

# The Census of Publius Sulpicius Quirinius (51 BC – 21 AD) misunderstanding of Luke 2:2.

Caesar recorded his various censuses (of lustrum), according to the document Res Gestae, in his 6th consulship (28 BC), in the consulship of Gaius Censorinus and Gaius Asinius (8 BC), and in the consulship of Sextus Pompeius and Sextus Apuleius (14 CE). The Res Gestae which was written in 14 AD does not mention the Quirinius's census of Syria when he became governor in 6 AD. The Res Gestae does not mention the census of the whole world and it gives account only of the Roman population.

According to Wikipedia, Quirinius was consul in 12 BC and was actively engaged in combat from 12 BC to 1 BC. We also read that 'a Roman officer who had served under him stating among other achievements: "By order of the same Quirinius I took a census of the city of Apamea"'. In other words, Quirinius did not need to be governor of Syria to be commissioned to carry out a census. In 6 AD, he was not the only one sent for the census. He was sent with other helpers.

Also, no name can be found as to who was in charge of Syria from 4BC-1 BC. It could have been Quirinius.

Luke could not have mistaken the historical facts of his time to indicate that the Census took place in 6 AD. And if he would indicate that the census did take place in 6 AD we just have to go back and rectify our reckoning of time in the light of his categorical historical statement. The Bible is also a very old compilation of historical documents.

What does the Greek sentence structure of Luke 2:2 actually convey?

Compare Luke 2:2 with Matthew 4:3 for the placement of the Greek adverb 'prote' commanding the genitive in Luke 2:2 as exemplified by the placement of the word 'breads' which is before the verb in the Greek phrase 'say that the stones these breads are'. So, 'breads' like 'prote' must be placed after the verb in reading the verse in the English language.

Luke 2:2 does not say that the first 'apographe' was 'in the leadership of the Syria of Quirinius'. Luke 2:2 reads: 'this the 'apographe prote was' of the leadership of the Syria of Quirinius'.

In the English sentence structure, Luke 2:2 reads 'this the apographe was prote (before-most or first-most, a superlative, or way before) of the leadership of the Syria of Quirinius'.

The lexicons indicate that the Greek 'prote' is the superlative of the Greek 'pro'. If the Greek 'pro' means 'first' or 'before', the superlative 'prote' indicates something 'way first' or 'way before'. Hence, the superlative 'prote' of the leadership of the Syria of Quirinius cannot mean or be the same as the 'pro' of the leadership of the Syria of Quirinius. 'Prote' refers to something before 'pro' in the verse. Hence, the 'apographe' which leads the family of Jesus to Bethlehem is 'prote' to the 'apographe' of Quirinius.

Why does Luke feel it necessary to make the comment of Luke 2:2? He simply wants to bring the attention to the fact that he is not referring to the subsequent apographe of the leadership of Syria of Quirinius in 6 AD.

There you have it.

Luke 2:2 does not say that Jesus was born during the census which Quirinius took in 6 AD or after when he became governor of Syria.

Again, in the contrary, Luke is emphasizing that he is not referring to the census of Quirinius.