

Harvard Theological Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/HTR>

Additional services for *Harvard Theological Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



***Judaism and St. Paul.* C. G. Montefiore. E. P. Dutton & Co. 1915. Pp. iv, 240. \\$.1.25.**

Kirsopp Lake

Harvard Theological Review / Volume 9 / Issue 02 / April 2016, pp 242 - 245
DOI: 10.1017/S0017816000004569, Published online: 03 November 2011

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0017816000004569

How to cite this article:

Kirsopp Lake (1916). Harvard Theological Review, 9, pp 242-245
doi:10.1017/S0017816000004569

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

being naturally referred to Apocalyptic Judaism and the prophets portrayed as the moral and religious teachers of their own age. He defends, however, the Messianic prophecies of Isaiah, the early relation of Jeremiah to the Deuteronomic Reformation, and the authenticity of his prophecy of the New Covenant. As more novel in point of view we note the suggestion that the tragedy supposed to be adumbrated in Hos. 1 is but a midrash of the editor's, "expanding the elements contained in the other two sections," and the well-marshalled arguments for the dating of Ezra's first visit to Jerusalem in the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes II, that is, 397 B.C. (pp. 260 f.).

ALEXANDER R. GORDON.

PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, MONTREAL.

JUDAISM AND ST. PAUL. C. G. MONTEFIORE. E. P. Dutton & Co. 1915.
Pp. iv, 240. \$1.25.

Mr. Montefiore has attempted in this book to face a problem which has received far too little attention both from Christian and Jewish scholars. It may be stated shortly as follows: If one reads the Epistles of Paul with the intention of comparing them with Jewish writings of the Rabbinical type represented by the Talmud, one is struck by the fact that Paul does not so much controvert Jewish teaching as ignore it, and that what he controverts is seriously different from Rabbinical Judaism. Of course many writers on Paul have surmounted this obvious difficulty by the simple process of first assuming that Paul must have been controverting the general Jewish doctrine which he had learned at Jerusalem, and then reconstructing this Judaism by claiming for it everything which Paul denies. That is the origin of a great many Christian presentations of Rabbinical Judaism. Unfortunately, when one turns to any of the Jewish writings of that time, or of the periods succeeding, he finds no trace of this reconstructed Judaism. That is a very curious result, and it was taken advantage of by van Manen to support his theory that the Pauline Epistles were not written by Paul. His position was that we know that Paul had originally been a Jew and was educated in the Rabbinical doctrines of Jerusalem; if therefore he wrote theological treatises or letters attacking Judaism, he might be supposed to show accurate knowledge of that which he attacks.¹

¹ Dr. Foakes-Jackson writes to me: "I remember addressing a Jewish audience in the vestry of one of the London synagogues on Josephus. In the discussion several scholars of distinction, among them Drs. Büchler and Friedländer, maintained that Josephus showed evident ignorance of the Rabbinic teaching of his age and could not have been, as he so loudly professes, an expert in the law and religion of his countrymen."

Documents purporting to be his but not showing this knowledge cannot be genuine; as therefore the Pauline Epistles do not show this knowledge they are not genuine. This argument was the only really strong point in van Manen's position, and it met with too little consideration from most Christian students of Early Christian literature.

Jewish writers, on the whole, have not seriously faced the problem any more than Christian writers have done. They, of course, have recognized the essential difference between that which Paul attacks and Rabbinical Judaism, but in the main they have contented themselves with shrugging their shoulders and expressing their opinion, in various degrees of politeness, that Paul talked nonsense.

Mr. Montefiore is the first scholar who has really attacked the problem with adequate knowledge and a sympathetic understanding both of Paul and Judaism. It is interesting to notice that he adopts a position which in some ways repeats and in others reverses the attitude of van Manen. He first draws a picture of Rabbinical Judaism, and then argues that this is so different from anything controverted by Paul that Paul can never have really belonged to that type of Judaism. So far he and van Manen agree. But he also assumes that the Epistles are genuine, and solves the problem by denying that Paul was ever a Rabbinical Jew of Jerusalem—thus reversing van Manen's result.

Mr. Montefiore grasps with complete candor the reason why neither his nor any other work on the subject will ever be completely final. We do not really know the Judaism of the time of Paul, and there is an inherent weakness in the position which Mr. Montefiore adopts (of necessity rather than inclination) when he reconstructs the Rabbinical Judaism of a much later period and assumes that the Judaism of the time of Paul was really very much the same thing. He points this out himself again and again, and though I think he is probably right in believing that he has allowed sufficiently for the difference between the Judaism of the year A.D. 50 and the Judaism of the year A.D. 500, after all, the difference is there, and it is that which renders the problem incapable of a complete solution. He concludes from this comparison between Paul and the Rabbis that Paul can never have lived as a Rabbinical Jew of Jerusalem, and then goes on to consider various factors which may have affected Judaism outside of Palestine, raising the question whether these are sufficient to leave room for the existence of Paul. His conclusion is that on the whole they are sufficient, and in this view he is, I believe, on the right line. Moreover it is entirely

probable, as he argues, that the Judaism of the Dispersion was not so good a *religion* as that of the Judaism of Jerusalem, though personally I should add the *caveat* that it may have been a better *theology*. I am not sure that this is not another way of stating the fact that, although we prefer the philosophy of Greece and polity of Rome, the more "modern" we are the more we go back to Palestine for our religion. It is the parable of the Prodigal Son, which is typically Jewish in its doctrine of forgiveness, rather than the Pauline doctrine of the Atonement, which appeals to us and seems to us to be true.

But suppose we accept Mr. Montefiore's conclusions, and say that it is extremely improbable that Paul was ever a Jew of Jerusalem. Does not this conflict entirely with the Biblical facts about Paul? The answer is that it does conflict with the speeches in the Acts, but that it agrees very surprisingly with Paul's own statement in the Epistle to the Galatians, in a passage which has been usually either overlooked or explained away. In Galatians Paul says that after his conversion he did not confer with flesh and blood but "returned" to Damascus. Critics have paid too little attention to the fact that this implies that Damascus and not Jerusalem was his real centre. We always read the story of Acts as though it meant that Paul was a Jew of Jerusalem who was sent by the High Priest to Damascus. In all probability the writer of Acts did interpret the tradition in that manner. But Paul's own words suggest that he belonged to Damascus; and it is hardly necessary to emphasize the fact that in Galatians and — apart from the speeches — in the "we"-sections of the Acts there is nothing to suggest that Paul was a person who was well known in Jerusalem. When he is tried before the High Priest there is no suggestion that he was well known, and his own statement that he was a Pharisee seems to have taken the court by surprise. These facts are of course perfectly well known to every one, but they have been curiously neglected by most writers, and I venture to suggest that one of the secondary services which will be accomplished by Mr. Montefiore's fascinating book will be to draw renewed attention to this side of the evidence of the Epistles.

Finally, I should like to recommend the reading of Mr. Montefiore's description of Rabbinical Judaism to all who wish to have any sympathetic knowledge of the real nature of that religion. He writes on this subject with the understanding of a born Jew, the skill of an artist, and the sympathy of a man in whom a wide education has deepened the springs of a religious life, which is not the less Jewish because it is liberal; and it should be remembered

that the test of the value of a religion, as distinct from the truth of a theology, is its effect on its adherents rather than the judgment of its opponents.

KIRSOPP LAKE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE MAN OF NAZARETH. FREDERICK LINCOLN ANDERSON. Macmillan & Co. 1914. Pp. xiv, 226. \$1.00.

Professor Anderson of the Baptist Theological Seminary at Newton, Mass., has given for general readers a reverent, sympathetic, fresh, and incisive "treatment of the most important problems about Jesus and his career," based on sound learning and good acquaintance with current discussion. After a lucid description of "the situation in which Jesus found himself," he discusses Jesus' belief in his own messiahship, and his positive teaching about the Law and God and duty and the future. The chapter on "The Character of Jesus" is impressive and moving. The point of view is that of a thoroughly conservative "liberalism"; accepting the accounts of the Gospels, believing that Jesus, a consistent human character, is Christ and Lord, not wholly satisfied with the statements and definitions of the Church about the secret of his personality, confessing its faith thus: "This Jesus, so strangely and uniquely full of God, is Lord in a sphere beyond the reach of our highest thought. He therefore demands and deserves the wonder, reverence, love, and supreme devotion of every human being."

JAMES HARDY ROPES.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

ST. PAUL AND JUSTIFICATION. Being an Exposition of the Teaching in the Epistles to Rome and Galatia. FREDERICK BROOKE WESTCOTT, Trinity College, Cambridge. Macmillan & Co. 1913. Pp. viii, 397. \$1.75.

"The purpose of this short Essay," so the author begins, "is to expound certain passages in the writings of St. Paul dealing with a religious question which occupied him largely during one period of his career." The question, it is presently said, was this: "How shall I become right with God — right once for all?" The passages expounded include nearly all of the Epistle to the Galatians, and all of the doctrinal part of that to the Romans (Chapters 1-11). As chapters nine, ten, and eleven of the latter Epistle form a separate section dealing with a distinct subject, our author has evidently carried his task beyond the limits which he prescribed for himself.