

Moderated by Sid Roth: Who Is Jesus? (Debate)

by Michael L. Brown

The debate explores the contrasting beliefs of Messianic and Orthodox Jews regarding Jesus, scripture, and tradition.

Duration: 2:27:23

Scripture: Isaiah 52:13

Topics: "Jesus Christ", "Gods Forgiveness"

Description

In this video, the speaker emphasizes the message of God's forgiveness and righteousness through the Messiah. He highlights the concept that all our sins were laid on the Messiah, who makes us righteous through his deeds. The speaker also emphasizes the importance of turning away from sin and turning to God for forgiveness. He mentions a visual image of the Messiah's sacrifice and encourages people to read the Bible to understand its significance. Additionally, the speaker mentions a belief among rabbis about a future Messiah who will bring great wars and ultimately lead people to mourn and become part of the Holy Remnant.

Transcript

Hello New York, this is Sid Roth and time is running short. I have two very special guests, special friends, and we are going to do something that has been 2,000 years in the coming. We are going to dialogue between Jews that believe Yeshua, that's Jesus, is the Jewish Messiah, and Jews that believe Yeshua, Jesus, is not the Jewish Messiah.

To my right I have Rabbi Tovia Singer, an Orthodox rabbi. He's a graduate of St. Louis Rabbinical College, New Jersey director of Jews for Judaism. He has spent over one-third of his life trying to persuade Jews to reject Jesus as the Jewish Messiah and return to Orthodox Rabbinical Judaism.

And to his right is Dr. Michael Brown, a Messianic Jew. He holds a PhD in Near Eastern Languages and Literatures from New York University. He's dean and director of Messiah Biblical Institute and Graduate School of Theology.

And what I'd like is for the audience to get to know both of you a little and find out how much you have in common, because I believe an Orthodox Jew has a great deal in common with a Messianic Jew. Tovia,

we'll start with you. What is your belief of Tanakh, or Jewish scriptures? In other words, do you believe that it came from God? What is your personal view, and what's the Orthodox view, which is even more important? Okay, we'll call it classical Judaism.

Every word, and this is important, every word, every letter of the Torah, every letter comes directly from God. Literally, God put us in a world, and he said, make something for yourself. The way you do that is through Torah.

Torah is the instruction booklet for life, and our sages have looked through the Torah, and throughout all our generations, we have looked through that Torah, and through it, that's how we reach a personal relationship with God, and that's so important, to have God in your life. Literally, make God your friend. Come to love him, because he loves you more than you can ever know.

Dr. Michael Brown, what is your view? Well, I appreciate what Tovia said. Certainly, the Hebrew scriptures are God's inspired word to me. I believe that it is the word that God has given us from heaven, and that if we follow the counsel of that word, we'll wind up following the truth absolutely, and come to know God, and walk with him directly.

And I see the Hebrew scriptures as the foundation of everything else that God has revealed to us as his Jewish people. Rabbi Singer, are you a biblical Zionist? By that, I mean someone that believes the physical Jew is entitled to the physical land of Israel, unconditionally, forever. Well, if what I said earlier is correct, then of course the Torah has told us, the Torah has made a promise to Abraham all the way back in the book of Genesis, saying that this land will be for you, not just Tel Aviv, but also areas such as Hebron.

I don't want to get political, but of course the land of Israel was put there for the Jewish people, and what other nation, after being in exile for two thousand years, has returned to that land to proclaim it their own? Dr. Brown? I agree wholeheartedly. Psalm 105 makes it categorically clear, reinforcing everything that's come earlier, that God has given the land to the Jewish people as a promised inheritance. And not only that, God has shown his favor and the chosenness of the Jewish people by protecting us and preserving us all these centuries, miraculously restoring us, just as he said that he would.

So we see this as fulfillment of scripture without a question. Now let's find a little bit of our divergent thinking. Rabbi Singer, what is your personal belief of the New Testament? Well, my belief of the New Testament really is no different at all than my belief of the Koran or the Bhagavad Gita or any of the canonized documents by many, many faiths.

The New Testament has brought the Jewish people away from Torah, has brought the Jewish people away from a personal relationship with God, although they thought that they were worshipping God through the New Testament. Certainly, the New Testament is a false document, although there are of course some elements within it which are just recording things that were true in history. Nothing that's false has nothing that's true in it.

There's always some element that's true. But the New Testament is a false document which describes a supposed life of Jesus which never existed. Rabbi, which never existed, what do you mean by that? Which never existed means that in terms of Jesus returning, resurrecting on Sunday morning, which is the foundation of the Christian faith.

Without it, there's nothing to Christianity. Without, as Paul himself said, if there is no resurrection, then of course we are all in our sins. Essentially, the element of the crucifixion and the resurrection is something that never took place, and therefore the Jewish people have rejected it, and those Jews who did reject it are those Jews who have maintained the covenant of God gave to Abraham.

Throughout the centuries, there have been many Jews who have become Catholics and Christians of different sorts, and I understand, and I'm sensitive to the fact that born-again Christians reject the idea that Catholics are real Christians, but regardless, all those Jews are not part of the covenant anymore. Isn't that interesting? God promised Abraham that there would be an eternal covenant, an eternal nation, yet all those Jews who have embraced the New Testament over the centuries, they're not here anymore identifying as Jews. As a matter of fact, I would venture to say that you, Sid Roth, and my friend Dr. Mike Brown, I would venture to say that all of both of you are here identifying as Jews only because your great-grandparents rejected Christianity.

Actually, your whole identity of Judaism is literally founded in a rejection of Christianity. Rabbi Singer, what about the words of Yeshua, Jesus? What do you personally think about those words? Well, because Jesus--first of all, we don't know that Jesus ever said those words. All we know is that a half a century later, people recorded them as Jesus had said them.

There are some of the words that were literally plagiarized from Matarot. We can find the same thing in the Koran. But forget whether they're authentic or not authentic.

Do you like the words? Well, there are some words that I love and there are some words that I hate. The words that I love are those words which are literally a repetition from Torah. It's not as important as what goes into your mouth as what goes out of your mouth.

God only knows that's so true. Okay, Dr. Michael Brown, what is your view of the New Covenant? Well, obviously, I see the New Covenant Scriptures as the fulfillment of everything that God revealed in the Hebrew Scriptures. I see that that's what they were pointing towards, that in incontrovertible ways, they point to Jesus as the Messiah.

And I'll tell you something that's interesting. Aside from the alleged non-existence of the Resurrection and the Crucifixion and the life of Jesus, if you will study ancient historical documents, you'll find that the New Testament stands out as the best-attested ancient book ever written. It's interesting that if you look at the Hebrew Scriptures, the oldest complete copy that we have of the Hebrew Bible, I'm talking about from beginning to end, the oldest complete copy of the Hebrew Bible we have is from the 10th century of this era.

In other words, about 1,300 or 1,400 years after it was completed. And while Tovia has no problem questioning the words of Jesus because he says they were written 50 years later, and there are differences about that also, I don't want to get into it, he has no problem believing every single word that's written in the Torah. Why? Because he believes in that.

But there's no ancient evidence supporting it, it's simply a matter of faith on his part. What I'd say also is that... Excuse me, Tovia wants to interject something there. Sure.

No, what I think here is very important is that Mike is partially right. Although the complete Scriptures were not found in its entirety from a time previous to Jesus, we do have Masoretic texts that actually go back

hundreds of years before Jesus ever walked the face of the earth. That's something that's really very, very central.

In terms of the New Testament manuscripts, we have thousands and thousands. If you read Josh McDowell's book on faith that demands an evidence, or something like that, evidence that demands a verdict, you'll find in there that he says that there are actually thousands of different versions of the New Testament writings. In actuality, when you talk about the Masoretic texts, there are actually only nine, and one of them actually takes in about 90% of all the Torahs we have today.

Yeah, just in response to that, to make a couple of corrections on the statement, the Dead Sea Scrolls, as they're commonly called, that Tovia was referring to, date at the earliest from a couple of hundred years BCE. BCE is before the Common Era, and that's the Jewish way of saying BC. They date from a couple of hundred years at the earliest before Jesus.

What's interesting is that there are many, many variants. In other words, when he said that every single letter is inspired, that was a statement of faith, because of the fact that there are many, many variants in the writing. When we get down to the New Testament text, and the thousands and thousands of texts that we have, the fact is that if there are, quote, divergences, they are absolutely slight and minute.

The other thing I wanted to say, to clarify this, especially for the Christian audience, Rabbinic Judaism does not follow the literal word of the Torah. It's often been said that you cannot have Christianity without a Christ, or you cannot have Messianic Judaism without a Messiah. That's true.

Just like you can't have marriage if you just have a husband. You need a husband and wife. The fact is that you cannot have Rabbinic or traditional Judaism without rabbis and tradition.

And as an Orthodox Jewish lawyer, Chaim Schimmel, says in the beginning of his book, *The Oral Law*, he says the Jews have never followed the literal word of the Hebrew Bible. The Jews have followed the traditions of the rabbis, believing that God also gave another Torah, another divine word to Moses on Mount Sinai, and it's only through that oral Torah, which was passed on, allegedly, through every generation, that supposedly you can understand the Hebrew Scriptures. So the fact of the matter is, what I'm looking for is the literal truth of the Hebrew Bible, and I say that only points us in one direction, and that is towards Yeshua as the Messiah, and not in the path of traditional Judaism.

Rabbi Singer, what is your view of the Oral Law, the Talmud? Okay. First of all, I just wanted to touch on one thing that Mike had said. You know, Mike talked about the New Testament being this early, unique document talking about the resurrection and crucifixion of Jesus.

It's important to stay sure that there was nothing else. That means no one else wrote about Him contemporarily. And let's take a look at the people who might have written about Him.

Philo of Alexandria, a person who wrote extensively, didn't write a word about Jesus. Isn't that interesting? If he really made such a mark on his generation, not a word was said about it. You look at the book of Josephus, which was written a little bit later than Jesus, but very short time, and we find there that Josephus said almost nothing about Jesus' life, and the few sentences that were said about Him, most scholars, or many scholars, if I'm going to be corrected on that, believe that those were added in later on.

That's first of all. By the way, just a point of interest, Josephus speaks very highly of James, or Jacob, as a tremendously godly man, and this is Jacob, the brother of Yeshua, who was recognized for his godliness

throughout Jerusalem, according to Josephus. Not only that, it's interesting that if you'll study ancient Egyptian accounts, at the time of the Exodus, you will not find a single word about the Exodus of the Jewish people, the Israelites, from Egypt.

Not a single sentence. In fact, Egyptian scholars who are not believers in the Scriptures say it never happened. The whole thing is a myth.

But we know, by faith and by other evidence in the Scriptures, that it did happen. There's far more evidence for the reliability of the New Testament writings, and there's an interesting book by F.F. Bruce called *Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament* that will give all the attestation that was there. It's amply attested.

The Talmud itself attests to Jesus, although it can't figure out quite where to date him. Sometimes it dates him 200 years before Jesus, and sometimes 150 years after Jesus, but it does make reference to him. It even makes reference to followers of Jesus, and no one can argue that within a matter of decades that the good news of Jesus the Messiah had begun to spread throughout the nations.

So we do have these as actual facts, but there's far more factual historical evidence back in the New Testament writings than the Old Testament, although I believe them both. And one last point of interest, there was a man named Sir William Ramsey, who was a scholar in the skeptical school Tübingen, which was a great center of learning in Germany, and they were very skeptical. There was a great scholar named F.C. Bauer who didn't believe in the Scriptures at all.

And Sir William Ramsey went on a mission basically to disprove the accuracy of the book of Acts, and ended up becoming an Orthodox believer in Jesus, and wrote many books demonstrating the historical accuracy of the New Testament. Dr. Brown, and then I'll let Rabbi Singer pick up on it, what in your opinion is the Talmud, the Oral Law? The Talmud is an amazing compilation. It's not a book in a normal sense.

It's divided into 63 tractates, or books, and has about two and a half million words. It's an incredible compilation of Jewish folklore, Jewish wisdom, Jewish custom, Jewish tradition, and Jewish interpretation of Scripture. It has some low sides to it, but overall it's a lofty achievement of man.

However, it does not reveal truth, it does not give an accurate interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures and of the Torah, the first five books in particular, and it certainly misunderstands the Messiah. And in fact, Christians need to understand this, that the Talmud in many places does not give you final dogmatic statements, but rather records debate, discussion. So it has many, many, many different opinions about the Messiah within the Talmud, but it does not come to a conclusive view of the Messiah at all, and certainly does not lead Jewish people in a path straight to God.

Rabbi Singer, I would say, obviously, if you think that the Talmud is giving us different understandings of the Messiah, you should read the commentaries on the Talmud. You would have a much better understanding of what the Talmud is saying. It's giving us a different understanding, a different way of viewing the exact same thing.

But what's most important is understanding... Excuse me, where did the Talmud come from? Well, the Talmud is actually a commentary. The Talmud is a commentary on something called the Mishnah. Now what happened was, when the Jewish people went into exile after the second temple was destroyed, it

was a very, very different kind of an exile.

In the first temple, when the first temple was destroyed, the Jewish people went almost as a whole, most of them went to Babylon, and there that's where they lived for 70 years, until very few of them went back to Israel. When the second temple was destroyed, it was something horrific. The Jewish people were spread out throughout the Roman Empire, and it was something where the Jewish people literally lost their autonomy in any way.

During that time, there was a great person, his name is Rabbi Yehuda the Prince, it was actually a little bit later, and he realized that if the Jewish people were going to different corners of the world, unlike the first exile, it was essential that these things which were transmitted orally could be now written down. That was very important. Later on, the Talmud, the students of the students of the students had to then write down a commentary to what these great, they were called Tanoim, wrote down, so that it can better be understood what they were saying.

And they were passing on a tradition, by the way, that even archaeology can point out. Now did the oral law supposedly come from Moses, who got it from God? Is that your belief? Oh yes. Now what portion of the Talmud came in that portion? Actually, not only was the Talmud from the oral Torah, there are many, it's all part of what we call the Messorah.

But if its portions of it are just commentary, then that could not have come from God. Let me give you an example, because I think a lot of people in the listening audience are having a little difficulty with what we're trying to say. For instance, the Jewish person, when it comes to Shabbos, as Shabbos will be coming in a few hours, there are many things that he's not permitted to do.

It's a statement that God created the world and we don't come from monkeys, and that's very important. Well, under certain circumstances, we're permitted to violate the Shabbos, specifically when there's any question where there is a jeopardy to human life. Now, Tano could have written, for instance, in the Tractate of Shabbos, that you are permitted, for instance, to light kindle a fire on Shabbos.

For the people who lived in his generation, they understood exactly what he meant. What he meant was that in case there was somebody who was sick and needed to warm themselves, you were allowed to, not only allowed to, but had to light a fire. The Talmud, those students had to write that, because in later generations, these people may not understand the full clarity of what these Tanoim were writing down.

This tradition that came from God directly to Moses and passed on to Joshua and throughout the generations through all the stages that we've had. Dr. Brown, do you want to comment on that? Sure. One thing, just for the benefit of our listening audience, remembering that Tobias is a rabbi and grew up with this, they may not even know what Shabbos is, which is Sabbath.

That's the Jewish pronunciation of Sabbath, just to clarify that for listeners. But I would say that anyone reading through the Hebrew Scriptures honestly will see that God made the covenant based on a written book, period. There is not a stitch of supportable evidence throughout the entire Hebrew Bible that God gave an authoritative oral tradition to Moses at any point.

It's based on the book. In fact, when you go, and there are many, many proofs within the Scriptures for this, and we may not have time to get into it, but when you get to Joshua 1, verse 8, God says to him, this book of the Torah of teaching, this book of the law, will not depart from your mouth. And then he goes on

and tells them to meditate on it day and night, etc.

Why the covenant was made on the written book, and there's not a single instance that gives any definite evidence of any kind to the existence of an oral tradition that God gave to Moses. In fact, there are numerous instances where the oral tradition violates the actual plain sense of the Hebrew Scriptures. That's why I said that Jews, religious Jews, and I admire rabbis for their sincerity, and we can have a friendly dialogue and differ and disagree, but I do want to point out that traditional Jews do not follow the literal interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Rather, they follow the rabbinic interpretation, and there's a world of difference in many, many cases, and it's important that we recognize who is following Scripture alone and who is not, because it's a major issue. Well, I would say, Mike, you're wrong over here. Any thought that the Talmud in any way contradicts any holy word that you'll find in the written Scriptures is just a lack of understanding.

If you had read the Mishnah in the area that I think you're talking about, you would find that everything is cleared up over there. But I want to just mention one other thing. You know, throughout history, there have been many deviant groups that have filtered away from the Jewish people, and some of them have said, you know something? We reject the oral Torah.

We reject this holy Messorah. Guess where they are now? They don't exist anymore. Look at the New Testament, for instance.

The New Testament has a group called the Sadducees, who rejected the oral Torah. Does anybody here know, maybe on your block, maybe a few houses down, there's some Sadducees living there? The Karaites, another glorious group, where are they today? They're perhaps a few families left in Israel. They're really not here anymore in any real way.

Isn't it odd that every group that has ever deviated from Judaism has lost the covenant of Abraham? As a matter of fact, I will submit to you that the only people that have maintained the covenant of Abraham are those people that have kept the written Torah as well as the oral Torah. Those who have attempted in any way to deviate have lost out. I mean, it's important to just look back in history.

You go to the time of Jesus, just take that period. The Roman Empire had 44 million people, of which 4 million were Jewish. That's 9% of the Roman Empire were living in 1991, and the Jewish people only reflect one-fifth of 1% of the world's population.

Whatever happened to all those percent? We should have been half a billion people if we would consider that same 9%. They've all been lost away, and they've all accepted the teachings of things that resemble what Mike Brown is saying, what other people are saying, that Judaism as it's been transmitted is, God forbid, incorrect. Dr. Brown, do you want to respond to that? Sure, I'd love to.

Number one, numbers are not the entire issue. For example, after the tragedies of the Holocaust, when it almost looked like Eastern Europe's entire Orthodox community was wiped out, people could have said, well, that's it. You see, that's the end of Orthodoxy.

But then Orthodoxy had a revival in our day. The fact is, if you want to go back to New Testament times, so you pick on the Sadducees. The Sadducees did not believe in the prophets or the rest of the scriptures.

They only believed in the first five books. Therefore, they were not following the prophetic tradition. In fact, for centuries, there existed Jewish followers of Jesus who continued to live as Jews, so much so that those in the church world, which were becoming more and more Gentile and more and more insensitive to the Jewish roots of the faith, said they don't differ from the Jews in any way.

In fact, they were suspect because they were so Jewish, and yet these people, for example, called the Nazarenes, categorically rejected rabbinic tradition and yet held to being Jews and following the scriptures as Jews. They existed for centuries, and there's evidence that they continue to exist, and lo and behold, here we are again today in the 20th century. The fact is, Israel has always been a dying and resurrected nation in many ways, and we're seeing the evidence of it.

One other point I just wanted to make, though, is this, that there are places, for example, in the five books of Moses where law is given, and then later on, later on in the Hebrew Bible, that law is repeated, and we see exactly what it meant and exactly how it was carried out, and yet it is interpreted totally differently in the Talmud. That's why I was saying that the traditions of the rabbis, as I said, there are many wonderful things in them, but they do not bring us to the truth of the scriptures. That's the key difference that we really have.

Let's go direct to the 64 million dollar question, Rabbi Tovia Singer. Who is Jesus of Nazareth? Well, who Jesus of Nazareth is, is somebody who really is no different, and the more important question really is who Jesus of Nazareth was not, and that is he was not the Messiah. If he was the Messiah, then we would have, we would be able to look out of our windows.

We'd be able to read the New York Times. The evidence would be on the front page of the New York Times, because instead of war being on the New York Times, we'd find peace on the front page of the New York Times. You know, you know, Mike and I can sit here, and you know, we like each other and everything.

We can sort of spar a little bit over here, back and forth, but I don't want to point you to this radio for the source of the truth. I want you to look out your window, because that's what I can point to. I'm not going to be a Houdini with you.

There's one miracle, and that one miracle is the evidence of the truth, and that's the miracle of the covenant. That was what God told Abraham, and God said, as long as your people will keep to this Torah, even when they go into exile, then they will remain the eternal nation, and yes, in Deuteronomy 7-7, God said that you will be few in number. Yes, you could have been great numbers, but only a few of us have kept the Torah in its proper way.

Isn't it an interesting coincidence that the Jewish people, and I'm going to take a shot over here. I know nothing about Sid's parents or grandparents or great-grandparents, and the same thing goes for Mike. Yet, I would venture to say that if I go back 100 years with either of you, that your great-grandparents or great-great-grandparents were Orthodox Jews.

If either of, if I'm wrong, jump in. No, you're correct. Oh, I'm correct.

What an interesting guess. How did I know that? I knew that, praise God, I knew that through God's holy word, because if those people, if those people in your background were not living according to Torah, and when I say Torah, I mean the written and the oral, you wouldn't be here identifying as a Jew. You'd be on

some Christian radio station, perhaps.

Dr. Michael Brown, do you want to respond to the fact that Jesus is not the Messiah because there is not peace on earth? Right. Let me just respond to the last thing that Toby said first, because he's made the point a couple of times. God has preserved the Jewish people, and if we read the Scriptures, we will see that He has preserved us in spite of our stubbornness and in spite of our unbelief.

I could point to the Muslims and say, well, the Muslims must have truth because they're persevering through the generations. So, that doesn't prove that it's the truth. I would also say, if not for the traditional Jewish community repelling and rejecting and pushing out Jews who believed in Jesus, along with the Church's insensitivity to the Jewish roots of the faith, the story would go very, very differently than what Toby is saying.

The fact is, Rabbinic Jews have in no way helped us as Messianic Jews to stay Jews. They've fought it, they've resisted it, they've argued, they've called us Mishumadim, destroyed ones, etc. So, there have been a force in many ways to push us away from Jewish roots, and I've had rabbis say, well, you're not Jewish anymore.

With that type of influence, it's by the grace of God that we maintain our Jewishness. But regarding the Messiahship of Jesus, number one, there's nowhere where Tovia can point in the Bible where it says, when the Messiah comes, this will happen. When the Messiah comes, that will happen.

We both have to agree that we have to look at the Scriptures and interpret what is and what is not Messianic. The second thing is, if it was so crystal-cut and clear, you would not have so many traditions within Judaism over the years discussing who the Messiah is and what will happen when he comes. You have the greatest philosopher in Medieval Judaism, Rav Sa'adu Gaon, living in around the 9th century, in his famous book of Beliefs and Opinions, he devotes a section to what will happen when the Messiah comes, and he was doing it to educate the people.

Several generations after that, they were still asking questions because they weren't clear on it. The fact is, Jesus and Jesus alone is the only possible candidate for being the Jewish Messiah. The fact of the matter is, the Messiah had to come before the Second Temple was destroyed.

The fact of the matter is that he alone has brought the Gentile world into the knowledge of God, into praying for the God, to the God of Israel. And the fact of the matter is that there are certain things that had to be fulfilled, had to happen, that if he was not the Messiah, there can't be a Messiah because there are no longer any potential candidates for it. And I would stake my life and eternity on the fact that he and he alone is the Jewish Messiah.

Rabbi Singer, is there a unified view in Orthodox Judaism about the Messiah? Absolutely. And what we know about the Messiah is so clear in the Scriptures. Never one says in the Scriptures that when the Messiah comes, when all these things are going to happen, whether it's peace on earth, nations shall not lift up sword against nation, a child will play in a cobra's den, none of them say he will come and then he will come again when these things will happen.

It merely says, it doesn't say he will return and come again. Yeah, I know people can pull out Scriptures where it says he will come twice, but it never says that it's referring to the Messiah. What's critical, and I want to get back to what Mike said a little earlier, you know, go back 2,000 years, you know, in the time of

Jesus, maybe the year 30, you know, God had many choices before him.

He had many groups of Jews who believed different things. You had the Jerusalem church headed by Peter and James. They, to the best of my knowledge, were probably Orthodox Jews, in a sense, meaning they kept Torah.

Yet, because they did not believe in the true Messiah and they followed a false Messiah, there's nothing left of them. The Jerusalem church was destroyed. Wouldn't it have been much more glorious that if the Jerusalem church would have continued and the Pharisees would have been destroyed? But God chose the Pharisees, and regardless of what light the New Testament puts the Pharisees under, these are people that live for God every second.

They love God with all their heart and with all their might, and it's their progeny that went on and indeed continue until today. Dr. Brown, do you want to comment? Sure. I'd say there are about three different points that Tovya made that I'd like to respond to.

The one is he keeps saying that it has only been Pharisaical or later Rabbinic traditional Jews who have preserved the Jewish people. Now, again, I say that it's God alone who has preserved the Jewish people. The fact is, as I mentioned, we've been a dying and resurrected nation.

We were scattered out of the land for all those generations, and now God has brought us back. Who has he brought back primarily? Israel, to this day, is primarily a secular nation. That's the hand of God.

Does that prove because the Zionists were secular that therefore, since we owe to them a great deal for the re-establishment of the modern state of Israel, that secular Zionism is God's? Well, of course not. God can work through whoever he wants to. People do need to understand that historically, the roots of the Church, of followers of Jesus, were in fact Jewish.

When he's mentioning the Pharisees and the preservation of Judaism through them, I just say, hey, wait a second. Look at how this message has gone throughout the earth. Right now, the Gospel, the Good News of Jesus the Messiah, is being declared in over 3,000 different languages.

There are hundreds of millions of peoples whose lives have been radically changed and, as I said, come to love the God of Israel through the Good News of Jesus the Messiah. You could say, so what? Numbers don't count. Well, I'm saying numbers are not the major issue, but there's so many answers to his point.

I just wanted to give a few. In reference to the Messiahship of Jesus, as I said before, there are many different views in traditional Judaism concerning the Messiah. There are traditions that say that there's a Messiah son of Joseph, as well as a Messiah son of David.

But Rabbi Singer said there was one view. Right. What he means, and so I don't want to be contentious with it, what he means, and I'll agree with this, is that there's an overall view that the Messiah son of David will come and regather the lost of Israel and bring all of Israel into knowledge of the Torah and establish peace on earth.

And in that sense, there is one unified view that he's speaking of. But even the Talmud asks the question, will he come in the clouds of heaven, or will he come riding on a donkey? And the answer is, there's just one opinion given in the Talmud. Well, if we're righteous, he'll come with the clouds of heaven.

And if we're wicked, he'll come riding on a donkey. I say no. First he came riding on a donkey, one person, and then he will come in the clouds of heaven.

Why? Because every word of the Hebrew Bible is going to be fulfilled, not either or. Also, it says in the end of Isaiah 52, a passage I'm sure we'll get into at great length in a little while, it gives us a clear picture of the servant of the Lord, who many rabbis have recognized as a messianic passage. And it says that the very same one who will be highly exalted, the Hebrew says, He will be exalted and lifted up and very high.

That very one who will be highly exalted will first be marred and beaten and rejected and die before he rises into his exaltation. So there are many indications that we do have about the two phases of Messiah's ministry. As I said, rabbinic traditions have developed some thought about two different messiahs.

We say no, there's not a messiah son of Joseph and a messiah son of David, but rather one messiah, Yeshua, Jesus of Nazareth. I'd also just make the point that if we will be honest about one Jewish view of the messiah, we'll see that it is somewhat of an overstatement if we'll look at the Hebrew Scriptures. And I'll explain what I mean as we get further into our dialogue.

You know, there are people listening right now, and they're saying, why is this dialogue going on? And I think when I get the answer to the next question I'm going to ask, they're going to understand why this dialogue is going on. I'm going to ask Dr. Brown, and then I'm going to ask in a little different way, Rabbi Singer. Dr. Brown, what happens to a Jewish person who believes that Jesus is the Messiah, a messianic Jew, that dies having not repented of this or changed his mind in any way? By the grace of God, he goes immediately into the presence of God and begins the path of eternal joy.

And what happens to a Jewish person that refuses or never even hears that Jesus is the Messiah and never believes in him and dies? We have a responsibility to take the message to those who have not heard. That's what the New Testament tells us. We must bring the word to all, to the lost sheep of the house of Israel and to all the nations.

But it's very categorically clear on those who have heard and rejected the truth that they are lost, that they will suffer the judgment of God. And that's what breaks our heart, and that's why we weep and pray, and that's why we engage in these dialogues. This is very serious business to you.

Life and death. Rabbi Tovia Singer, what happens to a Jewish person that believes Jesus is the Messiah, a messianic Jew, who does not repent to this fact and goes to his grave believing that Jesus is the Messiah? Well, really, who cares what Rabbi Tovia Singer thinks? What does God think about that person? In Isaiah 43, 11, God says, I, even I, I am the Lord. There is no other God besides me.

There is no other Savior besides me. Thou shalt have no other God before me. If you violate that, then you're violating all.

Nothing else matters. The first thing is to understand that anybody who embraces John 1, thinking that God, God forbid, came down in the form of anything, whether it's a cottage cheese sandwich or Jesus, that person is worshiping idolatry, and when that person does that, he loses his eternity. He will not resurrect at the end of days.

But it's also important for that person to know that God loves you so much, more than you can ever love yourself. You can look at the moving portrait of a woman, a mother, nursing her little infant baby. And as the baby is sucking, think about the love that's taking place, the bonding that's taking place between that

mother and that child.

Yet the prophet Isaiah says that as much as that woman loves that baby, God loves you so much more than that. Well, if God can love you that much, understand he's patient with you. And if you think in your heart that you've blown it, you've been making a terrible mistake, yes, we have to call on God's mercy because... Excuse me, I'm not following one thing.

You're saying that a Jewish believer in Jesus that dies, does he spend forever in hell? What happens to him? If that person dies without repenting, then that person goes to the eternal fires of hell. They will not resurrect at the end of days, and they will not enjoy the splendor of heaven. What happens to a Christian that dies believing in Jesus? It's a very good question.

There are 69 laws that regards to Gentiles. I assume you meant Christian, you meant Gentiles? Yes. Okay, because a Jew can be a Christian too, I guess.

But you're talking about a Gentile. A Gentile is also obligated not to worship idolatry, and that's very, very important. Now I know people are going to say there's a disagreement vis-a-vis from the Jewish standpoint where the Christianity is idolatry for a Gentile.

Let me say to you categorically that it is. If there's any confusion... So you're saying a Gentile that believes in Jesus that dies goes to hell? Believes that Jesus was God. This is very critical.

It's not just that Jesus was the Messiah. Then he's just fooling himself. But once you're playing with fire, you're playing with the fires of hell when you believe that God is here in the form of man.

People may say to me, Rabbi, but if God wanted to, wouldn't he? It's not the issue here. Would God come in the form of a stone? We know he wouldn't. God said he's not a man.

That's Numbers 23, 19. God tells us don't worship anything that resembles what's in the sky, what's below on the ground. Don't do it.

Stay away from it. And if you are, whether you're a Jew or you're a Gentile, you're created in God's image. God loves you.

And if you're a Jew, understand that you are the apple of God's eye, and he's going to be very critical with you, and you will lose your eternity if you worship idolatry. Tobias, question. Yes.

One mensch to another. Yes. Human.

Are you a righteous rabbi? Yes, I am. Today I am because you know what I did this morning? You just dropped your Torah. I know that, but that's okay.

No, I didn't drop my Torah, actually. I dropped the King James Bible, which is a Bible that's masquerading as a Bible, but it's not really God's word. That's what I dropped, so that's okay.

Now, getting back to your question, could you repeat your question one more time, Sid? Are you a righteous rabbi? Today I am a righteous rabbi because what I did this morning on my way here, I started to pray in my car, and I started to cry out to Hashem, and I confessed my sins to God. And God, through his mercy, not through his judgment, but through the mercy that is who he is, he has forgiven me, and I felt God's spirit inside of me, and he's anointed my work in my life. So today I am.

So what makes you righteous? What makes me righteous is because I'm here speaking out to the world. I have not abandoned you. I am not God's manager, but I am his salesman.

So if you don't speak out to the world, you're not righteous? That's correct, because part of what we have to do is not just... You know, a Jew is called to proclaim the one God. There's the one God, and there is no one else besides him. And ladies and gentlemen, is there any other way God could get righteous besides proclaiming the fact there's a God? Oh, no.

It's just one element, you know. It's what's important is that when next time, wherever you are, you're in Chicago, go to Northwestern University where they're teaching evolution. Scream out, no, we don't come from monkeys.

We don't come from fishes or cockroaches. God created us on the sixth day of creation, Friday afternoon. Excuse me, Dr. Michael Brown, what makes you a righteous Messianic Jew? Well, it's total dependence on the grace and mercy of God and a life that's been changed through the merits of the Messiah.

In other words, when God's grace came to me, when I came to believe that Jesus was the Messiah, it was almost 20 years ago, I was a heroin-shooting rock drummer. And the fact of the matter is, there is no possible righteousness in me at that point. You say, ah, but you were totally evil.

Well, I was evil, but the scriptures declare, the Torah says that the impulse of man's heart is only evil from his youth. The psalmist said I've been conceived in sin. In other words, we're a fallen race and the best of our deeds are just like filthy rags before God, no matter how well we do.

But if you proclaim God, will that make you a righteous Messianic Jew? That might make me better. That might make you righteous. No, it won't make me righteous.

What makes you righteous? What makes me righteous is the sacrifice of the Messiah, the God-ordained atonement. Wait a second, Rabbi Tovia Singer, comment on what he just said. He just said the thing that makes him righteous is the sacrifice of the Messiah.

That's what he said. Comment on it. Well, it's interesting.

The Torah never says, and that's what Mike believes in, talking about Torah and all the Hebrew scriptures, never says that the Messiah is going to be a sacrifice anywhere in the scriptures that he can point to. Essentially, Torah outlines for us what we're supposed to do when we're in diaspora. If you look at 1 Kings chapter 8, 46 through 50, God tells us this is what we're going to do.

It's in the inauguration of the temple, and there King Solomon says, when you're going into the lands where I will send you because of your sins, and there you will bethink yourself, and then you will confess your sin to God. God will hear your prayers, and he will forgive you. There is no statement there about any kind of a sacrifice.

So are you saying Torah says that if you pray, your sins are forgiven? Is that what you're saying? Not only does God say that, but God says that through the words where he says it is better to pray than it is to sacrifice. It's better to obey than a sacrifice. A sacrifice is actually inferior to prayer and repentance, and that's set in those words.

Dr. Michael Brown, comment on that. I appreciate these issues coming up, because it gives us a great opportunity to clarify that nowhere at all in the five books of Moses does it indicate at all that if you pray, simply pray, you will be forgiven apart from God's system of atonement. That's number one.

Excuse me, that seems to be the opposite of what you just said. Is there a place in Torah? First of all, when we look at Torah, we believe, and I believe, and Michael, correct me if I'm wrong, that I'm sure Mike believes that it's not just the five books of Moses, that the prophets and the writings were also the word of God just as much as the word of God as the five books of Moses. Is there any place in the Torah that states this? Yeah, absolutely.

And where is it? This is the way we see it. We see it in the role that sacrifice played. Yes, of course, sacrifice was an important part of atonement, but there were other parts of atonement.

You say was. It isn't anymore? No, of course not, because it says in Leviticus 17 that the sacrifices can only be bought on the altar. If it's bought at Calvary, or in somebody's backyard, or at somebody's barbecue, then it's not a sacrifice that's pleasing to God.

God tells us in the scriptures that when you will be in exile, you will there have to keep Torah. It doesn't say that you can relinquish it and take your tzitzot. You have to keep it on.

You have to keep your life connected to God through His holy Torah. But where in the Torah does it say prayer is okay? Again, we don't believe. You have to understand this.

We do not believe, Orthodox Jews do not believe, that the Torah alone is all the information. We believe that the prophets had a purpose, and the purpose of the prophets are to set us straight. As Isaiah said, you pray for me.

Excuse me. I'm just trying to clarify this point. So there is nowhere in the first five books of Moses that states the fact prayer is sufficient, or there is? Yes.

No. It specifically says in the Torah, and this is very important, that the sacrifice was an inconsequential form of atonement. How do we know this? Because the Torah says over and over again, you can look in Leviticus 4 and Numbers 15, you'll find that specifically says that the sacrifice was there for accidental sins.

Therefore, all I'm saying to you is this, that sin atonement, according to the five books of Moses, is something that is relatively insignificant. We find people sinning in the five books of Moses, and yet there is no sacrifice for their sin. Look at Exodus 22.

If somebody steals, there's no sacrifice for it. You pay back double. Again, is there a scripture in Torah that says prayer is sufficient for atonement for sin? No.

The point is, again... I tell you what, do me a favor, Tobias. I really like you. The answer is yes or no on this.

The answer is yes. The answer is yes. However... Wait, where is it? It's Leviticus 4, Numbers 15.

Leviticus 4 what? Leviticus 4, the entire chapter, where it tells us that the only way to atone for unknowing sins is through a sacrifice. This is very important. Therefore, Sid, you've got to be asking yourself this question.

What about all the sin? Let's face it, Sid... I'm asking myself the question I just asked you. Listen, people might be... No, no, no. This is important, Sid.

The overwhelming... Let's face it, the overwhelming majority of sin that's taking place on the world is not unknowing sin. Let's face it. When we talk about sin, we're talking about the sin that people are doing knowingly, and for that, Torah did not prescribe atonement through sacrifice.

You and I know that. Now, Mike, if you'd like to go right ahead. Okay, sure.

Number one is the fact that according to the words of God, let anyone read it in 2 Chronicles 7, Solomon prayed and he said, if this happens, if that happens, if we sin, if we go into exile, we'll pray towards this temple and God forgive us. It was founded, and let anyone read this in 2 Chronicles 7, it was founded on the temple sacrifices. God said, I will establish this house as a house of sacrifice, but if you break my laws and commands and get to a point where I reject you for a period of time, then I will destroy the temple.

So the whole thing where prayer had any effect was as they were praying back towards the temple. God gave no alternate system of atonement. That's number one.

Number two, the Torah categorically says, when I say the Torah, I mean the first five books, and Orthodox Judaism recognizes the first five books as being foundational and as dictated by God to Moses, and they do not recognize the prophets and the rest of the scriptures as on that same level of inspiration, whereas Christians would look at them as all equally inspired. The fact is, nowhere does the Torah, the first five books, say that prayer makes atonement for sins. Number two, Leviticus 16, the day of atonement, categorically says that that is the day when the entire nation can be forgiven for any and all of its sins, if it will do what God says through the sacrifices and humbling themselves.

Lastly, there are pictures, the clearest of all, being Isaiah 52, 13 verses 53-12, which presents the Messiah as a sacrifice, as an offering for sins. You know what it says? After it says that all of our sins were laid on Him, it says, God says proudly, speaking of a servant, my righteous servant will make the many righteous. It's the Messiah who makes us righteous by His deeds, and in fact, you know, you turn away from the sin, from the wickedness that you did, and you turn to God and become righteous, God will forgive you for your sin, you will be righteous in God's eyes, and the next verse, God says, does it my wish, do I want to punish the wicked, or rather do I want to see the wicked turn away from his evil ways? God loves you, and God wants you to bring Him into your life, and that's what's so very important.

Dr. Michael Brown, do you believe it's just a visual image of the blood? Well, what is the visual image? The visual image is life for life. That same prophet Ezekiel said this, the soul that sins shall die. Now, Tove has brought up an important point, which of course I agree with, which is that there must be repentance, there must be a change of life.

In other words, if someone says, I believe in Jesus, or I just want to sacrifice something at the altar, and they continue in their sin, and they refuse to repent of their sinful ways, they're not righteous in the sight of God. What's interesting, though, is again, the Day of Atonement, which is the holiest day in the Jewish calendar, and which is laid out clearly for us in Leviticus 16, does not use the word repent, interestingly enough, but it constantly refers to sacrifices and the sins of the people being put on the sacrifice. What is God trying to say? That sin demands punishment, sin demands judgment.

What if in all of our courts throughout the world, we said, hey, you changed your life, there's no penalty. You did right, there's no punishment. No, then our whole society would fall apart.

Sin demands judgment, sin demands punishment. Abraham says to God, will not the judge of all the earth do right? There must be a victim. God, in his incredible mercy for us, and his incredible love for us, has said to us as Jewish people, as Gentile people, you do not have to pay for your own sins, you cannot pay for your own sins, or you will be eternally lost.

Psalms 143 says, no living person will be pronounced righteous in God's sight. If we enter into judgment with God, he'll say, you're wrong. Every single one of you, on your own, are wrong.

Rather, God, by his grace, provides us with atonement. God, by his grace, provides us with an ability to change our hearts. But all of the sacrifices were pointing towards one central thing.

Sin demanded the taking of a life, and God would provide an innocent victim to suffer in our place. And who does that point to? Do you need a rabbi, or a priest, or a pastor, to say who that points to? It points to the one who shed his blood on behalf of mankind. Rabbi Tobias Singer, Isaiah 53 is a chapter that is discussed, and then discussed some more when it comes to a graphic illustration, Messianic Jews say, of the Messiah.

Do you see Jesus anywhere in Isaiah 53? No, absolutely not. As a matter of fact, not only don't I see Jesus in Isaiah 53, there are many Christians that don't see Jesus in Isaiah 53. If any of you tonight want to go, don't do it tonight, Shabbos, but you can do it before Shabbos, get yourself a New English Bible with an Oxford annotation.

These are written by Gentiles, and they all wrote that it's talking about the Jewish people and not the Messiah. Get yourself a Revised Standard Version, Oxford annotation. The same thing.

Why are all these Christians, and I know Michael said they're not real Christians, but why these are Christians, they're translators and commentators from the Christian standpoint, why are they all backing up the Jewish people that this is not talking about the Messiah, meaning the Messiah of David? Do not confuse that with any Messiah. King David was a Messiah, the priests were Messiahs, but talking about the Messiah, the Son of David, who comes at the end of days, only Him am I referring to. Now, why? Because... But aren't there some rabbis that believe that Isaiah 53 is speaking of the Messiah? Again, I have to correct, said it's just what I just said a moment ago.

Don't say just the Messiah. I know it's your show, but I've got to correct you. Say the Messiah from David.

No, there is not one, and I will say this emphatically, there is not one rabbinic tradition writing anywhere that says that it's referring to the Messiah, the Son of David. They say that this is a person who... But are there some that say it is the Messiah? No, they're saying it's a Messiah. That's categorically... Let me just, Mike, let me just... Sure, I'm sorry.

Let me just finish my sentence. You know, when we think of the Holocaust, it's very difficult for us to in any way really conceptualize six million people. When I think of the Holocaust, I think of that person who threw himself against the electrical barbed wire and is dead.

They're committing suicide. There is a moving portrait in our minds where we think of different things, and then that one individual that personifies the whole nation. Our rabbis understood that at the end of days,

when the Messiah is going to come, there are great, great wars.

They were just reflecting, of course, the words of Ezekiel and many others. And these great wars is going to be an individual, a Messiah, the Son of Joseph. And that individual is going to get killed in war, and it's going to turn people to mourn for him.

And when people are going to mourn for that individual, then people are going to actually become part of the Holy Rim of the Jewish people. Okay, we're going to have Dr. Michael Brown respond to that, but we've got to take a commercial break right now. Would you respond? Sure.

Well, the thing that really got my interest, and that actually I was astonished to hear, it's the first time I've ever heard it from the mouth of a rabbi, was that there are no Jewish interpretations of Isaiah 53 that it refers to the Messiah, namely the Messiah, Son of David. Actually, that's utterly baffling. There's a whole volume that Tove is familiar with called The Interpretation of Isaiah 53 According to the Jewish Interpreters.

That's the rough title of it. It was edited originally by a British scholar named Eberhard Pusey, and then after that he got a Jewish scholar to work on, and a Christian scholar to translate. The fact is, it gives dozens and dozens and dozens of Jewish interpretations of Isaiah 53, beginning with what's called the Targum, the Aramaic translation.

There are many rabbis that say it speaks of the Messiah. That doesn't mean that it does or it doesn't, just like there are, yes, Christians that say it speaks of Israel, or those in Christian churches that say it speaks of Israel. There are many, many candidates as to who it speaks of.

I'm convinced, without a doubt, that when you read it, and I'd encourage any Jewish listener to sit down with a Hebrew Bible and read Isaiah 52-13 to 53-12 out loud, prayerfully, thoughtfully, and ask himself, who does this speak of? But in the 16th century, one of the leading Jewish scholars living in Israel was named Rabbi Moses Alsheikh, Moshe Alsheikh, and he said, 16th century, all of our holy rabbis agree that this is a prophecy of the Messiah. Now the fact is, there are other opinions, and let's remember that the Messiah is the representation of his people. In other words, the Messiah is the head, the chief of his people, so that there are certain similarities between what the Messiah does and what happens to the people.

We are united, you know, in the Messiah as one. But the fact of the matter is, and as I said, I was baffled to hear him say this, there are many Jewish interpreters, including rabbis I've talked to in Brooklyn, who say, yes, this is a prophecy of the Messiah, King David. Now can you see in Isaiah 53, I just want to ask this one question, I'll let you respond, can you see in Isaiah 53 how an Orthodox rabbi might construe that it is Israel or a righteous remnant within Israel, and why that might be wrong? Sure.

Naturally, I read the scriptures and I believe I'm understanding them correctly, and I believe that a rabbi is reading them through colored glasses. Of course, that's what a rabbi told me, that he's reading it accurately and I'm reading it through colored glasses. The fact of the matter is, we both have reasons for our interpretation, we categorically disagree with each other.

Many times in the book of Isaiah where it speaks of the servant of the Lord, it's referring to the people as a whole. Sometimes it's referring to a remnant of the people. Other passages, like Isaiah 49, where it speaks of Israel initially, then it says that the role of this servant is to regather Israel.

So in other words, this is speaking about an Israel or a servant or a seed within the nation as a whole. So he might say, well, the servant of the Lord in many of the passages and in the context is often Israel, that's why I see it as referring to Israel. And look, the fact is, we've suffered, we've been abused, we've been rejected, etc., etc.

However, it can't work. You go through verse by verse, it cannot work for the people as a whole. Give me one example.

Well, one example is, according to the Torah, the people as a whole, if they were obedient, if they lived in accordance with the scriptures, they would be blessed, they would be the highest of all the nations, they would not come under any of the covenant curses. In other words, the people as a whole could not suffer what the servant of the Lord suffers here if they were righteous, and yet the servant is righteous. Also, Israel has suffered for its own sins, not for the sins of the nations, nor has Israel's suffering brought healing to the nations.

For example, Israel suffered at the hands of the Assyrians. The Assyrians overdid the punishment. What happened to Assyria? They're gone.

Israel, the Jewish people, suffered at the hands of the Babylonians. The Babylonians overdid the punishment. What happened to them? They're gone.

Israel suffered at the hands of the Greeks. That empire is gone. At the hands of the Romans, that empire is gone.

So it hasn't brought healing. Let's get a response now from Rabbi Tobel. First of all, I'm going to ask Mike, after the show, if he cannot find even one writing anywhere where Isaiah 53 is talking about the Messiah, the son of David, will he drop his messianic stuff? That's first of all.

Secondly, let's take a look at the moving portrait of the Holocaust again. We have a mother with her infant walking into the gas chamber. Now that little infant is clutched to that woman's breast, and she sits over there waiting for these supposed showers to go on, and gas comes in.

I want to ask Mike Brown, I want to ask every Christian, every Jew out there, what sin did that little baby commit? Indeed, God gave permission. Yes, Deuteronomy 28, Leviticus 26 talks about curses that will come upon the Jewish people, and yes, we have sinned. But the Gentile nations have gone too far, and God is very angry with them.

If you read, for instance, Zechariah 115, and I am very angry with the nations that are at ease. Why are they at ease? Because, this is not scripture, this is my paraphrase, because they're at ease because they have been punishing, unbelievable, the Jewish people. For I was wroth a little, and they helped to do harm.

That means God was angry with the Jewish people a little. This is the word of God. This is not a rabbinic source of any type.

This is just straight what God says. I was angry with them a little bit, but the Gentile nations, you could take any example of our persecution. Yes, of course, we deserved what went on in the Holocaust.

Some of us did to a certain point, but not what the Nazis gave to us, and that's indeed what the Gentile nations are saying in Isaiah 53, 1 through 10. Mike Brown says, you know, if anybody would read the scriptures, Isaiah 52, 13 through 53, 12, you might think it's talking about the Messiah. See, if you asked Rabbi Singer, I would tell you, don't read stuff from 52, 13.

Start from Isaiah chapter 1, and go through the whole book, because if you read something out of context, and I'm not saying that Mike's position was to get you to do that, but if you, maybe that's what he did, and that's why he thought Isaiah 53 is talking about the Messiah, because he started at 52, 13. Ladies and gentlemen, start with Isaiah 1, 1. Actually, start from Veracious. If you read the whole thing, you'll see that God says over and over that Israel, you are my servant, and it's talking not about all of Israel, but talking about the righteous remnant of the Jewish people.

Those are the people, by the way, who are going to mourn, going to mourn at the time at the end of days, and through that mourning, it's going to bring them righteousness. May I ask, respond, because we've got to go to phone calls, but respond very quickly. Okay, yes, I will give up my whole messianic stick if I cannot come up with that quote, but I have a question for you.

Will you become a messianic, too, if I can show you one? You know it. Okay, that's in the sight of God. Shake on it, my friend.

Done. It's done. I have the quote.

In fact, I won't tell you where it is right now. I have several, but I'll give you one in particular. The fact of the matter is we agree that the nations have overdone the punishment.

In fact, we wholeheartedly agree, and in fact, as I've read about Holocaust, you know, the books stacked up in my office that I read, I read, I tremble, I shake, I weep. I just got through writing something. One of the main goals is to present to the Christian church the utter horror of the agony and suffering that our people have endured, and to open the hearts and minds of the Christian church to begin to pray with broken hearts for the people of Israel, so that we can be spared from any more suffering of this kind.

By the way, just to clarify, and I'm not going to take issue with Mike, because we can go on forever, and if anybody wants, they can call me. But it's important to understand that Mike and I both agree that there are three narrations that take place between Isaiah 52, 13, to the end of Isaiah 53, 12. We both agree that Isaiah 52, 13 through 15, God is speaking.

We agree that Isaiah 53, verse 10, through the end of the 53rd chapter, God is speaking again. The question we have here is who is speaking from Isaiah 53, 1 through Isaiah 53, 10? It is the Jewish belief, it is Torah belief, indeed, that the one who is speaking are the kings of nations that are talking. That's a narration that's taking place.

I know this is confusing for all of you who are trying to get so much out of this. It's a radio station, it's only on for two hours, but as I said again, if you want to, any of you can call me, and I'll give you my number. No, Bill, we must go to telephone calls.

Stuart, New York City, you have a question. Yeah, hi, I'm on? You're on, Stuart. Okay, I have a two-part question, and I'm going to cite two scriptural verses.

Now is this directed to the rabbi? No, this would be directed to Dr. Michael Brown. Okay, thank you. Okay, and the two scriptural verses, one comes from the New Testament of Matthew chapter 1 and the whole chapter, but particularly also for sentence 11 and sentence 12.

And the other one would go to from the Jewish Bible, Jeremiah chapter 22, sentences 28 on to 30 at the end. So your question is going to be just maybe to help... Yeah, I'm going to give you the question now. Right, it has to do with the genealogy of Jesus.

First of all, in the genealogy of Jesus, in the sentence 11 and 12, it says, "...and Josiah begat Jeconias." You see, everyone's speaking here about Jesus, the son of David, so that supposedly the Messiah Jesus supposedly comes from David and the family of David. Now if you follow this genealogy in Matthew chapter 1, and first we start with that 11 and 12 of the mentioning of Jeconias as being in the genealogy, and then we go to Jeremiah sentence 28, and it talks about Jehoiachin, who is known as Jeconia, and he says he comes like a broken jaw. I'm reading some translation here.

"...that is thrown away, and that no one wants. Is that why he and his children have been taken into exile to a land they know nothing about? O land, land, land, listen to what the Lord has said." And this is what the Lord said. This man, now this is Jeconia, is a condemned man to lose his children, to be a man who will never succeed.

So what is your question? Well, the point is that if Jeconia's ancestors will never succeed, it says he will have no descendants who will rule in Judah. Is that your question? Yes, it says in verse 30. Let me just finish the question.

I'll make it real quick. Now, if you read the rest of the genealogy, the second part of the question is that God has an experience with Mary, and Jesus is the result. Joseph, the father, does not have the relations with Mary.

Now, Joseph comes from the family of Judah, and the genealogies in Jewish history, particularly in that period, come through the father. So that would mean that Jesus never came through the genealogy of Judah, and therefore he would not qualify, according to your scripture and according to New Testament scripture, he would not qualify to be the ultimate Messiah to redeem the people. Stuart, this is Sid Roth, and I just want to, so we can get a feel.

Are you an Orthodox Jew? Tell me where you're coming from. I'm essentially non-denominational. I have an interest in the Bible, and I've studied some Bible of New Testament Bible.

Stuart, are you Jewish? Jewish Bible? Stuart, are you Jewish? Am I Jewish? Oh, yeah, I'm very Jewish. Okay, fine, Mike. Now, Stuart, I just want you to listen carefully, because there's some very important answers to your question.

First problem that you've raised is that the genealogy of Yeshua is traced through Jehoiakim, who's also called Jeconiah or Coniah, and it says in Jeremiah 23:30, thus said the Lord, record this man as without succession, one who shall never be found acceptable, for no man of his offspring shall be accepted to sit on the throne. To sit on the throne of David and to rule again in Judah. Now, it also says earlier on, that even if you were a signet ring on my right hand, this is verse 24, I would tear you off even from there.

Now, the first thing that's important to note is this, that at the end of Jeremiah 52, it says that this man, Coniah, was lifted up from his exile. It goes on to say that he was given a position higher than any of the

other kings of the other nations, a regular allotment of food was given him, etc. And according to no less an authority than Rabbi David Kimche, writing about 800 years ago, this indicates to us that Jeconiah repented and the curse was reversed.

However, we have something more categorical than that, which is in the second chapter of the book of Haggai, it refers to the grandson of Jeconiah, whose name was Zerubbabel. Zerubbabel functioned as the governor of Judah. Now, number one here, he did prosper.

He was in the succession of David. Number two, we have evidence from the scriptures that Jeconiah repented and the curse was reversed. How do we know it? This is what it says in Haggai chapter two, beginning in verse 21.

And by the way, what I'm saying is also accepted in the standard rabbinic commentaries, if you'll check them. Speak to Zerubbabel, the governor of Judah. I'm going to shake the heavens and the earth and I will overturn the thrones of kingdoms and destroy the might of the kingdoms of the nations.

I will overturn chariots and their drivers. Horses and their riders shall fall, each by the sword of his fellow. On that day, declares the Lord of hosts, I will take you, O my servant Zerubbabel, son of Shealthiel, declares the Lord, and make you a signet.

Remember God said about his grandfather, if you're a signet ring, I'll cast you off my hand. Here he renews the messianic promises through Zerubbabel, his grandson. And God says, I will make you as a signet, for I have chosen you, declares the Lord of hosts.

So that's the first answer to the question. The second answer is this. The Messiah is not just David.

He is greater than David. Jesus asked his contemporaries, if the Messiah is David's son, how come David calls him Lord or master in Psalm 110? Jesus is not just the son of David in the physical sense. He is greater than David.

The fact is, though, we have a dilemma. How can he be born of man and yet be greater than man? Of course, the virgin birth is the answer to that. But if you'll study carefully 1 Chronicles chapter 2, you will see that in the case where there are only daughters, the genealogy is continued through the daughter and then down to the next generation.

You'll also see some interesting information in 1 Chronicles 3.19. I'll have to point you to that. And you've got to be very brief now, because I want Tobias to respond. Okay, sure.

I'll leave it right there for now. Okay. Rabbi Tobias Singer.

Well, first of all, it's important to know that when you refer to Psalm 110 as somehow, you know, King David was saying, the Lord said to my Lord. Unfortunately, you out there who don't know how to read Hebrew might be fooled by that to think that both Lords are the same. When you finally learn your Hebrew, I want you to look inside because you're going to find that there are two different words referring to those two Lords.

In English, they may be the same, but in Hebrew, they're violently different. The first Lord is the Jehovah name, and I'm pronouncing it that way because it's not God's name exactly. And the second one is Adonai, which is not sacred.

The second is a small I. Now, it's important to understand what's going on over here. When King David wrote the Psalms, he didn't write them for himself. He wrote them, as he says himself, for the Levites to sing in the temple.

Well, if they were going to sing in the temple, they were talking about things that God said to King David. Therefore, it says the people who are speaking are those who are the Levites in the temple, and therefore, they could say the Lord said to my Lord. In terms of the entire genealogy, Mike Brown is correct.

He has to rely on the oral Torah in order to know that Jeconiah indeed did repent. In terms of Zerubbabel, incorrect. Zerubbabel never became king.

Zerubbabel did not sit on the throne. He was somebody who was a governor who had a leadership position, but was not the king. By the way, if two of you remember, sure, when I quoted Psalm 110, I quoted it the same way.

Lord Master stood to clarify that. Of course, what he said about the Hebrew there was right. Number two, I wasn't relying on the oral law.

I studied the scriptures, came to that conclusion, and then said, let's see if the rabbis also came to that conclusion. And of course, Rabbi David Kempfi, not relying on the oral law, but relying on reading the scriptures carefully, came to the same conclusion that I did. We're going to Jerry in Queens.

Jerry, you have a question for Dr. Brown? Yes, Dr. Brown? Yes, sir. What I wanted to ask is, we know from Leviticus 17:11 that there must be actual bloodshed to achieve atonement. Because the life is in the blood, correct? Exactly.

Right. However, what I want to know is, where in the New Testament is Jesus' blood actually shed unto death? Where is his blood shed unto death? I might be missing your question. The fact that he's crucified, and his side is pierced as well, makes it clear that he pours out his lifeblood.

I don't know that anyone would really argue that. I don't know that Rabbi Singer would argue with that either. Well, excuse me, the blood that was shed from the side wound was after he was dead already.

But if you read in John, what I'm referring to is, where was his blood shed prior to his death? In other words, to bring about his death, just like... Oh, okay, sure. I can answer that simply for you. You know, I would point out that there is a Talmudic reference that says, In terms of the sacrificial system, there is no atonement outside of the blood.

And if you're familiar with the story of the crucifixion, first Jesus was brutally scourged, which made his whole back raw with blood. Then he was nailed to the cross and died hanging on the cross before there was even opportunity for him to suffocate to death. The only point though, in any case, that I would bring out is that it does not say that the animal has to die if its blood being shed.

It could die of a heart attack. But the key thing is that the blood must be shed because the life is in the blood, and no one would argue that Jesus' blood was terribly shed. Well, along those lines, what causes death as the blood leaves the body is immaterial.

The point is that it's the blood that's drained from the body that causes death. Of course, with the animal, you don't know, and with anything, there could be a number of causes of shock. What causes a shock?

What I'm referring to is that in the animal, you know that there had to be the blood loss.

We obviously can see, we visualize with our eyes the actual blood leaving the body. Excuse me, Jerry, we're going to have to take a commercial break. We'll let you pick up right here.

Dr. Michael Brown, respond to Jerry very quickly. Sure. The answer to the question is that we know that Jesus' blood was shed.

We know that he died as a result of being nailed to the cross and crucified, and the fact is no one would argue with the fact that his lifeblood was shed and that he died, he gave up his life, and you won't find anywhere, by the way, in Leviticus where it says the animal must die of bleeding to death. It's understood when you slit the animal's throat, et cetera, that it was going to die one way or another soon enough through the blood being shed, the same way with someone being scourged and nailed to the cross, but what we do know is that he did not die of asphyxiation, which is the normal method of death by crucifixion. That would have taken a period of time.

He died much more quickly. Stephen, Long Island, you're on the air. Yes, I'd like to make a statement, and then I'd like both gentlemen to have a chance to kind of react to the statement.

Before we start, I'm basing my questions on the following belief. First is the nature of Almighty God, that he's omniscient, all-knowing, and he knows events of past, present, and future. Secondly, that the Tenach, the Old Testament, is the Word of God.

It's inerrant, it's accurate, and it's divinely true. It does not contradict itself. And thirdly, that prophecy, since God is all-knowing, that the written accounts by Moses and the prophets were done for two reasons.

One, for the edification of those who were present at the time to hear it, and also for us who read the written accounts. Can we assume that both the rabbi and the doctor agree on those? I certainly agree with those. No problem.

Okay. So, we have a God who knows the future and lets us know through his prophecy to give us a chance to make amends or to repent of things that we do wrong. Okay.

The destruction of both Solomon's temple and Herod's temple were prophesized, and both those destructions took place. The chosen people were given warnings to repent of their sinful ways, and their failure to do so meant a scattering and a dispersal amongst the nations. Now, the Messiah of whom Moses and the prophets spoke would have to be from the tribe of Judah and the house of David.

Now, when the Romans sacked the second holy temple in the year 70, all the scrolls and records of the lineage were destroyed. Now, if the Messiah is still yet to appear, how are we going to know what his lineage is and how are we going to confirm that? And how come our all-knowing God, who knew that the temple would be destroyed, and it also says in the book of Daniel, chapter 9, verses 24 to 26, that the Messiah was to come and be cut off before the destruction of the temple. It kind of makes sense that if the Messiah was to come, the temple is destroyed, and then that whole sacrificial method of atonement would no longer be necessary.

Does that seem kind of obvious? Because it's kind of interesting to me that when we talk about the day of atonement, the Yom Kippur, we've gone through all these sages and rabbis that say, well, since we no longer have a sacrifice in the prayer of the Neleah service, in the last service, it says, accept our words as

ancient sacrifices. That's not what the Tanakh says, that's what the sages say. Use our words as ancient sacrifices.

Also, they decided that if Yom Kippur, we should give charity, that we should give money and charity as sacrifices. So they know there has to be a sacrifice, but they say, well, there's no longer a temple, there's no longer atonement by blood, so let's give money, or let's do good deeds, or let's use our words as sacrifices. Tobiah? Yeah, I just wanted to respond to a few of those, and I think there's some very good points there.

I think your first question is, how will we know when the Messiah comes? How will we know he's from the house of David? It's important for everybody to know that although he has to come from the house of David, that is not the sign of the Messiah. The reason it can't be the Messiah is because it's not exhaustive and exclusive. In order for something to be a sign, it has to be completely exclusive.

It's like saying the Messiah is going to be a man. Well, that's not the sign of the Messiah is going to be a man. Of course, if somebody comes up with a dress, well, somebody comes who is a woman, then we will know, of course, that he's not the Messiah.

That's first of all. We will know it because we will look out our windows, and the world will not look the way it does now. Let me go... Excuse me, why didn't God in his written word tell us that these are things to look for? The rod of Jesse, the line of Judah.

He told us things to look for, but it's not necessary to look for them. Again, you're making a mistake. If you look, for instance, in Isaiah 11-1, it does not say these are the things to look for.

Those words do not appear at all, and if you can supply them to our listening audience, I'd be very surprised. He wasn't told that his progeny would sit on the throne of Israel forever? It's called passive and aggressive prophecy. Understand that just like he is going to be a man, and I'm sure Mike Brown is not going to disagree with me on this, that's not what we call a sign.

Although, if he's a woman, he turns out to be a woman, that's fine. That's what Elijah the prophet is going to come. If you read the end of the book of Malachi, it tells us that Elijah the prophet is going to come, and he's going to point out to us the Messiah according to our tradition.

It's true it's in the Talmud, according to the tradition of the Talmud. It says over there that Elijah the prophet is going to tell us certainly who's going But is that important to know whether he was descended from David, or whether he's... It is important. It is not a sign.

...to look at the window instead. By the way, it's not a sign. Listen carefully.

A sign is always exhaustive and exclusive. If it's not, it can't possibly be a sign. Okay? By the way, I wouldn't fully accept that last statement, that a sign has to be exhaustive and exclusive, otherwise it's not a sign.

I'd just point someone to read Exodus, the third chapter, and notice the sign that's given there. However, let me say this, and Steve, I just want to take your point a little further. It doesn't say in Isaiah 11 either, these are the things to look for.

This is simply something that we both interpret ultimately as a messianic prophecy, but it is well taken, since we have so many arguments made against Jesus can't be the Messiah because he's not the son of David, over and over and over. I mean, I've been through this. We had an earlier call seeking to raise this.

The fact of the matter is, how could someone demonstrate it? There have been many pretenders. There have been many people that have made claims, and if someone cannot demonstrate it, it does raise a problem. Also, just to add to what he mentioned, Daniel, the ninth chapter, gives several things, no matter how you interpret Messiah, Daniel chapter nine gives several things that must happen before the second temple is destroyed, and some of those things clearly are messianic and must have been fulfilled before the second temple was destroyed, namely everlasting righteousness and eternal forgiveness had to be brought in, atonement had to be made before the second temple was destroyed, so I think that's another point that Steve is getting at.

Well, another point I was getting at is that if I'm a rich person and I can afford to give more in charity, am I buying my righteousness, or if I'm a more bright person and I can study more, am I more righteous, if I'm not doing it by God's grace, if I'm doing it by my own power, in other words, if my words are my sacrifices, if my charity, if these are things that are going to reconcile me unto God because I was born in a sinful state because of man's sin, then I'm doing it, not God. Now, first of all, by the way, what's your name, by the way? Stephen. Stephen, listen carefully.

The words that the charity is superior to sacrifice are not the words of the rabbis, that's the words of the prophets. In Proverbs 21.3, it says, Performing charity and justice is preferred to God to a sacrifice. So that's something that we understand to be not from any word in tongue, that comes from God's own words, praise the Lord, that are written rather than those that are transmitted orally.

To respond to what Mike said, Mike's pointed to Daniel 9, you're right, according to Daniel 9, in the verse it says there that six things have to happen, and I would submit to you that Christians believe that these six things had to take place during the time of the second temple, during the 70-week period. Has there been really an end to sin? Has there been everlasting righteousness? We're living in the 20th century, and 20th century alone, and it's not even over yet, 120 million people have died in wars. So we know right away that these things haven't taken place.

According to the, according to Torah, these 70 weeks is in a period of time, which once the 70 weeks are over, then begins the epoch of the Messiah, the messianic era, and now it's up to each generation, to every year. That's a major point. Dr. Brown, I want you to respond on that.

Sure. Well, again, we keep going back and forth as to who made it up and who got it from the Bible. I'll say I got it from the Bible.

Seventy weeks have been decreed for your people in your holy city. Seventy weeks, generally understood meaning of years, as it's written here in the footnote of my new Jewish version, until the measure of transgression is filled, and that of sin complete, until iniquity is expiated, and eternal righteousness ushered in, and prophetic vision ratified, and the Holy of Holies anointed. And then it makes it very clear that all this must happen before the Second Temple is destroyed.

For those who have received what the Messiah has done, to view the answer is yes. Transgression has been terminated, and the fullness of sin paid for, iniquity expiated, eternal righteousness ushered in, we are already living in the gift of righteousness that the Messiah has provided. Prophetic vision has been

ratified, and the Holy of Holies, which has been variously interpreted, the fact is it has been anointed, but it had to take place in any event before the destruction of the city, and that destruction took place in the year 70.

All right, we have a highly unusual caller that's right on. He's probably a friend of yours, Rabbi. His name is Craig.

He says he's an ex-Messianic Jew. Craig, did you have a question? Yes, I do. Hello? Yes, you're on.

We're with you, Craig. Yeah, hi, my name is Craig. I have a question for Dr. Brown.

Yes, sir. So, in the book of Daniel, especially right before he ends up in the famous story of the lion's den, there's a section where he's wondering how to react, and he ends up praying three times. There's a verse there saying, three times a day, that he ends up facing east and praying three times a day, as was the custom of the Jews.

What tells me two very important things. It tells me that there was a clear, some type of tradition being developed, that a tradition very similar to what every Orthodox Jew does today was developed, and that there was a possible for, at least we understand the prayers today, as being outside, as being a substitute for the sacrificial system, and I would argue that that's probably what they were similar idea in the book of Daniel, which I think is very difficult. That's a very difficult verse, I would argue, for Christians to deal with, and I'm curious, Dr. Brown's response.

Oh, sure. I appreciate you raising it. Frankly, if it's in the Bible, it's not difficult, at least I hope not.

It's truth, and I want to follow it. Number one, remember what I said earlier. There is nothing in the scriptures that says that we are bound to follow an oral Torah of the rabbis, nor does it say that God gave Moses an oral Torah on Mount Sinai.

That's the first point. I have no question that there are many customs and many traditions developed. You can read the book of Acts, and it speaks of living according to the custom of the Jews.

I mean, we can use a rabbinic calendar. There are many customs and traditions that everybody follows in any land or nation where they live. So I have no problem with the fact that there are customs or traditions developing.

We'll study any history of the Second Temple period. It'll tell us that many different competing customs and sects and groups were growing up. You have those reflected in the writers of what are called the Dead Sea Scrolls, and those reflected in the Pharisees, and so on and so forth.

So there are many customs, many traditions. Does the scripture say that we are bound by them? Does the scripture say what the Talmud says, that the custom of the people is Torah? No, of course not. Secondly, it doesn't mention anything about Daniel receiving atonement or forgiveness of sins through prayer.

We just want to look at what the text says, and I'll go back again to an important passage I alluded to before, but it's in 2 Chronicles, the 7th chapter, when God makes his covenant, and when he speaks, God says this, The Lord appeared to Solomon at night, 2 Chronicles 7, 12. I have heard your prayer and have chosen this site as my house of sacrifice. If I shut up the heavens and there is no rain, if I command the locusts to ravage the land, or if I let loose pestilence against my people, when my people who bear my

name humble themselves, pray and seek my favor and turn from their evil ways, I will hear in my heavenly abode and forgive their sins and heal their land.

Now my eyes will be open and my ears attentive to the prayers from this place. Why? Because I've established it as a house of sacrifice. And I have chosen and consecrated this house that my name may be there forever in my eyes and my heart shall be there.

Then he goes on and says, But if you break the covenant, and if you go against what I've said, then I will destroy this temple and cast you out of my sight. Daniel had no guaranteed method of atonement with the temple destroyed, but it was at that time as he prayed that God gave him revelation of Messiah to come, of atonement to come. That's why it's so important.

God began to bring to light the whole passages of the suffering servant in the book of Isaiah, and how he would suffer and all of our sins would be put upon him. So at the time when the temple was destroyed, God was beginning to reveal to Israel what the sacrifices really pointed to. But without the temple, no Jew has any right to come up with a new system of atonement outside of the sacrifice system, unless you recognize the sacrifice system is fulfilled in the Messiah.

How do you respond to that? Well, first of all, there's a couple of points here. You didn't give me the chance, Sid, before to respond to what Mike said in terms of Daniel 9, and that must be addressed. First of all, Mike did not in any way show us that it says in Daniel 9 that these six things have to take place during the 70 weeks.

You can infer it if you'd like to. And what I'd like to say here is, let's say, I'm going to go according to Mike, that it takes place during. What I'd like all the radio listeners to do is, I want you to think to yourself and think, have these six things taken place? Because that's what we're supposed to believe.

Jesus did these things. So let's read them. First of all, did Jesus terminate transgression? And again, I'm not reading anything into it.

These are the words in the Torah. Did Jesus end sin? The third thing, did he wipe away iniquity? Did he bring everlasting righteousness? Did he fulfill the words of the prophets? And did he anoint the holy of holies? I want to think to yourself, are all six things been fulfilled? Now, some people might say, well, that's going to happen in the second coming. It seems like, and this is going back to many calls before, it seems like everything that Jesus didn't fulfill are all the things that are exclusive and exhaustive, and they all wind up in the big trash basket called second coming.

None of them have happened yet. Actually, just in response to that, as I read those verses, I rejoice in my heart. I say, yes, they've absolutely been fulfilled.

And I also think, take the foremost biblical commentator in Judaism, Rashi. Two of you, you grew up, probably knew Rashi before I was playing baseball. You know, you were raised on it.

Rashi points to all these things as having these weeks issue out in the period right around Jesus. He just gets the people wrong. In fact, there's a fellow, interestingly, we have a former Messianic Jew.

We have a man who is a former Orthodox Jew. In fact, I can think of two of them who both became convinced of the Messiahship of Jesus when they were studying Daniel 9 and studying Rashi's commentary on it and said, it can't be what he says. It's got to be Jesus.

As far as the whole thing being put to the second coming, absolutely not. It's the traditional position that misses the fact that atonement must be made, that things must be set right, that God must provide a way for the nations and the people to know him as God. The traditional view just has the Messiah coming.

What happens to sin? What happens to human nature? Where's the punishment for sin? There's no answer. The rabbis have forgotten that the Messiah was not just a king, but he was also to function as a priest. Jesus did that in his first time on earth.

As a king, he fulfilled also the priestly ministry of giving himself as an atoning sacrifice and suffering for the sins of his people in intercession. He will return to rule and reign. But it's not a matter of putting everything to the second coming.

Without the first coming, there can be no possible second coming. Without what he did in his first time on the earth, there is no hope for mankind outside of that. First of all, I'll just say to you that, Mike, if you can say that Rashi said this, and I'm afraid that you may have never read Rashi.

If you did, you read it wrong, and I'm going to give you that you read it wrong. By the way, tonight, when you have time, read what the Gurah says. He will explain to you exactly what Rashi was talking about.

Any five-year-old would understand what Rashi was talking about. But what's important is that you read the Gurah? I've read the interpretation. Did you read the Gurah? I'll have to check it again carefully.

All right, check it again carefully, because I think once you do do that, I think you'll find things very, very different. It's also important for everybody to understand that Jesus was prophesied in the Torah, and that means in the Jewish scriptures. There is a verse, actually, that Sid Roth has on his tape, and it's important-- Oh, excuse me.

Let me correct that verse on the tape I told you is not on the tape anymore. You have an old one. That's okay.

That's okay. If you took it out, I'm glad you took it out, but let me just--I mean, I can play the tape here, but I don't want to do that, even though, Mike, Sid sounds good. The tape is called Secrets from the Jewish Scriptures, and on it, Sid Roth says that all these scriptures were carefully investigated for their translations, and in it, he reads a verse from Zechariah chapter 13.

Excuse me. No, I read that from the Tanakh. That's what it says in the beginning.

I didn't say I researched it. I said from the Hebrew publishing company researched it. Okay, that's fine.

I'll accept that. I mean, I just read it. Alex, that's fine.

I understand, but I'm sure you wouldn't just put anything on the tape. I'm sure it would be investigated in some way, that you wouldn't just do things arbitrarily. You wouldn't put something on there that you thought was false.

I know you, Sid, so I know that you wouldn't do that, but what I will say to you, it's out of context. Now, let me explain to you what I'm talking about. In Zechariah 13.6, there's a prophecy, and it says over there, these are the words that it says there, and one shall say unto him, what are those wounds in your hands? And he will say, those are the wounds that I received in the house of my friends.

Now, I will tell you that this verse is indeed referring to Jesus. If you read that chapter in context, instead of starting from verse six, but you start instead from verse one, you'll find there very clearly that it's talking about false prophets, that when the Moshiach will come, the real Messiah comes, you will see there that people will say, will be ashamed of their visions. All the prophets are going to come forward and say, boy, I was ashamed.

I shouldn't have been doing this. I really should have been at the toe of the ground, and one will say unto him, what are those wounds in your hands? And he shall say, those are the wounds that I received in the house of my friends. Now, I'll ask you, ladies and gentlemen, what other false prophet could you think of that had wounds in his hands? And these wounds are between his hands, whoever you want to read it, and these wounds received in the house of his friends.

Okay. Dr. Michael Brown, was Jesus of Nazareth a false prophet? That's what Rabbi Tobias Singer has just said. Jesus was the last great true prophet that God told us in the Torah, we must obey the words of the prophet or we'll be cut off.

He prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem and the great judgment that was coming on our people. Tragically, he wept over it. Tragically, judgment continues on us because we don't recognize the Messiah.

As far as Zechariah 13, it does not say, what are these wounds in your hands? In fact, one of the foremost Jewish scholars who lived in the century, H.L. Ginsberg wrote a whole study on this and in the Jewish translation that he edited, he correctly said, what are those sores on your back? And then he says, literally, the literal meaning there that he translates as sores on your back should literally be sores between your arms. And then he has sores or sometimes symptoms of hysteria. In other words, has nothing to do with Jesus.

I'm sorry, Dr. Michael Brown, Rabbi Singer, I'm going to promise you. I'm going to have both of you back on. Time is running short, but time is literally running short.

And by the way, that sounded just like Joseph, your description of Yeshua, the Jewish Messiah and Mishpochah. Next week, you are going to be so excited. I'm going to have a roundtable discussion of revival in New York City among Jewish people and not only New York City, but Israel.

We're going to have Messianic Jews in churches, Messianic Jewish congregations all saying the same thing, all saying that revival is breaking out in the greater New York area. And this is the Shabbat. I want to wish all of you Shabbat Shalom.

And I want to tell you that this week, because of Yeshua, you got it all. You have it all. Shabbat Shalom, Uncle Jay.

We want everyone everywhere to hear the good news. My guest happens to be in the studio, Dr. Michael Brown. But before I get to Dr. Brown, I want to tell you about an event that occurred about a month ago.

We had a debate over WMCA radio. WMCA covers a great deal of New York, New Jersey, even goes up to Connecticut. Very powerful radio station covering most of the New York metropolitan area.

And we're on during drive time from 4 to 6 p.m. And I had been asking the Holy Spirit to give me ideas for broadcasts. And this is one of these talk radio shows where people can call in and ask questions. And it's a very, very exciting concept.

And I believe that there are so many souls in the balance. And we're approaching it in such a way that we are cultivating and developing a very large, unsaved audience. I speak by faith, but I really believe that this is true, especially in light of some of the things I'm about ready to tell you.

One of our recent broadcasts came about as a result of listening to a cassette that was done in a home. And in this home was an Orthodox rabbi who had spent over one third of his life trying to persuade Jewish believers in Jesus to reject Jesus and return to rabbinical Judaism. And Dr. Michael Brown, who has a Ph.D. in Near Eastern languages and literature and has spent his life studying the scriptures, especially from the Hebrew and the Semitic language viewpoint.

And he's just a hand-picked vessel to take a Jewish belief in Jesus position. And when I heard this debate, it was done in a very, for lack of better words, in a discussion type of fashion rather than an angry type of fashion. And these were two Jews discussing, is Yeshua, Jesus, the Jewish Messiah? So I called up the rabbi.

His name is Rabbi Tovia Singer. He's an Orthodox rabbi, a graduate of St. Louis Rabbinical College. He is the New Jersey director of Jews for Judaism.

And then I called up Dr. Michael Brown, and we arranged for them to have a debate similar to the one I heard on the cassette tape on WMCA radio. And I asked Mike to be my guest this week because we want to discuss what this debate meant. We want to make it available to you.

It's two cassettes, and it's available for \$10. We'll talk about it a little later on in the broadcast. And Mike, before we even get to the debate, I feel we have to lay a foundation.

We have to--our Mishpochah have to understand that what is known as Judaism today, what is known as Orthodox Judaism today, is very different than what was known as Judaism before the Temple was destroyed. Tell me how what is known as Orthodox rabbinical Judaism today evolved. Sure.

If we think of Orthodox Judaism as traditional Judaism, right there we have the whole key. It is the religion of Jewish tradition. It is not primarily the religion of the scriptures, the religion of Moses and the prophets, but it's the religion of tradition, the traditions of the rabbis and the sages, primarily the rabbis and the sages who lived a whole generation and several generations after Jesus came and died and rose from the dead.

In other words, even though traditional Judaism claims it goes all the way back to Moses, the fact of the matter is traditional Judaism as a real religion, in fact, is later than the New Testament faith and is certainly not based exclusively on the Hebrew scriptures. In fact, you-- Excuse me, I have to challenge you on that. What do you mean by it's not based exclusively on the Hebrew scriptures? Now, that would be--that is a shocking statement to most of our listeners.

Well, the fact is, what I'm saying in terms of Rabbinic Judaism is not based exclusively on the Hebrew scriptures. That would be accepted by Rabbinic scholars as well. In fact, I learned that as a brand-new believer in Jesus almost 20 years ago reading a book that a rabbi had given me.

We made it clear that, no, it's not just the religion of the Hebrew Bible, but this is the religion of the Hebrew Bible plus the traditions of the rabbis. Just, for example, like the Catholic Church is the religion of the Bible plus the traditions of the church. So lots of things we see in the Catholic Church you don't see in the scriptures, and if you ask a Catholic priest about it, he'd say, oh, no, that's not in the Bible.

We developed that through our traditions. The same way, Orthodox Judaism has hundreds and hundreds and thousands of traditions and laws and customs that are not found specifically in the scriptures. Now, which has precedence? Let's suppose Orthodox Judaism, tradition, Talmud, says go right, and the scriptures clearly say go left.

What would an Orthodox rabbi do? Uh-huh. Here's the key now. This Orthodox rabbi would believe that when God gave Moses the law on Mount Sinai, that he gave him a written law.

That's what we have, the first five books of Moses, the Torah, the Pentateuch, okay? But he also believes, and this is a myth, but he believes it with all his heart, he believes that God also gave Moses an oral interpretation of that written law called an oral Torah or an oral law, and that that has been passed on through every generation and it's been developed and expanded in every generation and finally was put in written form, you know, 1,500 years ago, 1,800 years ago, you know, at different stages in history. So here's what he would say. Sid, you think that the written Torah says go left and the rabbinic traditions say go right.

That's because you really don't understand. You have to study it from our point of view so that even if with your own eyes you think that we're telling you left is right and right is left, you believe our traditions. In fact, it goes so far as to say this.

If you have the plain sense of the scripture on your side, for example, certain laws that if a woman committed a certain crime that you would cut off her hand, okay, that Moses Maimonides, one of the greatest sages in the history of Judaism, lived about 900 years ago, he specifically said even if it literally says cut off her hand, if you say I believe what the Bible literally says, even if you have been proven with signs and wonders, even if you are a prophet, okay, and you say follow the literal interpretation of the Bible, you're a false prophet. Why? Because the rabbis tell us it doesn't literally mean cut off her hand. It means fine her a certain amount of money.

So the literal interpretation, signs, wonders, the prophetic word, it doesn't matter. That is all in second place to the traditional interpretation of the scriptures. Well, so you're saying that it doesn't matter whether you're more persuasive on a particular point as to whether Jesus is the Messiah or not with an Orthodox rabbi, even if you win, you lose because he must rely on the traditions.

Is that what you're saying or no? That's exactly what I'm saying. Now, I don't want to discourage anyone from witnessing and using the scriptures. I believe that the Holy Spirit can open people's eyes.

What a box they're in. Here's what I've done over the years. I've studied the traditions.

I've given years of my life to studying the rabbinic traditions and learning as best as I could from rabbis and through rabbinic books and studying on my own. The reason is I want to understand exactly what they're saying, where they're coming from so that, let's say I have an interpretation of a particular verse and they say, it doesn't mean that. I say, well, look, rabbi so-and-so, rabbi so-and-so, rabbi so-and-so, they say it means that.

In other words, I'm giving that person an opportunity to understand. I'm not making this up. This is not some later Christian interpretation.

This is not some wild-eyed, charismatic interpretation. I'm trying to say this isn't just mine. There are rabbis who say the same thing.

So would you at least look again at the text with an open heart and an open mind? And with all the respect that I have for rabbis, I have friends who are rabbis, and I always say this when I speak of them because I don't want to speak disparagingly. I respect the study and the hard work and the devotion and the zeal. And like Paul said about the Pharisaical leaders of his day, that they have zeal for God, but not according to knowledge.

I recognize that. However, when I deal with these folks, it's very similar to dealing, say, with a Jehovah's Witness or other people in the cults because they are taught not to think on their own outside of the tradition. They are taught to think on their own within the tradition.

So everything must be through the eyes of the rabbis. And I'll give you the most shocking example of this I ever had. When we had our so-called great debate back in 1986 in the University of Maryland campus at Baltimore, after the debate, a guy came up to me, an Orthodox fellow, and we began talking.

And I was trying to quote Scripture to him and telling him he needed to seek God, etc. So I quoted to him in Hebrew from Proverbs 3, verses 5 and 6, where the Scripture says, trust in the Lord with all your heart and don't lean on your own understanding. And you know what he said to me? What? I mean, we hear that, and that means just seek God, cry out to God, ask Him for wisdom, ask Him for knowledge, read the Scripture, say, God, help me to understand and see.

He interpreted it to mean, you see, that proves my point. I can't lean on my own understanding. I have to trust what the rabbi says.

Let me tell you, at that particular debate, and that was a number of years ago, I talked to a yeshiva student, a man studying to become a rabbi, and I read Isaiah 53 to him. And he said, you're reading in the English, only the Hebrew counts. I said, okay, you read it to me in the Hebrew and tell me what it means.

And he said to me, I cannot do that. I can only tell you what the rabbis say Isaiah 53 means. I can't tell you what I say it means.

It would be a sin. And I was shocked. Here's the philosophy.

According to the Talmud, Moses stood on the highest plane of revelation and understanding of anyone who ever lived. Okay, he was that close to God on Mount Sinai, etc., etc. Every generation since then is further and further and further and further and further away.

Therefore, once the sages write down in a particular age what they believe the Scriptures say or what the traditions say or what the fixed laws are, then at a later time you can't go and say, well, I disagree with their opinion. Oh, certain things in the Talmud are just opinions back and forth, and they continue to develop through Jewish history, and a rabbi today has to make up his own mind. But in terms of the things that are fixed, here's the way it's understood.

I can only understand the Bible by standing on the shoulders of the great scholars and the great rabbis and the great sages who came before me. Who am I to disagree with them? After all, I'm so many generations removed. My only hope is to go to what my father learned from his father, from his father, from his father, until I can get all the way back to Moses on Mount Sinai.

Here's the problem. Moses on Mount Sinai gave us a written Scripture only. There is absolutely... But that's not what the rabbis say.

They say he gave us an oral Scriptures, which is called the Talmud. What is there maintaining? Just past hearsay that he gave it? The fact is, if you say that the oral Torah, which includes the Talmud, if you say the oral Torah is not from God, then what you're telling that person is either your father tricked you, or he was tricked. If not your father, his father.

In other words, somewhere along the line, somebody developed it, somebody made it up, but it really didn't go back to God. Yes, it is simply tradition. It is simply passed on.

And let's be honest. Someone in your family hears something, your family did it for two or three generations, you think it goes back forever. You can't remember how far it goes.

Oh, we've been doing this forever. That may just mean my grandfather did it, or great-grandfather. So what happened is, you know, a few years before Jesus, they began to develop traditions.

And then after a while, they said, oh, this goes back forever and ever and ever. Dr. Michael Brown, our time is up. I want you... Dr. Michael Brown, on yesterday's broadcast, we were talking about how Orthodox Judaism as we know it today is so different from Torah Judaism, or Biblical Judaism, and how it evolved.

And when we went off the air, we were talking in reference to the oral law. And what is something we probably should have done on yesterday's? Explain exactly what the oral law includes. Okay.

According to the Orthodox viewpoint, or the strictly Orthodox viewpoint, this is what happened. God gave Moses the written law. God gave him an oral interpretation.

Now, included in that would be, let's say the scriptures say, do not steal. Well, that was like a chapter heading, okay? And then, according to the tradition, God gave Moses the whole breakdown on all the categories of theft, et cetera, what is theft, what isn't theft, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Not only that, God gave Moses, according to the traditions, the key to understanding how to derive all of the oral laws from the written law.

In other words, kind of the key that would unlock the mystery door so that you could find all these hidden interpretations, et cetera, et cetera. So, that's what was given to Moses on Mount Sinai, according to the traditions. Not according to truth, but according to the traditions.

Now, as things developed through the... Excuse me. Based on your investigation, is there any way possible that that could be truthful? Oh, absolutely not. It's contrary to scripture, therefore it cannot be truthful.

It's not to say... Forgetting for a moment that it's contrary for scripture, is there any credible documentation that, in fact, it did come from Moses? Oh, no. The reverse is true. In other words, there's documentation through the scripture, through history and archaeology that, although you may have some customs here and there that are preserved in the oral law that are ancient, which we would expect, you know, certainly in the Middle Eastern culture that it's going to preserve many ancient things, just like the Bedouin Arabs do.

They lived the same way for centuries and centuries. So, it preserves here and there some ancient customs, laws, practices, et cetera. But no, we know from every angle, whether it's through history as it unfolded, through archaeological evidence, and as I said, through the scriptures themselves, that it's impossible that there was this oral tradition in unbroken form going back to Moses.

The bottom line, as I say, is it's contrary to scripture. It goes against scripture, interpreting scripture. It goes against the whole covenant that God gave.

And it's a real serious thing. You know, when we think that people are basing their entire lives on this, in other words, they're not coming to scripture in an open and unbiased way. They're coming to scripture through the eyes of tradition.

That's a very serious thing. And the only answer to that, ultimately, is going to be lots of prayer that God would change hearts, that God would show people the bankruptcy of the traditions that they're putting their life in. I'm talking about bankruptcy in terms of bringing them to the Messiah, and that God would enable us to penetrate their hearts with loving truth.

Now, you know, one other thing in terms of the oral law as it develops, lots of traditions were added on. Lots of customs of the people were added on. So, therefore, assuming that their assumption is correct, that it came from Moses, it was elaborated on to such a degree that if it even came from Moses, what we have today is far, far more than what came from him, assuming that was true.

Is that correct? Right. And supposedly, that's contained within the system. In other words, in every generation, you need judges to adjudicate.

You have legal decisions. You have questions. What can we do on the Sabbath? What can't we do on the Sabbath? Well, you know, we have new technology and science, etc.

How does that impact things? And what about abortion? And what about, you know, all these different, you know, euthanasia, all these different issues? So, you have lots of questions coming up. So, you need scholars in every generation to judge and make legal decisions. Therefore, they would say that the tradition has to continue to develop and grow.

You say, well, hang on. That makes sense. What do they do in the Bible? Well, on the one hand, if you had legal disputes, you know, who stole this? Well, I say you stole from me.

No, you stole from me. Well, you had judges. We have no argument with that.

If I lived in Israel and there were rabbinic judges in the land, then that's who I'd submit to in terms of legal cases. You know, there's no argument about that. But if there was a real question about what did God mean in the word, you know what Moses did? We have several different instances in the Torah where Moses did this.

If there's a question and Moses didn't know what to do, he didn't reason it out. He went and he asked God and God told him. And the same way through the prophetic book.

No, a rabbi would not do this. Of course not. An orthodox rabbi.

Oh, no, no, no. In fact, the whole idea of asking God what to do, I mean, that's totally contrary to the tradition. What you do is you ask a rabbi or you study it out and you reason it out in a logical fashion.

But the idea of praying and asking God to give you insight, I mean, that would almost be mocked. You might say, oh, I was helped. I was helped by heaven to come to this understanding.

What it means is I did my studying. The more I studied all the texts and the more learning I did, the more rabbis I talked to, I came up with some insight. They want to thank God for that.

But the idea of you have to go back to the source of revelation and ask God for insight and ask God to speak to you, no, that is not Torah rabbinic Judaism. In fact, I had an argument with a fellow from Jews for Judaism, an anti-missionary group years ago. He said, if you really want to know what the prophets meant, ask God and the Spirit will speak to you.

And I said, I agree with that. But you don't agree with that. I said, you're talking the way the Christians talk.

You're using born-again Christian terminology. You're using Spirit-filled believing terminology to try and appeal to people who are followers of Jesus. But that is not rabbinic Judaism.

In fact, there's a joke, you know, and it's an exaggeration, but there's some truth to it, that when a Christian gets in trouble, he prays, and when a Jew gets in trouble, he studies. Because, you know, that's the whole thing. A lot of truth to that.

Mike, there is much in the Talmud that is negative about Jesus being the Messiah. Did that come from Moses? Well, number one, let's say this is an overstatement to say there's much in the Talmud that's negative. The Talmud is two and a half million words.

There's a lot of beauty in it, but I'll tell you, anyone reading it would get dizzy. Any impartial reader who just starts, let's assume they could perfectly understand the Hebrew and the Aramaic that it's written in, okay? And they could fully understand the development of the dialogue. The one thing they would know-- Excuse me, but isn't it all translated into English? Yeah, but it's-- You lose the nuances.

Unless you use a real good study edition, and the first few are just coming out now, you know, by authorized rabbinic scholars. Unless you use that, it's tough to just follow it in English. You know, it's difficult.

But if someone takes you through it, there's one thing you'll know immediately, Sid. This did not descend from heaven. This thing goes in and out and up and down and all around.

There is no spirit of thus saith the Lord in it. As far as what it says about Jesus, there are a few scattered references here and there. Yes, they are negative.

They are blasphemous. However, the one thing that the Talmud tells us about Jesus is it knows that he lived. It knows that he died.

It knows that he was influential, you know, because of the attacks on him. And because at other places it mentions some of his followers. It even says, don't let so-and-so pray for you.

This fellow's a Messianic Jew. Don't let him pray for you. It's better to die than to let him pray for you and to be healed, which is an admission of the power that they had.

The implication is that someone would get healed if a Messianic Jew prayed for them. Right. But the bottom line is the Talmud isn't quite sure when Jesus lived.

See, the Talmud has a hard time with dates. Why? Well, because the rabbinic chronology is off. In other words... Wait, if it's from God, how could it be off? Well, that's what we're saying.

It ain't from God, brother. The fact is, what it does say, one time it places Yeshua in the time of a rabbi who lived in the second century BCE. In other words, the second century before Jesus.

That's when it places him. You know, that sounds to me like I read a book recently on the Koran that has a number of things that are... It's quoting the Old Testament, and it has the stories and the characters in different places. And the Koran claims that it's actually the Bible, the Old and New Testaments that got it mixed up, and the Koran alone has the true revelation.

In fact, what happened was Muhammad learned from Jews and Christians, and then he went his own way, and he got things botched up, and he came up with a so-called new revelation. But we know historically and factually that the Koran is not accurate, and the Scriptures are. But, you know, there's another place in the Talmud where it places Jesus in the second century of this era.

In other words, one time it places him... And so an Orthodox rabbi would blindly... What would he say if he raised this point? Well, I have a friend who was an Orthodox rabbi and now is a follower of Jesus, and he raises these points to these rabbis, and it's just an endless argument around... You go in a big circle. It's sort of like in... We don't have time to go into this, but you had an amazing challenge by Rabbi Tovia Singer on the air. And Rabbi Tovia Singer said, if you could prove something, would you renounce your Messianic Judaism if you could not prove it? And then you turned around and said, well, Rabbi Singer, if I can prove this particular thing to you, will you renounce your Orthodox Judaism? And to tell you the truth, Mike, I was shocked when he said, yes, he would.

And you were not on the air when I gave him the quotes proving he was wrong. But I have to tell you, Mike, I have never seen someone go in so many circles and refuse to be... I'm a very straightforward type person. I like a bottom line.

I mean, if anyone knows me, they know that. And he refused to give me a... He refused to say yes or no. All he did is walk in a circle.

That's the rabbinic mindset, legal argumentation, proving both sides. And then sometimes you come to the end of the argument and they say, both sides are right, or we can't come to any conclusion. The whole thing is legal thinking, logic, developing the intellect to think in these ways, etc.

But is it truth from heaven? No. I'm sorry. Our time is up.

There was a time, Dr. Michael Brown, in which an Orthodox Jewish rabbi would not debate a Messianic Jew. Why was that? Well, that is really the sad story of the history of so-called Christian antisemitism. The church as it existed in its public outward form for many years was hostile to the Jewish people.

And unfortunately, especially in Catholic traditions over the years and then in many Protestant traditions as well, so that Jews would be forced to hear a bishop come into the synagogue and preach to them. They'd be forced to hear this. Many times they were given a choice of baptism into the Catholic church or death.

Or, for example, they were forced to have public debates. And it was kind of a no-win situation most of the time, you know, where the volumes of the Talmud would be burned because people would be so upset with the Jews. It hasn't been an open and honest exchange.

There's good reason why the Orthodox Jewish community looks very leery at such a thing. Oh, yeah, and they feel because of, in many cases, the misrepresentation of Christianity. In other words, it really doesn't represent Jesus many times.

It doesn't represent the Jewish roots of the faith. It's a man-made thing that parades itself around as Christianity, but it's not the real gospel, the real truth. The tradition of Christianity they take issue with, as opposed to, well, they would take issue with pure Christianity, too, but the tradition misrepresents the pure.

Right, and they say, look, Hitler was after our bodies. You know, they use these things that are very inflaming and try and provoke the Jewish community to anger against us. Hitler was after our bodies.

You're after our souls. In other words, people like you and I, we pray. We cry out to God on behalf of Jewish souls.

Sometimes we weep before God. We want to see them come to the fullness of the truth. We want to see them come to the Lord.

We want to see them saved. We do anything for them. We're equated with Hitler in their eyes.

I was witnessing to a man just the day after this dialogue that Toby and I had on the radio, and he was an older man, you know, maybe in his late 60s, and I went to talk to him about the Lord, and he said, how can you do what you're doing after the Holocaust? Well, the Holocaust wasn't Christian. Nazism was anti-Christian, yet-- But the perception is it was Christian. Exactly.

In Germany, it was looked at as having an equal number of Protestants and Catholics, the only major European country that could boast that. And it had a tradition that was saturated, as some scholars have said, saturated with Jew hatred, from the traditions of Martin Luther to the traditions of the Catholic Church. So the fact of the matter is, in many Jewish eyes--and it's tragic, it's a work of the devil, it's a totally diabolical thing--the Holocaust is associated with Jesus.

And we, who are seeking to do a pure work for God and reach out and change people's lives and love them into the kingdom of God are equated with Hitler. I mean, you tell me that that's not diabolical, that's not from the pit, and you tell me that that doesn't pull people away from true dialogue. Boy, I'll tell you something else, though, in all candor.

When I first came to the Lord in 1971, you know, I was a heroin-shooting rock drummer. I didn't know anything about anything religious, okay? Yes, I was bar mitzvahed. I knew enough Hebrew then to read my bar mitzvah text.

I didn't understand the word I read. I instantly forgot all the Hebrew. Now I get saved.

Which, by the way, is typical. Yeah, typical, especially for a conservative Jewish upbringing like I had on Long Island. If I had been very orthodox, of course, it would have been different.

For example, like Tovia, the rabbi that we dialogue with, he's only 30 years old, but the fact is he had a very, very traditional upbringing. I mean, you see him now, he doesn't have a long beard, you know, he just has a mustache, he looks like he could be a Messianic Jew, and by God's grace, he will be soon enough. But the fact is, when you look at him, you would know that he had a very, very orthodox upbringing.

So as soon as he was able to talk, his father was teaching him traditions, teaching him Hebrew. And when he was five years old, probably, he'd start reading the Torah in Hebrew, of course, always with rabbinic commentaries, never on his own, always through the eyes of the rabbi. I've heard a story from another individual about him which kind of shows why he studies the way he does to be against Yeshua.

His father, who was a rabbi, said to him one day, something awful has happened. Two members of our community, two Jews, have embraced Jesus. And Tovia was maybe about 10 years old, and it had impact on him.

And this is how someone, you know, decides to devote their life to proving that Jesus is not the Messiah. So in other words, he's had that seed in him for two-thirds of his life. Right.

And in the last 10, 12 years in particular, he's devoted to specifically studying against us. Let me be honest, though. Here's another reason why people are not eager to dialogue now.

As I said, when I got saved, I didn't know anything. And there were many rabbis who were happy to talk to me and wanted to spend time with me and wanted to influence me. You know, traditional rabbis, Hasidic Jews in Brooklyn that I met with Lubavitch, who are leading aggressive missionary Jews, you could call them to Jews, and other rabbis I talked to.

And they keep challenging me on the Hebrew, and you don't know anything, and this and that. Well, I'd study and learn with anyone, you know, as much as I have opportunity to, to this day. Well, you know, so I learned.

I studied. In fact, I could have become a rabbi a lot quicker than I got my PhD. It was a much tougher degree, in all honesty.

And Tovia, being an honest fellow, told me, you know, he said, Mike, I envy your scholarship in Semitic. So, I mean, he recognizes that I worked hard at what I'm doing, you know. And in fact, he said one thing that was kind of disparaging to me on the show.

He said, any five-year-old would understand this. And I said to him on the phone, subsequently, I said, Tovia, I said, you know I've read this. You know I understand these things.

You know, why did you say that? He said, Mike, I sinned against you. I apologize. So, I mean, we have a, we have a mutual loving respect, one for another.

But here's the other reason why people don't want to get this out. And I had an Orthodox rabbi tell me this. I mean, this guy memorized everything.

He was sharp. He shouldn't have been intimidated by talking to me. But you know what he said? I said, I'll get 300 Messianic Jews together in Maryland if you'll come and have a public dialogue with me.

Because he claimed no one would do it with him. No Messianic Jews. I said, I'll get 300 Messianic Jews to come and hear you.

I said, and I'll invite you to my Bible college and allow you to address all my students and I will not rebut you. I said, all I want you to do is when we gather the people together for a public forum that you bring in Orthodox Jews. That's all I want you to do.

He said, no. Why? He said, number one, it's a waste of time. They could be studying Talmud.

He said, the other reason is you might influence them. Aha. In other words, maybe I'll get them to think.

You know, if we have Jewish listeners that aren't sure about the Messiahship of Jesus, well, study it out on your own. You can go to one shul and they'll say one thing, and one synagogue will say another thing, and another will say another thing. Oh, they all may be united against Jesus, but they're not united on everything else.

Who says they're right? Who says their religion is the true religion? You owe it to yourself. Why do they spend so much time on a Messianic Jew as opposed to the 98% of secular Jews in America that aren't even sure there's a God? Well, I think there are a few reasons for it. On the one hand, they see that we are religiously interested.

In other words, our hearts have awakened. We're serious. We want to follow God.

And look, Tobias said it to me. You know, I have it on tape from a discussion we had in another fellow's home. He said to me, look, you fellows, you Messianic Jews are closer to the truth than Reformed and Conservative Jews.

He said, and I believe that for many of you, it's the first path on the way back. Now, the fact is, it is the way back. It is the truth.

Is Orthodox Judaism the first path on the way back to knowing the Messiah? No. However, it might be possible for people who were secular and become traditional, that might be a path that could get them one day in the right direction. What do I mean? Well, they're interested.

They want to know God. It's like a Jew that goes into the occult and then finds the Messiah. But it's a horrible way to find the Messiah.

Right. So that many, many Jews have returned to tradition in our day. But according to write-ups that I've seen from reliable Jewish sources, many of them are in the front door and out the back door because they didn't find what they were looking for when they got into it.

You know, I'll tell somebody, if you're not sure, start reading the Talmud. Start reading the New Testament and see which brings you to God. Get on your knees and cry out and see which brings you to God.

You'll be amazed with the answer. Dr. Michael Brown, our time is up. And, Dr. Michael Brown, let's talk a little bit about the debate.

And one of the points that Rabbi Tovey, a singer, raised was if Jesus was the Messiah, if Jesus was such a significant person in history, how come most of the accepted Jewish historians have not talked a lot about him? Yeah, he raised that question, and really, in fact, it works against him. On the one hand, these same scholars that he mentioned, Philo of Alexandria, who died in around the year 40, and then Josephus Flavius, who survived the war, the Jewish war in the year 70, and then wrote his history later in the first century, the fact is that neither of these men specifically mention the great rabbis either, you know, the great and wonderful rabbis. In fact, they tell us, Josephus tells us some things about the Pharisees.

He himself was a Pharisee, but he doesn't tell us the same things about the Pharisees that the Orthodox Jews tell us. He doesn't tell us that there was an unbroken tradition going back to Moses. But what does

he say about Jesus? Tovey mentioned that Josephus writes a little bit about Jesus, and he is the great Jewish historian of his day.

Philo of Alexandria was not a Jewish historian. He was a philosophical writer, right, living in Egypt. But in any case, Tovey said, well, Josephus says something about Jesus that's very controversial, and then I made a point that I just want to correct, because there's more I should have said.

I mentioned, well, Josephus mentions James, Jacob, the brother of Jesus, as a very godly man who was put to death, etc. Actually, he simply mentions James, the brother of Jesus, who was called Messiah, who was put to death. And that's all he says about him.

It's the later church fathers who talked about how godly and pious and law-keeping James was. But what I should have really pointed out was that, wait a second, Tovey, Josephus talks about John the Baptist, just the way the New Testament talks about him. And virtually all scholars accept that testimony as authentic.

Not only that, this is the basic consensus among modern scholars of what Josephus actually says about Jesus. And let me read this to you. There are a couple of lines that it's believed a later Christian put in.

Okay? I'm going to take those out and just read to you the most accepted text of what Josephus actually said about Jesus. Now this is not... For those that aren't aware, who is Josephus? Josephus was a Jewish general who basically sided with Rome during the Jewish war from 66 to 70. In other words, he tried to have his Jewish people not fight a losing war.

And because of that, when he went over to the Romans, he was widely heralded and accepted by them. And he became a great historical writer and wrote about the events of that time, wrote a massive history of the Jewish people for the benefit of the Romans. Now the fact is, later scholars have said it's amazing that Josephus said anything about Jesus, because he wasn't a political leader, and he wasn't one that the Romans would be looking for in terms of a Jewish history.

And yet, this is what Josephus did say. He said, at this time, there appeared Jesus, a wise man, for he was a doer of startling deeds, a teacher of people who received the truth with pleasure. And he gained a following both among many Jews and among many of Greek origin.

And when Pilate, because of an accusation made by the leading man among us, condemned him to the cross, those who had loved him previously did not cease to do so. And up until this very day, the tribe of Christians named after him has not died out. Now, I took out the lines that say he was the Messiah and he rose from the dead, etc., because later scholars believe that a Christian, writing in a later time, put those words in.

So let's take those out. This is a testimony of the most noted Jewish historian of the day. He doesn't mention the great rabbis of the day by name, in terms of laying out the details of their lives and what they taught and who they were.

But he does mention Jesus in a way that's actually startling. And we mention, of course, that the Talmud mentions Jesus. It just can't figure out where to put him, and that it mentions his followers.

And as I said to Tovia, we've got great attestation from the Roman historians about these Christians. Everybody's writing about them. Everybody's talking about them.

And we know, historically, that those who first followed Jesus, the Jewish followers of Yeshua, spread the word to the Gentiles and against impossible odds. Look, they did not have a building. The first followers of Yeshua did not even have a building that they met in as a formal, quote, church building until the earliest one that's been found is from 261 of this era.

In other words, for 130 years, this was a despised, persecuted sect without even a formal building that they called their own, according to archaeological evidence. It was outlawed by the Roman authorities, and yet it spread like wildfire throughout the ancient world. I mean, it's so well attested, it's actually silly to say what he said when he referred to the so-called life of Jesus.

He was speaking things he ought not to have spoken. Let me ask you one of the strongest emotional arguments that Rabbi Tovia Singer raised in the debate. And I'd like you to respond to that.

He said that if a Jewish person becomes a Messianic Jew, then the, I believe it was like the next generation or the one after, either or, would not be Jewish. Right. He kept bringing this point up.

This was one of his major things. That's not, that has nothing to do with whether Jesus is the Messiah or not, but that was an emotional, I find there's a great deal of emotion. That's why I really appreciated it, that it was really discussion going on rather than, you know, people getting angry or anything.

I mean, this two-hour debate was really a two-hour dialogue and discussion. And so when the emotional issues are raised, I mean, that is a very emotional time. I want to, I was born a Jew and I want to die a Jew.

And I want the Jewish people to exist as a distinct people, because God says that in the Torah, that he wants that. And so, and he says that if I believe in Jesus, then my, assuming the messianics, then my ancestors will not be part of the Jewish faith. You know, it's an interesting thing when you talk about emotional appeal.

Yes. One Orthodox person listening to the show commented to me afterwards, they said, you know, he spoke like a born again Christian. In other words, he said, God loves you and he wants you to have a personal relationship with him and on.

I feel the anointing of the spirit on my life and on my work. Why does he use terminology like that? Well, to appeal to believers in Jesus, to appeal to followers of Yeshua, to appeal to quote Christian terminology. And then the person said, and you sounded like the rabbi, just talking, you know, clear.

And the fact is I was not going to try and appeal to people's emotions. I wanted to sit down, honestly, before God. You could do that.

You have the ability to do that. And you chose, you chose to go straight with facts. I get up and preach, you know, in different countries in the world.

You better believe I'm putting everything I've got into it to persuade people to surrender their lives to God, body, soul, spirit. But I'm not going to have anyone, you know, in a dialogue context, you know, say, well, Mike, you were just trying to make an emotional appeal. No, I'm trying to appeal to truth.

Well, anyway, he says, if you go back, you know, a few generations to either of our great grandparents, something like that, you'll find that they were Orthodox. Right. And I think in my family, you've got to go

back to great or great, great grandparents.

And I think yours just really parents or grandparents. Yeah, my father was an Orthodox. Right.

And so his whole point is that it's traditional Jews who have preserved the Jewish people. And he kept referring to it. So if you become a messianic Jew, not only are you a traitor, but you're destroying the Jewish people.

Well, number one, first thing, and I said it over and over, God has preserved the Jewish people in the Torah itself. It makes it clear in spite of our sin, in spite of our rebellion, in spite of our hard heartedness, in spite of our disobedience, God would preserve us as a people. So God gets the credit, not traditions of Judaism.

Oh, that's interesting. You're saying that the Orthodox Jews are taking the credit for what God should be having the credit for. God did it.

I mean, look, however, that's pretty interesting. You know, listen, I'm not a Catholic, but the fact is that it's the Catholic monks who preserved, you know, the tradition of keeping the documents of the New Testament scriptures. Does that mean therefore I become a Catholic? No, God preserved it using whatever channels he chose to use.

So first thing, God preserved our people. The second thing, and this is so important, Messianic Jews still worshipped in the synagogues until they were kicked out. The rabbis devised a prayer against what they called the heretics, a prayer against ultimately and foremost Messianic Jews so that here's how they could weed them out.

It was a curse where you would say curse to the heretics, so on and so forth. And if you were a Messianic Jew, you wouldn't speak a curse over yourself. So for that prayer, you'd be quiet.

And then they'd say, aha, you're a Messianic Jew. They drove us, just as Jesus said they would, they drove us out of the synagogues and told us in subsequent generations, you're not Jewish. In spite of that, Sid, there's a tremendous revival of true Jewishness among followers of Jesus.

I am more Jewishly oriented and more studying Torah now than I was when I was raised. So we're going back to truth in spite of traditional Judaism trying to push us away and tell us we're not really Jews. There's also another point I raised on the debate.

Who is it that is primarily responsible in terms of Jews for the reestablishment of the state of Israel? Secular Zionists. And to this day, the secular Zionists are still the dominant force in the country and are in many cases militantly opposed to the orthodox ways. Does that mean that secular Zionism is God's answer that we should all become secular Zionists? No.

God uses who he wants to use how he wants to use them. That is God's business. And to let someone appeal to emotions and try and make you feel like you're a traitor, I want people to know that they're being traitors against God when they reject his Messiah who was crucified for them.

That's the real issue. That's a good point to stop right now. Our time is out.

Now, I must ask you a question. On the debate, you were challenged by the rabbi, and you in turn also challenged the rabbi over the issue of Isaiah 53. That obviously is an important issue, because I would say

the most graphic description of Jesus as the Jewish Messiah is found in Isaiah 53.

And Rabbi Singer said no, if I understand correctly, no reputable rabbi would say Isaiah, no ancient rabbi, respected rabbi would say that Isaiah 53 speaks of Messiah Ben David. Now, for those to understand the nuance of this issue, orthodoxy believes in two messiahs, Messiah Ben David, it talks about in the Talmud, Messiah Ben Joseph. Ben Joseph is like Joseph of the Bible, who was rejected by his own brothers and thrown into a pit and then risen to be a savior.

And because they're all the suffering servant prophecies about the Messiah. Then there were equally a number of predictions about a king Messiah, they called him Messiah Ben, which means son, Messiah Ben David. Now, he said no reputable ancient rabbi would say that Isaiah 53 spoke of Messiah Ben David.

And he said he would give up his orthodox Judaism. He was so sure of that, if you could find such a quote. Now, you found not one, not two, but at least half a dozen quotes, which you gave me personally.

And I read it to him on the air and on the air, he said to me, first of all, he said to me that how do I know the English is correct? And I told him it was if I accepted the Jewish source. That's in other words, how did I know the English was translated correctly? And I said it was an accepted Jewish source. That's how I know it.

But he absolutely refused to accept your quotes. Were your quotes accurate? And why did he refuse? Well, it's unfortunate that this played out the way it did with him really trying to talk his way out of the plain sense and truth of these. Let me say a few things.

Of course, the translations were accurate. They were done by a leading scholar at the turn of the century. There was an orthodox scholar.

Why did he even question whether the translations were accurate? Well, because they were so blunt and clear. And it's a first reaction if someone's reading English and you know the Hebrew. Well, you challenge it.

I mean, I had that done to me for years. Now people can't, you know, for a long time, they haven't been able to do it to me. In fact, I can challenge them.

Well, do you know the origin of the words? Do you know how this works out in other Semitic languages and how that plays on the Hebrew? You know, but even though, to be perfectly honest, I pray for Tovia and I have a real love for him. And he and I talk as friends. I mean, we are doing opposite work against each other, but we speak as friends.

Even though I respect his rabbinic scholarship, to be perfectly honest, he hasn't raised any points yet that have made me think and wonder. Actually, on that two-hour debate, I have to tell you, being extremely objective, and Tovia told me that obviously I was prejudiced, but I was a very fair, this was his quote to me, I was a fair moderator and I tried my best to be. He did not win on one point on an objective basis.

I think if someone listens carefully just to the truth of what was said, they'll see that, I mean, here and there, I let things go because they were inconsequential. You know, I'm not going to say, Tovia, why are you using Christian terminology talking about the anointing of the Spirit on your work? I mean, is that really rabbinic Judaism? No, it's a ploy to win Jewish people away. And then maybe he'll come up with a Talmudic source here or there that says, and so you know, the fact is I let certain things go, but every point

of substance, you know, we wanted to be gracious, and as I said, I love him and I'd sit down with him any time, but no, the fact is, here's how the argument developed.

I made reference to Isaiah 53 because I wanted to get to that. Man, I always like to just read it, let people hear it. It's the most graphic presentation of the Messiah.

Let them read the whole Bible, start a book of Genesis and let them read until they get to that point, but when they get to that point, if they're not convinced by then, they certainly will be. Well, anyhow, I wanted to get to that. I made passing reference to the fact that there are rabbis who interpret it as referring to the Messiah.

Then he went on and said, but there are Christians, meaning, and he knows they're liberal Christians, that they're not fundamental evangelical believers. They interpret it in their study Bibles as being, referring to Israel, just like many of the rabbis do, or most of the rabbis do. So you countered by saying, yes, but aren't there rabbis who refer Isaiah 53 to the Messiah? And he said, not Messiah, son of David.

Meaning, yes, there's this tradition about Messiah, son of Joseph, who'll be a great general, and he'll die in the final great war, and then Messiah, son of David will come and have him raised from the dead, et cetera, et cetera. So all the suffering passages refer to this Messiah, son of Joseph, not to Messiah, son of David. And then he said, you know, he'll ask me after the show if I can't find one single reference that shows that the rabbis refer this to Messiah, son of David.

Will I give up my whole Messianic stuff, you know, my Messianic stuff? And of course I said I would, because I knew what I was talking about. And I said, I'll give up my whole Messianic shtick if I can't, but if I can find one, will you become a Messianic? And he said, yes. We shook on it.

In fact, it was videotaped. We've got, you know, 700 club was there to videotape the whole thing. Right.

So anyway, I gave, in fact, there were four key quotes that I gave. I came up with those. I said, no sense to multiply anymore.

But all of the rabbis that deal with the text agree, and he himself agrees, if someone listens to the tape, they'll see him say it, that the passage begins in Isaiah 52 verse 13 through chapter 53 verse 12. It's called in Hebrew a parashah, a section. Okay.

The chapter divisions are later. So these sections were earlier divisions and all the rabbis who deal with it begin. They'll refer to this particular parashah.

In other words, 52, 13 to 53, 12. And that's when they introduce their comments. And some of them say blatantly that this refers to the Messiah.

So how does he say no? He said, I mean, he said on the air to me publicly before everyone that could hear that that is, does not mean that a rabbi says it's Messiah Ben David. How could he say that Mike? Well, number one, he's a rabbi and he's been trained to think rabbinically. And sometimes, like we said, unfortunately, it goes around in circles.

Here's what example, the first quote you challenged him. I'm still having problems. I can't understand why he could not say, yes, you nailed me.

I made a mistake. Yeah, look, no one expected him to give up being an Orthodox Jew. No, no, I didn't want it, but I want him to admit he made a mistake.

Look, for example, I admit he makes a mistake publicly. He admitted it to me. No, publicly, publicly, the rabbis I know gladly would.

In fact, you know, we humble ourselves in the sight of God. He lifts us up. That's why I said when I quoted Josephus, I was slightly inaccurate.

Let me give you the more accurate thing. Yes, because, you know, it wasn't inaccurate. It just wasn't complete.

Right. Well, there was one little piece that I brought in that someone else said and put it and I put it on Josephus lips. But the fact of the matter is, and I went back through the tape and every syllable and word I said, I'll stand behind.

It was truthful. It was accurate. And that one little thing, yeah, slight correction I want to make.

We give him the same opportunity. But here's what he did. It's like this saying not one single gospel mentions this particular fact.

And then I read to Sid. Here's where it mentions it in Mark. And you say, yeah, but it doesn't say that in Luke.

That's what he was doing. Right. I know it doesn't say Luke, but it says it in Mark.

In other words, here's a rabbi in this particular section. He frustrated me no end because I said, Tovia, when I make a mistake, I say it. Why can't you admit you made a mistake? And he said to me, I didn't make a mistake.

He still won't even admit it to me over the phone in private. He says, I'll keep you in suspense. I said, Tovia, there is no suspense.

He said, well, I'm a specialist in this. I said, Tovia, you know it. I'm a specialist.

Also, the fact is you made a mistake. You know, so your first quote you read to him is from something called Yalkut Shimoni. It's a collection of rabbinic homiletical interpretations on the scriptures.

So you read in the interpretation from Zechariah 4, 7, speaking to Zerubbabel, where it goes off in this whole homiletical interpretation. Then it quotes Isaiah 52, 13. And then it says, and who does the Messiah come out of? He comes out of David.

And this refers to the Messiah. Hey, he was nailed. And you know what he said? But if you look at Yalkut over here, it says something different.

Yes, of course. We understand it. It's got tons of different opinions.

He just challenged me to produce one. I mean, we've got one of the foremost rabbinic sages who ever lived, Moses ben Nachman, called Nachmanides, living around the 12th, 13th century. One of the great scholars of his day.

He said, now my view of this whole text is that it refers to Israel. But because the Midrash, the homiletical interpretation applies it to the Messiah, son of David, he said, that's who I'm going to apply it to. He says, I'm going to interpret the whole text, all of Isaiah 53, as referring to Messiah, son of David.

And there are other texts. The fact is, truth is truth. And one day, by God's grace, we'll get our friend to admit to the truth.

One last question. He said something that shocked me. He said that a Jewish believer in Jesus that dies goes to hell.

And then I said, what happens to a Gentile person that believes in Jesus that dies? Does he go to hell? And the rabbi said, yes. Why would he say such a thing? I've never heard that publicly stated. He said if he believes Jesus is God, then he goes to hell.

The fact is, one of the great rabbinic authorities in the Middle Ages, called the Meiri, he said for a Gentile to believe that Jesus is God, in fact, is not idolatry. And when I challenged Toby with that during a break, he said, how did you know that? I said, well, I've studied things, you know? He said, yeah, well, there is a disagreement of opinion on that. And you'll see, he even mentions there's a disagreement.

But more importantly, I've sat down with a brilliant rabbi that I know in the New York area. I know another rabbi in Israel, or a man who's studying to be a rabbi in Israel. We've gone through it with rabbinic scholars, our position of the Messiahship of Jesus and his deity.

And we have been told that our view is actually not idolatrous either. So all that is just maybe scare talk, but not truth. Dr. Michael Brown, I'm sorry, but our time is up.

This is Sid Roth with an update. On June 7th, 1991, Dr. Michael Brown and Rabbi Tovia Singer were my guests again to clarify the challenge over Isaiah 53. Dr. Brown stated Rabbi Singer made a mistake.

Rabbi Singer admitted he didn't say what he really meant to say, but we did not insist he renounce Orthodox Judaism. Daniel, the Jewish prophet, tells us when you die, you do not cease to exist. Your spirit goes somewhere forever based on your actions in this life.

Once you die, it's too late to change. Your fate is sealed. Daniel says we go to either everlasting life or everlasting condemnation.

Since you don't know when your end will come, this is the most critical decision of your life. All have sinned, and the penalty for sin, even one, is everlasting condemnation. But God provided a provision for forgiveness of sin.

If a perfect person gives his life up for you, then your life would be spared. This perfect one is the Messiah. The Jewish prophets tell us how to recognize Him.

He would be born in Bethlehem of the ancestry of King David. He would die before the Second Temple was destroyed, and the Temple was destroyed in the year 70 A.D. He would rise from the dead, and by His wounds, Isaiah 53 tells us, we would be forgiven. Only Yeshua, Hebrew for Jesus, fulfilled these and 300 other requirements.

God has already sent the Messiah to redeem you from sin and death. If you say this prayer out loud with me, and believe it to the best of your ability, you'll be forgiven for all your sins. The Messiah will live inside

of you, and you will know God.

Please repeat after me. Dear God, I have sinned, and I'm sorry. With Your help, I turn from my sins.

Please forgive me, in Yeshua's name. I believe that Yeshua died, rose from the dead, and is at the right hand of God. Now that I am clean, I make Yeshua my Lord, and ask Him to live inside of me.

If you would like to correspond, receive our teaching newsletter, or our cassette catalog, write to me, Sid Roth, Post Office Box 3, 4444, Bethesda, Maryland, 20827. Our telephone number is Area Code 301-963-4400. This is Sid Roth reminding you, now is the set time to blow the trumpet.

If you would like to receive a complimentary copy of our teaching newsletter, cassette catalog, and information about becoming Mishpochah, write to me, Sid Roth, Post Office Box 3, 4444, Bethesda, Maryland, 20827. Our telephone number is Area Code 301-963-4400. For credit card orders, call the same number, Area Code 301-963-4400.

For a cassette tape of this week's broadcast, send \$5 to Sid Roth, Post Office Box 3, 4444, Bethesda, Maryland, 20827.

Audio: <https://sermonindex1.b-cdn.net/9/SID9253.mp3>

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/michael-l-brown/moderated-by-sid-roth-who-is-jesus-debate/>

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net