We said, in our last number, that "the pious of the nations of the world" are, according to the oral law, those who have received the seven commandments of the sons of Noah. We said that of the laws laid down for their own conduct, some, as for instance that respecting divorces, are such as would introduce confusion and misery into Gentile society—and that others, referring to the administration of justice by Rabbinical tribunals, are extremely unjust. But the advocates of the oral law think, nevertheless, that it is very tolerant, more tolerant than the New Testament, because it says that "the pious of the nations of the world have a share in the world to come." Now we cannot help feeling a curiosity to know how great or how small that share will be. And this our curiosity is excited by the following information, which the oral law commands to be communicated to a Gentile who wishes to turn Jew:

As they are to be made known to him the punishments attached to these commandments, so they are also to inform him of the rewards for keeping them. They should inform him, that, by the doing of these commandments, he will be worthy of everlasting life; and that there is no perfectly righteous man, except that possessor of wisdom who does and knows them. And they are to say to him, Be assured that the world to come is laid up for none but the righteous, and they are Israel; and as to this that thou seest Israel in trouble in this world, their good things are laid up for them, for they cannot receive an abundance of good things in this world, like the nations. Their heart might, perchance, be lifted up, and they might go astray, and lose the reward of the world to come, as it is said, 'Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked.' The Holy One, blessed be he, brings upon them the abundance of afflictions for no other reason than this, that they may not be lost. All the nations shall be utterly destroyed, but they shall abide." (Hilchot Issure Biah, c. xiv. 3—5.)

To us this sounds very much like a flat contradiction to the above declaration, that "the pious of the nations of the world have a share in the world to come." Here, on the contrary, it is stated that the blessings of that state are reserved "for none but the righteous, and they are Israel;" and again, "all the nations shall be utterly destroyed." And it is even implied that the nations get their good things in this world, and do not suffer affliction, as they are not to have that blessedness, which is reserved for the righteous. How, then, are we to reconcile these two sayings? There are only two ways which occur to us, either by saying that this is not strictly true, but only a fair speech in order to catch proselytes; or, if it be strictly true, that then "the pious of the world" are to have a much smaller share in the blessedness to come. In any case the spirit is far from charitable or tolerant. It represents God as an acceptor of persons, saving Israelites simply because they are Israelites, and destroying the other nations because they are not Israelites. The New Testament representation is very different, and far more worthy of "The Judge of all the earth." It does indeed say, "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." But in this very declaration, we have an impartial rule applied to all mankind. "He that believeth," of whatsoever nation, kindred, or tongue—Jew or Gentile, white or black—"shall be saved." "He that believeth not," whether he be called a Jew or a Christian, whether he be a son of Japheth, of Shem, or of Ham, "shall be damned." The New Testament asserts no monopoly of salvation for one favoured family. It excludes none because he had not the happiness to be descended from a privileged stock. It lays down a general and impartial rule to be applied to all the children of men. The oral law says,

"All Israel has a share in the world to come." The New Testament says, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord,
shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he
that doeth the will of my Father which is in
heaven." (Matt. vii. 21.) The oral law
says, "The world to come is laid up for
none but the righteous, and they are Israel." The New
Testament says, "God is no re-
specter of persons; but in every nation he
that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is
accepted with him." (Acts x. 34, 35.) Now
then we appeal to the good sense of every
Jew, even of the Talmudists, to tell us which
of these two statements is most just, impartial,
and worthy of the Just Judge?

But the reasoning employed in the above
extract from the oral law, is as false as the
principles which it is intended to support,
when it says, "As to this that thou seest
Israel in trouble in this world, their good
things are laid up for them, for they cannot
receive an abundance of good things in this
world like the nations," it directly contradicts
the law of Moses, which everywhere promises
an abundance of temporal blessings to Israel,
if obedient. "It shall come to pass, if thou
shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of
the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all the
commandments which I command thee this
day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on
high above all nations of the earth, and all
these blessings shall come upon thee, and
overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the
voice of the Lord thy God. Blessed shalt
thou be in the city, and blessed shalt thou be
in the field. Blessed shall be the fruit of thy
body, and the fruit of thy ground, and the
fruit of thy cattle, the increase of thy kine,
and the flocks of thy sheep.

. . . . The Lord
shall cause thine enemies that rise up against
thee to be smitten before thy face; they shall
come out against thee one way, and flee
before thee seven ways. The Lord shall
command the blessing upon thee in thy store-
houses, and in all that thou settest thine hand
unto; and he shall bless thee in the land
which the Lord thy God giveth thee" (Deut.
xxviii. 1—8, &c. )

Here, then, is temporal
blessing in abundance, promised to obedience;
and the afflictions which have come upon
Israel are not because of their piety, but be-
cause of their disobedience. In this case, then,
the oral law speaks utter falsehood. God has not
two ways of dealing with nations, but one way.
He gives every nation a fair trial, and if they refuse to hearken to his voice, he pours
out upon them his wrath. The rise, and
growth, and trial, of a nation is slower, and
requires more time than the growth and trial
of individual men. The life of a nation is, so
to speak, longer than the life of a man. Cen-
turies are required as the time of a nation's
trial, but all history, sacred and profane, tes-
tifies the truth of the general rule given in the
Old Testament, "Righteousness exalteth
a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." The only difference which God makes between

Israel and the other nations, is with regard to
their national existence in this world. He
has crumbled the mighty empires of Assyria,
Babylon, Greece, and Rome into dust, but
he still preserves the independent existence of
the family of Abraham, according to his
covenant; and when, as a nation, they repent
and return to him, He will remove the rod
of his anger, and give them the temporal pro-
spersity which He has promised by the mouth
of Moses his servant. But this promise of
temporal blessing will not justify any im-
penitent Jew at the tribunal of God's judg-
ment. The hopes held out by the oral law
are utterly fallacious, and dis honouring to
God, inasmuch as he is represented as unduly
favouring one nation, and unjustly condemning
all others.

An advocate of the oral law may, however,
find out some other way of evading the evi-
dent intolerance of the above statement, and
still insist upon it, that as the Talmud says,
"The pious of the nations of the world have
a share in the world to come," it is a very to-
lerant book. We therefore proceed to inquire
what pains the rabbis have taken to add to the
number of those who are to be saved. They
believe, as we are told, that every one, who
receives and observes the seven com-
mandments of the sons of Noah, will be
saved; they believe that all others must be
lost; have they then taken any pains to make
known this important information to the
world? Or, if that was not to be expected
during the captivity, did they during the days
of their power and dominion? Or, at least,
did they offer every facility to those Gentiles
who might come to renounce idolatry, to re-
ceive the necessary instruction? Did they
command all their disciples to be ready day
and night to open their doors at the knock of
the penitent idolater, and by receiving rescue
him from everlasting destruction? Not one
of all these things. They commanded that,
during forty-nine years out of every fifty, such
converts should be refused, and that if they
did not choose to be circumcised, and observe the
whole Mosaic law, they should be left to pe-
rish.

"What is meant by a sojourning pros-
elyte? Such an one is a Gentile, who has
taken upon himself not to commit idolatry,
together with the remaining commandments
given to the sons of Noah, but is not circum-
cised nor baptized. Such an one is received,
and is of the pious of the nations of the
world. And why is he called a sojourner? Be-
cause it is lawful for us to let him dwell amongst us
in the land of Israel, as we have explained in the laws concerning idolatry. *But a sojourn-
ing proselyte is not received except dur-
ing the celebration of the ju-
bilee.* (Hilchoth Issure Bial. c. xiv. 7, 8.) During the other fourty-nine years the unfor-
unate heathen might perish, if they did not 
choose to become Jews alogether. How was 
this chasibah? Was it tolerant? What 
use was there in talking of the liberality of 
The Talmudic law during these fourty-nine years? 
The Rabbinist might say, We grant that the 
pious of the nations may be saved; and a 
Gentile might answer, Well, I am willing to 
become one of the pious; I wish to be saved; 
receive me. The Rabbinist would answer, 
Nay, you must wait until the year of Jubilee. 
The Gentile might urge, there are eight-and-
fourty years to pass away before that; in the 
meanwhile I must die, for I am already old, 
and if I die, I must be lost. The Rabbinist 
could only reply, I cannot help you, unless 
you will consent to be circumcised and turn 
Jew. But what will be thought of the char-
ity of this law if we add, that there had been 
no jubilee, and consequently no pious amongst 
the nations for two thousand seven hundred 
years and more? Yet this is what the oral 
law tells us.

**Since the time that the tribe of Reuben, 
and the tribe of Gad and the half-tribe of 
Manasseh were led away captive, the ju-
bilees have ceased, for it is said, ‘And ye 
shall proclaim liberty throughout the land 
unto all the inhabitants thereof,’ (Lev. xxv. 
10); that means, when all its inhabitants are 
upon it, and moreover when the tribes are not 
mixed one with another, but all dwelling 
according as they were appointed.’* (Hilchoth 
Shemitah, c. x. 8.) We have the account of 
this captivity in the following words, ‘In 
those days the Lord began to cut Israel short: 
and Hazael smote them in all the coasts of 
Israel: from Jordan eastward, all the land of 
Gilead, the Gadites, and the Reubenites, and 
the Manassites.’ (2 Kings x. 32, 33.) That 
was, according to the common chronology, 
about 854 years before the Christian era. If 
to this we add 1836, we have 2730 years 
since the time that there could be a jubilee, 
and consequently 2720 years since any Gen-
tiles were converted from the errors of idolatry 
to the religion of the sons of Noah. What 
is it then but solemn mockery, in any one ac-
quainted with the oral law, to tell us that the 
Talmud is tolerant, and admits “that the 
pious of the nations of the world may be 
saved;” when according to that same book 
seven-and-twenty centuries have elapsed, since 
such many converts were received? We be-
lieve that those who make this defence are 
unacquainted with the principles of the system 
which they undertake to defend. The truth 
is, that the authors of the oral law, finding 
that they could not altogether deny salvation 
to the pious of other nations, were determined 
not to add to their number, and therefore 
limited the possibility of this mode of conver-
sion to times that had elapsed long before 
they were born. But in their own times they 
would not receive any one who was not will-
ing to be circumcised and to receive the whole 
law. And hence we see how exactly the New 
Testament represents the state of the case, 
when Christianity was first propagated 
amongst the Gentiles, and free salvation was 
proclaimed to all who believed, without be-
coming Jewish proselytes. The Rabbinists 
opposed with all their might. “And certain 
men which came down from Judea taught the 
brethren and said, Except ye be circumcised 
after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be 
saved.” And again, “There was a certain 
sect of the Pharisees which believed, 
saying that if was needful to circumcise them, 
and to command them to keep the law of 
Moses.” (Acts xv. 1-5.) It was not the 
year of jubilee, and therefore renunciation 
of idolatry was not sufficient in the eyes of these 
traditionists, who believed that at such a time 
there was no salvation except for those who 
observed the whole law. But how is it now? 
If a Gentile should desire now to become 
one of the pious of the nations, could the Jews 
receive him? According to the above general 
principles, certainly not. The tribes are still 
scattered and mixed up together. The land 
has not got “all its inhabitants.” There can 
be no jubilee, and therefore those that wish to 
be saved, must, according to the oral law, turn 
Jews, or take their chance of living a year 
of jubilee. But we are not necessitated to 
argue from the principles. The thing is 
expressly laid down in the oral law. After 
explaining, as we have quoted above, who are 
the pious of the world, and that the year 
of jubilee is the only time for receiving them, it 
adds—

"But in the present time, though a man 
should be willing to take upon him the whole 
law with the exception of only one of its least 
requirements, he is not to be received." Now 
then what becomes of the boasted toleration 
of the Talmud? It says that ‘the pious of the 
nations of the world may be saved.’ But it 
says, first, that such converts can only be 
received once in fifty years. It says, secondly, 
than even those scanty opportunities have not 
occurring for the last 2700 years; and, lastly, 
it positively forbids the Jews in the present 
time to give the Gentiles a chance of salvation, 
unless they are willing to receive the whole
law. What use is it then to talk of the pious of the world, or to say that people of other religions may be saved? According to the Talmud, there are no pious of the nations, unless perchance there may be some descend- ants of those who were received 2700 years ago. But all history that we have ever seen is silent on the subject. We do not know of a single congregation of Noahites in the whole world. The forefathers of the Christians were not received during the year of jubilee. They were idolaters received against the wishes of the Rabbinists. The Britons and the Saxons were converted to Christianity long after the final dispersion of the Jews, that is, at a time when, according to the Talmud, it was unlawful to add to the pious amongst the nations. Neither were they received according to the Talmudic condition, in the presence of three learned Jews.

"And it is necessary for such an one to take the seven commandments on him in the presence of three learned men, who are qualified to be rabbies." (Hilchoth Melachim, c. viii. 10.) According to the oral law, then, there are no such persons now existing as "the pious of the nations of the world." It is, therefore, idle to talk of the liberty with which they would be treated, were they forthcoming. Thus the only appearance of an argument in favour of the Talmud vanishes into thin air, and mock our grasp, as soon as we endeavour to lay hold of it. Those who caught at this phantom of charity, no doubt meant it sincerely. They thought that the oral law was misrepresented. They were told that it was charitable, and they therefore nobly came forward in its defence. If they had known its true principles, they would have denounced them. Their advocacy went on a false supposition. But now that we have set forth the true bearings of the case, and given them chapter and verse to which they may refer, and convince themselves, we call upon them to do so: and then, as they hate intolerance, to join with us in protesting against it, even though it should be found in that system, which hitherto they have believed, on the testimony of others, to be divine. At the same time we would seriously ask of them to compare this system, which has been for more than 1700 years the religion of the majority of the Jewish nation, with the system laid down in the New Testament, and to decide which is most agreeable to the character of God, as revealed in the law and the pro- phets, and most beneficial to the world. The oral law says, that God has commanded the heathen to be left for 2700 years without the means of instruction, and that when the days of Israel's prosperity come, the nations are to be converted by force; but that even then, they will not be raised to the rank of brethren, but only be sojourning proselytes. The oral law looks forward to no reunion of all the sons of Adam into one happy family. The New Testament has, on the contrary, commanded its disciples to afford the means of instruction to every creature. It speaks to us Gentiles, who were once regarded as poor outcasts, in the language of love, and says, Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God." (Ephes. ii. 19.) It takes nothing from you. It asserts your privileges as the peculiar people of God; but it reveals that great, and to us, most comfortable truth. "That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body;" and it promises a happy time, when there shall be one fold and one Shepherd. It does, indeed, tell us not to forget what we once were, "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." (Eph. ii. 12.) It reminds us that the olive-tree is Jewish, and that you are the natural branches, and warns us against all boasting. (Rom. xi. 16—24.) And we desire to remember these admonitions, and to acknowledge with thankfulness, that all that we have received, is derived from the Jewish nation. We ask you not to compare the oral law with any Gentile speculations, or systems, or inventions, but with doctrines essentially and entirely Jewish. Christianity has ef- fected great and glorious changes in the world, but we take not the glory to ourselves. We give it to God, who is the author of all good, and under Him, to the people of Israel. We ask you, then, to compare these two Jewish systems, Rabbinism, which has done no good to the Gentiles, and perpetuated much error amongst the Jews; and Christianity, which has diffused over the world the knowledge of the true God disseminated the writings of Moses and the prophets, and increased the happiness of a large portion of mankind. The comparison may require time, and ought to be conducted with calmness and seriousness. But we think that, even without instituting that comparison, you must acknowledge that the principles of the oral law, discussed in this paper, are contrary to the law of Moses; and that, therefore, a decided and solemn protest against these Rabbinical additions, is an immediate and imperative duty.
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