

הברית החדשה.
THE NEW TESTAMENT
IN HEBREW.

Delitzsch or Salkinson-Ginsburg;

To be had for thirty-five cents, or for the asking.

Address the Editor of THE PECULIAR PEOPLE.

עדות לישראל

"Witness to Israel."

A sixteen-page monthly in the Hebrew language devoted to Jewish interests.

TERMS.

Domestic Subscriptions (per annum),	35 cents.
Foreign " " "	50 "

THE REV. CH. TH. LUCKY, Editor,

Agent for England :

THE REV. WM. M. JONES, D. D.,
56 Mildmay Park, London, N., Eng.

THE
PECULIAR PEOPLE.

A Christian monthly devoted to Jewish interests.

Domestic Subscriptions (per annum),	35 cents.
Foreign " " "	50 "
Single copies (Domestic),	3 "
" " (Foreign),	5 "

All Business Communications should be addressed,

THE PECULIAR PEOPLE,
Alfred Centre, N. Y.

All Communications for the Editor should be addressed,

THE REV. WILLIAM C. DALAND,
Leonardsville, N. Y.

Agent for England :

THE REV. WM. M. JONES, D. D.,
56 Mildmay Park, London, N., Eng.

Entered at the Post-office in Alfred Centre, N. Y., April 5, 1889, as second-class matter.

THE PECULIAR PEOPLE,

A CHRISTIAN MONTHLY,

DEVOTED TO JEWISH INTERESTS.

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

— o —
EDITOR,

THE REV. WILLIAM C. DALAND,

Leonardsville, N. Y.

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

— o —
Vol. II.

NOVEMBER, 1889.

No. 8.

— o —
CONTENTS.

The Banner of the Jew, - - - - -	169
Editorials, - - - - -	170
Solomen Questions Addressed to Hebrews of Culture,	172
The Everlasting Nation, - - - - -	176
The Jews of Jerusalem, - - - - -	182
Weiss Correspondence, - - - - -	184

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

THE PEULIAR 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.*

הכִּיטוּ אֶל-צִוֵּר חֲצַנְתֶּם
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., NOVEMBER, 1889. No. 8.

JUDÆUS SUM ; JUDAICI NIHIL A ME ALIENUM PUTO.

THE BANNER OF THE JEW.

BY EMMA LAZARUS.

Wake, Israel, wake! Recall to-day
The glorious Maccabean rage,
The sire heroic, hoary gray,
His five-fold lion-lineage;
The Wise, the Elect, the Help of God,
The Burst of Spring, the Avenging Rod.

From Mizpeh's mountain-ridge they saw
Jerusalem's empty streets, her shrine
Laid waste where Greeks profaned the Law
With idol and with pagan sign.
Mourners in tattered black were there,
With ashes sprinkled on their hair.

Then from the stony peak there rang
A blast to ope the graves; down poured
The Maccabean clan, who sang
Their battle anthem to the Lord.
Five heroes lead, and following, see
Ten thousand rush to victory!

Oh for Jerusalem's trumpet, now,
To blow a blast of shattering power,
To wake the sleepers high and low,
And rouse them to the urgent hour!
No hand for vengeance—but to save,
A million naked swords should wave.

Oh deem not dead that martial fire,
Say not the mystic flame is spent!
With Moses' law and David's lyre,
Your ancient strength remains unbent.
Let but an Ezra rise anew,
To lift the *Banner of the Jew!*

A rag, a mock at first—ere long,
When men have bled and women wept,

To guard its precious folds from wrong,
 Even they who shrunk, even they who slept,
 Shall leap to bless it, and to save.
 Strike! For the brave revere the brave.

WHEN two parties become engaged in any controversy, especially in religious controversy, the discussion is seldom prolonged very far before it becomes evident to any dispassionate observer that both parties are somewhat in the wrong.

MOST certainly is this the case if the discussion be one the issue of which affects, to some extent, the honor of the sects or parties to which the participants belong. Rarely in such a case is truth maintained on either side, even when truth and not honor is the ostensible end for which the controversy is waged.

AND if, in such a case, one should, in the interest of peace, attempt to show to each party his error, he is almost certain to fail in this object, and to arouse instead against himself the ire of both parties; and if the peace-maker himself belongs to one of the sects or parties in question, the anger of the party with which he is affiliated is not always the less violent of the two.

WE, therefore, knowing this tendency of human nature, hesitate to interfere, even in the interest of peace, when the controversy is between Jew and Gentile. But such a discussion not infrequently arises concerning the old theme of anti-Jewish prejudice, and whenever it is the subject of controversy, for example, between Jewish and Christian newspapers, it is certain to remain at the end in the state in which it began, if not a worse state, and he who attempts to mediate has for his pains his labor and the anger (or perhaps the contempt) of both Jews and Gentiles, with only the answer of a good conscience to comfort his sorrows and heal his wounds.

PARTIES to the discussion we have mentioned almost always fall into what seem to us two very grave errors.

Jewish writers, editors, and others, in their denunciation of this unworthy prejudice against Jews, invariably attribute to it a religious character, and call it the fruit of religious teaching, falsehood in the pulpit, in Sunday-schools, etc. On the other hand, Christian writers, while rightly denying that the prejudice is essentially a religious one, almost without exception endeavor to try to show that there is not much prejudice any way, and when they do admit that there is they try to justify it, and deny stoutly that the church is in any way responsible for the prejudice or that the church has any duty in view of it.

THAT a general anti-Jewish prejudice exists among Christians we cannot deny, and nothing gives us greater pain than the fact that Christians do not try to overcome it. That it is the result of centuries of animosity, connected more or less with religion, we know very well. But that this feeling, well nigh universal, is the result of the religious teaching in the Christian Church of the present day, is an egregious mistake. Say, rather, that those cases of intolerant religious teaching are the result of the prejudice already existing, rather than its cause. The influences which maintain this prejudice and keep it alive, are manifold, and the difference in religious faith is but one, and that hardly the most potent one. The prejudice is racial and social rather than religious, and its genesis in the individual is so obscure as to be beyond the reach of analysis.

THE error made by our Jewish brethren grieves us. It grieves us that they persist in attributing this prejudice to the current religious teaching. It grieves us that they misunderstand many Christian teachers who have a warm love for Israel. But if this affords us grief, the error of the Christians in refusing to rid themselves of this unworthy feeling fills us with righteous wrath. The coolness with which Christian (?) people try to justify this feeling and fancy they are free of blame when they find, or think they find some reason for the prejudice, is astounding. Their Master came to give to the people of Israel a more

abundant life. He gave His life a loving sacrifice of patient toil for them. He would gather them to Himself as the mother hen her tender brood. But His followers affect a lofty tone, and say: "Many people dislike you and despise you. *We* don't individually, but many do, and there are reasons, and you will have to stand it or remove the reasons." The difference in spirit between Jesus and the Christians is quite decided. He taught self-denial; He taught to love the unlovely, even our enemies, as His Father loves all mankind; but His followers have forgotten to love Israel, the people whom He loved with a perfect love, and when reminded of the failure they simply shrug their shoulders and say, "It is not to our taste."

SOLEMN QUESTIONS ADDRESSED TO HEBREWS
OF CULTURE.

BY FRANZ DELITZSCH.

(Continued from page 156.)

THE religion of the New Testament contains nothing the foundation of which was not laid as a preparation in the Word of God in the Old Testament. When Paul says of Jesus (Rom. 4: 25) that He was delivered for our offenses and was raised again for our justification, it is essentially the same as what was said of the Servant of the Lord in the 53d chapter of Isaiah. For of Him who, according to God's economy, offered Himself for His people, Israel confesses, as believing in the great, wounded Sufferer, "The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed." And even the Lord, who took Him to Himself from agony and judgment, says of Him who was taken away and lifted up by his persecutors, "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities." So then, the Servant of the Lord willingly went to His death in order to atone for our sins, and even through death He was exalted of God whose decree He had fulfilled in order to procure for many, *i. e.*, as many as believe on Him, a righteousness which will avail before God, which rests upon the atonement wrought

by means of Himself. Christianity does not necessitate to the Israelite new and strange modes of thought, but only this one new thought, that the prophetic word in the Old Testament has come to a full realization in the crucified and risen Jesus.

But how is it to be thought possible that from the voluntary sufferings and death of a man, atonement, justification, and righteousness, accrue to those for whom He takes this suffering and death upon Himself? We will, for the moment, leave it uncertain whether the Servant of the Lord, portrayed in Isaiah 52: 13 to 53: 12 is one person or a plural number; in either case Israel there confesses that salvation and righteousness is wrought for them all through the vicarious suffering and death of One who was long unrecognized and at last fully acknowledged. How are these to be mentally connected?

Perhaps the following story is not inapt to afford an approach to an insight into the matter. I have it from Hesba Stretton, the English story writer, who has also written many other stories from which are made manifest the ethical grandeur and moral value of vicarious suffering and death. The scene of the story which I just now recall is a great London court in which a countless number of people lived thickly huddled together, for the most part poor and morally degraded. The steward of the house maintained strict government, but he was himself a rough, unbelieving man. A faithful and zealous missionary had for a long time left no means untried in order to bring the light of the gospel to this benighted multitude. His courage and loving tact was exhausted, when his son, a gentle lad, who was gifted with a lovely voice, offered to go into the court and to endeavor to touch the hearts of the inhabitants and melt them by striking up some religious songs. The father knew to what danger his child exposed himself, but because the salvation of men was to him more than all else, he yielded at last to the impulse. The boy went day after day, took his station in the middle of the court, and, with a voice as clear as a bell, in which his very soul was felt, began his songs of Jesus. At first there

gathered about him a great crowd, drawn thither by the strange sight and the enjoyment of the music. But little by little, as they perceived the intention of his coming, they withdrew, and finally their applause turned to hatred, which increased to such a pitch that at last the troublesome singer, struck by a stone from the hand of the steward, sank to the ground and was carried away as one dying. He was not really so greatly injured as to die, but he was in imminent danger of death, and this danger was enhanced by his deep sorrow of soul on account of the failure of his good intention and the rejection of his kind wish. But how salutary was the fruit already borne by this sacrifice of self almost to death! Certainly it did not avail for all without distinction, but for all those who examined themselves in the presence of this noble young life all but destroyed. The first fruit was this: From the deadly hatred with which they had requited that love whose wish was to save them from their depravity, they came to the consciousness of their guilt in all its terrible enormity and worthiness of condemnation. The second fruit was found in this: That in the bleeding head and pale face of the sufferer they had before them a picture of innocence able and willing to offer itself a sacrifice for the guilty, an image of divine love which seeks the lost, and a view of that true righteousness, the essence of which is unselfish love. And a third fruit was this: That in remorseful self-blame they cried to God, that He might not let the work of this longing, self-sacrificing love remain unavailing toward them, and that He would make them partake of the righteousness of this just one against whom they had so grievously sinned.

And now we ascend from the lower to the higher, from the comparison to the Incomparable One; from this youthful minstrel whose confession was a note from the many thousand-voiced choir of believers in every age, to that Servant of the Lord whose very person signifies the salvation of mankind; for the Lord says of Him, "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon him; he shall bring

forth judgment to the Gentiles." Isa. 42: 1. We turn from this youth, whom sympathy induced to rescue the dwellers of a neighboring house from their estrangement from God, to that Servant of the Lord who was decreed to become the salvation of the world throughout its utmost extent (Isa. 49: 6), and who accomplished this work as Saviour with a loving tenderness which would not break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax. Isa. 42: 3. We arise in thought from this child, whose zealous testimony brought upon him an illness of perhaps a month, to that Servant of the Lord, "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," whose whole life was marked by sympathetic suffering, and ever full of anguish; from this child whose ardent love brought him near death, to that Servant of the Lord, that Pierced and Bruised One who was led as a tender lamb to the slaughter (Isa. 53: 5-7); from this sick child around whose couch, conscious of guilt, stand the inmates of the premises, and even the house steward, to that Servant of the Lord in whose presence an entire great nation confess their blindness and their sins, through which they have caused his martyr death. From this we gain an insight into the moral consequences of the self-sacrifice of the Incomparable Sufferer. In Him it may be seen of what sin is capable; it outdid itself when it put to death the Holy One of God as a common malefactor. His death is a powerful sermon on repentance. In Him it is shown of what zeal for the Law is capable; for it was the people of the Law who, from the standpoint of the Law, like the friends of Job, considered him rejected of God, and in fanatical devotion to the Law, dragged him to the judgment seat. In Him it is to be seen of what love is capable; for the intensity of His love toward those who hated Him consumed His life, and even when dying He still implored forgiveness for the evil doers. Isa. 53: 12. But this love stood in the place of heavenly love, for it was God's will to bruise Him, and it was God Himself who caused Him to sink in such grief.¹ His suffering was the means to a

(1) ויהיה חפץ רכאו החלי.

fore-ordained end. His self-sacrifice was to become the ground of his exaltation, and the foundation of a great congregation who should give Him thanks for their redemption and justification. Isa. 53: 10, 11. The depth of their iniquity was revealed when they shed the blood of God's Chosen One; and at the same time in that God-ordained, self-sacrificing love there was offered to the sinners a saving hand which brought to those who seized it in faith, forgiveness and mercy, and the gracious power to begin a new life. So we see that through the work of the Servant of God, which, suffering, dying, and living again, He accomplishes, there is wrought for sinners the knowledge of themselves (repentance), the forgiveness of sins (justification), and a new life, well pleasing to God (righteousness).

"Yes," one will object, "but all that sounds exactly like Christianity." Without doubt it is exactly like Christianity, and yet we have been especially careful not to go outside the thoughts directly or implicitly contained in the 53d chapter of Isaiah. The Messiah, according to an older conception, is a king. But, as in Psa. 110, Zechariah gives to the Branch the priestly crown in addition to his crown as king. And to these two crowns there is added by the second Isaiah and Zechariah the crown of thorns which God transforms into a more than royal crown. The picture of Christ on the easel of prophecy was now ready, and there remained nothing except that the one there portrayed should appear, and that the finger of him who stood as the last of the prophets upon the confines of the two great ages of the world should point to Him and say, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!"

(To be continued.)

THE EVERLASTING NATION.

BY THE REV. ADOLPH SAPHIR, D. D.

THE apostle of the Gentiles combines in his own person the most lucid illustration of Israel's past history, ending with the rejection of Jesus, the Messiah, and of Israel's future conversion by the self-manifestation of

Christ, and subsequent unbroken devotedness and service to their divine Lord. The intermediate period also between Israel's rejection and restoration is ushered in by his apostolate, and its character is most fully explained by his teachings. For it is in his epistles only that the mystery of the church is fully explained, as well as the end of the church dispensation, and the re-instatement of Israel as a nation believing in Jesus. Thus the whole plan of God in Christ concerning Israel, the church, and the ultimate kingdom of which Israel is the center, stood before his mind and lived in his heart, intimately connected with his own experience, and interwoven with all his apostolic teaching and practice.

For he himself had experienced that Israel, although entrusted with the oracles of God, although in possession of His holy law, and although animated with zeal for God, still rejected the salvation of God as it appeared in Jesus. But he had also experienced that such was the grace of God and the power of His love that even to the murderer of Stephen mercy was shown, and that the persecutor of the church was converted into an apostle of the Gospel; and thirdly, he had experienced personally that the temporary rejection of Israel as a nation was made, according to the divine wisdom and grace, the occasion to bring the Gospel to the Gentiles; and unto him was committed the knowledge of the mystery of the church in which Jew and Gentile were united into one body.

But, lastly, the deep and inextinguishable love to his nation, of which his conscience bore witness in the Holy Ghost, that it was not merely of nature, but in communion with Christ, gave an intense earnestness to his testimony, that according to the promises given to the fathers, which were confirmed by Jesus Himself, "all Israel shall be saved;" and the whole nation, chosen and formed by God for His glory, will, in the latter days, acknowledge Jesus, and be the center of the divine kingdom on earth. All these four points¹—facts rooted in the Word of God—were

1) 1 Tim. 1: 12-14; Phil. 3; Rom. 9-11; Eph. 3.

embodied, as it were, in the person of the apostle Paul, and were organically connected with his apostolic teaching. Hence we find in that epistle, which contains more than any other a systematic exposition of the whole counsel of God, as it is to be made known to all the nations of the earth,—the world-wide epistle to the Romans—the apostle not merely explains righteousness and life in Christ to every believer, but also the mystery of Israel. For this mystery cannot be omitted without injuring the integrity and affecting the character of testimony.

The apostle is most anxious that the Gentile Christians should not be ignorant of this mystery; and this for a two-fold reason. If Israel is finally and totally rejected the very foundations on which our salvation rests are obscured and endangered. The unconditional covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and not the conditional covenant of works through Moses, is the ground of Israel's position; for they are the children, not of Moses, but of Abraham. The sovereignty, the faithfulness, the power and wisdom of God, are all illustrated in this, that nothing, not even Israel's sin, can frustrate the counsel of God, who has chosen and formed this nation for Himself. The depth of mercy to the chief of sinners, as well as the principle that the gifts and callings of God are without repentance, would not be seen unless a national conversion and restoration are to be expected. That nation which God has called an everlasting nation, and concerning which the sun and the audiences of the moon and of the stars are a pledge that it shall never cease from being a *nation before Jehovah forever*, must have yet this wonderful future before it.¹ The root is the eternal election of God; the foundation, the covenant of grace; the channel, Jesus; the Messiah, of the seed of David, the Minister of the circumcision; and the center, the cross, over which was written, "Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews," and to which ultimately the tear-filled eyes of repentant Israel will turn.

But the second reason why the apostle is anxious that

1) Isa. 44: 7 (Heb.); Jer. 31: 35-37.

the Gentiles should not be ignorant of this mystery is because in this ignorance they will become wise in their own conceits, and, appropriating to themselves the promises given unto Israel as a nation, assume an unscriptural attitude in the world, and forget to fix all their hopes on the return of Jesus according to the Scriptures.

As our Lord, when He appeared to Ananias, said of the apostle, "He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel," so we may expect that the apostle of the Gentiles will yet lift up his voice to the children of Abraham, and explain to them the Scriptures in the light of the cross of Jesus; while unto the Gentile Christians there will be revealed through him in these latter days, the mystery of Israel, which at the time of the Reformation was not understood.

Jesus came to the whole nation;¹ Israel as a nation rejected Him.² Jesus, as we read in the Gospel of Matthew³ was taking leave of the whole nation. He spoke to the Pharisees; He spoke to the Herodians; He spoke to the Sadducees; and after having given, as it were, the last word unto each representative part of the Jewish nation, He sums up all in that heart-rending farewell—"Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children"—the whole nation as a nation—"under my wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house shall be left unto you desolate." But the farewell is not forever. It is a farewell only for a given and definite period. "Ye shall not see me until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The Saviour, ere he was crucified upon Golgotha, had, in His own loving and sorrowing heart, the living and assured hope that that same

1) Throughout Scripture Israel is frequently spoken of as "all Israel" acting as one man. The distinction between the remnant and "all Israel" runs through Romans 11. Compare on the other side the "some" in Romans 3: 3.

2) "Then answered all the people and said, His blood be on us and on our children." Matt. 27: 25.

3) Matthew 22: 15; and 23.

nation which, as a nation, had rejected Him, would again, as a nation, welcome him as the Messiah that cometh in the name of the Lord. And after He had died upon the cross, and appeared again to His disciples, before He ascended up into heaven, He ratified to the apostles the promise that was given of old, that He would come and restore the kingdom to Israel; only not at the present time, because the dispensation of the church had to intervene. Thus it is in harmony with the testimony of Jesus, which is the spirit of prophecy, that the apostle Paul declares that "all Israel shall be saved."

But as all Israel shall be saved *finally*, in the meantime God has not *totally* rejected His people. This the apostle proves in the simplest and most obvious manner. If God had totally rejected His people, the prayer of Jesus on the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," would not have been answered. The prayer of Stephen before his death, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge," would have remained without a divine response. Paul himself is the most striking illustration that God had not totally rejected His people; for God had mercy on him, and revealed unto him His Son. We read of three thousand at Jerusalem, and afterwards five thousand, and afterwards many myriads, or ten thousands of Jews who had come to the knowledge of Christ. And during the first centuries the number and importance of Jewish Christian congregations, who, to a certain extent, still observed the law of Moses, and in whom there lived the vivid consciousness of their connection with the Old Testament history, were considerable.¹ Finally all Israel shall be saved, and during the intermediate period of the church God has not totally rejected His people.

Two points are thus given to us in the apostolic teaching—Israel's rejection of the Messiah, and Israel's future restoration. In the destruction of Jerusalem and the tem-

¹) This point has again been illustrated by the recent discovery of the "Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles" (through the labors of the Metropolitan Bryennio.), a document most probably written as early as 150 A. D.

ple, and in the dispersion of Israel among the nations, was manifested in actual history, what to the eye of faith appeared already at the crucifixion of our Lord, when the veil of the temple was rent in twain. The arch of Titus, still to be seen at Rome, declares to the whole world what believers knew from the written Word, that divine judgment has fallen upon the nation on account of their unbelief. If we ask what connection subsists between unbelieving Israel of the past and restored Israel of the future, between Jerusalem given into the hands of the Gentiles, and Jerusalem restored; there are three facts which, according to the Divine Word, bridge over this interval.

In the first place, according to the Word of God, it is obviously necessary that the Jewish nation should remain in existence as a nation until these latter days. Their enemies must not succeed in destroying them; their enemies must not succeed in so favoring them that they amalgamate through indifference and worldliness with the other nationalities.¹ And also it is necessary that they should not be absorbed by the Christian churches, so as to cease to exist as a separate community. How marvellously has all this been fulfilled every one can see, in the countries of Europe and of the whole world, where God has scattered His people.

Co-existent with Israel's continuance as a nation, we are to expect, secondly, that throughout this whole period there will always be a "remnant according to the election of grace." And thus it has been in the ancient, the mediæval, and the reformed churches to this day. And lastly, that the gospel of the kingdom will be preached among all nations; the apostasy of Christendom will be fully developed, and become universal. And while the faith of the true children of God will be intensified in earnest waiting for the return of their Saviour, the times of the Gentiles

1) The profound word of a Spanish Rabbi, uttered during the fearful persecutions of Ferdinand, deserves to be remembered: "We are a nation, on whom rest both blessing and curse; now you Christians wish to exterminate us, but you shall not succeed, for there is a blessing resting on us; and a time is coming when you shall try to elevate us, and you shall not succeed, for we are under a curse."

will thus draw to a close, and restored Israel will become the center of the kingdom of God on earth.

How marvellous are God's ways! As at the first advent, through the rejection of Jesus the gospel came to the Gentiles, so at the second advent of Jesus He will be received by Israel when He brings judgment upon apostate Christendom. And as at the Tower of Babel the whole human race was scattered by the judgment of God, and thus was divided into nations, so by the mercy of God, immediately after the Tower of Babel, through the election of Abraham, there was laid the foundation of that nation, through which as a nation, all nations as such shall be blessed. Through the church individuals are gathered out from among all nations to believe in Jesus; but it is through the nation of Israel that national Christianity will be established upon the whole face of the earth.

Such, I believe, are the outlines of what is clearly taught us in connection with the gospel and the mystery of the church by the apostle Paul.—*The Everlasting Nation*, May, 1889.

THE JEWS OF JERUSALEM.

Thirty thousand out of the forty thousand people of Jerusalem are Hebrews, and the Israelites bid fair to again become the predominant people in Palestine. The Turkish Government, which has for ages prohibited them from living longer than three weeks at a time in the Holy Land, is, under the influence of the foreign government, relaxing its restrictions and at present they are coming here by the hundreds. They are engaging in business and they now control a great part of the trade of Jerusalem.

A curious people they are. They are nearer the type which existed here in the past, and they have a prescribed dress and their appearance is like that of no other people of the Orient. The boys and men wear long coat-like gowns which reach, without belts, from the neck to the feet, and which show other gowns beneath them at the front. Their heads are covered with cloth or velvet caps

bordered with long brown fur which stands straight out, forming a wide fringe about the head. None shave, and all who can wear beards. Each face is framed in two long curly locks of hair which come out just in front of the ears and in many cases reach down to the breasts, in accordance with an injunction of the Scriptures.

I have visited a great number of their houses; whole families live in one cave-like room of the size of a hall bedroom with no windows, and lighted only by the door at the front. Both walls and floor are of stone. There is little furniture to speak of. There is only a bed or two for the grown people, and the rest of the family must lie on the floor. The kitchen is, in most cases, a little box just high enough for the women of the house to stand upright in, and not more than three feet wide and four feet deep. At the back of this there is a rude stove of stone for the burning of charcoal, and somewhere in the catacombs, which make up the tenements of a score of families, there is a well, which is the common property of all. On the doorposts of each dwelling, whether it be of only one room or more, there is tacked a rolled-up strip of white parchment six inches long, on which is written the name of Jehovah and the ten commandments, and every one of these Palestine Hebrews wears the commandments tied upon his arm under his coat. They have in some cases phylacteries for their foreheads at time of worship, and most of them are very devout.

One of the greatest sights of Jerusalem is the wailing place where every Friday certain sects meet on the outside of the walls of the Mosque of Omar, which occupies the site of Solomon's temple, and with their heads bent against the stones, sorrow over the loss of Jerusalem and pray God to give the land back to his chosen people. This custom has been observed since the days of the Middle Ages, and it is one of the saddest of sights. The old men, the weeping women who kiss the stones of the wall that separates them from what was once the site of Solomon's temple, and which is even now the holiest spot on the earth to the Hebrew, the genuine feeling expressed by all and the faith

that they show in thus coming here, week after week and year after year, is wonderfully impressive. It is indeed one of the strange sights of this strangest of cities. A nation is mourned for, and chants which they utter contain expressions such as the following: "We pray thee have mercy on Zion; gather the children of Jerusalem together; may the kingdom soon return to Zion; comfort those who mourn over Jerusalem; may peace and joy abide with Zion and the branch of Jesse spring up at Jerusalem."—*From Frank G. Carpenter, in the New York World.*

DISCONTENT is the want of self-reliance; it is infirmity of will.—*R. W. Emerson.*

MEN are won not so much by being blamed as by being encompassed by love.—*Channing.*

WEISS CORRESPONDENCE.

37 Strada Olteni, BUCHAREST, Roumania, August 27, 1889.

To the Editor of THE PECULIAR PEOPLE:

Dear Sir,—If I may claim a little space in your useful paper, I will undertake to refute the plausibly well-digested objections of Rabbi Weiss.

Christianity has stood the test of nineteen centuries, and, by its inherent divinity, it cannot do otherwise than stand the test of eternity, and that in spite of all its critics and opponents.

Rabbi Weiss is evidently a candid critic, and, for aught I know, may be a learned man. So was likewise Rabbi Gamaliel, and we read of him, in Acts 5:33-42, that when the apostles were brought before the council and arraigned for teaching in the name of Christ, and would probably have been severely punished, he stood up and with courageous intrepidity admonished his compeers to "refrain from these men;" "for," said he, "if this counsel, or this work, be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."

Christianity, it must be remembered, was then only, so to say, in the bud. What Rabbi Gamaliel would say now,

were he alive, to the beneficial influences and triumphs of the cross, we cannot exactly say; but we may conjecture that his conclusive testimony would be somewhat thus: "This counsel and work is of God, and, do what ye will, ye cannot overthrow it, ye are committing the great sin of fighting against God."

Rabbi Weiss has the privilege of living and seeing what his great predecessor had not, and yet he overlooks everything, and comes forward with a string of objections which are not only nugatory in themselves, and contrary to the testimony of Scripture, but which are likewise in contradiction to sound judgment, and clash with palpable facts.

Rabbi Weiss first objects to the words of Christ (Matt. 10:34), "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword," and insinuates that it was a part of our Lord's mission to sow discord among mankind. Does Rabbi Weiss really believe this to be one of the objects of Christianity? I trow not. If it were, the religion of Christ would carry its own sentence upon its forehead. But every candid reader of the New Testament knows how far this is from being the case; he knows that our Lord did not mean these words to convey a maxim or an injunction, but that Christ, in his omniscience, knowing the frailty of human nature, and foreseeing the consequences which will follow the adoption of His religion, uttered the words as a foreview of what will take place.

The principal object of our Lord's appearing in the flesh, was, as is well known, to make peace between God and fallen men, and by virtue of this most important office, He is styled the Prince of Peace. The dissensions which our Lord foresaw would arise consequent upon the establishment of His religion, cannot therefore any more be ascribed to His having wilfully originated them, than can the Anti-Semitic movement be traced to the teaching of Christianity. But let us see how dissensions arose.

Our Lord Himself preached first the glad tidings of the kingdom among His countrymen. The most of them rejected His claims, but some believed in Him. Let

us for a moment imagine ourselves in a family wherein, for instance, two believed and the other members whereof did not. What is the outcome of this religious difference? There must needs arise disagreements in such a family. The non-believer would reproach and scorn the two who believed, and these would in consequence feel bound to separate themselves from the rest, for they could not, for conscience sake, have any further fellowship with them, just as there can be no fellowship between light and darkness, God and Baal.

The apostles, after the ascension of Christ, continued to preach the gospel of peace among the Jews. Their preaching was blessed and led to the conversion of many.

The Word of God in their mouth proved a two-edged sword, a fire which began to purify the gold from the dross, and the consequence was that a separation ensued between the followers of Christ and His opponents. But not the former were the originators thereof. Those who believed would not at first separate themselves from the commonwealth and worship of Israel. They continued to attend the temple service as before, and were content to remain Jews in every respect, except their faith in Christ¹. But the unbelievers gave them no peace and ultimately thrust them out, and thus compelled them to form a separate community, and to turn to the Gentiles, being mindful of the Word of God in Isa. 49: 6, "I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." The experiences of the messengers of peace among the Gentiles were in no way different from their experiences among the Jews. We have only to consult the records of Church History to perceive the similarity of their treatment.

And what experiences do believing Israelites have now-a-days? How are they thought of and treated by their brethren according to the flesh?² Let the Jews themselves, including Rabbi Weiss, seriously consider these questions,

1) An unnecessary exception.—Ed. P. P.

2) The writer of a "Jewish View" has in the last issue of your paper (Aug.), given us a bit of his mind on this matter.
H. S.

and then. if they have the courage, let them repeat the objection against Matt. 10: 34, 35.

I remain, dear Mr. Editor, yours faithfully in the
Lord,
H. SILBERBUSCH.

41 East 69th Street, NEW YORK CITY, October 6, 1889.

To the Editor of the PECULIAR PEOPLE:

Dear Sir,—Although not of the blood of Israel, I feel that the God of Israel is my God, and I long that His chosen people may come to the light.

A part of the Day of Atonement just passed I have spent in reading Rabbi Weiss's answers to letters which have appeared in your magazine. Hitherto I have watched with interest and kept silence, saying, "I am young, and ye are very old; wherefore I was afraid, and durst not show you mine opinion." I have given ear unto the word of those that replied to Rabbi Weiss, and waited anxiously for them; but, behold there was none of them that convinced the Rabbi or that answered his words. Wherefore now have patience toward me and listen.

As the Rabbi himself has said, every word may not be answered, for they are too many. Therefore, his earlier letters and the answers of his critics I pass by except in so far as he has cited them in his last letter. I also say nothing upon his words in answer to the three gentlemen who replied to him in your magazine for July and August, except in one point to which I shall refer at the close. But let me say a few words upon the two points of the controversy between the Rabbi and Mr. Goodfriend.

1. If I understand Rabbi Weiss aright, he claims in regard to Gen. 49: 10, that the Messianic doctrine is purely a rabbinical teaching and therefore cannot be accepted by Christians, unless they accept every rabbinical teaching. Rabbi Weiss also seems to maintain that the Messianic expectation is in general unscriptural, since he says in his letter of June 10th (PECULIAR PEOPLE, p. 114), "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."

Now while I know very little of the rabbinical doctrines, I am willing to concede them as much weight in interpreting the Old Testament Scriptures as I do the early Christian fathers in interpreting the New Testament. Their writings are a part of general history, and have a value as setting forth the opinion of the time—a historical value, no more and no less. Still they have a claim upon our attention, and they are just as valuable to the Gentile Christian as to the non-Christian Jew. The Jews, in every age, have certainly expected a Messiah of some kind or other, even when they say as now-a-days, “The so-called time of the Messiah is only that time in which all men will unite in worshiping the ONE holy God, and live together in brotherly love, peace, and harmony.” I think their expectation is most certainly scriptural, and that it is a personal Saviour of whom the Scriptures speak. Gen. 3:15, no matter how figuratively we take the account of the fall, teaches that the human race will one day rise and conquer the serpent-like evil. And what is more probable than that, as, even in a figure, through Adam the whole race fell, so shall redemption come to the race through one man? Though fallen, goodness still exists in evil men, and so evil still exists in those that are redeemed. This Messianic conception of the race we find in the 8th Psalm, and from the descendants of Abraham is this blessing to come. The covenant in Gen. 12:3 shows this, and in Gen. 18:18 and 22:18 this promise is repeated. Later we see Isaac, and then Jacob, and, of the sons of Jacob, Judah, as the chosen ones in the descent from Abraham.

While I am not sufficiently skilled in the language of Eber to argue with Rabbi Weiss in regard to his interpretation of Gen. 49:10, still it certainly means that Judah is to have the pre-eminence in some respect till some one shall come; and I think with the Revised Version (margin) that it is till He comes to whom the pre-eminence belongs, or till that pre-eminence which belongs to Judah comes. Compare Num. 24:17 and 19. The Scriptural expectation of the religious pre-eminence of Judah seems soon to cen-

ter in some one who shall arise in the good time coming. Moses (Deut. 18: 15) speaks of a prophet like unto himself. Some were to hearken unto him and some not. In the Psalms, too, the expectation is of some One out of Israel who is chosen of Jehovah, as in Ps. 80: 17 (Hebrew Bible, 18th verse), and in Ps. 110, and many other places. This One out of Israel is variously represented, under the figure of a Prophet, a Priest, or a King, as one who attains his kingdom through suffering. Psalms 2, 22, 110, etc. Though these refer to events in the past, they form a dim picture of what was certainly expected, in some sort, by the people and the prophets at a later time. The King was to be a second David (Jer. 30: 9), in the days after the captivity is brought back. The Shepherd is "a man, my fellow," saith the Lord of hosts. Zech. 13: 7.¹ All through the prophets the expectation is clear of a coming of Jehovah to His people in the person of One, and His coming is in grace and in judgment to the Gentiles and to His people.

But why multiply words? What mean the "Rod" and the "Branch"² in Isa. 11: 1-15, and the "Servant"³ in Isa. 42: 1-4; also 52: 13 to 53: 12; the "Branch of Righteousness"⁴ in Jer. 33: 15; "My Servant the BRANCH,"⁵ in Zech. 3: 8; the "King, just and lowly,"⁶ in Zech. 9: 9 and the "Messenger of the Covenant"⁷ in Mal. 3: 1? I have not space to quote and refer to the many scriptural passages which mean nothing if not the expectation of a Messiah. 'This certainly is not tradition.

Rabbi Weiss's objection to the quotation of Mal. 3: 1, because the prophecy is not explicitly, *whom ye reject*, is hardly valid. The expectation of a Messiah was surely sufficiently

(1) על-רעיו ועל גבר עמיחי.

(2) חסר and נצר.

(3) הן עברי אתמך-בו בחירי רצתה נפשי.

(4) צמח צדקה.

(5) עברי צמח.

(6) הנה מלךך יבוא לך צדיק ונשע היא, עני ורכב על-חמור ולי-איר בן-אנות.

(7) הנני שלח מלאכי ופנה-דרך לפני, ופתאום יבוא אליהיכלו הארון אשר-אתב מבקש-ים ומלאך הברית אשר אתם הפצים, הנהיבא אמר יהיה צבאות.

universal, as shown by the many allusions of the prophets, to justify the words, "*whom ye seek.*" It was, indeed, as our Saviour said in John 5: 39, 40, "Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me; and ye will not come to me that ye may have life." (R. V.) They sought the Messiah and yet rejected Him. This is a great truth, and no discrepancy. But after all, the prophets were not inspired of God for the purpose of giving curious predictions, which, like a puzzle, could only be understood after they were fulfilled. They had messages to the people of their time; but in and through these messages they caused to shine forth the great truth of the redemption of the human race through Israel and through the Son of David, Jehovah's chosen Servant, Immanuel.

In the specializing of references, Rabbi Weiss has, in a previous letter, fallen into the same error he attributes to Mr. Goodfriend. For he quotes our Saviour's words, "I came not to send peace;" and says He cannot therefore be the "Prince of Peace." Why does he take words from their context? Any one who has read the Gospels knows that our Saviour meant that He sent a sword because not all accepted the Gospel of Peace. Rabbi Weiss takes these words as if they represented Christ's mission to men. Why does he quote two sentences in which the Messiah speaks of a sword and strife, and leave unquoted His many sweet messages of peace? As examples, the prophecy of Zacharias, in Luke 1: 79, the angel's words in Luke 2: 14, and His own words in Matt. 10: 13, Luke 7: 50, 10: 5, 19: 38, John 14: 27, 16: 33, 20: 21, Matt. 5: 1-12, 11: 28-30. Many other words, as well as His deeds, show that He is, in truth, a Healer and no maker of strife. He speaks of strife in the family as one of the many trials that His disciples must endure for His sake. This is not His fault, but the fault of the many who do not accept Him. With Rabbi Weiss's criticism upon Mr. Goodfriend's use of the passage, "Let us make man," etc., and perhaps even in regard to "Unto us a child is born," etc. I will, in the main, agree. But not so with his treatment of Isa. 53: 10, "When thou shalt

make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days." The soul means, of course, the Servant of the Lord, Himself. As "my soul" is equivalent to "me." It is, "When thou shalt make *him* an offering for sin." Not for His own sin, but the sins of the world. To interpret as Rabbi Weiss does is to twist the meaning of the text. That the Servant of the Lord, though offered as an עֹלָה, should still see His seed and prolong His days, is fulfilled in Christianity, and Jesus Christ's presence evermore at the right hand of the Father.

2. What Rabbi Weiss says as to three not being in one cannot be met with human logic. Yet we think that it were better for him to take what the New Testament declares about this and see if it is the same as what he is fighting.

God is omnipotent, and could dwell in the person of a human being as easily as anywhere else. And if he appeared as a human being in the olden time (Gen. 32:24), why not in the person of Jesus of Nazareth to fulfill the prophecies concerning the blessed reign of the Son of David and the sin-bearing of the Man of sorrows, who, in Zech. 12:10, is represented as Jehovah Himself?

The miraculous birth and incarnation of Jesus is to be treated as other miracles and divine manifestations of the inspired history. It is the logical climax of the supernatural element in the history of Israel and of the world. It depends for its proof, not upon the question whether עַלְמָה in Isa. 7:14 does or does not mean a virgin, or whether the sign given to Ahaz was or was not literally fulfilled in his day. The history of Israel was a supernatural history. God was in it, and the culminating feature in that history was the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. The prophets were not inspired to foretell events with that detail and literalness of language that would be most pleasing to some critics; and even after the prophecies have been fulfilled, the apologists cannot so set forth and explain them as to convince the multitude of their verity in the same way that the mathematician proves the truth of his proposition.

But we do find, evidently and clearly, that man fell into sin, that God determined to redeem him, that to this end He chose a people and instructed them in His law, gave His words to them by the prophets, and testified to their truth by many miraculous signs; and by these prophets He signified that one day He would come in grace and in judgment by His Servant, His Anointed of the House of David, His Son, His Chosen One, His Priest, His King, the great Publisher of Peace, and that through Him He should redeem His people and the Gentiles. This redemption was to be wrought by His Servant, who should be rejected, though long expected, who should be offered as a sacrifice for the sins of His people, and who, pierced by them of Jerusalem, stands in a mysterious relation with God. This we see in Jesus of Nazareth, mysterious in His advent and in His departure from this world, like Melchizedek, "priest of the most high God," without "beginning of days or end of life," a King of David's House, His life a benediction of peace to His people, gathering up in His teaching all the wisdom of every age, and attesting His mission by signs and wonders, which of themselves taught the lessons of God. He fulfilled the great purpose of God to show to man, and especially to His chosen people, His love and sacrifice for those hostile to His will. Truly, this is the Son of God.

I said at the beginning that I would advert to one remark made by Rabbi Weiss, and that is his reference to the "exploded falsehood" that the Jews crucified Jesus of Nazareth. There is a half truth on either side of this statement. The Romans indeed performed the act; but many of the Jews, and the leaders among them, too, cried out, "Crucify him!" We, as Christians, should not, however, cast the odium of His crucifixion upon the Jewish race because a few hot-headed ones said, "His blood be on us and on our children;" neither, on the other hand, should Jewish writers ignore the part that certain Jews played upon that occasion.

WILLIAM C. WHITFORD.

