

THE PECULIAR PEOPLE,

A CHRISTIAN MONTHLY,

DEVOTED TO JEWISH INTERESTS.

Founded by the late Rev. H. Friedländer and Rev. Ch. Th. Lucky.

EDITOR,

THE REV. WILLIAM C. DALAND,

Leonardsville, N. Y.

"The Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself."
Deut. 14:2.

Vol. II.

AUGUST, 1889.

No. 5.

CONTENTS.

Editorials,	97
Weeping Jerusalem,	100
Solemn Questions Addressed to Hebrews of Culture,	103
A Jewish View,	111
Correspondence,	113

PRINTED BY
THE AMERICAN SABBATH TRACT SOCIETY,
ALFRED CENTRE, N. Y.

THE PECULIAR PEOPLE.

"The Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself."—Deut. 14 : 2.

*A Christian Monthly devoted to Jewish Interests, Political, Social,
Literary, and Religious.*

הַבֵּיטוּ אֶל-צוּר חַצְבַּתְּם
וְאֶל-מִקְבַּת בּוֹר נִקְרָתֶם
Isa. 51 : 1.

"For my brethren and companions' sakes, I will now say, Peace be within thee. Because of the house of the Lord our God, I will seek thy good."—Psa. 122 : 8, 9.

VOL. II. ALFRED CENTRE, N. Y., AUG., 1889. No. 5.

JUDÆUS SUM ; JUDAICI NIHIL A ME ALIENUM PUTO.

WE continue in this issue the Weiss correspondence, and take pleasure, also, in printing Rabbi Weiss' rejoinder to two of his Christian critics.

WE publish likewise under the caption, "A Jewish View," a letter which is sent us from New York City, with regard to which we must needs say a few words.

IN the first place our correspondent states that he would consider it beneath his dignity to contribute for a paper if it were edited by a Jewish Christian. Why? We presume our correspondent would say, because a Jewish Christian is unworthy of notice. This proceeds upon the assumption that no honest, upright Jew would become a Christian; that the only motive which could possibly induce a Jew to confess faith in Jesus is one of worldly gain. Is this assumption fair?

Such an assumption could only be based upon the supposed fact that all converts observed are unworthy, or upon the impregnability of the Jewish case as opposed to the Christian arguments. The latter our correspondent himself waives for the sake of his own method of proof. He therefore cannot base his assumption upon it. With

regard to the facts as observed, our correspondent cites a few notable instances, and presumably his irritation at these causes him to consider every Jewish Christian beneath his notice.

THERE are Jewish Christians no more to be compared with thoes whose names are mentioned in this letter than is the noonday sun in his strength to be compared with midnight darkness. We are surprised that our correspondent will consent to write at all for our pages. THE PECULIAR PEOPLE was founded by Jewish Christians; it is issued especially to stand for principles dear to Jewish Christians; its contributors are largely Jewish Christians; and its editor is a Jewish Christian with the exception of the mere accident of birth.

IN citing the unpleasant facts of our correspondent's letter we have anticipated him, as he himself intimates. These are nothing. It is not necessary that if a Jew becomes a Christian he must descend to the level of these base accessions to Christianity. If one becoming a Christian is compelled to associate with these, in remaining a Jew, he must associate with those from whom these came. Many times a mercenary Jew comes to a Christian minister unsought, thinking to make a speculation of his spiritual professions. There must be many such willing subjects among Israelites, else base "conversionism" would not flourish. Why does not our correspondent cite *such* as his companion religionists, of whose society he is proud? To say, "I will not become a Christian because there are mean and wicked Christians," is as much as to say, "I will not remain a Jew because there are mean and wicked Jews."

OF course when our correspondent leaves the question of the world to come, as "bearing the seal of mystery," he forsakes the common ground on which we orthodox Christians and Jews may meet. Our religion is concerned with something more than social life. We believe

that the Bible is concerned with a world to come; Judaism expects a world to come; we Jewish Christians believe in a world to come; Christianity, as well as Judaism has suffered from admitting doubts with regard to the mysterious and the supernatural in God's dealings with His chosen people and with mankind. We here add a few words on this point, which we omitted from our last issue. Orthodox Christianity is not without its faults, and it needs to come into a closer accord with Biblical teaching before it will be perfectly safe against decay from within. Had Christianity in its doctrine and practice remained free from pagan Gentile error, Robert Elsmere might never have been written, Judaism might never have received the infection, and the Jews might long ago have accepted the Messiah. We of THE PECULIAR PEOPLE stand for a pure Jewish Christianity, the Christianity of the Bible, without admixture of Gentile error. The claims of such a Christianity we urge upon our Jewish brethren.

BUT, allowing our correspondent his own method, we nevertheless believe with St. Paul that "godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." 1 Tim. 4: 8. We trust our correspondent's view be not so limited that he would find it necessary to "pitch his religious tent" in the place indicated. The Christian Church has numbered and still numbers among its own "scholarly divines" many of the Hebrew race. Why need our correspondent cite so unworthy a comparison? He also must know that the right-minded portion of the so-called Christian world shares his own feelings with respect to the treatment of ex-Minister Strauss and the exclusion of Israelites from any social privileges. We beg also to inform our correspondent that he is mistaken when he says, "no missionary has ever been known to work for his living," etc. He has quoted names freely. We will not do so, but we can point him privately, if he wishes, to many cases of Jewish Christians who pursue their ordinary callings and work for the honor of their Master among their people. for no earthly

reward but to be misunderstood by their brethren. They are not missionaries in the strict sense but we would show our correspondent that his sentence involves perhaps a self-contradiction. If we point out a man who does work for his living, our correspondent will say, "But *he* is not a missionary." And, yet, such win more souls honorably than many who are more widely known. We assure our correspondent, that if he becomes a Christian, we will not deprive him of the privilege of pursuing his business, and we would prize the influence of his life more than that of any missionary work he might be tempted to perform. In conclusion, we beg our correspondent to consider both the Old Testament and the Codicil, to compare them honestly and faithfully, to see whether they bear not the same seal and the same divine signature, whether the witnesses in both cases be not of equal credibility. If he finds it so, ought he not to bow in acceptance of the later portion of revelation as well as of the former? "Ye believe in God," says Jesus of Nazareth, "believe also in me." John 14: 1.

WEEPING JERUSALEM.

Notes of a sermon by the Rev. A. Bernstein, preached at the Episcopal Jewish Chapel, Palestine Place, London.

Text. Lam. 1: 11, 12. "See, O Lord, and consider; for I am become vile. Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is done unto me, wherewith the Lord hath afflicted me in the day of his fierce anger."

I. Zion's sorrow was in proportion to the calamity which she had experienced. So great was this calamity that the lamenting prophet represents the very ruins crying, and the Targum of Jonathan compares it to the banishment of Adam from the garden of Eden. [A brief historical review was given of the gradual development of the greatness of Jerusalem from the time of Melchizedek to that of her double destruction.] At the latter she was smitten with the three scourges with which David was threatened: namely, with war, famine, and pestilence, together with internal dissension. Then was the prophecy of Moses fulfilled (Deut. 28: 49, 50), and the Saviour's tearful warning realized.

II. But now Zion appeals to God and men for sympathy.

(a) In this appeal we notice an encouraging sign. She confesses her sin, yea, her vileness.

(b) What kind of sin does she confess? She says, I became a *ויללה*, a prodigal, a spendthrift. This is exactly descriptive. She misused her gifts and privileges. The sin of idolatry was pardoned, but the national sin against the Holy Ghost, in rejecting the gospel *after* the resurrection of Christ and the pentecostal visitation, will not be pardoned until a national repentance takes place.

(c) But as the weeping daughters of Jerusalem were looking at the cross, the Saviour's sympathy was awakened, and it made Him forget His own sorrow so that He could command them to go and preach repentance to their children, and, if possible, to wipe away their tears. So our compassionate Highpriest commands us now. This is the duty of us Hebrew Christians in particular, before we appeal for help and sympathy to the church at large, with the words: "Is it nothing to you all, to show real compassion to desolate Zion?" If we desire to receive national comfort, we must first feel national sorrow. Nehemiah did so, and his name rightly means, *The comfort of Jehovah*. All they that pass by Jerusalem take a great interest, even in its ruins. Witness the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund, and of the Syrian Colonization Society, and especially the half-century's work of the Jews' Society there. What are we doing toward a national revival? But to this end it is necessary that we do not lose sight of the three cardinal points to which the history of our nation will and must ultimately lead us:

1. We shall have no other King but Christ, no other sceptre but that of the cross, and no other rule of government and conduct but that of the gospel.

2. Whatever language we may acquire and speak, the sacred language of Hebrew shall alone be our own.

3. To whatever country we may belong by birth and by attachment, Palestine, the land given by God to our fathers by an oath, shall alone be ours for an everlasting

possession, even when there shall be a new heaven and a new earth.

III. 1. Zion acknowledges the righteousness of God. His wrath is kindled on account of impenitent sin, which His longsuffering has long endured. He vindicates His character as not being one-sided, only a God of love. In Zion's punishment there is a warning for every sinner.

2. In the atonement of Christ on the cross God became the Just and the Justifier of the believer. He has in Christ reconciled the world to Himself. And so we believers can truly say, "I will praise thee, though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortest me." But this song of praise is to the prophetic ear a national song, and the counterpart of the lamentation. We therefore have hope concerning the salvation of all Israel. The fulfillment of Isaiah 12 will follow the fulfillment of Isaiah 11. So then we see Jerusalem smiling through her tears. Two Rabbis walked once over the ruins of the temple. One of them wept and the other laughed, and the latter explained the reason of his merriment by saying that the fulfillment of the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem was to him a pledge of the fulfillment of the promises of its restoration.

This, then, is the practical lesson. Weeping Jerusalem should awaken sympathy on the one side, and inspire us with hope on the other. When pain is felt there is still life. The very annual lamentation on the ninth of Ab and on the Day of Atonement, are manifest proof that Israel's conscience is not entirely dead. This is likely to increase. Israel's new birth will be the product of sorrow. They will look upon Him whom they have pierced, and mourn. Let us cultivate more love and unanimity among ourselves and more kind and conciliatory feelings toward our brethren who greatly differ from us. Remember that it was dissension and reciprocal hatred among the various parties within the walls of the Holy City that gave the enemy the advantage, and caused the final catastrophe. The Zealots wanted to pierce through the body of Rabbi Johanan Ben Zaccai, when he was carried through the gate in the

guise of a corpse in order to plead before Titus to obtain a refuge for himself and the learned, to enable them to study the traditions. And though our brethren are in the main still asking for the same privilege, let us not pierce them by our unkind language about them and toward them, still less by our unchristian conduct, for they are only dead in appearance but alive in reality. The dry bones in the valley have marvelously the organ of speech remaining in them. In Ezek. 37: 11, "they say, our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off for our parts." Let us comfort them with the comfort wherewith Christ has comforted us. Let us also ask the whole church: Is it nothing to you all ye that pass by? She must not pass by Zion without comforting her. To all God's people the prophet says: "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God." "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem; they shall prosper that love thee."

SOLEMN QUESTIONS ADDRESSED TO HEBREWS OF CULTURE.

BY FRANZ DELITZSCH.

(Continued from page 83.)

He who accepts the Christian religion as the continuation and consummation of Israel's religion will find this view amply confirmed in the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. But these confirmations are no proofs for the outsider; and in putting questions to the conscience of the Jewish reader, I pass by all pleas which are without cogency for him who has not yet accepted the Christian faith. I will base my arguments upon suppositions which are accepted both by the believing Israelite and the believing Christian, and chiefly upon these two assumptions: firstly that there is a history of God's revelation, *i. e.*, of God's free acts and communications, by which he has interrupted the natural course of things; and, secondly, that prophecy is an effect of Divine revelation, not being the result of natural combination, but having proceeded from Divine illumination.

If there is no history of Divine revelation, Anti-semitism is right in asserting that Israel's consciousness of being the chosen people of God, destined to communicate to the world God's revelation, is nothing but the vanity of a conceited national pride. And if there is no prophecy resting upon the inspiration of the Spirit of God, all the facts in which the Christian religion recognizes the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies, as for instance, that the good shepherd in the book of Zechariah was given by the ungrateful people as his price, 30 pieces of silver, and that 30 pieces of silver the reward of betrayal on the part of Judas Iscariot, are the mere play of chance. The Israelite who adopts such a position rejects the Christian religion at the cost of depriving his own religion of its divine basis—he is a “denier of the first cause,” undermining and cutting up the divine root of the Jewish and Christian religion alike.

But supposing that we, my Jewish reader and myself, are agreed in recognizing the hand of God in history and prophecy, I shall carefully avoid, what has often been done, namely, to make use of passages in the Prophets, the explanation of which is of a disputable character. I shall not adduce Gen. 49: 10 as proof that Shiloh (the Messiah,) is to come at a time when Judah shall have lost the regal dominion. I consider this explanation wrong, and the fulfillment, supposing the explanation could be admitted, would not be correct, for Jesus appeared in the time of the dominion of the Herodean dynasty. That dynasty was, indeed, of Edomitic origin, but, according to religious profession, it was Jewish. According to “Sota” 41 a, when king Agrippa wept in reading Deut. 17: 15, “One from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee,” the people tried to comfort him by shouting, “You *are* our brother!” and indeed he was their brother, the Edomites having been, two hundred years before, by circumcision, incorporated into the Jewish nation when the Hasmonean king, John Hyrcanus, conquered them. Still less is it possible to prove from the 70 weeks in the 9th chapter of the book of Daniel, that Jesus is the Messiah, because after He had been removed, and

Jerusalem afterwards destroyed, 7 and 62 weeks, *i. e.*, 69 times 7 years had elapsed. In the first instance, "Messiah" may be the legal title of the high priest, who was violently removed, and secondly, the backward calculation of 483 years brings us to no event of real importance which might serve as a starting point.

Daniel's 70 weeks are an enigma which awaits yet its solution, because it has been found that Antiochus Epiphanes was not yet the final arch-enemy of the people of God, and after his removal it was not yet the final redemption which was brought about, but only a prelude to it.

Prophetic foresight of the distant future is subject to the law of perspective. The end appears side by side with the immediate future, but when the latter is reached there appears between it and the end an expanse of time. What in the perspective seemed shrunk together is now widely extended. The prophets of the time of the exile connected with the end of the captivity, and the faithful believers in the time of the Seleucidæ connected with the end of the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes extraordinary hopes, which, when these respective consummations occurred, were only imperfectly fulfilled. This is by no means derogatory to the value of prophecy; it is simply God's order that the look into the distant and the look into the immediate future—the divine and the human—should be combined in it.

In one point the prophets of the time of the exile are agreed: they know only two temples, that of Solomon, the *first house*,¹ which the Chaldæans destroyed, and a post-exilic temple, the *second house*.² The temple described by Ezekiel is not a third temple of stone which is to be erected at the end of time, when the second temple shall have met with the same fate as the first (a fate nowhere foretold), but it is an ideal for the realization of which the post-exilic prophet hoped, when Israel shall have repented (Ezek. 43: 10, 11), and all his tribes, and with renewed first love returned to

(1) בית ראשון
(2) בית שני

the land of their fathers, a condition which was not fulfilled. Chapters 40 to 48 of the book of Ezekiel are an unfulfilled prophecy. On account of their disagreement with the pre-exilic and post-exilic order of divine service, they are for the synagogue an unsolved riddle, so that their explanation is a task reserved for Elijah.¹ On their account the whole book of Ezekiel was in danger of being declared apocryphal; but a certain Chanania, with a store of three hundred barrels of oil, retired to his study and happily explained away all the contradictions against the Law. (Chagiga 13 a.) Such is the assertion, but nowhere do we find samples of their supposed reconciliation, nor does this temple anywhere appear as the goal of Israel's hope. In fact, there is no such thing as a *third* temple mentioned by Ezekiel; there is a second temple, as it was to be according to Ezekiel's conception, but it was never really built.

When, by permission of Cyrus, a number of exiles under Zerubbabel, the prince, and Joshua, the high priest, had returned to their fatherland, the foundation of a new temple was laid, in 534 B. C., the second year after the return. The building was soon interrupted, but was resumed in 520 B. C., the second year of the reign of Darius Hystaspes. In this year, the second of the reign of Darius, was it that Haggai and Zachariah began to preach. These both prophesy that the beginning of the Messianic time would occur in the time of this temple. "The glory of this latter house," we read in Haggai 2: 9 "shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts; and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts."

And in Zechariah 3: 8, we read: "Hear now, O Joshua, the high priest, thou, and thy fellows that sit before thee, for they are men wondered at: for, behold, I will bring forth my servant THE BRANCH." From the time that Isaiah 4: 2, Jeremiah 23: 5, and 33: 15 were written, THE BRANCH had been the name of the Messiah, as of the branch of David which was to grow from lowliness to glory, and to spread around him everywhere salvation and glory.

¹ פֶּ-שֶׁה וְ עֵתִיד אֱלֹהֵי לְרִשָּׁה

In the 6th chapter of Zechariah we read that the prophet was to make "crowns, and set them upon the head of Joshua, the son of Josedech, the high priest," that he may represent in a picture what was to come: "Behold the man whose name is THE BRANCH, and he shall grow up out of his place (his home), and he shall build the Temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne; and the counsel of peace shall be between them both (viz: the high priest and the king, *i. e.*, the two offices now separated from one another)."

At the time when this prophecy was spoken, the building of the second Temple had been resumed by permission of Darius. It was easy to see that it would be far behind the Solomonic Temple in magnificence. But it is endowed with all the more glorious promises. It is to be the abode of peace; the Prince of Peace, king and priest in one person, after the order of Melchizedek, is to appear in the time of this temple. In the sixth year of Darius, in 506 B. C., the building was finished. Under these circumstances, the Temple which THE BRANCH builds, the Son of David, the ultimate fulfillment of the promise given in 2 Samuel 7, can be no *third* temple of stone. History moves forward, not backward. But what *kind* of temple was he to build? If Jesus is the Messiah, we have an intimation regarding it in the answer He gives after having cast out of the Temple the money-changers and those that sold sacrificial animals, to those who wanted to know what authority He had for His actions. That answer was an enigma even to His disciples. "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up." John 2:19. Here, too, the temple which was to come in place of the post-exilic temple restored by Herod, is certainly not one of stone.

Supposing the temple which THE BRANCH was to build was to be one of stone, we should have to assume the appearance of THE BRANCH to occur at a time when the second temple is destroyed. But that would contradict Malachi, the last of the three post-exilic prophets who prophesies in the first verse of his third chapter: "Behold, I will

send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in; behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts."

Here are three different persons introduced. The way-preparing messenger, viz., Elijah, as he is called later on; the Lord, *i. e.*, God; and the messenger of the covenant, *i. e.*, the mediator of the new covenant promised by the prophets. Jer. 31:31, Isa. 42: 6; 48:8. What we are to understand is, I suppose, that the coming of this mediator of this covenant is, indirectly, the coming Lord Himself. But what we are concerned with is only this: that the day of the Lord which accomplishes judgment and salvation, and ushers in the time of the new covenant, occurs during the time of the second Temple. This second Temple has, however, been more than fifteen hundred years removed from the holy mountain, so that not one stone has remained upon another.

Has, after all, that been fulfilled long ago, which you, my dear Jewish reader, expect yet to come hereafter? Is not, after all, perhaps, that Jesus who once addressed to the Jewish people the words, "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate,"—is not He, after all, THE BRANCH spoken of by Zechariah, and "*the messenger of the covenant*" spoken of by Malachi? Has He not truly ushered in a new time in which the kingdom of God went over from the rightful basis to the other nations, as Malachi, according to the first chapter and eleventh verse, declares to have actually seen? These are questions addressed to the conscience, which every Israelite to whom truth is dearer than his accustomed notions, should ask himself, as in the sight of God.

It is, then, a spiritual temple of living stones which, according to the prospect held out by Zechariah's prophecy, THE BRANCH, who combines in himself the priestly and royal offices, would build. The congregation of the New Covenant, whose mediator is the messenger predicted by Malachi, is this spiritual temple. For it is a congregation, gathered, in the first instance, out of Israel, but afterwards

breaking down the national limitation, and reaching out towards all nations. It is a congregation, not kept together by the bonds of consanguinity, but it is a spiritual congregation, united by their unity with the God of revelation. The Old Covenant is dissolved after it has been shown to be insufficient to realize the counsel of God which is directed toward the whole race of man. National privilege has ceased after having performed its preparatory service. The Law of Israel is a national law, and as such unsuitable to become the rule of life for a congregation composed of all nations. It was a preparatory step, and is now, since Christ appeared, an obsolete platform. The Prophets, and Psalmists, and the writers of the so-called Books of Wisdom, laid, already, stress upon the essential in religion; they deprecated the external compliance with ceremonial laws, demanded in place of animal and vegetable sacrifices self-dedication of the inner man, and reduced the real will of God, whose reflex are the ceremonial prescriptions, to the real and immediate religious concerns. They prepared for what has been realized by the Christian religion, namely, the deepening and widening of the religion of the Law. Of course, if the Mosaic Law were truly an unchangeable divine revelation, Judaism would be right in opposing the Christian religion. Maimonides takes up that position; but not without opposition from other Jewish dogmatists like Isaac Albo, who maintains: God Himself may, in changed circumstances, declare a change in what he originally commanded. A proof of this is to be found, *e. g.*, in the relationship of the laws given in the book of Deuteronomy, dating from the fortieth year after the Exodus, toward the Law given from Sinai in the first year.

That the Hebrew male slave should be free in the seventh year, according to Ex. 21: 2, is, according to Deut. 15: 2, extended into granting the same privilege to the Hebrew maid-servant. The general law, in Ex. 21: 16, that stealing of men is to be punished with death, is narrowed, according to Deut. 24: 7, so as to apply only to the case of the stolen person who has been sold as a slave, being a Hebrew. While, according to Lev. 17: 3, no sacrificial animal may be

slain except at the Tabernacle; the killing of animals for domestic use is, according to Deut. 12, allowed in any locality.

And again, the old law, according to which, wherever God is present, a plain altar of earth or uncut stones, and without steps, should be erected, according to Ex. 20: 24 ff., was superseded by the erection of the Tabernacle and the brazen altar, and by the demand of the book of Deuteronomy for a central Sanctuary, as the exclusive place for sacrifices. These are only a few examples, which might be augmented by others referring to laws about festivals as given in the Pentateuch. The names of the festivals, the number of the great feasts, the prescriptions referring to sacrifices—all have been modified, in the course of time. And if, within the time covered by the Pentateuch, the law underwent changes, why should changes which have a right to lay claim to divine authority, be considered impossible in the time after the Pentateuch? The Prophets prove the contrary. The Law, according to Deut. 23: 2, excludes all eunuchs from the congregation of the Lord. But the Prophet Isaiah, according to 56: 3-5, of his book, breaks through this barrier of the Law and comforts the eunuchs returning from Babylon by the promise of membership with all its rights. It might be objected that though such modifications in isolated cases might be admissible, the complete abrogation of the ceremonial law is inconceivable.

But for the Prophets there exists no such insurmountable difficulty. "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord," we read in Micah 6: 6-8, "and bow myself before the high God?" Shall I come before Him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

And Jeremiah says, in deprecation of the hypocritical sacrificial services: "I spake not unto your fathers, nor

commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices; but this thing commanded I them, saying: Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people." Jer. 7: 22. These are declarations which sound like anticipations of the future abrogation of the ceremonial law.

It is different, indeed, with Ezekiel, who, in chapters 40 to 48, propounds a new ceremonial law for the whole of Israel returned from the land of exile. But the new ecclesiastical and political commonwealth which he describes has not been realized, its conditions having remained unfulfilled. But this part of the book of Ezekiel is on this very ground an important part of the Canon of the Scriptures, that it furnishes a clear proof against the immutability of the Mosaic Law.

The Midrash says frequently that the Holy One—blessed be He—will give a new Law through the Messiah. The new feature of this Law is that it discloses the object and spirit of the old.

Does not the preacher of the Sermon on the Mount correspond to this picture of the future?

And another passage in the Midrash says: In the days of the Messiah all sacrifices will cease, except thank-offerings. Is not Jesus, perhaps, after all, that servant of the Lord who, according to the prophecy in Isa. 53: 10, will "make his soul an offering for sin" for his people?

(To be continued.)

A JEWISH VIEW.

NEW YORK, June 11, 1889.

To the Editor of THE PECULIAR PEOPLE.

Dear Sir,—In the first number, for April, you assert: "That the editor is by birth a Gentile may be a matter of regret to many of our readers." Permit me to differ with you, and to state that had your organ emanated from a Jewish Christian, I would have considered it beneath my dignity to contribute for it. But since you are a Christian by birth, I consider it to be my sacred duty to make a few remarks, leaving theology, however, out of the question.

Although we Jews are proud of never attempting to propagate monotheism among the Gentile world, yet I fully appreciate your strenuous efforts to promote Christianity among the Jews. But I fear you will have to agree with me that the efforts were, are, and ever will be, "love's labor lost." The reason for my opinion I base upon plain, substantial, undeniable, living facts.

For argument's sake let us both assume the roles of the principal characters. You, in addition to your true Christian conviction, appear as a true friend, urging me to accept Christianity for the sole benefit of being saved, both here and hereafter. Your proofs from the Old Testament bearing upon the New, are so convincing that I cheerfully agree with you in every particular. You will, then naturally urge me to redeem my conviction by my action, *i. e.*, to renounce my former erroneous Judaism, and substitute for it my self-convincing belief in true Christianity. My answer will then be as follows: About the existence of a future state of bliss and misery neither of us could argue pro or con, as it is enveloped in an impenetrable cloud bearing the seal of "mystery" upon it, as it is proven in Holy Writ—"The secret things belong to the Lord our God," etc. But in my opinion a paradise and hell exist upon earth for us to strive after and reject. It is then my manly duty to become a Christian in order to avoid the latter and secure the former. Indeed, I would, then, cheerfully comply with your wish, providing you could point my way clear to true happiness. But alas! can you do it?

At present I pay liberally for the privilege of belonging to Temple *Ahawath Chesed*, where I gather the gems dropping from the lips of the scholarly divine, Dr. Kohut. When leaving the temple I exchange greetings with men identified with philanthropy that knows neither race nor creed. But lo! and behold! no sooner will my bald head become saturated with the baptismal water than I will have to pitch my religious tent in the residence of the Rev. Jacob Freshman, there to be tortured by his stereotyped harangues, which are in direct contradiction to the teachings of Christ Himself, who said, "Not every one that saith un-

to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven." Besides, I will be forced to form my acquaintance with double and triple converts, and full-fledged thieves at that, as the last addition the Rev. Mr. Freshman made to Christianity demonstrates. At present I am proud to consider as friends such co-religionists as ex-minister Strauss, who has accomplished more good for Christianity during his sojourn in the Ottoman Empire than all the missionaries combined; while, when I become a Christian, I will be forced to associate with those who "black-balled" Mr. Strauss. At present I am proud of the acquaintance with my co-religionist, Mr. A. B. de Frea, who monopolizes the management of all the charitable fairs for the exclusive benefit of sick and poor Christians. At my becoming a Christian I am at once initiated into the society of those who use their religion as a barrier, shutting out the identical Mr. de Frea from their Christian inns. As no missionary has ever been known to work for his living (missionary work excepted,) I, too, on account of my early tuition, will, no doubt, be installed as a chief rabbi missionary. Then the sacred duty devolving upon me will be to entrap Jewish little children into Christian schools, covered up by signs in Hebrew. That this is the rule instead of the exception, I refer you to your own graphic account in your organ for April, page 3. In short, I, as a Jew, claim that since the original Old Testament has not been contested, I decline the acceptance of the codicil. You, however, endeavor to convince me that by accepting the dogma embodied in that codicil I will become as great an example as Shlamowitz, Rosevalley, Freshman, Green, Taubes, Kramer, and a host of others too numerous to mention.

A. BENJAMIN.

CORRESPONDENCE.

COLUMBUS, Ga., June 10, 1889.

To the Editor of THE PECULIAR PEOPLE:

Dear Sir,—The replies of Messrs. Cook and Ernst to my last communication are undoubtedly productions of good and learned men, but far from satisfying the *Jewish* mind

that Christianity is necessary for salvation. The Jew does not believe in the trinity of God, for the "*Lord shall be one and His name one.*" Zech. 14: 9. So therefore God cannot be three in one, nor even can His name be more than one. I will not indulge at length upon this point, as it would take too much space, for I have to make two replies in one, with many questions to answer. I beg to be clearly understood, that I offer no *modernism*, which our orthodox Christian friends so quickly hurl at a *reasoning* Jew. I give no other meanings to words and passages of Scripture than they bear on their face, and I quote the old, old Scriptures, without my own flavoring extract, and without change or modification. Is this modern? If I can make reason out of the original text, why should I seek interpretations foreign to the general acceptance of the language?

The very first prophet, the greatest of prophets (Isaiah), in his very first chapter, personifying God, says: לְכוּנָא וְנִכְחָה "Come now, and let us reason together." Yet some disregard reason because it is detrimental to their theory; and if one argues with reason he is *modern*, while God, in Isaiah's time, invites Israel to reason. Mr. Cook holds that, because Jews of old expected a Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth must needs be the one expected. But was that expectation scriptural? I say no. It was rabbinical and traditional. If, then, our good sister religionists accept one part of tradition, why not the remaining nine hundred and ninety-nine parts? Because that would disfranchise their theory. I, however, must here refrain, for I promised to remain within scriptural bounds.

Well, then, Israel was promised a deliverer, a publisher of unbounded peace. Jesus is quoted to say, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword." Matthew 10:34, Luke 12:51. For the sword, alas! the Jews have had enough of it without getting it from the "*Prince of Peace*," whom they expected to perfect their safety. Again he said, "I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law." How much sweeter does it sound the

way the good Old Testament has it: "He shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers." Mal. 4: 6. Make your own inference, but within the bounds of reason. Mr. Cook admits that one can be saved without believing in the Saviour, provided he know not the gospel history. "But to know that history and shut one's eyes to its resplendent evidence that *God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself*, is another matter, and incurs a fearful responsibility." There are good, honest, and sincere men reading the gospels, with faithful hearts, to find the truth, and if they cannot discover what some claim in them, would Mr. Cook call this shutting their eyes? The Bible does not say so. Cannot the reasoner accuse, with more impunity, the one who argues with blind faith, of shutting his eyes? Here, very suitably, I precipitately come to Mr. Ernst's quotation, "Secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but those things which are revealed belong unto us." Deut. 29: 29. If, then, one reads the Scriptures with this motto before him, why dive into mystic interpretations? Why say he cannot see it, he shuts his eyes, and other such epithets? Twotimes two are four, let some one shut his eyes to this fact. And yet some tell me that three are in one. God never revealed it except you seek out round-about interpretations. God's commandments are pure, enlightening the eyes, and not wrapping them up with darkness, making it transparent to only a few.

Mr. Ernst says, when I quote, "Look unto me [God], all the ends of the earth, and be ye saved," that how to be saved remains in the background, to be told how, by whom? By those that owned this Book from its incipency, or by those who have taken it from us and want now to tell us that they know it better? Why did Mr. Ernst pass by my quotation from Micah 4: 5, where it says, "All people will walk every one in the name of his god, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and ever?"* Does not this clearly indicate that the Lord tolerates all,

*See note at the end of this letter.

irrespective of religion, and religion shall no more be the object of strife? Each may perform his religious functions and yet be fraternal and friendly to all, with God to bless all as His children.

Mr. Ernst makes it appear that Moses in supplicating God for forgiveness of Israel's sin, is willing to be banished for them from God's presence; but Moses said, *מחני נא מספרך* "Blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book" (Ex. 32: 32), offering himself as a sacrifice, but Mr. Ernst does not say what God's answer was. "Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book. Therefore now go, lead the people," etc. This shows that a Saviour cannot expiate the crimes of a sinner; the wicked must stand their own consequences. It also shows that people need a leader here, but in the hereafter none can stand between the justice of God, the Father, and man, His child. The Jews never came to God through the mediation of the priests any more than people now come through the minister; only because the art of printing was not known; and who possessed the Scriptures and books of knowledge? The priests and those who could afford it. To-day every paper that comes to your house is more than a priest, and more than a single preacher, for a preacher can only reach his limited hearers, while the paper thrusts itself upon thousands of readers. As to the sacrifice, it was never intended to savor God's desire, but to provide the priests and Levites who had no other means to live than what the sacrifices afforded them (see Lev. 22, ff, and Deut. 14: 27-29, and other places), and it was a sin against God's ordinance to neglect this, just as it is sinful now-a-days to withhold the pay from teachers and ministers.

Let us, in conclusion, bear in mind that notwithstanding that there are more Jews now in the world than there were ever before, with more missionaries eager to convert them than ever before, the conversions are fewer than ever before. Year after year new synagogues are built, and rabbis consecrated and ordained; yea, the blessing of God seems to shower down upon us, as in accents

of divine approval of our religion. Should this not be plain evidence that God liveth, and Israel forever?

L. WEISS.

NOTE.—If we recollect aright, Mr. Ernst wrote a paragraph on this point. On account of lack of space we were compelled to condense Mr. Ernst's letter, and omit it. He treated it in a manner similar to that in which Mr. Robitschek answered it in the last part of his letter, which had to be carried over from our last issue, and which reads as follows:

Rabbi Weiss seems to gather from Micah 4:5, that "all people will walk every one in the name of his god," and he, Rabbi Weiss, the only true worshiper, extends the fraternal hand unto them. No, my dear sir, the nations must first learn to go up "to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob" (Micah 4:2), serving him who was to come forth from Bethlehem, and was "to be ruler in Israel" (Micah 5:2), before there can be any godly fraternity between Jew and Gentile. For in Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Gentile, but they are all one, brothers and sisters, children of the living God, but *only in Christ Jesus*.

I close my long letter with the hope and prayer that the Almighty may pour his Spirit upon this poor, benighted people, and that they in turn, may seek him with their whole heart; for if thou shalt seek the Lord thy God, "Thou shalt find him, if thou seek him with all thy heart, and with all thy soul," says the Lord. Deut. 4:29.

To the Editor of THE PECULIAR PEOPLE:

Dear Sir,—In your May number you print a letter from Rabbi L. Weiss, which certainly challenges a response.

The first point which he makes relates to the well-nigh unconquerable prejudice which, through the force of early education, will bias a man's opinions either in favor of Judaism or Christianity, as the faith of his parents or educators is Jewish or Christian. True, but it is equally true of the sincere and earnest idolater who carefully trains her child to worship images in stone or metal. But is not the ignorant zeal of this heathen mother and the blind prejudice of her heathen child to some degree blame-worthy? What is so unsparingly condemned in the Hebrew Bible as

idolatry? Will ignorance shield the law-breaker? Why then were sacrifices offered by the pious Hebrew for sins of ignorance? Certainly, knowledge of a law increases guilt. But on the other hand, the ignorant transgressor is responsible to his Maker and Law-giver for that darkening of the intellect and paralyzing of the conscience which hides the truth from his eyes. There is such a thing as "sinning against light;" yes, there is such a thing as gazing with persistent unbelief at the Lord our God, who is a Celestial Sun, and in consequence becoming religiously blind, as the eyes of the body are blinded when we recklessly gaze at the terrestrial sun. The Great Rabbi of Christian doctrine, even Jesus, tells us, "That servant which knew his lord's will and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes." Luke 12:47, 48. Still it is true that the ignorant transgressor is not innocent, and shall receive stripes. Why? Because every man should be sufficiently intelligent and sensitive to right things to do those things *before they are commanded by written statutes*; and the mental stupidity and torpor of consciousness which are the elements of man's spiritual ignorance are the results of closing the eyes against the light and hardening the heart.

With sorrow do we say that one of the most striking illustrations of this judicial blunting of the spiritual perception of the soul is found in Isaiah speaking of the children of Israel. The Lord said to Isaiah (6:9,10), "Go and tell this people: Hear ye in hearing, but understand not; and see ye in seeing, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and turn and be healed." This is a prophecy concerning the majority (not all) of the Jews, and explains the blindness of Israel as a nation in 1889. Jesus, the Messiah, came to His nation, and not a Hebrew rabbi can be found who does not speak of Him as a good man, and regrets His crucifixion. Why,

then, was He condemned by the Sanhedrim and rejected by His nation? It was a sin of ignorance. This ignorance was judicial blindness, the punishment for sinning against the light which shines from the Torah and the Prophets, illuminated, as they are, by God's Holy Spirit. With a heart full of love for Israel, I ask the attention of all Hebrews to this very important matter of their fatal sin of ignorance, their sin of this century as truly as of past centuries.

On one occasion Jesus of Nazareth, walking toward Jerusalem, was very hungry, and coming to a fig-tree found no fruit, but only leaves, for it was early spring, and too soon for new fruit. Jesus, disappointed, said, "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward forever. And presently the fig-tree withered away." Matt. 21: 19. This is supposed to illustrate the case of the Jewish nation when they refuse to make such a zealous use of their Torah and Prophets as would lead them to Christ and Christianity.

The fig-tree, in Palestine, when in vigorous condition will bear fruit late in autumn, so that when overtaken by winter there will remain on its branches until the advent of spring figs almost ripe. These figs only need for a few days the warm rays of the spring sun, and the fruit is ready to be plucked by the hand of the hungry. So, if the Jew, in the day when Jesus was upon the earth, had made a *wisely* zealous use of the Mosaic institutions, they would surely have been led to accept Jesus as the Messiah. They lived not up to the light they had, and their lightness turned into darkness. This has been equally true of Christians whenever they have ceased to retain the life of a true, living Christianity. All that has been left after the departure of the living Jesus, are dead, dry forms of doctrine and worship, and the soul cannot live upon husks. Those who should know tell us that commonly the Judaism of to-day is largely a dry form and a mere name and history; and that seldom does the Jewish heart go out to Jehovah as to a Father and Saviour. Be this as it may, I well know that if any living Hebrew will be as zealous to obey the Torah as Moses, David, and Daniel, he will be brought

to see that he is a great and helpless sinner, and that he needs a day of atonement and a lamb slain in his stead, and that lamb is Jesus, made a curse for us by dying on the cursed tree. Honest, earnest prayer, will bring light to darkened eyes.

Rabbi Weiss is mistaken in supposing Christians teach:

1. That no one can be saved without a personal knowledge of the historic Christ? What we do say is (a) that all, of all nations and all times, who are saved, secure salvation by virtue of the obedience, sufferings, death, and resurrection of Jesus, the Messiah of God. (b) We tenderly, tearfully, say to every Hebrew, that it is a very dangerous for him, with a knowledge of Jesus, to reject Him as Lord and Saviour.

2. But Rabbi Weiss is again mistaken in supposing that the Lord spoken of in Isaiah 45: 22, 23, is any other than the Jesus whom we thankfully accept as our Lord, our Saviour, and our Messiah. But this only the Spirit of God can show to the man who believes not in Jesus. Man is helpless to convince his fellow if the Power of God be absent.

A. B. KING.

FOR the first time a Jew has been elected Rector of an Austrian university. Professor Dr. Alvis Zucker, to whom this honor has been extended by the Bohemian University at Prague, has been compelled, however, to decline accepting it, as his Parliamentary duties make too great requisites upon his time. Two prominent Jews in the city of Tunis have been appointed members of the Central Council of Public Hygiene. They are M. Raymond Valensi, engineer, and M. David Cazes, Principal of the Alliance School.—*The American Hebrew*

THE fundamental claim of the Sabbath rests upon its being solemnly ordained in the Bible. Whether we look upon this book as the cumulative outcome of Jewish law-givers and scribes, or of divine inspiration, its authority is alike unquestionable. We need be troubled with no *dokumenten hypothesen*, or Wellhausen theories, when considering the Sabbath. The Bible is saturated with the idea of the sacred day.—*Mr. Max Cohen, in a Lecture on the Claims of the Sabbath.*