

THE PECULIAR PEOPLE,

A CHRISTIAN MONTHLY,

DEVOTED TO JEWISH INTERESTS.

Founded by the late Rev. H. Friedlaender and the 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.

FEBRUARY, 1890.

No. 11.

CONTENTS.

Editorials, - - - - -	241
The Revised Old Testament, - - - - -	245
The Jews in Europe, - - - - -	247
News, - - - - -	256
Gleanings from the Jewish Press, - - - - -	257
כבוד ישראל, - - - - -	260
The New Year, - - - - -	262
Correspondence, - - - - -	264

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.

הביטו אל-ציר הצבתם

Isa. 51 : 1. ואל-מקבת בור נקחתם

"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., FEBRUARY, 1890. No. II.

JUDÆUS SUM ; JUDAICI NIHIL A ME ALIENUM PUTO.

THE more rationalistic Jewish speakers and writers—and when we use this term we mean it in no offensive sense—lay great stress upon their rejection of the New Testament narratives upon so-called *historical* grounds. Applying to these writings the same criticism which they apply to the sacred books of other faiths containing religious doctrine and miraculous narratives, they are constrained to class them in the same category, as myth, legend, or deception, perhaps written with innocent motives and perhaps with intent to deceive. The doctrines distinctively Christian are rejected as being contrary to Judaism, and as lacking that convincing authority which might establish them as divine truth.

By these writers and speakers we are often told—and with somewhat of truth—that the Christian world, in its thought and belief, is approaching this (rationalistic) Jewish position, and they quite naturally ask how Christians can expect Jews to believe narratives which multitudes of Christians themselves accept with many reservations, and to incorporate into their stock of faith doctrines which multitudes of Christians touch lightly in their teaching, and pass quickly by in their thought, while many reject them entirely. They note the fact that if they, rationalis-

tic Jews, reject the gospel narratives, there are also rationalistic Christians, who, to say the least, have their doubts.

TO THE credit of these excellent theologians it must be said that they frequently admit that, with regard to many Old Testament narratives, they hold similar views, at least in the case of miracles there recorded. But this difference, however, is to be observed. While measuring swords in combat most hostile with their orthodox Jewish brethren, they yet stand most earnestly for the preservation of Judaism, according to their conception of it; and they all revere the Old Testament writings as containing the truth of God revealed to men. Also all, nearly without exception, maintain—though perhaps often in a qualified sense—the supernatural or miraculous character of the Sinai revelation of the Law of God to Moses. That great fact is, to most at least, inexplicable without divine intervention in affairs mundane.

Now, without entering into the controversy between the orthodox and rationalistic parties, whether in church or synagogue, we wish to call attention to this curious condition of things. We have rationalistic Christians eliminating the miraculous element from Old and New Testaments alike, and—at least the sincere and devout ones, for with others we do not concern ourselves—considering both as under divine Providence *media* of conveying to man a great body of religious truth bearing the divine impress clearly manifest. We have rationalistic Jews eliminating the miraculous element—all of it—from the New Testament, and rejecting it *in toto*, while from the Old Testament they eliminate all—or nearly all—the miraculous element, and consider it alone the *medium* of conveying to man religious truth, bearing surely the divine seal. Let the progress of Christianity toward this *quasi* Jewish position be as these writers and speakers insist, the Christian binds the Old and New Testaments together, and is convinced that they contain somehow a divine element absent from all other literature, while the Jew similarly regards the Old Testament,

but puts the New upon another shelf in his library, or affects to despise it altogether.

OCCUPYING, at least for the moment, the platform of our rationalistic friends, we would submit that, however subjective be the considerations which compel the Christian to see an especial Divinity in the life and work of Jesus Christ, their cogency is equal with that of those which compel the Jew to attribute an especially divine manifestation to the revelation upon Sinai. If the Law of God, given to Moses, is inexplicable except it be regarded as a divinely revealed law, equally inexplicable are the teachings of Jesus Christ in the complete elucidation of that law and the perfect realization in His life of the ideal contained in that law except He be regarded as the Divine Revealer of God to men. If the reasoning Jew to-day finds his reverence for the Mosaic Law by no means enhanced by the miraculous signs attendant upon the giving of that law, but on the other hand, is so overwhelmed by the majesty, the grandeur, the moral sublimity of that law, that he is thereby constrained to predicate its divine origin, and therefore to believe in the reality of the recorded supernatural manifestations; so, likewise, the reasoning Christian would not accept and devoutly believe certain doctrines simply because miraculous signs attest them, but because of the grandeur and the moral excellence in the life, character, and teachings of Jesus Christ he is constrained to confess Him divine, and therefore to believe the truth of the wondrous miraculous signs which accompanied His sojourn among men. Christianity is its own best evidence.

WE said that certain Jews claim that rational criticism compels them to reject the historicity of the gospel narratives, as well as of much related in the Old Testament, though of that they are by no means so wont to speak. We said also that the doctrines of the Old Testament they accept as being the essence of Judaism, while the doctrines of the New Testament they reject as anti-Jewish. Herein,

we believe, is where they mistake, partly through a quite natural prejudice and a lack of that favorable disposition toward Christian doctrine, such as is always needful in order to a just appreciation of religious truth, and partly through a lack of candor in their relative treatment of the two Testaments. The doctrines said to be distinctively Christian and peculiar to the New Testament deserve a closer and fairer study at the hands of those who reject them. Of these and their connection with the Old Testament, and of their position as the culmination of Messianic prophecy, and as the completion of the doctrine of redemption gradually unfolded in the Old Testament, we hope to speak in our next issue. Our object now is to point out the fact that Jewish rational critics, even when most free from prejudice, have not drawn parallel conclusions from their criticism of the Hebrew writings and of the New Testament Scriptures. If a rationalistic Judaism is free from dependence upon miracle, and stands upon its own incontrovertible and inherent evidence, so does a rationalistic Christianity. The great three-fold doctrine of God, of man sinful and redeemed by the divine Saviour, and the continued work of the divine Spirit, bringing man gradually to God likeness is more important than the mathematical statement of the doctrine of the Trinity. The great truth that God, in order to bring mankind back to a perfect harmony with Himself, entered into a union with human nature, and thereby brought human nature into union with God is more important than the historical statement of the Incarnation. *Tempus omnia revelat*, and, whatever be the lengths to which an uncontrolled rationalism may throw itself, time will show whether the Christian doctrines are legitimate developments of what, for the sake of argument, we will call Jewish teachings, or whether they are unworthy additions from without. We, Jewish Christians, not being ourselves rationalists, at least to the extent of our friends, are willing to await the verdict of time.

FOUR things come not back; the spoken word, the sped arrow, the past life, the neglected opportunity.

THE REVISED OLD TESTAMENT.

The revision of the Old Testament, finished in 1884, is very different from that of the New Testament. The New Testament revisers, on the basis of the oldest MSS. and versions, went back to the original Greek text as nearly as they could determine it. The Greek New Testament which they had before them differed in many important respects from the Greek New Testament from which King James' translators worked. The case with the Old Testament was radically different. There was no attempt at a revision of the Hebrew text. The work of ascertaining the oldest and best Hebrew text is yet to be done. The Hebrew text from which the revisers work differed in no essential respect from that which lay before King James' translators. From this, the Massoretic text (of which the earliest MS. whose date is certainly known is of the 10th century) the revisers departed, as they say in their preface, "only in exceptional cases." The revisers admitted that the Hebrew text ought to be revised on the authority of ancient versions, but they held that "the state of knowledge on the subject" was not such as to justify any attempt at the reconstruction of the text. That the Massoretic text does not represent the oldest Hebrew original once in existence will be manifest to any student who will take the pains to compare it with the three most important versions, the Syriac (Peshitto), the Greek (Septuagint), and the Latin (Vulgate). For instance, it often happens—indeed it occurs again and again—that when there is a difference of reading, the Septuagint and the Peshitto agree, while the Massoretic text goes with the Vulgate. Now the Peshitto version was made in the second century, from the Hebrew; the Septuagint was made between B. C. 280 and B. C. 150, from the Hebrew; the Vulgate was made by Jerome between A. D. 392 and 404. In view of these dates, the fact that the ordinary Hebrew text of the tenth century (MS. A. D. 916) agrees with the Vulgate of the fourth century, while the Syriac version of the second century agrees with the Greek version, 280–150, B. C., both these latter being independent of each other and both made from a Hebrew

original, would certainly indicate that our Hebrew text is not the same as that of the time of our Lord. Much, therefore, remains to be done in comparing these three versions, and many others, with the text as it appears in many Jewish commentaries, etc., and so ascertaining as nearly as possible the earliest Hebrew text.

But aside from this question of the text, as a mere revision of the former translation, the revised version of the Old Testament is incomparably superior to the Authorized Version of 1611. Notice the poetic form of the poetical books, *e. g.* Job, Psalms, etc., the improvement in the much more accurate translation of the Song of Songs, and the poetic fragments in other books, *e. g.* Gen. 4: 23, 24; 9: 25-27, etc., especially Gen. 49: 2-27. Note also Ex. 15, Num., ch. 21, 23, and 24, Deut. 32 and 33, 1 Sam., ch. 2. Read Isa. 38: 10-20, Hab. 3: 2-19, etc., etc. For special improvements in translation notice Gen. 1: 21, "sea monsters" for "whales," Ex. 12: 35, 36 "asked" for "borrowed" (there was no loan with the expectation of a return), Gen. 4: 15, "appointed a sign for" instead of "set a mark upon," v. 21 "pipe" for "organ" (!), etc. Ps. 16: 2 has "I have no good beyond thee" instead of "my goodness extendeth not to ther." Notice in Ps. 16: 10 "she'ol," *the under world*, instead of "hell." Compare with this the same in the New Testament, Acts 2: 27, "Hades" for "hell." The American Committee would substitute this word for "grave" or "pit," where the English Committee have used the latter to translate the Hebrew word *she'ol*. As in the case of the New Testament, the readings of the American Committee given in the appendix are generally to be preferred, for example "Jehovah" for "Lord," etc. Class VI., as noted above, is a conspicuous exception. Let a fair-minded person look up the few references here given, read them according to the margin and the readings of the American Committee, and he cannot fail to be convinced of the improvement of the Revised Version of the Old Testament over the authorized translation. These references are but a drop in the bucket. If the common English reader wants to know the sense of God's Word he cannot afford to be

without the Revision. It is not, to be sure, what it ought to be, but it is the best we have, and will repay a thousand-fold all the study put upon it by any but the most prejudiced mind.

A STUDENT.

THE JEWS IN EUROPE.

BY DR. JOHANN JOSEPH DOLLINGER.

(Continued from page 231.)

The succeeding popes firmly adhered to the principles and demands of Innocent III. If the Jews built themselves a new synagogue it had to be pulled down; they were only to repair the old ones. No Jew was allowed to be a witness against a Christian; the wearing of badges, of the hat or yellow cloth, the bishops were to enforce by all means of coercion. This law of badges was specially harsh and cruel, for, through them, in the frequent riots and tumults in the towns, the Jews fell all the more easily into the hands of the furious, who recognized them at a glance, and on their migrations they unavoidably became the prey of the numerous marauders and vagabonds who naturally deemed every Jew outlawed. In Spain, therefore, the Jews were permitted to wear any garb they pleased in traveling, which permission, however, was soon withdrawn again.

Eugene IV. especially, who retracted again the humane concession made by Martin V., rendered the ecclesiastical laws—already ruthless enough—still more severe, so that people could not help asking how these men should be able to drag on their miserable existence if all these laws were to be strictly enforced.

What the popes left unmentioned, the Councils of the various countries supplied. They forbade, for instance, a Christian to let or sell his house to a Jew, or to buy wine of him. To all this were added the often renewed orders to burn all the copies of the Talmud and the commentaries thereon, *i. e.*, by far the greater portion of Jewish literature—on account of the passages which were said to occur in

it expressive of hostility to Christianity; whence resulted new torments, persecutions and imprisonments in abundance. It seemed as if the powerful of the earth had for the tormented people only stones instead of bread, and no other answer to their petitions and questions but that which their ancestors once gave to their tyrant Herod. On his asking them what he was to do for them they answered him, he was to hang himself.

The new theory, which considers the Jews to be slaves, was now adopted and elaborated by the divines and canonists too. Thomas Aquinas, whose doctrines are regarded by the entire Church as incontrovertible, decided that princes might dispose of the property of these men, doomed to perpetual slavery, in the same way as of their own goods and chattels. A long series of canonists set up on the same ground the assertion that princes and lords might take away the sons and daughters of Jews by force and have them baptized. That a baptized Jewish child was not to be left to the father was generally taught, and still continues a demand of the Church. The princes had, meanwhile, eagerly seized the papal theory about the everlasting slavery of the Jews desired by God, and the Emperor Frederick II. founded thereupon his claim that all the Jews belonged to him as emperor, according to the logic of that period, that the sovereignty over them had come down from the ancient Roman Emperors to him as their successor. His son, Conrad IV., already used the expression, "Bondmen of our Exchequer," and the *Schwabenspiegel* knew that "King Titus had appropriated them to the Exchequer of the Empire." King Alfred even demanded of King Philip of France the extradition of the French Jews, and subsequently the Jews themselves said in a memorial to the magistracy of Ratisbon, they belonged to the Emperor, that he might save them from total extirpation by the Christians, and preserve them in memory of the sufferings of Christ.

From the 14th century this bondmanship to the Exchequer was interpreted and treated as complete slavery. "You belong," says the Emperor Charles IV., in a docu-

ment to the Jews. "to us and to the Empire, with your bodies and property; we may do and deal by both in whatever way we like and seems good to us." Indeed, the Jews, like merchandise, frequently passed from one hand into another; the Emperor, now here, now there, declared the debts they had to claim cancelled, and secured a high sum of money for it, usually thirty to a hundred per cent for his Exchequer.

The protection which the Emperor and the Empire was to have afforded to the bondsmen of the Exchequer, was frequently illusory, even when privileges were granted them; as a matter of fact they were beyond the pale of the law. Only where self-interest demanded not to allow these men, after all useful and profitable in many ways, to be completely ruined, the governments would interpose. Otherwise, from the Emperor through all ranks down to the mob, everyone's hand was against them. Frequently, too, protection was assured to them only for a definite term, on the expiration of which they were as good as outlawed, unless they at once purchased a renewal of the letters of protection by a heavy sum of money. They were made use of like sponges which were allowed to suck themselves full to be afterward squeezed out. What happened in the year 1390 deserves to be treasured up in the memory of the Germans for an everlasting warning. The king, princes, nobility, and the cities, were equally in debt through the long civil war; whereupon the example already set by France was followed. At the Diet of Nuremberg all debts due to Jews were cancelled, for which act the debtors paid fifteen per cent into the Royal Exchequer. By this the Duke of Bavaria, for instance, Count Oettingen, and the city of Ratisbon, profited 100,000 gold florins each.

If any prince had once shown himself favorable to the Jews of his country, or to some individuals or other among them, be it by bestowing on him some estate or office, a papal letter of admonition or rebuke immediately appeared, reminding the prince that a son of the servant maid should never be preferred to a son of the free woman. Papal car-

dinal-legates ordered it to be decreed by the Councils (such as at Vienna in 1267,) that no Jew should be admitted in a public bathing establishment, an inn, or a house of call for journeymen; that no Christian should be permitted to buy meat of a Jew, because he might otherwise easily be poisoned by him in an insidious manner. The Synod of Salamanca of 1335 declared that the physicians of the Mosaic faith offered their services only because they wished to extirpate to the best of their power the Christian people (*i. e.*, the population of the whole of Europe).

Thus hatred and abomination were sown, and wholesale massacre reaped. Accustomed to the idea that every Jew was the born foe and debtor to Christians, the nations,—at a time when all that was horrible and unnatural was seized with predilection, aye, with avidity, and believed in—deemed the Jews capable of every crime, even the most improbable or impossible. From the 12th century the legend was spread, that the Jews wanted Christian blood, some said for their celebration of Passover, others as a remedy for a secret hereditary disease, and therefore they every year murdered a boy. But, in addition, it was reported that they annually crucified a Christian by way of mockery at the Saviour.

If anywhere a corpse was found that exhibited traces of violence, or a dead child, a Jew must have been the murderer; mostly a crime committed by several individuals conjointly was assumed, and the rack was applied until it extorted confessions. Then followed cruel executions, and in many instances, a wholesale hanging of the entire Jewish population in town and country. A properly regulated, impartial administration of justice was not to be thought of. The judges, or authorities themselves, trembled before the fury of the populace, convinced beforehand; for it was firmly assumed that the most atrocious deeds might be expected of every individual of that murderous people. Sometimes, too, it was an image of Christ which a Jew was reported to have stabbed with a knife, or mutilated, which then became a signal for slaughter. Since the year 1290, the rumors of ill-treated and miraculously bleeding hosts

were superadded. From Paris, where the first case happened, the new fable spread over the neighboring countries. Soon other towns pretended to possess a similar sacred object, and now it seemed as if the Jews, seized by a demoniac frenzy, at the same time believed and disbelieved in some ecclesiastical dogma, and harbored an invincible desire for a painful death—so frequently were these pretended crimes avenged upon them. In London, Jews were murdered because, it was reported, they had intended to destroy the great city by Greek fire.

The great plague, which, in 1348, made its way through Europe, and depopulated it, could, it was known at once, proceed only from Jews. The fact that this people, leading a sober and frugal life, were afflicted by it to a much less degree than the Christians, raised the surmise to a certainty. They had, everywhere, in consequence of a great conspiracy, in which the lepers, too, had joined, poisoned the wells and springs, nay, even the rivers. At Zofingen poison was said to have actually been found in a well. On the rack some Jews and lepers confessed the deed. Then a storm of fanaticism of the most brutal vindictiveness and vulgar covetousness broke out, such as Europe had never witnessed either before or since. The victims, in some towns, were counted by thousands. Many anticipated the fury of the mob by suicide. In vain did Pope Clement VI., in two decrees, declare the Jews to be innocent. Only in the remote Lithuania those saved by rapid flight found an asylum.

But it was not only for their religion and the crime imputed to them that the hatred of the populace was directed against the Jew; a third motive, acting as powerfully, or even more so, was superadded. The Jews lent money on interest, they were usurers, they carried on a trade, indispensable it is true, but nevertheless sinful, and sucked dry, it was said, the Christians. The charge was not untrue, and was yet unjust.

Popes and Councils, on the strength of an incorrect interpretation of the passage in Luke 6: 35, have, since the end of the 8th century, in ever increasing severity, con-

demned and inflicted ecclesiastical penalties on the taking of all interest on loans, in whatever form it may be done. In the early Church only the clergy were forbidden to take interest. But as the influence of the papal chair augmented the prohibition was extended to laymen too.

Not that any distinction was made between interest and usury, but every stipulation or taking of even the least amount beyond the capital lent was forbidden by the Popes and Councils; a prohibition from which, as Alexander III., in 1179 declared, no dispensation could be granted—to which Clement V., at the Council of Vienna in 1311, added the decision, that it was heresy to maintain that taking interest was no sin.

Thereby all commerce and trade was hampered by unendurable shackles. Pope Gregory IX. had even pronounced the advances of money, with stipulated interest, which the maritime trade stood in need of, to be condemnable usury.

The Church had thus placed herself in opposition to the nature of things, to the indispensable requirement of civil life, of general traffic; she might indeed forbid her own ministers to take interest, but she could not order or compel them to lend out money without interest. Amid the universal want of ready money at a time when the stock of gold and silver was constantly decreasing, and no substitute for it as yet existed, all, from the highest to the lowest, frequently were under a necessity to borrow money, and since the trading in money was so strictly forbidden to Christians, and could be carried on by them only under the disguise of various forms of business or circuitously, the Jews, to whom other branches of trade and positions of life were debarred, here stepped in. An industrious people the Jews had always been. As long as they formed a separate state, farming, horticulture, and handicrafts were their principal occupations. In their hands Palestine had become one of the best cultivated and most fertile countries of the earth.

The Mosaic law, indeed, aimed at the cultivation of the soil, the furtherance of the growth of corn, wine and oil. Even in the first centuries after Christ, and after the de-

struction of their nationality, the Jews remained true to their ancient customs. Josephus, at the beginning of the second century, still praises the industry of his co-religionists in handicrafts and agriculture.

In Roman literature and the laws of the Emperors, there is no trace of their having been addicted to barter and petty trade, or having at all become a mercantile people. The numerous Jews who lived in Rome seem to have been poor. The mighty and extremely bloody revolts of the Jews in Egypt, Cyrene, and in the Isles, show that they did not form a population carrying on trade or petty dealings, for such a one is not in the habit of taking up arms. Even down to the 10th century they had formed in Spain, the south of France, and Germany, too, a settled population; but this situation had become untenable through the hostility of the Church and the people; and since the days when the Italian maritime and commercial towns, with their fleets, had begun to flourish, they had been ousted from their position as traders between the West and the East.

The guilds and the prohibition of trafficking did not permit Jews to practice any handicraft, nor could they live by agriculture, the possession of territory being forbidden them almost everywhere. Cardinal James, of Vitry, who well knew the East, observed, about the year 1244: "Among the Mohammedans the Jews performed manual labor, though, indeed, it was only the lower and slighted trades which they carried on; but among the Christians they lived by lending money on interest." On hearing this the thought obtrudes itself, what a benefit it might have been to the world, both Christian and Jewish, if at that time some cardinal or pope had reflected on this contrast between the Jews under the Koran and the Jews under the Cross, and drawn the obvious practical inferences therefrom!

Thus, too, the medical profession was, as a rule, debarred the Jews, although in Mohammedan countries they acquired high reputation particularly in medicine; for the Councils forbade the sick, on the penalty of excommunica-

tion, to take physic from a Jewish physician, since, as they said, it was better to die than to be cured by an infidel. Besides, they were excluded from all the schools, both the higher and the lower. Whoever thirsted for knowledge had to become a rabbi, and if, for once, as a most rare exception, a prince like Alphonso X., of Castile, availed himself of the services of Jewish mathematicians and astronomers, the culture of these men was acquired where the Koran prevailed.

Taking interest from strangers was allowed the Jews by their law, and the alleged prohibition of Christ (it was at first said on both sides,) could not be binding on them. But from the time of Innocent III, a change took place. For, now, at the close of the 12th century, divines and canonists taught that taking interest was forbidden as a sin, both according to the natural and the divine law of the Old and New Testaments. Innocent III., therefore, decreed that Jews should be forced to return interest levied by them, and introduced for that purpose a means formerly not employed—viz., the Christians should, compelled by excommunication, break off all intercourse with such Jews as refused returning interest. That meant, persistently carried out, to be delivered up to starvation. Hence arose sad complications and conflicts of various kinds. The bishops who had the charge of inflicting excommunication were often inclined to be earnest in the matter, and the Synods, *e. g.*, that of Avignon in 1209, called upon them to do their duty. The princes, on the other hand, in whose interest and as whose bondsmen the Jews carried on their moneyed transactions, protected them or not rarely appropriated to themselves, without much ado, the whole fortune of the Jews as acquired by taking interest, or, compelled Christian debtors, too, to pay arrears of interest into their treasury.

Altogether, the confusion into which the hierarchy, through its prohibition of interest, had plunged both the clergy and the laity, was terrible, and the canonists tormented themselves to invent distinctions and find issues from the labyrinth. In innumerable instances no one

knew what to do under the actual circumstances, or the principle was sacrificed though, in theory, no one durst impugn it on the penalty of death. Consistently, the Christians ought to have been forbidden even borrowing on interest, since they thereby tempted the Jew to sin. But popes, bishops, and the clergy in general were themselves frequently under a necessity of resorting to a loan and paying interest; in fact, the entire organization of the Papal Government, the administration of the benefices, and the taxation levied on the clergy by the popes, was calculated to render the bishops, clergy, monasteries, and charitable foundations tributary to Jewish capitalists. Hence, then, the canonists taught that the Jews being lost as it was, a few sins more or less did not matter; but as for the Christians borrowing of them, distress was their excuse.

No doubt, the interest demanded by the Jews was extremely high and often exorbitant; but that was owing to the then money value, the want of coinage, and above all to the crushing taxes which the Jews had to pay the princes and the municipal authorities. The Cahorsins and the Italian bankers demanded as high rates of interest as the Jews, and wherever they got the money trade into their hands everyone, as for instance in Paris at the beginning of the 14th century, wished the Jews back; for their activity as the mediums of the money traffic was, on the whole, beneficent in many ways, and at that time not to be replaced. They effected in the northern countries and in Spain what in Italy the bankers' companies—partly favored, partly tacitly tolerated, and frequently used by the popes and bishops—of the so-called Lombards, of the money-dealers of Asti, Sienna, Florence and other cities, attended to; and indeed Lombards and Jews at times competed with each other in France and England. The Emperor Louis, son of Louis of Brandenburg, in the year 1352, issued a public invitation to the Jews to settle in the country free from taxes, because, "since the time when the Jews perished (he means the great massacre of 1348) want of money prevails everywhere in our country among rich and poor."

(To be continued.)

The Peculiar People.

חדשות הנעשות—NEWS—במחנה ישראל.

IT is claimed by some papers that General Fonseca, the head of the provisional government of Brazil, is of Jewish extraction.

THE Imperial Academy of Fine Arts at St. Petersburg, has recently decided that Jews shall no longer be admitted among its members.

THE Hebrew Boys' Manual Training School in Chicago, for the children of the Polish and other foreign Jews, is now building, and will be opened during the year. Over \$40,000 is subscribed, one-half that sum being the gift of Mr. Henry Mandel, of New York.

A SEMITIC Museum is to be established at Harvard University. Mr. Jacob H. Schiff, of New York, has given \$10,000 toward the museum, which is to be expended for the purchase of such casts of clay tablets, manuscripts, coins, and other objects as will render the museum, when opened, at once available for its purpose.

ABOUT \$12,000 has been subscribed as the beginning of a fund to establish a Hebrew Hospital in the southern part of New York City. This additional hospital has now become a necessity, since the Hebrew quarters below 14th street are so densely populated. This project is a credit to the practical philanthropy of our Jewish brethren, and it promises to be successful.

DR. NATHAN MARCUS ADLER, chief rabbi of the *Ashkenazim* congregations of England, died at Brighton, Jan. 21, 1890. He was 87 years of age, a native of Hanover, Germany. For forty-five years he has been easily the most influential man among the conservative Jews of England.

In his death a great loss has befallen the large community of which he has been so long the acknowledged leader.

It will pain all of our readers to learn that a letter from Leipzig informs us that Prof. Franz Delitzsch is still seriously ill. He is confined to his bed, and his recovery seems hopeless. His successor in the University will probably be Prof. Buhl, of Copenhagen. Prof. Delitzsch still continues some of his literary labors, and hopes to be able to finish the new edition of his New Testament.

GLEANINGS FROM THE JEWISH PRESS.

BE CHARITABLE.

In commenting upon a certain story in which the author makes one of her characters, a Christian mother, inculcate upon her child a proper feeling toward Jews, a Jewish paper says of the author :

We must express our gratification at the fact that she takes occasion to strike hard at a senseless religious prejudice, which reflects great discredit upon Christianity in general, but especially upon its teachers, who in the main seek to strengthen this bigotry to the injury of their own faith, rather than dispel it, as they can readily aid in doing.—*The American Hebrew*, Jan. 17, 1890.

We know well that many Christians indulge a senseless prejudice against Jews. We know that their judgment of Jewish people is often unjust. And yet, as often before in these pages, we plead for fair treatment and justice on both sides. We know that, as the *American Hebrew* regularly maintains, the Christian press tries to deny altogether this prejudice, or to justify it and to sever it altogether from religion. But we also perceive that the Jewish press too generally magnifies it. We do not believe that Christians, or Christian teachers (at least American Protestants), "in the main seek to strengthen this bigotry." We know many Christian people of the average sort, and many Christian ministers, good, bad, and indifferent; and while we have often sadly observed the existence of this prejudice, sometimes in those who have admitted that

they possessed it and wished that they could conquer it, we have found few, if any, who "seek to strengthen it." We think that the mother in the story did only what most intelligent mothers would do. We therefore say to our Jewish friends: Be charitable in your view of Christians. Let not your sensitiveness blind you to the facts as they are. Exaggeration only increases hard feelings on the part of Jews, and does not diminish it on the part of Christians.

THE BAPTIZED JEW.

1. Is the baptized Jew a *happier* man than the unbaptized Jew has been?
2. Is the baptized Jew a *better* man than the unbaptized Jew has been?
3. Is the baptized Jew a *more useful member of society* than the unbaptized Jew has been?

—*The Jewish Voice*, Dec. 13, 1889.

The above queries were propounded by the *Voice* to the editor of THE PECULIAR PEOPLE. To each of them we return the answer, "No." This will, however, require a little qualification. The fact that a Jew, or any other man, is or is not baptized makes him neither happier nor unhappier, neither better nor worse, neither more nor less useful. Baptism is the outward or visible sign of a supposed inward or invisible grace. In itself it is nothing except a God-ordained rite. If the Jew, or Gentile, be baptized conscious that he does not possess the inward grace, he ought, as a hypocrite, to be unhappier; he certainly is worse; and indirectly he is likely to be of less good to society. If, on the other hand, the baptized person be self-deceived, he may be unhappier because more unfortunate; he is not necessarily worse nor less useful, but his baptism is in no respect a benefit. It is with baptism as with circumcision. The condition of heart determines happiness, goodness, and real usefulness. "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiff-necked." Deut. 10: 16. "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live."

Deut. 30 : 6. Compare also the New Testament. "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality, and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead." Col. 2 : 10-12.

We know very well that the *Jewish Voice* uses the term "baptized Jew" because it believes that no Jew ever became the subject of that grace of which baptism is the outward sign. We therefore answer the question as presented, "No." But we would be recreant to the trust committed to us as followers of the Lord Jesus did we not affirm: The truly Christian Jew is a *happier*, a *better*, and a *more useful* man than the non-Christian Jew has been. Such, if properly instructed, would naturally be baptized. But if ignorantly unbaptized, he would be happier, better, and more useful notwithstanding.

He would be happier because he would be submissive to the divine will and not rebellious against it; he would be happier because he would be in the divinely appointed way, because he would possess a greater fulness of divine truth, and a more abundant spiritual life.

He would be better for the two-fold reason, that he would have these spiritual advantages whereby his life might be made better, and that he would have implanted in his breast the disposition to make use of them.

He would be more useful as being one whose religion as a system of belief and practice more accurately represents true religion as it is in the divine ideal. See THE PECULIAR PEOPLE, p. 74. *Cæteris paribus*, the more adequately the subjective conception of religion represents the divine ideal, the better its realization and the more useful the man. Of course the realization of this is in many respects dependent upon the individual. But he who is happy as a Jew would if truly a Christian be happier; he who is good as a Jew would if truly a Christian be better; and he who is a useful member of society as a Jew would if truly a Christian be more useful.

כבוד ישראל * .

A little book, under the above title, has just appeared in Hebrew and German, and it is, at first sight, satisfactory to notice that this author, who only a few years ago made himself notorious as a bitter enemy of the Jews, and was ready to take an oath that the Talmud contained some foundation for the most cruel accusation against the Jews, which we dare not even to name, has changed his disposition towards them, and indicates, in the title of the book, his desire to honor them. But, in looking over its pages, we are reluctantly obliged to apply to him the rabbinical adage :

משכיח בעיר ופוגם בבשר

"One who praises the skin and finds fault with the meat," or the words of Horace, *Quanta laboras in Charybdi!* † In these letters the author displays a praiseworthy attempt to convince the Jews of the truth of Christianity, but the expressions he uses towards them are of such a character that they would arouse the indignation, not only of the Jewish reader, but also of the apostle Paul himself. He compares them to beasts; nor does he apparently agree with the apostle that all Israel will eventually be saved, for he says that "in the last days a remnant of the rebellious people will be saved, according to God's gracious election." p. 26.

It is amusing to find him refer to the Jewish Rabbis, whom he formerly denounced in no measured terms, as *our* fathers, while he is ignorant of the fact that they had long ago disowned his kinship by saying that a Gentile cannot bring first-fruits into the temple, because he cannot, as the law prescribes, repeat Deut. 26 : 3-10, where the expression, "our fathers," occurs. The author is mistaken in his assumption that the Jews of the present day will ground their faith on what the fathers in the Midrash, or in the Zohar said, in the same way that he supports his theology on the teaching of the fathers of the church. But this is a minor defect in the book, and we would also gladly admit that the four chapters which it contains, viz., the Seed of the Woman, the prophets Noah, Abraham, and Jacob, are on the whole fair, though laborious expositions of Scripture. We also welcome the admission on the part of the Roman Catholic professor, that the *ipsa* of the Vulgate Version for the Hebrew הוּיָא in Gen. 3 : 15, is a mistake of copyists, and that "the Virgin can only bruise the Serpent through the Son,"

* כבוד ישראל, Die Ehre Israels. Neue Briefe an die Juden. Hebraisch und Deutsch von Prof. Dr. A. Röhling.

† In how mighty a charybdis wast thou struggling !

and that the doctrine of the immaculate conception is simply a subject of logical necessity and of historical fact. Though how the logical necessity does not make necessary the immaculate conception of the mother, and so on backwards to the Fall, and how the historical fact can be known by us, are matters which the author has not considered. To this we can only say that he presumes too much on the well known saying: *Credat Judæus*, and if the book is a tract for the Jews of the present day, it is at the same time a model which should not be imitated by other tract writers. But apart from his theology, which is a mixture of Romanism and Calvinism, into which we cannot now enter, the literary style and the way the book appears is more than a complete failure. Be it remembered that the author writes letters to Hebrews in the Hebrew language, and so we might expect that he would at least be careful in the spelling of Hebrew words; but this is far from being the case. The orthography is so bad that words in their present form convey a strange and often an absurd meaning in the context, and the mistakes are so numerous that they abound in every page, and even in quotations from the Bible. But the Hebrew itself is indescribably worse, and were it not for the German translation we should not know what the author means. Not to speak of bad grammar and syntax, he uses Hebrew verbs in forms which never appear, and new-coined nouns, and sometimes words which mean contrary to what he intends to convey. We will adduce one striking example. For the word *coming* of the Messiah he uses the word מְבִיא, which means the *going down*. Would not his Jewish readers, who are inclined to mock, triumph at this careless blunder? We, therefore, with all kindness, recommend the author, instead of sneering, as he does in a note at Professor F. Delitzsch, to study more diligently his Hebrew New Testament, and his Tracts to the Jews, and then he will be better qualified to write both in style and tone "new letters" to them.

A. BERNSTEIN.

It is, perhaps, needless for us to comment upon the opinion of our contributor. Certainly it never could have been expected that Dr. Rohling would write such a book. The Lord does indeed show wonders. Even the heart of an archbishop and arch-enemy of the Jews can be turned to friendship. The Dr.'s German is very fine, though his Hebrew is very bad, in fact it is no Hebrew. If Dr. Rohling wrote the Hebrew he is an עם הארץ without an equal; if

another has written it, then that other is the עַם הָאֶרֶץ. But the ideas expressed are good, though somewhat in the spirit of the Catholics.

But despite the faults of the book we must say that we are glad to welcome it. We only wish that such might oftener appear. This is the only way to do mission work amongst the Jews. Write to them, write for them, write of them. If they will reject what is written for them, how much more will they reject all other methods. Christians generally fail to see this. They either let the Jews alone or employ false methods. Neither one nor the other is right. *Christ must be preached to the Jews.* But we must not employ false methods. Let Christians work for Christ's sake, and not for the sake of every man with whom they are pleased. The best method of working amongst Israel is by means of *literature*. This we are glad to see Prof. Rohling tries to do. It is a good sign.

Still it would seem that in one respect כְּבֹד יִשְׂרָאֵל is not worth the author's pains, for no Jew will read these letters with the view of seeing what he says, but with the view of seeing whether he does not say something bad about Jews. If a Delitzsch writes "Ernste Fragen," he is known as the great friend and lover of the Jews, and his book is read with eagerness. Every Jew is profited by it, even if not convinced. But not so with a Rohling, who is known only as the Catholic Archbishop, the conspirator against the Jews, and their bitterest enemy. Still we rejoice at the good sign, and we hope to see many others.

THE NEW YEAR.

Among the periodicals of special interest to Jewish Christians, the first to reach our desk in the month of January is *Le Reveil d' Israel*, which, with that month, begins its fifth year. Always worth a second reading, this number breathes an unselfish love for Israel, and a heartfelt yearning for their return to their Saviour. It contains interesting reviews of the progress of the Jewish Christian movement, and the general work of missions in France.

The Jewish Intelligence and *The Jewish Herald* both give to their readers in the first number many suggestive articles, though some afford, perhaps, a too roseate view of the Jewish-Christian world. May God grant that their words be true! The mottoes of the Hebrew Prayer Union for 1890 are full of a tender regard for erring Israel, the leading thought being כִּי יְהוָה רַבֵּר טוֹב עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל, "For the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel." Num. 10:29. The mottoes are all from the Hebrew Bible, except the concluding passages, as follows:

"Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them be the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fullness!" Rom. 11:12.

"For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead?" Rom. 11:15.

"How much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree!" Rom. 11:24.

"So all Israel shall be saved." Rom. 11:26.

With the month of January *The Everlasting Nation*¹ begins under most hopeful auspices its second volume. This new magazine, the first number of which appeared last May, is one of the signs of the times. It is not a missionary publication, in the strict sense, but it is, nevertheless, a most efficient handmaiden of the best work in extending the gospel to Israel. It is, as its title proclaims, a "monthly journal [48 pp. 8vo.] of history, biography, prophecy, literature, exegesis, and passing events relating to the Jewish people." It gives information concerning Jewish customs and history, which render it invaluable to Christians. Every number is full of varied and interesting matter. It is withal so scholarly, so courteous and kind toward Jewish people, that if read by Jews it cannot fail to commend to them the Christian faith as the true portion and the highest glory of Israel.

¹) Editor, the Rev. Albert A. Isaacs, M. A., Vicar of Christ Church. Leicester. Publishers, A. J. Lev and Co., 9 Great Russell St., London, W. C. Price, Four Shillings per annum.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of THE PECULIAR PEOPLE:

SACCARAPPA, Me., Jan. 1, 1890.

Dear Brother:—Mr. Mark Levy, as I read in your paper, has been lecturing on the return to Palestine, under a flag of Judah. I admire the moral courage of our brother greatly for raising the latter, but I confess that I should not have cared to stand with Mr. Levy on that platform. I, too, believe in a restoration of Israel in the not very distant future (though I am too much used to the ways of America, with my hopes centered upon eternal life, to *hope* for that restoration.); but I do not believe, by any means, in a blood and iron theory or practice. The servants of the Lord Jesus do not fight, not even for their rights, much less for what is not their own. "He that scattered Israel," says the prophet Jeremiah, "will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock." "Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the coasts of the earth, . . . and they shall come with weeping, and with supplication will I lead them." Jer. 31: 10, 8, 9. This is the way Israel shall be gathered, and let no man try any other.

There is nothing that stands in the way of Israel's restoration but their unbelief in Israel's God, Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews. So long as they reject their King, their sacrifice, and their ephod, they shall also remain without their land. But let them first seek the Kingdom of Heaven and its righteousness, and all these things shall be added to them; and the scepter shall return again to Judah, when they shall say, Blessed is Jesus, who cometh in the name of the Lord. The Lord Himself will hasten to gather them, though for a short time they may remain among the Gentiles, "as the dew from the Lord, as the showers upon the grass, that tarrieth not for man.

. . . And the remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people, as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep; who, if he go through, both treadeth down and teareth in pieces, and none can deliver." Micah 5: 7, 8.

SOLOMON ROBITSCHER.