

## Notes and Opinions.

“**Harnack versus Harnack.**”— Under this title Professor W. B. Smith contributes a striking article to the December *New World*, in which he tests the real worth of Harnack’s statements in his preface as to the “reactionary” character of his work. Professor Smith finds “two Harnacks, one speaking in the preface, one reasoning in the volume itself, and these in no wise resemble each other.” After a careful study of the work he finds that “the great theologian’s work has no comfort for tradition.”

This is a little too strong a statement, but, as we have previously pointed out, it is not more misleading than its opposite. One thing we can rely upon — the more the New Testament is studied, the more does it justify faith in Jesus Christ.

**Paul as the Originator of a Sociological Theory.**— A somewhat unexpected appeal to Paul as a sociologist was made by Professor F. H. Giddings in the annual address before the American Academy of Political and Social Science. As reported in the July number of the *Annals* of the society, his position was as follows: It was necessary for Paul to find a psychological fact or principle of social organization which should be also universal. This social fact was that of like-mindedness. Over and over again in his epistles he forces this fact upon the attention of his readers, and warns them to give heed to it. The texts to which appeal is made for such a position are: “Be of the same mind one towards another;” “Speak the same thing;” “Be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment;” “Stand fast in one spirit, with one soul;” “Be of the same mind, having the same love, being of one accord.” Paul, Professor Giddings thinks, derived this idea from the Greeks, but was the first to single it out as the all-essential fact to be remembered in the development of any plan of social organization.

Is, then, Paul among the sociologists — not merely religious reformers, but sociologists? And was his sociology that of Professor Giddings himself? And did he, like Professor Giddings, regard society at “any number of like-minded individuals, who know and enjoy their

like-mindedness, and are therefore able to work together for common ends"? In some way the leap seems a long one between a desire to avoid church quarrels and such a definition of society. Perhaps Paul took it. But might not Professor Giddings just as well have found him dealing with the nowadays contemned "social organism," when he speaks of a church as the body of Christ and of individuals as limbs? There is a considerable amount of social teaching in Paul's letters, but we venture to believe that the apostle was innocent of any conception of society in the modern philosophical sense of the word. He knew the "world" and he knew the "church," but did he think like a sociologist? And if he did not, is it quite fair to appropriate him bodily as the originator of some social theory?

**Woman in the Ancient Hebrew Cult.**— In the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. XVII, Part II, Professor Ismar J. Peritz has a long and valuable article upon "Woman in the Ancient Hebrew Cult." After discussing the current views of such relations and the position of woman in other Semitic cults, he shows that women were present at the sanctuary in religious gatherings, that they shared in the sacrificial meals and in the sacrificial act itself, in Nazaritism, in prayer, in consulting the oracle; that, after the growth of the ritualistic legislation, women were not excluded from the three yearly feasts, but the later regulation counted males only as firstlings. Professor Peritz maintains even that in the most ancient Hebrew rites circumcision was not confined to men, but that such limitation was due to the late exilic view. In the matter of the cult of the dead and the worship of ancestors, it seems to be true that women were very nearly on an equality with men, while they were also prophetesses, and even officials in the tabernacle and the temple, having a special part in the music of this service.

Such a view as this is radically opposed to the current view found in Stade, Schwally, Benzinger, Nowack, and possesses a considerable amount of strength, and, if correct, casts considerable light upon the depressed fortunes of Jewish women under the later law.

**Did Tertius Write Romans, Chaps. 15 and 16?** — In the same number of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* Professor W. H. Ryder, of Andover Theological Seminary, after a minute discussion of the evidence, comes to the conclusion that Paul closes his epistle to the Romans with 14: 23. He then added the doxology of 16: 25-27, and the letter at first circulated in this form. Marcion perhaps removed the doxology.

At an early date there was circulated with this epistle, or appended to it, a letter or part of a letter from a Roman evangelist named Tertius (16 : 22) to his friends at Rome. In an Alexandrian or Egyptian recension the long doxology was transferred to the end of this composite document, apparently taking the place of the short doxology (16 : 24). Tertius had the style of Paul, and Paul's conception of Christian love and morality, but apparently not his profound idea of the nature of the Christian life. If Paul wrote his epistle to the Romans as early as 54 A. D., and died before 60 A. D., probably this little epistle of Tertius was written in 64 A. D.

Such an opinion as this is not novel, as far as the independent authorship of these two chapters is concerned, but suggests a theory as to Tertius that is worthy of consideration in comparison with the treatment accorded the passage by Sanday and Headlam. But we are hardly convinced by Professor Ryder's argument. So far as the sixteenth chapter is concerned, the case is tolerably strong, but even here might not the words be those of an amanuensis, Tertius, appended to the letter which he had just completed for Paul himself? In the case of the fifteenth chapter, however, Professor Ryder's view seems untenable. It is well-nigh impossible that the events in the life of a certain Tertius should so closely resemble the experiences of Paul himself. Notwithstanding all the difficulties connected with these two chapters, it is not yet clear that they were not written by Paul himself, with a possible exception of some salutations from Tertius to the church at Rome.

**The Interpretation of the Facts rather than the Words of Parables.**— In the first number of the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* for 1899 Pastor Wiesen discusses the parable of the Ten Virgins. As the basis of his interpretation he lays down the important principle that the facts rather than the words are to be interpreted. But to a considerable degree he injures his method by holding that these facts are to be treated in a neo-allegorical fashion, and is further not content to find one great teaching in a parable. When will our interpreters agree upon a legitimate method of parabolic exegesis? There is one—but it can be discovered only in the methods of Jesus himself.

**Epaphras the Postman.**— In the *Expositor* for December, 1898, Professor J. Rendel Harris again brings the papyri letters to the interpretation of Paul's writings, and argues that their conventional style implies they are answers to letters received by the apostle. He holds

that Colossians should be headed *To Colossians : a reply to kind inquiries brought by Epaphras*, and that the opening verses of the epistle are quotations from a real letter addressed to Paul. But more important is his belief, based upon similar grounds, that Ephesians is not a circular letter, but an answer to one received by the apostle (3 : 13 ; 6 : 21). The omission of *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* implies probably that some other name has been omitted, probably *ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ*. If Laodicea and Colossæ were the churches addressed, the similarity in style is explained — for Epaphras was the scribe or “postman” for both, and the return post was brought by the same man, Tychicus. The letter to the Philippians was also in answer to one brought by Epaphroditus, who had come overland from Colossæ, since 1, 7, and 12 imply the use of phrases employed in this letter received by Paul. Thus, says Professor Harris, Epaphras came to Rome bringing papers and parcels for Paul from Colossæ, Laodicea, and Philippi, traveling overland. Tychicus carried replies to the two former and, later, Epaphras to the latter. Professor Harris further holds that his inquiry is not unfavorable to a belief in the genuineness of the most important facts of the correspondence.

All of which is very interesting. But does one read aright, when one is asked to accept the genuineness of Ephesians because it seems in a couple of sentences to be an answer to a letter written from Laodicea, whose style was like that of a letter (similarly discovered) written from Colossæ, and that the style was similar because the same Epaphras was scribe for the two churches, or *at least the postman?*

Professor Harris is right when he disclaims meaning “to say that there are no further difficulties in connection with the Ephesian-Colossian problem.” But perhaps, after all, his paper is a satire upon the more reckless methods of criticism. If so, it is delicious.