

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Declaring God's Glory Through Welfare Work
WILLIAM A. BUEGE

Studies in Discipleship
MARTIN H. FRANZMANN

Brief Studies

Homiletics

Theological Observer

Book Review

VOL. XXXI

November 1960

No. 11

BRIEF STUDIES

THE DECREE OF CLAUDIUS IN ACTS 18:2

According to the Acts of the Apostles Paul met at Corinth Aquila and his wife Priscilla, who recently (προσφάτως) had come from Italy διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης . . . (18:2). Although the bibliography on the passage is extensive, the treatment by New Testament critics frequently fails to discuss all the ramifications of the problem. We shall attempt, therefore, to evaluate the pertinent primary evidence.

Six ancient authors must be considered at the outset.

1. Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit — Suetonius, *Claudius* 25.4
2. τοὺς τε Ἰουδαίους πλεονάσαντας αἰθῆς, ὅστε χαλεπῶς ἂν ἄνευ ταραχῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου σφῶν τῆς πόλεως εἰρχθῆναι, οὐκ ἐξήλασε μὲν, τῷ δὲ δὴ πατριῷ βίῳ χρωμένους ἐκέλευσε μὴ συναθροίζεσθαι — Dio Cassius, *Historia Romana* 60.6.6
3. Anno eius nono expulsos per Claudium urbe Iudaeos Josephus refert, sed me magis Suetonius movet qui ait hoc modo: Claudius Iudaeos impulsore Chresto adsidue tumultuantes Roma expulit, quod, utrum contra Christum tumultuantes Iudaeos coerceri et comprimere iusserat, an etiam Christianos simul velut cognatae religionis homines voluerit expelli, nequaquam discernitur — Orosius, *Historia contra Paganos* 7.6.15-16
4. Κατὰ δὲ τούσδε τοὺς χρόνους Παύλου τὴν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ κύκλω πορείαν μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ διανύοντος, Ἰουδαίους Ῥώμης ἀπελαύνει Κλαύδιος, ὃ τε Ἀκύλας καὶ Πρίσκιλλα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων Ἰουδαίων τῆς Ῥώμης ἀπαλλαγέντες ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν καταίρουσιν,

ἐνταῦθά τε Παύλῳ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ συνατριβούσιν, τοὺς αὐτόθι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἄρτι πρὸς αὐτοῦ καταβληθέντας θεμελίους ἐπιστηρίζοντι. διδάσκαλος καὶ τούτων ἡ ἱερά τῶν Παράξεων γραφή — Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 2.18.9

5. No reference in Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae*
6. No reference in Tacitus, *Annales*

On comparing Suetonius with Acts 18:2, it appears that Claudius, who ruled from 41—54 A. D., expelled from Rome all Jews as a result of constant rioting. Although the ablative absolute *impulsore Chresto* has produced much controversy, we may assume that heated discussions in the Jewish community at Rome concerned the acceptance of Jesus as the Christ, and we may conjecture that Suetonius, misinterpreting his source, as he seems to do not infrequently, thought Christus (or Chrestus, as the name was often spelled, with the pronunciation no doubt being the same in the Greek of the day) was present in person to stir up trouble. Suetonius, who lived ca. 75—160 A. D., serving for a brief period as secretary to the emperor Hadrian (117—138 A. D.), is of no help in establishing the date of the “expulsion”; for each biography in the *Lives of the Twelve Caesars* (Julius Caesar to Domitian) follows a fixed pattern: the family and birth of the emperor; his life to his principate, the events of his rule arranged by subjects rather than by chronology, his character and personal appearance, and his death.

Dio Cassius (ca. 155—230 A. D.), however, seems not only to disagree with Suetonius, but even to be refuting deliberately some statement that Claudius had expelled the Jews. Dio's *Roman History* covered originally in eighty Books the period from the

supposed landing of Aeneas in Italy to his own time. The extant portions are Books 34—60, which cover 70 B. C. to 46 A. D.; Books 78 and 79; and the Paris fragments, which include the events of the years 207 to 200 B. C. Also extant are some excerpts and quotations made by later writers, and especially the epitome of Books 1—30 made by Zonaras in the twelfth century, and the epitome of Books 61—80 made by Xiphilinus toward the end of the eleventh century. Since Dio Cassius is far superior as a historian to Suetonius, following as closely as he can his great exemplar Thucydides, his remarks are not to be taken lightly. Although his work originally bridged approximately one thousand years, for the early Empire (or from Julius Caesar to Marcus Aurelius) he apparently relied on such official accounts as the emperors allowed to be published.

The disagreement between Dio Cassius and Suetonius has led some scholars to conclude that their respective remarks do not refer to the same occasion.¹ The statement of Dio, it is true, occurs in his discussion of the events of 41 A. D., the first year of Claudius' reign; while Orosius (loc. cit.; cf. supra) definitely dates an expulsion in the ninth year of Claudius (49 A. D.). Claudius' pro-Jewish edict² of the year 42 A. D., however, seems inconsistent with the early date implied by Dio Cassius. Orosius, moreover, cites Josephus as his source for the date, although there is no reference in the extant works of Josephus to such an expulsion of the Jews by Claudius. Orosius, furthermore, who died ca. 418 A. D., as presbyter in Africa, is frequently referred to as notoriously inaccurate. Also the silence of Tacitus, whose extant writ-

ings cover the second part of Claudius' reign, must be explained in any discussion of the later date (49 A. D.).³ The statement of Eusebius is of little assistance, since Acts is apparently his only source. Nor can the adverb πρόσφατως (Acts 18:2) be decisive on the date; for while "recently" seems inclined to the later date (49 A. D.), the adverb in Greek as well as in English is relative. Aristotle employs the cognate πρόσφατος in referring to Homer (*Meteorologica* 351b35).

In spite of the difficulties involved, and assuming that Suetonius and Cassius are referring to the same incident, with some reservation the date usually is placed at approximately 49 A. D.⁴ Orosius, it is true, may have mistaken his authority as Josephus (unless he is citing a work of Josephus no longer extant, which assumption appears not too likely), but upon some authority he dates the incident in the ninth year of Claudius, which would be from Jan. 25, 49, to Jan. 25, 50 A. D. This date fits well the Pauline chronology of Acts (18:1) as enlightened by the Gallio inscriptions,⁵ and would permit the preferable interpretation of πρόσφατως (Acts 18:2). The main difficulty to the late date (49 A. D.) seems to be Dio Cassius. The extant portions of his *Roman History*, as noted above, present Claudius' reign to 46 A. D. Whether he made further mention of Claudius' decree in the

³ Tacitus' *Annales* originally covered the years 14—68 A. D. (Tiberius through Nero) in 16 books. Extant are Books 1—4; parts of Book 5 and of Book 6; and Books 11—15 with part of Book 16—covering respectively the reign of Tiberius (14—37); the second part of Claudius' rule; and the reign of Nero (54—68) except the last years.

⁴ Ramsay would prefer 50 A. D., since in one instance Orosius is off a year according to Tacitus; but one instance gives little authority for assuming that all of Orosius' dates are incorrect by a year. Cf. *St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen* (1927), pp. 68, 254, 459.

⁵ Cf. *Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. Foakes-Jackson and Lake (1933), V, pp. 460—464.

¹ Cf. Sherman Johnson, *Anglican Theological Review*, XXIII (1941), 175; M. Shepherd, "The Source Analysis of Acts" in *Munera Studiosa*, ed. Shepherd and Johnson (Cambridge, Mass.: Episcopal Theological School, 1946), p. 96.

² Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 19.5.2-3.

section no longer extant, unfortunately, cannot be determined. But since Dio's remark is general, without citing any date, he may not have intended to define the incident with the year 41 A.D.

Of more serious implication, again assuming with some reservation that Suetonius and Dio are referring to the same incident, is the nature of the decree. Dio's apparently deliberate refutation of a general expulsion of the Jews, as seemingly implied by Suetonius, no doubt has had more influence than any probable disagreement on dates in deducing that each refers to a separate incident.⁶ But must Suetonius be thus interpreted? The Latin of Suetonius may mean that Claudius' action concerned only those Jews who "were constantly rioting," not a general expulsion of all Jews from Rome. In view of Dio Cassius such an interpretation of Suetonius seems preferable. Also the silence of Tacitus, provided the incident occurred in 49 A.D., and of Josephus, seems to agree with the suggested interpretation of Suetonius. Any edict concerning the banishment of the entire Jewish population from Rome appears to be so drastic that mention of it would be expected in Tacitus and Josephus; a "police action" involving a limited number of individuals who were regarded as trouble-makers in the community, however, might have been omitted much more easily by

⁶ Kirsopp Lake oversimplifies the differences between Dio and Suetonius: "Dio Cassius confirms the evidence of Suetonius, but adds that the difficulty of expelling so many persons led to a revision of the decree, in which Claudius contented himself with forbidding Jewish assemblies" (*Beginnings of Christianity*, V, 459). Some would compare the reversal of Tiberius concerning the astrologers (Suetonius, *Tiberius* 36), but a revision of a decree concerning the expulsion of astrologers by Tiberius is hardly parallel; for the astrologers would not have been nearly so numerous as the Jewish population in Rome, and Tiberius revoked his decree only after the astrologers promised to renounce their profession.

Josephus and Tacitus. By deducing, then, that in addition to a probable forbidding of Jewish assemblies only the "ringleaders" suffered banishment, the remarks of Suetonius and Dio Cassius appear to agree as to the nature of Claudius' action.

But Acts states: διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι πάντα τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑρώμης. How much stress should be placed on πάντας? To assist in answering the query, let us examine several other passages in Acts.

Ἦσαν δὲ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ κατοικοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι, ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν (2:5)

Was *every* nation in the world represented at Pentecost?

ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἅ προκατήγγειλεν διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ, ἐπλήρωσεν οὕτως (3:18)

Did *all* the Old Testament prophets proclaim the suffering of Christ?

Ἐγένετο δε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ διωγμὸς μέγας ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις· πάντες διεσπάρησαν κατὰ τὰς χώρας τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων (8:1)

Did *all* the Christians leave Jerusalem except only the twelve apostles?

καὶ εἶδαν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες Λύδδα καὶ τὸν Σαρῶνα, οἵτινες ἐπέστρεψαν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον (9:35)

Were *all* the inhabitants of Lydda and Sharon converted?

τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ ἔτη δύο, ὥστε πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Ἀσίαν ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου, Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλληνας (19:10)

Did the Gospel reach *all* the inhabitants of the Roman province Asia during the two to three years Paul labored at Ephesus? It appears that Acts in the cases cited is employing the figure hyperbole and that the literal

meaning of πάντας in 18:2 should not be stressed.

Nor is the hyperbolic use of πᾶς peculiar to Acts. One example each from Matthew, Mark, and John will suffice.

Τότε ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία καὶ πᾶσα ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν (Matt. 3:5-6) καὶ κατεδίωξεν αὐτὸν Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶρον αὐτὸν καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ὅτι πάντες ζητοῦσίν σε (Mark 1:36-37)

καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· ῥαββί, ὃς ἦν μετὰ σοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, ᾧ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας, ἴδε οὗτος βαπτίζει καὶ πάντες ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν (John 3:26)

In addition to the figure hyperbole in the New Testament, several other aspects of πᾶς should be considered before insisting on taking πάντας in its literal sense in Acts 18:2. Xenophon of Ephesus in the second century A. D. writes (2.13.4):

πάντας ἀπέκτεινεν, ὀλίγους δὲ καὶ ζῶντας ἔλαβε. μόνος δὲ ὁ Ἰππόθοος ἠδυνήθη διαφυγεῖν

The most stress πάντας can bear here is "many," "very many," or "nearly all." In Plato's *Republic* the context indicates that πᾶς implies "composed wholly of," "nothing but," or "only" (579b):

Ἔτι ἂν, ἔφη, οἶμαι, μᾶλλον ἐν παντὶ κακοῦ εἶη, κύκλῳ φρουρούμενος ὑπὸ πάντων πολεμίων

The *Corpus Hermeticum* (13.2) contains another example of this use of πᾶς.⁷ Although πᾶς frequently denotes "every," it also may imply merely "any" — cf. Demosthenes, *First Olynthiac* 16, *Against Meidias* 2, *On the Crown* 5; Plato, *Ion* 532e, *First Alcibiades* 129a, *Apology* 39a, *Phaedo* 114c;

⁷ Cf. Sophocles, *Electra* 301, *Philoctetes* 622 and 927.

Sophocles, *Antigone* 175, *Oedipus Colonus* 761; Herodotus 4.162.4, 4.195.2; Lysias, *Against Eratosthenes* 84, *For the Soldier* 16; Xenophon, *Hellenica* 7.4.21; Matt. 13:19; Luke 1:37; Gal. 2:16.⁸

The predicate position of πάντας in Acts 18:2, furthermore, deserves consideration. It is the attributive position of πᾶς which stresses totality. Several examples from Classical Greek and from the New Testament will be sufficient.

καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲν πλείων ὁ πᾶς χρόνος φαίνεται οὔτω δὴ εἶναι ἢ μία νύξ

"For in that case eternity appears to be no greater than a single night" (Plato, *Apology* 40e)

μόνος οὗτος τῶν πάντων ἀνθρώπων

"He alone of all men" (Lycurgus 131)

τούτων δὲ κατεχομένων οὐδ' ἂν οἱ πάντες ἄνθρωποι δύναιντ' ἂν διελθεῖν

"With these [mountain peaks] occupied, neither could absolutely all the men pass through" (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 5.6.7)

τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἁγίους

"all the saints with them" (Rom. 16:15)

οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί

"all the brethren with me" (Gal. 1:2)

ἦμεθα δὲ αἱ πᾶσαι ψυχαὶ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ διακόσαι ἐβδομήκοντα ἔξ

"We in the boat were in all 276 persons" (Acts 27:37). An attributive position of πάντας in Acts 18:2, therefore, would stress totality, but the predicate position appears to permit the interpretation that only the "ringleaders" suffered banishment.

According to Dio Cassius, furthermore, the great number of the Jews in Rome at

⁸ Perhaps we should note in passing the adverbial phrase παντὸς μᾶλλον, denoting "more than anything" (Plato, *Crito* 49b, *Protagoras* 344b, *Gorgias* 527b, *Phaedrus* 228d), and equating "quite so" in answers (Plato, *Phaedo* 67b).

that time would have made it difficult for Claudius to have expelled the entire Jewish population. Other primary evidence seems to corroborate Dio. As early as Cicero's *Pro Flacco*,⁹ delivered in 59 B.C., the Jews in Rome who possessed citizenship were numerous enough to influence the political assemblies and the jury courts of the Romans, and the amount of gold sent yearly to Jerusalem from Italy and the provinces caused alarm to some statesmen of Rome. In 4 A.D., it is believed, more than 30,000 Jews lived in Rome, for above 8,000 joined a deputation from Jerusalem.¹⁰ The number of Jews at Rome under Tiberius no doubt was even larger, for he was able to draft 4,000 Jews from Rome for military service.¹¹ Scholars, therefore, estimate that the Jewish population at Rome at the time of Claudius may have been as high as 50,000—a rather large group to be expelled.

The usual policy of Rome, likewise, seems to have been the banishment only of the leading Jewish propagandists. Already in 139 B.C. an aggressive spirit of proselytism led to such action.¹² Also under Tiberius the legislation appears to have been leveled against those who were highly suspected, or convicted of guilt, or overzealous in making converts among the native Romans.¹³ Thus Claudius' decree concerned perhaps only

⁹ 28.66—69.

¹⁰ Cf. Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 17.11.1, *Bellum Judaicum* 2.6.1.

¹¹ Cf. Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 18.3.5; Tacitus, *Annales* 2.85; Suetonius, *Tiberius* 36.

¹² Cf. Valerius Maximus, *Epitome* 1.3.3.

¹³ Philo states (*Legatio ad Gaium* 24.161) καὶ τοῖς πανταχόσε χειροτονουμένοις ὑπάρχοις ἐπέσκηψε (i. e., Tiberius) παρηγορήσαι μὲν τοὺς κατὰ πόλεις τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους, ὡς οὐκ εἰς πάντας προβάσει τῆς ἐπεξελεύσεως, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μόνους τοὺς αἰτίους—ὀλίγοι δὲ ἦσαν. Dio Cassius remarks (57.18.5): τῶν τε Ἰουδαίων πολλῶν ἐς τὴν Ῥώμην συνελθόντων καὶ συχνοῦς τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἐς τὰ σφέτερα ἔθνη μεθιστάτων, τοὺς πλείονας ἐξήλασεν.

those Jews who took active part in the disorders and were the chief protagonists; for while his charter of liberties for the Jews, cited by Josephus (*Antiquitates Judaicae* 19.5.3), granted religious privileges to the Jews, it also limited their activities by forbidding wholesale propaganda. In spite of Orosius' doubt (7.16.15-16; cf. supra) the Christians who engaged in the heated discussions no doubt suffered banishment as well as the Jews. Claudius' action, referred to in Acts 18:2, may have been a part of his general "antioriental" policy, stressed from 47 to 54 A.D.,¹⁴ although his measure seems to have been aimed primarily at removing civil disorders, with little, if any, theological ramifications.

ROBERT O. HOERBER

LUTHER AND MELANCHTHON
AT MÜNSTER IN 1960

"Luther and Melancthon" was the theme of the Second International Luther Research Congress, which met at Münster in Westphalia, Germany, Aug. 8—13, 1960. Scholars and interested persons from 15 countries came to hear and to discuss the latest findings of top-ranking researchers. They came from Germany and the Scandinavian countries, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark. Twenty men came from the U. S. A. to attend this meeting; three from England. India and Argentina and Brazil were the other overseas countries that had delegates. Switzerland, Holland, Austria, Spain, the Democratic National Republic (the East Zone), and Poland sent representatives. Not all of the scholars invited from the East Zone were permitted to attend; at least four, however,

¹⁴ Kirsopp Lake (*Beginnings of Christianity*, V, 460) devotes a paragraph to Claudius' "antioriental" policy during these years, acknowledging indebtedness to Prof. V. M. Scramuzza, who wrote "The Policy of the Early Roman Emperors towards Judaism" (*ibid.*, pp. 277—297) and who cites the statements in the previous note.

were in attendance. The sessions were held in the Westfälische-Wilhelms-Universität.

Responsible for the conference were the members of the continuation committee, of which Willem Kooiman of Amsterdam was president and Vilmos Vajta of Geneva was secretary. The Theological Commission of the Lutheran World Federation was the sponsoring body.

The emphasis of the conference was a historical-theological one. The conference, like the First International Luther Research Conference in Aarhus in 1956, belongs to the greater movement usually referred to as the Luther Renaissance.

Concern with the person and theology of Martin Luther, the first and the greatest of the Reformers, began soon after his death. German scholarship during the past four centuries has investigated and interpreted Luther to his church and his nation. However, the last part of the 19th century and the 20th century saw a specific resurgence of interest in Luther as a man and as a theologian. In 1883 the inauguration of the Weimar Ausgabe of his works stimulated a renewed interest in Luther. Reinhold Seeberg and Karl Holl may be singled out for their part in promoting Luther research.

Luther does not belong only to the German Lutheran scholars. The Luther Renaissance was furthered by Nathan Söderblom of Sweden; scholars in other Scandinavian countries, including Finland, became active. In Germany the Roman Catholic scholar Joseph Lortz gave a greatly revised picture of Luther over against those of Heinrich Denifle and Hartmann Grisar. Scholarship in England began to concern itself with Martin Luther. In the United States of America and even in South America the study of Luther was stimulated. Henry Eyster Jacobs may be singled out as one of the early American participants in the Luther Renaissance.

Luther research today is carried on in

virtually all of the major countries of the globe with the possible exception of Red China and the Soviet Union.

Important as Luther is for the study of the Reformation, there is need to go beyond research in the work and writings of Luther alone. This was emphasized in several of the presentations at Muenster.

In the first of the formal essays Wilhelm Pauck of Union Theological Seminary pointed out that the contributions of Bucer, Calvin, Cranmer, and others had to be reckoned with in order to arrive at an understanding of the Reformation, just as the work of Melanchthon belongs to the heritage of Lutheranism. Pauck emphasized the character and aims of Melanchthon's humanism and the nature of the friendship between Luther and Melanchthon. He spoke of Luther's "deep understanding of Melanchthon's humanistic way of thinking even though he was conscious of his own reliance upon totally different sources."

Lauri Haikola, a Finnish scholar, also treated the basic differences in the thought processes of Luther and Melanchthon; his essay centered on the doctrine of justification in both Melanchthon and Luther. This doctrine, too, was the theme of the paper presented by Robert Stupperich of the host school. He concentrated his investigations on the period from 1530—38 in speaking about the doctrine of justification in Luther and Melanchthon.

Still on the common theme of "Luther and Melanchthon" Harold J. Grimm of Ohio State University dealt with social and economic aspects of the Reformation. He showed that both Luther and Melanchthon had an attraction for the *Buerger* of cities like Nuremberg.

Bernhardt Lohse of the University of Hamburg also looked at both Luther and Melanchthon. He was concerned about their attitude toward monasticism. Melanchthon's

readiness to follow Luther was demonstrated by this piece of research.

Pierre Fraenkel of Geneva concentrated on Melanchthon in his essay, "Ten Questions Concerning Melanchthon, the Fathers and the Eucharist."

But, after all, it was a Luther Research Congress; Luther therefore received some unmitigated attention.

Warren A. Quanbeck of Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., presented a study of "Luther and Apocalyptic." Ernest Bizer of the University of Baden talked on the relationship of humility, faith, and justification in Luther's lectures on Romans. From the East Sector of Berlin came the venerable Rudolph Hermann to give an analysis of one exegetical aspect of the controversy between Luther and Latomus. Herbert Olsson of Sweden was forced to speak almost extemporaneously because of the loss of his manuscript on Luther's doctrine of the Law.

Different and delightful was the popular presentation by Oskar Thulin, the director of the Luther Halle in Wittenberg. His slide lecture on Melanchthon in artistic presentations reviewed the life and accomplishments of this reformer. On one evening the visitors were privileged to hear a concert arranged for them.

Several reports on the progress of research and studies were read. Theodore Tappert of the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia reported about the status of Philip Melanchthon's fame and research in America. From Warsaw Oskar Bartel told about the research being carried on in Poland on both Luther and Melanchthon. A letter was read from Jenő Sólyom of Budapest. The letter, over ten pages single spaced, told of the research on Melanchthon being carried on in Hungary during the last 500 years. These voices reminded the assembly that the Reformation was not confined to Germany or to the Northern part of Europe.

The papers delivered at the Muenster Con-

ference will be published. This report, avoiding critical analysis and summaries of the papers, has emphasized the many-sided nature of the research and study being carried on by many different scholars in the field of Reformation history.

A banner across the street in front of the Muenster Bahnhof welcomed the Luther scholars to the city once made notorious by the antics of the Anabaptists and later by the Treaty of Westphalia. The setting, the sponsorship, and the attendance underscored Luther's international role after more than 400 years.

CARL S. MEYER

LEADERSHIP

The Australasian Theological Review

March, 1960

At the moment much emphasis is placed upon leadership. The word is frequently in the mouth even of people who have never given a single moment's serious thought to the meaning and the implications of that concept. One hears of leadership camps and groups and of training for leadership. Probably such undertakings are to be commended and encouraged. For, even though one believes that the true leader of men, like the true poet and the ideal teacher, is born, not made (do we not speak of "born leaders of men"?), it is certainly true that both the poet and the teacher are all the better for a mastery of the technique of their craft; and why should it be otherwise in the case of the leader? Still, the mere acquisition or the learning of "the rules of the game" is not enough. Mastering the art of prosody may make a person a clever versifier, but it will never make him a poet. Studying the Principles of Education may develop a sound drill-master who knows his trade; but something more is needed to make an inspiring teacher. Similarly, there may be rules of leadership that can be learned from an instructor or from a printed book; but, unless there be

something more solid behind it, the mere acquisition and application of rules will produce a poor imitation or a caricature rather than a genuine leader.

The term "leadership" is ambivalent. Leaders may mislead as well as lead aright. Most of the world's great leaders, perhaps, have set men off in the pursuit of false ideals and have led them to misery and ruin. This is precisely what one would expect from the corrupt nature of man as portrayed in the Scriptures. And even within outward Christendom much leadership has been exerted in the wrong direction. And that, again, is exactly what one would expect in view of our Lord's warning against false Christs and false prophets. Nor is it a question merely of avoiding false teaching and wrong standards of living. The would-be leader who flies in the face of good taste and good sense need not be astonished when he finds himself in the position of the man who complained that he was perfectly prepared to lead, but that people refused to follow!

Again, true leadership has nothing in common with blustering and bumptiousness, with display and ostentation, with the blatant assertion of authority. When hearing the word "leader," some people may think of the antics of the typical cheer-leader of some American high school or college, who with frantic gesticulation and frenzied utterance stimulates hundreds or thousands of his—or her—fellows to similar exuberance of action and vociferation. It is perhaps true, though a sort of paradox, that true leadership is most effective when it is least in evidence.

It is no doubt possible to compile, after careful reflection, a long and perhaps formidable list of personal traits held to be necessary in the person who would exercise leadership, and of other traits considered to be desirable. But it is perhaps simpler, quicker, and better to reduce the number of such qualifications to a very few which are essential in the strict sense of the term, since

without them leadership becomes impossible. These are, it seems to me, competence and integrity. The former, which may be analyzed as consisting in native ability plus achievement, may appear in different forms according to the fields or spheres—and there are many—in which leadership is to be exercised; the second is a matter of character in the special sense of the term, that is, acting in accordance with sound and good maxims. Both these qualities are indispensable for the simple reason that they are needed to create confidence and maintain confidence; for very self-evidently leadership cannot be exercised if there is no confidence on the part of those who are expected to follow. Leadership and confidence are correlatives.

The purpose of these lines, however, is not so much to philosophize upon leadership in the abstract, as rather to apply the conclusions reached to those men in the Christian Church of whom leadership is expected and demanded by God Himself. We refer to the incumbents of the Christian ministry. It would not be difficult to demonstrate that the qualifications which "bishops" must possess, according to the Divine Word, as well as the duties which that Word lays upon them, presuppose or include the quality of leadership. Or one may simply point to the fact that the familiar Greek word *hegemones* (leaders) is twice applied to such men in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 13:7, 17). The Authorized Version translates the word: "Those who have the rule over you," which requires some explanation. Luther's translation *Lehrer*, teachers, comes closer to the original, perhaps, but it does not bring out the full force of the word. Moffatt correctly translates "leaders." That spiritual leaders are meant is plain from both verses; for in v. 7 these men are described as those "who have spoken unto you the word of God," and in v. 17 the words are added: "They watch for your souls, as they that must give account." In v. 7 there may

be a reference to special leaders, such as departed apostles. By analogy, we may include other leaders besides the pastor of a parish in this little study, all the more since, in Australian usage, the term "church leaders" always refers to officialdom in the church. Such men are certainly not exempt from what has been said, and from what will be said in the paragraphs to follow. But we are thinking primarily of the parish pastor—the very word pastor, which means "shepherd," reminds us that he is to "feed the flock of God" (Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 5:2), which surely presupposes the qualities of leadership.

The competence which the pastor needs in order to be a leader of his people is really identical with that *bikanotes* spoken of in 2 Cor. 3:5-6. It does not coincide with intellectual capacity; yet in view of the very great importance attached by Scripture (as in the Pastoral Epistles) to the teaching function of the ministry, intellectual capabilities and attainments must be held to play a highly significant part in his competence or *bikanotes*. General muddle-headedness will inevitably extend to the field of theology and the function of teaching. Certainly, to err is human; but the man who notoriously lacks the capacity of "thinking straight," that is, of arriving at sound and well-founded judgments, is almost a menace in the ministry. If a man is of small mental calibre, to begin with; if he just manages to squeeze through his theological course, perhaps gently propelled by tutorial complaisance traceable to public and official clamour ("we need more man-power!"); if he then, having reached his goal, promptly proceeds to forget most of the little he has learned; if, compared with some of his parishioners, he is almost illiterate; if his people, even while perhaps loving him and respecting his office, feel inclined or compelled to apologize for his deficiencies: then the basis of confidence is to a large extent non-existent, and there can be no question of effective leadership.

As has already been stated, other factors besides purely intellectual traits enter into that competence which creates confidence and makes for leadership. Competence cannot be predicated of a man, or at best only in a limited sense, who suffers from serious defects of temperament and personality, such as being afraid of people, habitual and painful indecision, inability to make up his mind, lack of initiative. One who must be cajoled and coaxed or pushed and prodded into action cannot be a leader. Precisely the same is true of the man who, being too easily swayed by his feelings, must be restrained from hasty and ill-advised actions.

Integrity is the other great requisite in him who would be a leader. Does this require proof? Once let the pastor—for we are now dealing with the pastors as leaders of their congregations—become known as one who is careless about the truth, or one who is dishonest in money matters, or as an unreliable gossip, or as an idler, or as a self-seeker, or as insincere in the matter of faith and confession, and there can be no question of leadership. (The question of whether, or when, such failings of character quite unfit a man for the Christian ministry is not being discussed here.)

Competence and integrity are the qualities without which leadership becomes impossible and unthinkable. Evidently, then, the matter of effective future leadership is not irrelevant in the recruiting and training of theological students. If we want good leadership in the church, we must have competence and integrity in its ministry. God demands no less, though the former may be considered a somewhat more flexible or variable concept than the latter.—One may say that when congregations show spiritual deterioration rather than spiritual growth, poor leadership, or lack of leadership, is usually at the root of the trouble. From the slow progress of some mission field we are not to infer a poor quality of missionary work. For some fields are more stony and thorny than

others (Matt. 13:4-7); one man reapeth where another has sown (John 4:37, 38); and the wind bloweth where it listeth (John 3:8). Similarly, long-established congregations may fail spiritually despite the honest efforts of faithful pastors; but it will probably be admitted that in such cases one cannot rule out the possibility of faulty leadership.

In the final analysis our sufficiency, our power of leadership, is of God; chiefly because only the Holy Spirit can create that living faith in the Redeemer without which no one can be a true Christian theologian. Lack of the required gifts both of intellect and of personality — not to speak of character — is a clear indication that a man should not enter the ministry; though, unfortunately enough, this lack does not always appear at the early stages of formal study. For him who has received these gifts the best course in leadership is briefly outlined in Luther's famous methodological dictum: *Oratio* (and that includes true piety, without which all prayer is blasphemy), *meditatio* (which means serious and prolonged study), *temptatio* (and that includes the overcoming of temptation) *faciunt theologum*. We add: *Et faciunt ducem*.

H. HAMANN

STATISTICS ON WORLD LUTHERANISM

The following figures are taken from the new directory of the Lutheran World Federation. They give the membership of Lutheran churches, missions, and some attached congregations as reported to the LWF in February 1960. Other attached diaspora congregations are not included because no reliable figures are available concerning them.

General Summary

61 Member Churches of the LWF	49,637,971
Nine LWF Recognized Congregations	7,115
Lutheran Churches and Congregations Outside the LWF	5,861,617

United Churches in Germany (after deduction of non-Lutheran members)	15,595,077
--	------------

Total	71,101,780
-------	------------

By continents, Lutherans are distributed as follows:

	All Lutherans	LWF Members
Europe	58,985,362	41,965,591
North America	8,198,898	5,320,260
South America	822,999	589,486
Asia (and adjacent islands)	1,478,487	1,348,986
Africa (and Madagascar)	1,299,819	367,172
Australia (and New Zealand and New Guinea)	316,215	53,591

Countries having the most Lutherans (more than one million) are:

Germany	36,827,257
U. S. A.	8,054,417
Sweden	7,000,000
Denmark	4,304,000
Finland	4,234,244
Norway	3,173,523

Baptized membership figures of the Lutheran churches of the world dropped slightly during the past year to a new global total of 71,101,780, according to official annual statistics published by the Lutheran World Federation here.

The revised statistics showed that membership gains tabulated for all of the other continents and islands of the earth were insufficient to offset substantial losses reported by a few church bodies in Europe, notably in eastern Europe. The global net loss was given as 33,288. Last year's total was 71,135,068.

Major reported loss was that of the largest Lutheran Church in Germany, the Church of Saxony in the Soviet Zone, whose new membership figure of 3,800,000 was 613,699 less than what was reported a year ago.

Chiefly as a result of this church's drop, the combined membership of the 61 bodies affiliated with the LWF did not during the past year pass the 50 million mark as had

been expected. The new total for these 61 bodies, plus nine local congregations officially recognized by the federation, is 49,645,086, compared with 49,901,198 in 1959.

(On March 20, 1961, the official membership roll of the LWF will be increased to 64, with a combined membership—together with the nine recognized congregations—of 49,699,680. The occasion will be the admission of two more African churches and one Asian church, in accordance with the federation's constitution, on the first anniversary of the approval of their applications by the Executive Committee at Porto Alegre, Brazil.

(They are the 21,400-member Church of Central Tanganyika, the 28,149-member Church of Usambara-Digo in the same country, and the 5,045-member Taiwan Church on the island of Formosa. The 64 member churches will be found in 33 countries and will include 11 Asian and five African churches.)

Many European bodies—which are often national, "folk," or territorial churches—were listed with figures identical with those given a year earlier. Among them were 27 German churches with Lutheran memberships totaling nearly 27 million, the Church of Sweden with a round 7 million, those of Denmark and Finland with over 4 million each, two Norwegian Churches with about 3 million together, and the Hungarian Church with a little more than 430,000.

The first five countries named have, with the exception of the United States, the largest national Lutheran constituencies. The over-all total for Germany is 36,827,257—more than half of world Lutheranism. The United States comes in second place with 8,054,417, which is 214,523 more than its 1959 membership total.

Actually, the church bodies functioning

in the United States have memberships adding up to 8,313,848, according to latest figures released in New York by the National Lutheran Council on July 30, but this includes their Canadian constituencies totaling 259,431.

Definite growth reported for Latin America, Asia, Africa, Australia, and the islands of the seas reflected the evangelistic activity of the missions and younger churches in those areas.

Continentwise, South America added 43,155 to a 1959 total of 779,844; Asia and adjacent islands, 24,659 to a previous 1,453,828; Africa and Madagascar, 120,851 to 1,178,968; Australia, New Zealand, and New Guinea, 33,314 to 282,901. Europe, home continent of more than 80 per cent of the world's Lutherans, experienced a net loss of 431,225 from its 1959 total of 59,416,587.

Lutherans constitute the largest Protestant confession, embracing about one third of world Protestantism. Approximately 70 per cent of all Lutherans belong to churches affiliated with the LWF. Of the remaining 21,456,694, the LWF figures showed that 2,442,933 belong to The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod of North America.

But most of these 21.5 million Lutherans belonging to churches not affiliated with the LWF are represented by the 15.5 million who belong to union (joint Lutheran-Reformed) churches in Germany, Martin Luther's homeland.

Since Germany's 36.8 million Lutherans are similarly distributed in numerous territorial churches (*Landeskirchen*) and American Lutherans are similarly divided into autonomous synodical units, the largest single Lutheran body on the globe continues to be the 7,000,000-member Church of Sweden. It is followed by the 4,304,000-member Church of Denmark and the 4,234,244-member Finnish Church.

Germany's Church of Saxony, which last

year was in second place, now comes fourth, and her sister body, the Church of Hannover, is fifth, with 3,777,000 members. The Church of Norway follows with 3,155,323.

Among the countries that are still objects of major missionary efforts, the new statistics list 657,603 baptized Lutherans for India, 648,349 for South and Southwest Africa, 318,722 for Tanganyika, 227,285 for Madagascar, and 209,828 for New Guinea. All these figures represent substantial gains over a year ago.

The new statistics were released in the latest annual LWF directory, which has just been published. The directory contains figures for some 200 Lutheran groups in 70 countries and other areas.

It provides also full information about the organization, leadership, and work of the various branches of the federation. For the Lutheran churches and missions of the world it gives not only membership figures but also the names and addresses of their heads.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

WILLIAM A. BUEGE, pastor, Christ Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, Minn.

MARTIN H. FRANZMANN, professor, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

H. HAMANN, president, Concordia Seminary, Adelaide, S. Australia

ROBERT O. HOERBER, professor, Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.

CARL S. MEYER, professor, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

MARTIN H. SCHARLEMANN, professor, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.