syria, AD. 6-9, was therefore

his second tenure of that office. He had administered Syria at some

previous time. Is not this earlier administration the occasion to which

Luke refers?

Here again, however, we are confronted with a serious difficulty. The

supreme authority on the subject, Mommsen, considers that the most

probable date for Quirinius's first government of Syria is about BC.

3-1; but the question is involved in serious doubts, which Mommsen

fully acknowledges. That time is doubly inconsistent with Luke: Herod

was dead before it, and it is inconsistent with the whole argument of

the preceding pages that the enrollment should have been postponed so

long after the periodic year BC. 9.

Again, Luke does not specify exactly what was the Roman office which

Quirinius held at the time when this first enrollment was made. The

Greek word which he uses hegemoneuontos tes Surias Kureniou occurs

elsewhere in his History, indicating the office of procurator (Luke

3:1; so hegemon, Acts 23:24, 26, 33; Acts 24:1, 10 and Acts 26:30) and

the noun connected with it is even used (Luke 3:1) to indicate the

supreme authority exercised by the reigning Emperor in a province.

Hence the word, as employed by Luke, might be applied to any Roman

official holding a leading and authoritative position in the province

of Syria. It might quite naturally denote some special mission of a

high and authoritative nature; and many excellent authorities have

argued that Quirinius was dispatched to Syria on some such mission, and

that Luke, in assigning the date, mentions him in preference to the

regular governor.

We find, then, that uncertainty reigns both as to the date of

Quirinius's first governorship, and as to whether Luke called him

governor or intended to indicate that he held a special mission in

Syria.

Let us now scrutinize closely the evidence bearing on the career of

Quirinius. We shall find that, as in so many other cases, a firm grasp

of the clue that Luke offers us will guide us safely through a

peculiarly entangled problem, and will illuminate a most obscure page

of history. The difficulties of the case are due to the contempt in

which Luke's testimony has been held by the historians and one school

of theologians, and the timorous and faltering belief of others.

The only certain dates in the life of Quirinius are his consulship in

BC. 12, his second government of Syria beginning in AD. 6, his

prosecution of his former wife, Domitia Lepida, in AD. 20, and his

death and public funeral in AD. 21. It is certain that during the

eighteen years' interval between his consulship, BC. 12, and his second

Syrian administration, AD. 6, the following important events in his

career occurred.

1. He held office in Syria, and carried on war with the Homonadenses, a

tribe in the inner mountainous district lying between Phrygia, Cilicia

and Lycaonia: he gained in this war successes which were judged so

important that two solemn acts of thanksgiving to the gods

(supplicationes) in Rome were decreed, and the decorations of a

triumphing general were awarded to him. The two supplicationes were

probably awarded for victories in two successive years, for a

supplicatio was the compliment awarded for a successful campaign, and

it is hardly probable that two such compliments would be paid to a

general in one year for a single war against one tribe. Moreover,

taking into consideration the difficult character of the country where

the war occurred, the distance from Syria, the strength of the tribe

which had successfully defied the armies of King Amyntas, and the

stubborn resistance likely to be offered at point after point and town

after town in their large territory, it is quite natural that two

campaigns might be required for the whole operations. It is, however,

not wholly impossible that two specially brilliant victories may have

been gained in one year over the tribe, and that each was thought

worthy of a supplicatio.

2. Quirinius governed Asia after his first administration of Syria.

This was usually an annual office, and the probability therefore is

that in his case also it lasted only one year. The exact date is

uncertain. We know with great probability that

Asinius Gallus governed Asia in BC. 6-5.

Cn. Lentulus Augur governed Asia in BC. 2-1, also BC. 1-AD. 1 [95]

M. Plautius Silvanus governed Asia in AD. 1-2.

Marcius Censorinus governed Asia in AD. 2-3.

Further, Quirinius was probably in Armenia in AD. 3, as tutor of Gaius

Caesar. There are therefore open for Quirinius's tenure of the

proconsulship of Asia only the years BC. 5-4, or 4-3, or 3-2, or AD.

4-5, or 5-6.

Again, as M. Waddington, the supreme authority on the subject, points

out, the normal interval between the consulship and the proconsulate of

Asia during Augustus's reign was five or six years. The only long

interval known in that period is twelve years, viz., in the case of Cn.

Lentulus Augur, who was consul BC. 14 and proconsul of Asia BC. 2. It

is therefore not probable that Quirinius's proconsulate was postponed

over such a long interval as sixteen years (BC. 12 to AD. 4). We

therefore conclude that he was probably governor of Asia some years

between BC. 5 and 2, and at latest BC. 3-2. Now, his Syrian

administration was earlier, and therefore BC. 4-3 is the latest that he

can have spent in Syria.

Thus already we find ourselves led to a different opinion from

Mommsen's theory.

3. When Lollius, the tutor of Augustus's young grandson Gaius Caesar,

who was charged with the arrangement of the Armenian difficulties, died

in AD. 2, Quirinius was selected as his successor, obviously on the

ground of his great experience in Eastern service. Thereafter he must

have spent AD. 3 in Armenia, and probably remained in company with

Gaius until the latter, coming back towards Italy wounded and ill, died

on the Lycian coast on 21st February, AD. 4.

Zumpt, however, argued that Quirinius was sent to Armenia with Gaius

Caesar in BC. 1; and that afterwards Lollius took his place. We follow

Mommsen; but it is obvious how difficult and slippery the whole career

of Quirinius is, and how slow we should be to condemn Luke for an error

in regard to him.

4. Quirinius married Domitia Lepida at some unknown date. He afterwards

divorced her, and accused her of attempting to poison him in A. D. 20.

Suetonius mentions, as a fact which roused general sympathy for

Domitia, that the accusation was brought in the twentieth year after.

We ask, "After what?" Common-sense shows Mommsen and others to be right

in understanding "the twentieth year after the marriage"; we therefore

reject the other interpretation "the twentieth year after the divorce".

[96] Mommsen supposes that the marriage was contracted in AD. 4, when

Quirinius returned from his honorable duties in Armenia, and that

Suetonius makes a great exaggeration when he speaks of the twentieth

year. But in such an obscure subject it is surely best to follow the

few authorities whom we have, unless they are proved to be inconsistent

with known facts. Suetonius is a good authority. Can we not justify him

to some extent?

Domitia Lepida had been betrothed to Augustus's elder grandson, Lucius

Caesar, and on his premature death was married to Quirinius. Now Lucius

died on 20th August, AD. 2. But the Romans of that period showed the

minimum of delicacy in respect of marriages. As soon as the betrothed

husband of a wealthy and noble heiress died, the place was open to

reward some of Augustus's trusted servants; and no long delay is likely

to have occurred in giving her a substitute for Lucius. It is probable

that she was married to Quirinius in the autumn of AD. 2, and thus the

accusation was brought against her in the nineteenth year (according to

Roman methods of counting) from her marriage. In round numbers the

populace would talk of "the twentieth year," and thus Suetonius's

expression is justified; he professes to be reporting the common talk

about the trial.

We conclude, then, that Quirinius was in Rome in the autumn of AD. 2;

and was then honored with this grand marriage and the post of guardian

to the future emperor, Gaius Caesar. But such honors as this imply that

his career in preceding years had been very distinguished. Thus we

become still more firmly convinced that his pro-consulate in Asia was

past as well as his government of Syria, and that these positions, with

the experience in Oriental affairs acquired in them, marked out

Quirinius as the proper person to guide the inexperienced Gaius Caesar,

and to set right the muddle which had been produced by the headstrong

and ill-regulated conduct of Lollius, the previous guardian of the

young prince.

These lines of reasoning make it most probable that the two years

during which Quirinius was administering Syria and conquering the

Homonadenses cannot have been later than BC. 5-3, and may have been

earlier.

The same result follows from the consideration that the punishment of

the Homonadenses is not likely to have been postponed so late as the

years BC. 3-2. The presence of a tribe of barbarians, hostile and

victorious, on the frontier of the Roman provinces Galatia and

Pamphylia, and adjoining the dependent kingdom of Cilicia Tracheia

governed by Archelaos, must have been a source of constant danger. We

know that about BC. 6 the pacification of the mountainous Pisidian

districts in the south of the Galatic province was proceeding, and the

system of military roads was being constructed; [97] and this operation

was probably coincident with or even subsequent to the war against the

Homonadenses.

But here we find ourselves face to face with the difficulty which has

determined Professor Mommsen to place the first Syrian government of

Quirinius in BC. 3-1. Quinctilius Varus governed Syria for at least

three years, 7-4 BC.: this is rendered quite certain by dated coins of

Syrian Antioch struck in his name, [98] and by the statement of Tacitus

that he was governing Syria during the disturbances that followed on

the death of Herod. [99] Sentius Saturninus certainly governed Syria

9-7 BC., and Josephus says that he was succeeded by Quinctilius Varus.

[100] There seems therefore no room for Quirinius's administration of

Syria until we come down as late as BC. 3; yet we have already seen

that other lines of argument prompt us to place his Syrian government

earlier than that year.

In this difficulty I see no outlet in any direction, whether favorable

or unfavorable to Luke, except in the supposition that the foreign

relations of Syria, with the command of its armies, were entrusted for

a time to Quirinius, with a view to his conducting the difficult and

responsible war against the Homonadenses, while the internal

administration of the province was left to Saturninus or to Varus

(according to the period when we place the mission of Quirinius). This

extraordinary command of Quirinius lasted for at least two years, and

had come to an end before the death of Herod in BC. 4, for we know on

the authority of Tacitus that the disturbances arising in Palestine on

that event were put down by Varus; and this trouble, as belonging to

the foreign relations of the Province, would on our hypothesis have

been dealt with by Quirinius, if he had been still in office.

The question will be put, and must be answered, whether such a

temporary division of duties in the Province is in accordance with the

Roman Imperial practice. Such a theory is not permissible, unless it is

defended by analogous cases and by natural probability. The theory was

first suggested to my mind by the analogous case of the African

administration, which from the time of Caligula onwards was divided in

such a way, that the military power, and with it the foreign policy of

the Province, was controlled by a Lieutenant of Augustus, [101] while

the internal affairs of the Province were left to the ordinary

governor, a Proconsul.

Almost simultaneously with my papers on the subject there appeared a

memoir by Monsieur R. S. Bour, [102] in which he quotes some other

analogies to justify this view. He points out that Vespasian conducted

the war in Palestine, while Mucianus was governor of Syria, from which

Palestine was dependent. Tacitus [103] styles Vespasian dux, which is

not a strictly official title, but exactly describes his actual duty.

He was a Lieutenant of the reigning Emperor Nero, [104] holding

precisely the same title and technical rank as Mucianus. We suppose

that Quirinius stood in exactly the same relation to Varus as Vespasian

in regard to Mucianus. Quirinius was a special Lieutenant of Augustus,

who conducted the war against the Homonadenses, while Varus

administered the ordinary affairs of Syria. The duties of Quirinius

might be described by calling him dux in Latin, and the Greek

equivalent is necessarily and correctly hegemon, as Luke has it.

Again, Corbulo commanded the armies of Syria in the war against Parthia

and Armenia, while Ummidius Quadratus [105] and Cestius Gallus were

governors of Syria. Josephus speaks of Gallus, but never mentions the

name of Corbulo. We suppose that Quirinius stood in the same relative

position as Corbulo, and Josephus preserves the same silence about

both.

The chief difference between the view which M. Bour holds and the

theory which we advocate is that he distinguishes this position which

Quirinius held in BC. 7-6 from the first governorship of Syria, which,

like Mommsen, he places after BC. 4. This makes the unnecessary

complication that Quirinius first commanded the Syrian armies, then

after two or three years governed Syria, and then once more governed

Syria. But M. Bour does not observe that even on the first occasion

Quirinius was legatus Augusti; and it appears quite correct to say that

in AD. 6-9 he as legatus Divi Alugusti iterum Syria obtinuit, even if

he had not been again governor of Syria after BC. 7-6.

Moreover, in the inscription recording the career of (probably)

Quirinius, there is no possible space to insert a distinct government

of Syria between his successes against the Homonadenses and his second

governorship. The inscription clearly implies that the Homonadenses

were conquered in his first Syrian administration.

It is a matter of secondary importance that M. Bour supposes Saturninus

to have ruled Syria while the enrollment of Palestine was going on, and

yet acknowledges that this occurred in BC. 7 or 6. As we have seen,

Varus came to govern Syria in the summer of BC. 7. [106]

The conclusion of the whole argument is this.

About BC. 8-5, Augustus made a great effort to pacify the dangerous and

troublesome mountaineers of Taurus, to prevent the continual plundering

Which they practiced on the peaceable provinces to which they were

neighbors, Asia, Galatia and Syria-Cilicia, and to avenge the death of

the Roman tributary King of Galatia, Amyntas, in BC. 25. On the one

hand the governor of Galatia, on the other hand the governor of Syria,

were both required in this work. Part of the mountaineers' country was

nominally part of the Province Galatia, having been formerly in the

kingdom of Amyntas (which had been transformed into the Province

Galatia). But Galatia did not contain an army; and the administration

of Syria-Cilicia had always to intervene, when Roman troops were needed

during that period on the eastern Roman frontiers.

In BC. 6 the first great step and foundation of the Roman organization

was in process of being carried out among the western and northern

mountaineers by Cornutus Aquila, governor of Galatia. A military road

system was built among them, and a series of garrison-cities (Coloniae)

was founded, Olbasa, Comama, Cremna, Parlais and Lystra. These

fortresses were connected by the Imperial roads [107] with the

governing center of Southern Galatia, the great Colonia Caesarea

Antiocheia in Southern Phrygia adjoining Pisidia.

About the same time the military operations from the side of Syria were

carried out. Josephus tells so much about Saturninus, as to make it

clear that he was not engaged in an arduous and difficult war far away

in the Taurus mountains, south from Iconium and Lystra. Either the war

was later than his time, or it was conducted by a distinct official. As

to the official's name there is no doubt. Strabo [108] tells us that it

was Quirinius who conquered the Homonadenses and revenged the death of

Amyntas. The period is, on the whole, likely to coincide with the

connected operations of Cornutus Aquila on the north-western side.

Accordingly, the probability is that in BC. 7, when Varus came to

govern Syria, Augustus perceived that the internal affairs of the

province would require all the energy of the regular governor, and sent

at the same time a special officer with the usual title, Lieutenant of

Augustus, to administer the military resources of the province, and

specially to conduct the war against the Homonadenses and any other

foreign relations that demanded military intervention. Moreover, Varus

had no experience in war; and an experienced officer was needed. Thus,

Quirinius conducted the war pretty certainly in BC. 6, perhaps in 7 and

6, perhaps in 6 and 5.

The first periodic enrollment of Syria was made under Saturninus in BC.

8-7. The enrollment of Palestine was delayed by the causes described

until the late summer or autumn of BC. 6. At that time, Varus was

controlling the internal affairs of Syria, while Quirinius was

commanding its armies and directing its foreign policy.

Tertullian, finding that the first periodic enrollment in Syria was

made under Saturninus, inferred too hastily that the enrollment in

Palestine was made under that governor. With full consciousness and

intention, he corrects Luke's statement, and declares that Christ was

born during the census taken by Sentius Saturninus. Luke, more

accurately, says that the enrollment of Palestine was made while

Quirinius was acting as leader (hegemon) in Syria.

The question will perhaps be put whether Luke could rightly describe

the authority of Quirinius by the words "holding the Hegemonia of

Syria". The preceding exposition leaves no doubt on this point. The

usage of Luke shows that he regards Hegemonia in the provinces as the

attribute both of the Emperor and of the officers to whom the Emperor

delegates his power. Now that is quite true in point of fact. The

Emperor primarily held the supreme authority in Syria (which was one of

the Imperatorial provinces, as distinguished from those which were

administered by the Senate through the agency of its officers, entitled

Proconsuls). But the Emperor could not himself be present in Syria or

in Palestine, hence he delegated to substitutes, or Lieutenants, the

exercise of his authority in the various provinces which were under his

own direct power. These substitutes, when of senatorial rank, bore the

title Legatus Augusti pro praetore, and when of equestrian rank the

title Procurator cum jure gladii; but both Legati and Procuratores are

called by Luke Hegemones, as exercising the Hegemonia that belongs to

the Emperor. Now Quirinius was exercising this delegated Hegemonia over

the armies of the Province Syria, and it seems quite in keeping with

Luke's brief pregnant style to say that he held the Hegemonia of Syria.

But why did Luke not name Varus, the ordinary governor, in place of

dating by the extraordinary officer? If he had had regard to the

susceptibilities of modern scholars, and the extreme dearth of

knowledge about the period, which was to exist 1800 years after he

wrote, he would certainly have named Varus. But he was writing for

readers who could as easily find out about Quirinius as about Varus,

and he had no regard for us of the nineteenth century. Quirinius ruled

for a shorter time than Varus, and he controlled the foreign relations

of the province, hence he furnished the best means of dating.

But why did Luke not distinguish clearly between this enrollment and

the later enrollment of A. D. 7, which was held by Quirinius in Syria

and in Palestine? We answer that he does distinguish, accurately and

clearly. He tells that this was the first enrollment of the series, but

the moderns are determined to misunderstand him. They insist that Luke

confused the use of comparative and superlative in Greek, and that we

cannot take the full force of the word "first" as "first of many". They

go on to put many other stumbling-blocks in the way, but none of these

cause any difficulty if we hold fast to the fundamental principle that

Luke was a great historian who wrote good Greek of the first century

kind.

NOTE 1

Quinctilius Varus, governor of Syria. The exact date is shown by the

coins of Antioch, which bear the numbers ke, ks', kz' of the Actian

era, accompanied by the name of Varus. Now the battle of Actium was

fought on 2nd September, 31. When such an event was taken as an era,

the years were not (as was formerly assumed by many authorities) made

to begin from the anniversary of the event. The years went on as

before; but the current year in which the event occurred was reckoned

the year 1. Hence, in countries where the Greek year common in the

Aegean lands, beginning at the autumn equinox, was employed, the year 1

of the Actian era was BC. 32-31 (beginning 24th September, 32).

But that system could not be the one which was employed in reckoning

the Actian years at Antioch, for the year 26 in that case would end in

the autumn of BC. 6. Now, coins of the Actian year 26 mention the

twelfth consulship of Augustus, which did not begin till 1st January,

BC. 5; similarly coins of the year 29 (ending on that system in autumn

BC. 3) mentioned the thirteenth consulship of Augustus, which did not

begin until 1st January, BC. 2.

The Actian years in Antioch were therefore reckoned by a system in

which the years began before 2nd September. It is probable that the

year which was sometimes used in Syria, beginning on 18th April, may

have been employed also in Antioch. But whatever the exact day of New

Year was, the following table shows the system of Actian years in

Antioch: --

Actian year 1 ended in spring (perhaps 17 th April), BC. 30

Actian year 25 ended in spring (perhaps 17 th April), BC. 6

Actian year 27 ended in spring (perhaps 17 th April), BC. 4

Actian year 29 ended in spring (perhaps 17 th April), BC. 2

Varus, therefore, came to Syria at such a time that coins marked 25

were struck after his arrival, i.e., he arrived probably soon after

midsummer of that year, i.e., July to September, BC. 7. He remained in

Syria until at least the midsummer of BC. 4, some months after the

death of Herod.

NOTE 2

The theory has also been advanced that Quirinius was one of a number of

commissioners, appointed by Augustus to hold the enrollment throughout

the Roman world, Quirinius being the commissioner for Syria and

Palestine. In this capacity, also, Quirinius would be a delegate

exercising the Emperor's authority, Legattts Augusti; and therefore he

might rightly be said by Luke hegemoneuein tes Surias This theory is

possible; it offends against no principle of Roman procedure or of

language. It may be the truth. But, on the whole, it seems to have less

in its favor than the one which has been advocated in the text. M. R.

S. Bour [109] judges of it exactly as I have done. It was advocated in

the summer of 1897 by Signor O. Marucchi in the Italian review

Bessarione.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[94] Acts 5:37; Josephus, Ant. Jud., 17., 13; 18., 1, 1.

[95] Lentulus was in office in Asia on 10th May, BC. 1, and therefore,

as Mommsen says, governed during the year 2-1 (Res Gestae D. Aug., p.

170). But, as Waddington sees (Fastes d'Asie, p. 101), Lentulus seems

to have been still in office on 12th August, and therefore probably

ruled Asia also in the year 1 BC. -- 1 AD.

[96] Mr. Furneaux takes the latter sense in his admirable edition of

Tacitus, Annals, 3., 23, and so apparently does Nipperdey also; and it

must be acknowledged that Suetonius's expression suits that. Sense and

the historical facts, however, show it to be impossible.

[97] See my Church in the Roman Empire, p. 32; C. I. L., 3., No. 6974.

[98] See Note 1 at the end of Chapter 11.

[99] Probably about 1st April, BC. 4.

[100] Ant. Jud., 17., 5, 2.

[101] Legatus Augusti pro praetore.

[102] See Note 2 at the end of Chapter 11.

[103] Hist., 1., 10.

[104] Legatus Augusti pro praetore.

[105] He was unfit for the war, Mommsen, Rom. Gesch., 5., 382 f.

Corbulo governed Syria for a time after Quadratus; but the burden

apparently was too great, and Gallus was appointed.

[106] M. Bour also finds an allusion to the universal enrollment in a

phrase of the Monumentum Ancyranum where the restored text was omnium

prov[ inciarum censure egi or statum ordinavi]; but he has not remarked

that the recovered Greek translation proves the sense and words to have

been omnium prov[ inciarum Populi Romani]... fines auxi.

[107] basilikai hodoi, Church in Rom. Emp., p. 32; Lanckoronski, Stadte

Pamphyliens, 2., p. 203.

[108] Strabo, p. 569. His account certainly suggests both that the

revenge was not delayed so late as Mommsen's view implies, and that a

good deal of time was needed to carry out all the operations involved,

the foundation of new cities, the transference of population, etc.

[109] L'Inscription de Quirinius et le Recensement de St. Luc, Rome,

1897: a treatise crowned by the Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia.

This skillful argument was presented to the Academy in Dec., 1806, and

published in the late summer or autumn of 1897. It refers in a

concluding note to my papers on the same subject in Expositor, April

and June, 1897.
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PART 3

SOME ASSOCIATED QUESTIONS

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CHAPTER 12

SOME ASSOCIATED QUESTIONS

A BRIEF reference to some of the other difficulties, which have been

found in Luke's references to matters of contemporary history, will

form a fitting conclusion to this study.

In some cases all that is wanted to solve the difficulty is proper

understanding of Luke's words. That, for example, is the case with Acts

11:28, where the statement, that in the days of Claudius there was

famine over all the world, has been misinterpreted to imply that

harvests failed and a famine ensued in every part of the whole world at

exactly the same time, which would be an obvious exaggeration, and

therefore not entirely trustworthy: it would be quite in the rhetorical

style of Tacitus or Juvenal, not in the simple and true manner of Luke.

But, as all the commentators have pointed out, Suetonius, Dion Cassius,

Tacitus and Eusebius mention scarcity occurring at different times in

widely scattered parts of the Roman world during that reign; and an

inscription has been interpreted (though not with certainty) as

referring to a famine in Asia Minor some years before AD. 56. [110] At

no period in Roman history are so many allusions to widespread famine

found as under Claudius. Luke refers to what must then have been an

accepted belief, that at some time or other during the reign of

Claudius every part of the Roman world suffered from famine.

A much more difficult case occurs in Acts 5:36-37, where Gamaliel in

addressing the Sanhedrin says: "Before these days rose up Theudas,

giving himself out to be somebody, to whom a number of men, about 400,

joined themselves, who was slain, and all, as many as obeyed him, were

dispersed and came to naught. And after this man rose up Judas the

Galilean in the days of the enrollment' and caused people to revolt

under his leadership: he also perished; and all, as many as obeyed him,

were scattered abroad."

Now Josephus describes "a certain magician, named Theudas, who, while

Fadus was Procurator of Judea, persuaded most of the people ton

pleiston ochlon to take up their property and follow him to the river

Jordan; for he told them he was a prophet, and he said that he would

divide the river by his command and afford them easy passage through

it; and he deceived many by telling them this. Fadus, however, did not

permit them to profit by their folly, but sent a squadron of cavalry

against them, which falling unexpectedly upon them, slew many of them

and captured many alive. And they took Theudas himself alive and cut

off his head and brought it to Jerusalem "(Ant Jud., 20., 5, 1).

In the following paragraph Josephus describes what happened under the

government of Tiberius Alexander, the successor of Fadus; and, among

other things, he tells that "the sons of Judas the Galilean were slain,

viz., that Judas who caused the people to revolt from the Romans when

Quirinius was making the valuation of Judea".

It is pointed out that in two successive paragraphs Josephus speaks

first of Theudas and then of Judas, dating the latter under Quirinius;

and that in two successive verses Luke speaks first of Theudas and then

of Judas, dating the latter at the great enrollment (i.e., under

Quirinius). From this the inference is drawn that Luke, reading

hurriedly and carelessly the passage of Josephus, falsely inferred that

Theudas, who is mentioned first, was the elder; and they point to the

analogy, between the two accounts of Judas, [111] as evidence that Luke

borrowed from Josephus.

Finally, since Josephus's Theudas rose and fell several years after

Gamaliel is supposed to have delivered his speech, they infer that Luke

had no authority for the words which he puts into Gamaliel's mouth, but

freely invented the whole according to a common practice among ancient

historians. Luke, as they say, constructed a suitable speech for

Gamaliel out of his own scrappy and inaccurate reading, and thus made

Gamaliel describe an event that had not yet occurred, supposing it to

have taken place before AD. 6.

Without doubt, if this theory is correct, we must throw up our whole

case as hopeless. The blunder attributed to Luke is so ingeniously

many-sided as to destroy his credit in various directions. It shows

that he invented his speeches without authority; that he was incapable

of reading two short paragraphs of Greek without misunderstanding them;

that, even when he had a good authority before him, he could not report

his information without introducing a portentous blunder; that he was

so ignorant of Judean history as to think that an event which Josephus

dates under Fadus could be, in the first place, older than Gamaliel's

speech (delivered soon after AD. 29 or 30), and, in the second place,

older than the great enrollment. The most wretched old chronicler, in

the worst and most ignorant Byzantine time, has not succeeded in doing

anything so bad as that. To find a parallel instance of ignorance and

stupidity, where knowledge is professed and must be expected, one must

come down to modern times and look in the papers of rejected candidates

in a "pass" examination, who have vainly tried, with the minimum of

care and work, to delude the examiner into the belief that they know

enough to be permitted to scrape through the test.

But is not this too gross a blunder? Is it credible that a person who

was so shockingly ignorant and inaccurate should aspire to be a

historian? The aspirations of men are usually Founded on the conscious

possession of some qualifications for success. Luke evidently aimed --

and probably was the first to aim -- at connecting the story of the

development of Christianity with the course of general Imperial

history. Surely he would not have aimed at doing so, unless he

possessed a certain moderate knowledge of that history. In his preface

he declares that his motive for writing his work was that he was in

possession of such exceptionally excellent information, gained from

first-rate authorities. But only the grossest incapacity and ignorance

combined could have enabled him to succeed in attaining so colossal a

blunder.

The theory seems to me incredible, irrational, and psychologically

impossible. It is irreconcilable with the known facts and the character

of Luke's History; and I am confident that if it had been stated about

any writer who was not a Christian, it would have been universally

treated with the contempt that it merits. It is the sort of fancy that

brands its originator and its believer as either lacking the critical

faculty or blinded by prejudice.

Moreover, the theory is founded on an accidental peculiarity of order

in the text of Josephus, and presupposes that Luke was indebted

entirely to one passage of Josephus for his knowledge of Theudas and

Judas. He could hardly have read any additional authority without

acquiring some more correct idea as to the time when Theudas lived.

It is not here the place to discuss the question whether Luke had read

Josephus. As Dr. Sanday [112] says, the assumption that he used the

Jewish Antiquities "rests on little more than the fact that both

writers relate or allude to the same events, though the differences

between them are really more marked than the resemblances". He adds

that "Schuerer [113] sums up the controversy by saying that either Luke

had taken no notice of Josephus at all, which he thinks the simpler and

more probable supposition, or at once forgot everything that he had

read". The latter opinion is that of a scholar who believes Luke to

have written after Josephus. We hold Luke to have written before him.

In truth there is between Luke and Josephus the minimum of resemblance

and the maximum of discrepancy possible between two authorities writing

about the same period, and both (as we believe) enjoying access to

excellent authorities.

Moreover, it is clear, on the recognized principles of critical study,

that Luke used some other authority and was not indebted to Josephus

alone; for he mentions the exact number of persons who followed

Theudas, viz., 400, whereas Josephus would lead one to believe that

Theudas had a very much larger following. [114] Thus Luke had other

means of learning the date of Theudas. It may be answered that Luke

invented the number, and designedly or through incapacity varied from

the account that Josephus gives. To that no reply need be given: they

who say so will be ready to declare that Luke, who could read Josephus

and suppose the procurator Fadus to be older than the great enrollment,

was equally capable of reading any number of additional authorities

without profiting by them!

We cannot, it is true, tell who was the Theudas to whom Gamaliel

refers. The period is very obscure; Josephus is practically our only

authority. He does not allude, or profess to allude, to every little

disturbance on the banks of the Jordan. There is no real difficulty in

believing that more than one impostor may have borne or taken the name

Theudas; that one Theudas, amid the troubles that followed the death of

Herod the Great (a period about which we have no information except

that there were great troubles, calling for the presence of a Roman

army from the Province Syria), or at some earlier time, pretended to be

somebody, and found 400 followers; and that another Theudas, about AD.

44-46, called himself a prophet, and led after him a great part of the

Jewish people.

The result is, at present, disappointing. We have to leave the

difficulty unsolved. We must hope for the discovery of further

evidence. Meantime, no one who finds Luke to be a trustworthy historian

in the rest of his History will see any difficulty in this passage.

But there is good cause to look forward confidently to the progress of

discovery. The advance in knowledge, due to the increased activity in

searching, has been immense during recent years. The whole essay, which

has been here set before the public, is founded on one discovery; and

after it was print it has been confirmed by a new find. [115]

We may suitably conclude the essay with another discovery, slight in

itself, but significant of the general trend of advancing knowledge.

[116]

The reference in Acts 10:1 to an Italic Cohort (of which Cornelius was

a centurion) has caused some difficulty and discussion in recent years.

Some excellent scholars have entertained the suspicion that this detail

is an anachronism, caused by the intrusion of circumstances that were

true at a later time into this early period. It is established by an

inscription that an Italic Cohort was stationed in Syria at a

considerably later time; and the theory is that Luke, knowing that such

a Cohort was there at the time when he wrote, either incorrectly added

this detail to the story which he learned about Cornelius, or in some

other way manipulated or invented the story. What reason he had for so

treating the story, and how precisely he treated it, the theory does

not state. It simply casts discredit in a vague way on the story,

accusing it of containing a false detail. [117]

Among non-theologians, Professor Mommsen pronounces no judgment, but

avoids making any positive suggestion about the Cohort, in his

illuminative paper in the Sitzungsberichte of the Berlin Academy, 1895,

p. 503. [118] Marquardt, in the work from which all study must always

begin in these subjects, Romische Staatsverwaltung, 2., p. 467, note 5,

accepts the words of Acts as an ordinary authority, quoting them along

with other references to an Italic Cohort. A recent discovery confirms

the position taken by Marquardt, and will probably be held by most

scholars as a sufficient proof that, in our present state of knowledge,

the suspicion that has been entertained about the reference is contrary

to the balance of evidence.

Dr. Bormann [119] publishes an inscription found recently at Carnuntum,

one of the great military stations in Pannonia, on the south bank of

the Danube, a little below Vienna. It is the epitaph of a young

soldier, Proculus, a subordinate officer (optio) in the second Italic

Cohort, who died at Carnuntum while engaged on detached service from

the Syrian army (as an officer in a corps of archers from Syria,

temporarily sent on special service and encamped at Carnuntum). [120]

Proculus was born at Philadelphia (doubtless the city of that name

beyond Jordan, the old Rabbath-Ammon), and his father bore the Syrian

name Rabilus.

As to the date of this epitaph, Bormann and Domaszewski, two of the

highest authorities, have come independently to the same conclusion.

The epitaph was found with a group of others, stamped by criteria

derived both from nomenclature, and from inscriptional and alphabetical

character, as belonging to the period of the early emperors. This group

belongs to all older cemetery, which was in use before AD. 73, when a

new camp near Carnuntum was built for the soldiers stationed there.

Further, the service on which these Syrian soldiers had come to

Carnuntum can be dated with the highest probability.

In AD. 69, Syrian detachments to the number of 13,000 men swelled the

army which Mucianus, governor of Syria, led westwards to support

Vespasian in his struggle against Vitellius. But before Mucianus

arrived on the scene, the armies of Pannonia and Moesia had declared

for Vespasian, marched into Italy, and finished the contest. Their

departure had left the northern frontier undefended against the

barbarians, Dacians, Germans, etc., beyond the Danube. As Tacitus

mentions, the Dacians showed signs of invading Moesia, and Mucianus

dispatched the Sixth Legion [121] to guard against them on the Lower

Danube. Tacitus does not say anything about the Upper Danube; but there

also the danger was so obvious, that an experienced governor like

Mucianus could hardly fail to send a guard thither also; for the words

of Tacitus (Hist., 3., 46) show that he was fully alive to the danger

all along the northern frontier. In this way we may conclude that part

of the detachments came to Carnuntum; and there Proculus died, perhaps

in AD. 70. The Syrian armies were evidently soon sent back to the East,

where the Sixth Legion is shortly afterwards mentioned as engaged in

operations in the northern parts of Syria in 73.

There was therefore an Italic Cohort stationed in Syria in AD. 69. It

was recruited from Syria, [122] and therefore, according to the

principle laid down by Mommsen, it belonged to the eastern Roman

armies. It is therefore in every way probable that an Italic Cohort was

stationed in the Province Syria, as Dr. Bormann has observed, about AD.

40, when Cornelius is mentioned as "a centurion of the Cohort called

Italic," resident in Caesarea (the Roman governmental center of

Palestine).

This discovery, it is true, does not prove conclusively that the Italic

Cohort, which had been stationed in Syria before AD. 69, was there as

early as about AD. 40. It is not beyond the range of possibility that

the Cohort might have been sent to Syria between 40 and 69. Movements

of troops from province to province were not rare, and the Italic

Cohort might have been moved in that interval. But, in general, the

movements were caused by military requirements which can be

ascertained. As Marquardt says of Syria, "the same Legions remained for

centuries in the province," and they were divided between many

different stations, not massed in single centers: for example,

detachments of the Third Legion called Gallica, can be traced in Sidon,

Beirut, Aera in the district Auranitis, and Phaena in Trachonitis. The

whole burden of proof, therefore, rests with those who maintain that a

Cohort which was in Syria before 69 was not there in 40. There is a

strong probability that Luke is right when he alludes to that Cohort as

part of the Syrian garrison about AD. 40.

A series of arguments have been advanced to buttress this assumption

that Luke when he spoke of an Italic Cohort in Syria about 40 was

guilty of an anachronism.

It is pointed out, in the first place, that between AD. 41 and 44,

during which period Judea was formed into a dependent kingdom ruled by

Herod Agrippa, a Roman Cohort would not be stationed in Caesarea. If

this were certain, it would merely confirm the view taken by many

scholars that the incident of Cornelius occurred earlier than 41. But

as a matter of fact we know far too little of the relations between the

rule of Agrippa and the provincial administration to be sure that a

centurion would not be resident in Caesarea during his short reign.

There is nothing more obscure than the precise terms on which the

numerous dependent kingdoms in Asia Minor and Syria were administered.

It is practically certain that these subject kingdoms were tributary

from the first, even when they had never before been subject to Rome;

and even Herod the Great's action was controlled by Rome in many

important respects, and his subjects took an oath to be faithful to the

Romans. But the Judean kingdom of Agrippa, as it existed in AD. 41-44,

had long been actually part of a Roman province; and there is great

probability that it might retain certain relations with the provincial

government, and that officers of the provincial soldiery might be kept

resident in the capital, Caesarea, to maintain these relations. There

is much that might be said on this point; but it is not necessary for

our main purpose. Moreover, the whole subject is so obscure that a

scholar who aims simply at understanding the subject will at present

refrain from any dogmatic statement about it, and will certainly be

very slow to condemn an ancient author for inaccuracy, because he does

not confirm the modern scholar's hasty conjecture. All that need be

said is that at present we find the argument so devoid of force that it

hardly even affords any presumption in favor of a date for the incident

of Cornelius earlier than AD. 41.

In the next place it has been argued that even between AD. 6 and 41,

when Judea was part of the Province Syria, and when Roman auxiliary

troops were stationed both at Caesarea and at Jerusalem, an Italic

Cohort cannot have been stationed at Caesarea. This assertion is based

on a series of conjectures as to the Roman forces stationed in Judea

during these years. It is fortunately unnecessary for me to discuss

these conjectures: I need only point out

(1) that they are in direct contradiction to the principles previously

laid down by Mommsen, the supreme authority on the subject; [123]

(2) that Mommsen has now considered them and judged them to be

"erroneous in every respect". [124]

But, further, even supposing that these conjectures were strong enough

to support the conclusion that the Italic Cohort was not stationed in

Caesarea, we know far too little to justify the inference that a

centurion of that Cohort could not be on duty there, detached from his

Cohort on special service. The entire subject of detachment-service is

most obscure; and. we are very far from being able to say with

certainty that the presence of an auxiliary centurion [125] in Caesarea

is impossible, unless the Cohort in which he was an officer was

stationed there.

Since the question of the Roman troops in Palestine is so full of

difficulties, that it is hardly possible to make any assertion in the

matter, what judgment should be pronounced on the light-heartedness

which suspects Luke of inaccuracy, because he does not conform to the

conjectures which some distinguished German professor sets forth? It is

a matter of interest to observe how slow some very learned New

Testament scholars are to appreciate the principle, which is regarded

as fundamental by the historical and antiquarian students, that no

conjecture which is not founded on clear evidence has any right even to

be propounded, if it contradicts the direct statement of an ancient

authority. Much less ought the ancient authority to be discredited

because he disagrees with a loose and disputed modern conjecture.

The episode of Cornelius in Acts is characterized by that vagueness and

want of direct, incisive statement of details, which Luke shows in

handling the early history of the Church in Palestine. He was not at

home in the province of Syria, and the Jewish people in particular he

neither understood nor liked. If the narrative of Cornelius showed the

same mastery of facts and surroundings as is apparent in Philippi or

Ephesus or Cyprus or Athens, we should find it far more instructive

than it is as to the way in which an officer of the Roman army of

occupation lived. Was he resident in a private house? How was he in

such close relations with the Jews throughout Palestine? Many questions

suggest themselves, pressing for an answer, which I cannot give. But

the tendency of discovery distinctly is, in this as in other cases, to

confirm the trustworthiness of the general situation.
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[110] St. Paul the Traveller, p. 48 f.

[111] en tais hemerais tes apographes kai apestese laon opi so autou in

Luke, and ton laon hapo apostesantos Kuriniou tes Ioudais timeteuontos

in Josephus.

[112] Bampton Lectures, 1893, p. 278.

[113] Lucas und Josephus in Zeitschr. f. krit. Theologie, 1876, p. 574

ff. Josephus's great work on the Jewish Antiquities was written about

AD. 93-94.

[114] peithei ton pleiston ochlon . . . hepestha are his words.

[115] See Preface.

[116] The following paragraphs are shortened and modified (but without

altering the opinions stated) from an article in the Expositor,

September, 1896.

[117] Steht . . . unter dem Verdacht, Verhaltnisse einer spateren Zeit

in eine fruhere zuruck verlegt zu haben.

[118] Mit Sicherheit vermoegen wir weder diese cohors Augusta (Acts

27:1) noch die speira Italike . . . zu identificieren.

[119] Archaol. Epigr. Mittheil. aus Oesterreich, 1895, p. 218.

[120] Ex vexil. sagit. exer. Syriaci, where Bormann's completion of the

abbreviations seems beyond question ex vexillariis sagittariis

exercitus Syriaci.

[121] This Legion, called. Ferrata, was enrolled by Augustus and

stationed in Syria. It formed part of Mucianus's army in AD. 69; and it

remained in Judea at least as late as the third century.

[122] Proculus was in his seventh year of service when he died, and had

probably enlisted in AD. 64 (when he was nineteen years old).

[123] See Mommsen in Hermes, 19., p. 217.

[124] In jeder Hinsicht verfehlt, Mommsen in Berlin. Akad. Sitz. 1895,

p. 501.

[125] Auxiliary centurions, being of lower rank than legionary, were

not employed as frumentarii (like Julius in Acts 27.); but there were

other ways of detached service.
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APPENDIX: DOCUMENTS
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THE INSCRIPTION OF QUIRINIUS

(LAPIS TIBURTINUS)

GEM � QVA � REDACTA � INPOI

AVGVSTI � POPVLIQVE � ROMANI � SENATV

SVPPLICATIONES � BINAS � OB SVPPLICATIONES � RES � PROSP

IPSI � ORNAMENTA � TRIVMPI

PRO � CONSVL SVPPLICATIONES � ASIAM � PROVINCIAM � OP

DIVI � AVGVSTI SVPPLICATIONES � ITERVM � SYRIAM � ET � PH

The following restoration is often doubtful: --

P. Sulpicius P. F. Quirinius cos., datus rector Gaio Caesari Divi

Augusti

nepot..................................................................

...... Pr., pro consule Cretam et Cyrenas provinciam optinens

Marmaridas et Garamantas

subegit................................................................

........................................................ Legatus pro

praetore Divi Augusti Syriacas legiones optinens 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 triumph alia decrevit

Proconsul Asiam provinciam optinuit, legatus pr. pr. Divi Augusti

iterum Syriam et Phoenicen provinciam optinens regnum Archelai in

provinciae formam redegit.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

THE INSCRIPTION OF AEMILIUS SECUNDUS

(LAPIS VENETUS)

Q � A E M I L I V S . � Q . � F

P A L � S E C V N D V S i n

C ^ S T R I S � D I V I � A V G . � S u b

P � S V L P I c I O � Q V I R I N I O � L E G a u g .

^5 C a E S A R I S � S Y R I A E � H O N O R I

B V S � D E C O R A T V S � P R a E F E C T

C O H O R T � A V G � I � P R a E F

� C O H O R T � I I � C L A S S I C A E � I D E M

� I V S S V � Q V I R I N I � C E N S V M � E G I

^1 0 A P A M E N A E � C I V I T A T I S � M I L

L I V M � H O M I N � C I V I V M � C X V I I

I D E M � M I S S V � Q V I R I N I � A D V E R S V S

I T V R A E O S � I N � L I B A N O � M O N T E �

C A S T E L L V M � E O R V M � C E P I � E T � A N T E

^1 5 M I L I T I E M � P R A E F E C T � F A B R V M �

D E L A T V S � A � D V O B V S � C O S � A D � A E

R A R I V M E T � I N � C O L O N I A �

Q V A E S T O R � A E D I L � I I � D V V M V I R � I I

P O N T I F E X S

^2 0 I BI � P OS IT I � S VN T � Q � A EM IL I VS � Q � F � P AL

S EC VN D VS � F � E T � A EM IL I A � C HI A � L IB

H � M � A M P L I V S � H � N � S
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THE ITALIC COHORT INSCRIPTION

(LAPIS CARNUNTENSIS)

P R O C V L V S

R A B I L I � F � C O L

P H I L A D E L � M I L �

O P T I O � C O H �I I

I T A L I C � C � R � F

T I N I � E X � V E X I L �S A

G I T � E X E R �S Y R I A C I

S T I P � V I I � V I X I T � A N

X X V I

A P V L E I V S � F R A T E

F � C �

Proculus Rabili f (ilius) Col( lina)

Philadel( phia) mil( es) optio

coh( ortis) II Italic( ae) c( ivium)

R( omanorurn centuria) F[ aus] tini,

ex vexil( lariis?) sagit( tariis?)

exer( citus) Syriaci stip( endiorum)

VII; vixit an( nos) XXVI. Apuleius

frate( r) f( aciundum) c( uravit).
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RATING PAPER: Apographe

Metrodoroi epimeleteI

para Apunchios Inarotios

hellenomemphites ^sic Apographomai

kata to ektethen prostagma

ten huparchusan ^sic moi oikian

kai aule ^sic en ton Hellenioi en topoi Imensthot

hieroi, hes metra tes men oikias p(echeis) ka epi p(echeis) ig

tes de aules p(echeis) d epi p(echeis) [. . .],

geitones pros noton oikia Taupsaitos

Phanotos, pros borran Pasitos harianios

kai hodos ana meson, pros liba

sitopoeion mou kai hodos ana meson,

pros apelioten Pokaus Petept. n. os.

Tauten oun timomai (pachmon) d' (=400).

Kai allen oikian, en e sitopoiousin

kai aule, ^sic hon metra tes men oikias

metra p(echeis) ka epi p(echeis) ig, kai tes aules p(echeis) d

epi p(echeis) ig, geitones Onnophris Horou oikias,

pros borran Pasitos tou Harianois kai hodos

ana meson, pros liba Nephergerios

Pachratou, pros apelioten he progegramene ^sic

oikia kai hodos ana meson. Tauen oun

timomai chalkou (drachmon) b' (=2000)

/ ta(lanton) a.
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Index of Greek Words and Phrases

\* [204]gunai

\* [205]parekolouthekoti

\* [206]anebe

\* [207]anataxasthai

\* [208]ap' arches

\* [209]apographesthai

\* [210]apographesthai pasan ten oikoumenen

\* [211]apographomai

\* [212]apograpsasthai

\* [213]apographe kat' oikian

\* [214]andres

\* [215]anothen

\* [216]Apographe

\* [217]Apographe

\* [218]ek tou prouptou eis to polemein te kai blaptein epermenoi

\* [219]en meso tes ekklesias

\* [220]en tais hemerais tes apographes kai apestese laon opi so autou

\* [221]eporeuonto

\* [222]heorte

\* [223]ee soi aute

\* [224]he heorte

\* [225]hegemon

\* [226]hegemonia

\* [227]hegemoneuein tes Surias

\* [228]hegemoneuontos tes Surias Kureniou

\* [229]he

\* [230]hina epignos . . . ten asphaleian

\* [231]hote proton ekeleusan apographas genesthai

\* [232]hun ehuion

\* [233]hoste apographenai pasan ten hup' auton genomenen gen kai hen

proen eichon Rhomaioi

\* [234]Augoustos

\* [235]Metrodoroi epimeleteI para Apunchios Inarotios

hellenomemphites sic

\* [236]aules

\* [237]basilikai hodoi

\* [238]dia ton keramon

\* [239]keramos

\* [240]kai

\* [241]kathos paredosan hoi autoptai

\* [242]kathexes soi grapsai

\* [243]ke

\* [244]kz'

\* [245]kratiste

\* [246]kratiste Basse

\* [247]kratistos

\* [248]ks'

\* [249]oikoumene

\* [250]palai chromenos auto philo, nun hupekoo chresetai

\* [251]pantos goun tou Ioudaikou bebaiosantos di' horkon e men

eunoesein Kaisari . . . hoide ouk omosan

\* [252]parekolouthekoti

\* [253]parekolouthekoti anothen pasin akribos

\* [254]peithei ton pleiston ochlon . . . hepestha

\* [255]prosektesanto

\* [256]speira Italike

\* [257]sumpases choras tes hupo Rhomaiois

\* [258]ta touton

\* [259]ti emoi kai soi, gunai

\* [260]ti emoi

\* [261]ton laon hapo apostesantos Kuriniou tes Ioudais timeteuontos

\* [262]ton pleiston ochlon

\* [263]ton kata ten eparchian hegemonon

\* [264]philtate
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\* [265]Collega Imperii

\* [266]Coloniae

\* [267]De uis enim instrumentis saecularia probari necesse est

\* [268]Legati

\* [269]Legatus Augusti pro praetore

\* [270]Legatus Augusti pro praetore.

\* [271]Procurator cum jure gladii

\* [272]Procuratores

\* [273]a silentio

\* [274]anni Augustorum

\* [275]atrium
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\* [277]breviarium totius imperii
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\* [279]cives Romant

\* [280]de facto

\* [281]de jure

\* [282]ex vexillariis sagittariis exercitus Syriaci.

\* [283]frumentarii

\* [284]impluvium

\* [285]lacunae

\* [286]legatus Augusti;

\* [287]legatus Divi Alugusti iterum Syria obtinuit

\* [288]libellus

\* [289]minutiae

\* [290]omnium prov

\* [291]optimus

\* [292]peristylium

\* [293]rationes imperii

\* [294]reductio ad absurdum

\* [295]supplicatio

\* [296]supplicationes

\* [297]tribunicia potestas

\* [298]tributum capitis
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\* [299]Dichtung und Wahrheit

\* [300]Ein allgemeiner Reichscensus war dazu weder nothig noch

zweckmassig

\* [301]In jeder Hinsicht verfehlt

\* [302]Mit Sicherheit vermoegen wir weder diese cohors

\* [303]Steht . . . unter dem Verdacht, Verhaltnisse einer spateren

Zeit in eine fruhere zuruck verlegt zu haben.
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