

JUDAISM & UNITARIANISM.

A Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the
Hebrew Union College

by

Milton Ellis.

Milton Ellis
March 1921.

Cincinnati, Ohio,

Mic. 8/78

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Bibliography.

List of Abbreviations.

Preface: Problem and Plan.

Introduction : Meaning and History of Unitarianism. ~ 1-16

Chapter one: Judaism and Unitarianism Have Points of Contact. 27-70

Rationalism of Unitarianism.

13 Rationalism of Judaism.

Social Aspects of Unitarianism.

59 Social Aspects of Judaism.

Universalism of Unitarianism.

Chapter two : Judaism and Unitarianism Entertain Different Attitudes toward Jesus. 71-91

Christian Misrepresentation of Judaism.

Unitarian Belief in Humanity of Jesus.

Unitarian Belief in Perfection of Jesus.

The Unwonted Unitarian Emphasis on the Personal Acceptance of Jesus.

The Jewish View of the Imperfectibility of Man.

The Limitations of Jesus.

Its Whole Past rather than a Single Personality, the Basis of Judaism.

Chapter three: Judaism and Unitarianism Take Opposite Views concerning the New Testament. 93-

Unitarian Belief in the Perfection of New Testament Teachings

New Testament Vitiating of Jewish Monotheism.

New Testament Doctrine of Non-Resistance and Unqualified Love.

Narrowness of the New Testament.

Jewish Dependence of the New Testament.

New Testament Misrepresentation of Judaism.

Chapter Four: Judaism and Unitarianism Hold Contradictory Conceptions of the Originality of their Respective Teachings. III

The Brotherhood of Man, the Core of Israel's Ethics.

The Fatherhood of God the Center of Israel's Theology.

The Mission Idea, A Vindication for Judaism against the Charges Made against it.

Chapter Five : Conclusion.

Unitarianism is Christianity and not Judaism.

133

Unitarian Claim of Christian Parenthood.

Christian Colouring of Unitarianism.

Christian Background of Unitarianism.

The Jewish Historical Consciousness.

Jewish Self-Consciousness and Sense of Self-Identity.

The Completeness of the Jewish Life.

Conclusion.

Bibliography.^x

General Works on Unitarianism.

- .. Crooker, Jos., Unitarian Church, The, A.U. A. Tract no. 2.
- .. Shippin, Rush, Unitarianism. A.U.A. Tract no. 71
- .. Encyclopediæ Britannica, Unitarianism, vol. XXVII.
- .. Slicer, Thomas², What Unitarianism Really Is, A.U.A. Tract no. 248.

Unitarian Theology.

- Badger, George, Who are these Unitarians ? A.U.A. Tract no. 228.
- Bixby, James, Our Beliefs and Some of the Reasons for them,
A.U.A. Tract no. 116.
- Bingham, C., Unitarian Principles and Doctrines, A.U.A. Tract no. 17.
- Beethoven, Bronze, Crisis of Unitarianism in Boston, The, Boston,
1859.
- Everett, Charles, Human Nature not Ruined but Incomplete, A. U. A.
Tract no. 3.
- Casson, Charles, Five Fundamental Principles of our Faith, A.U. A.
Tract no. 210.
- Clarke, James Freeman, Has Unitarianism Done its Work ? A.U.A.
Tract no. 34.
- Channing, William, Unitarian Christianity, A.U.A. Tract
- Crossky, Henry, Unitarians, The, In Religious Systems of the World.
London 1911.
- Clarke, James, Manual of Unitarian Belief, Boston 1884.
- Crothers, Samuel, Introduction to Unitarianism, An, A.U.A. Tract
No. 117.
- Eliot, Charles, Twentieth Century Christianity, A.U.A. Tract no. 273.
- Eliot, Thomas, Radical Difference between Liberal Christianity and
Orthodoxy, A.U.A. Tract no. 94.
- Emerton, Ephraim, Unitarian Thought, New York, 1911.
- Hale, Edward, Unitarians, The, A.U.A. Tract no. 91.

^x Note: Only books actually read in preparation for the writing of this thesis are listed.

Bibliography, (Continued)

- Hale, Edward, Unitarian Principles, The, A.U.A. Tract no. 51.
- Hereford, Brooke, Brief Account of Unitarianism, A.U.A. Tract no. 214.
- Little Catechism, A.U.A. Tract no. 224.
- Mott, Frederick, Unitarianism. A.U.A. Tract no. 14.
- Parker, Theodore, Additional Speeches, New York, 1864.
- Parker, Theodore, Collected Works, vols. 1-XIV, London, 1866.
- Parker, Theodore, Views of Religion, Boston, 1885.
- St. John, Charles, I Believe, A.U.A. Tract no. 258
- Savage, Minot, Unitarianism, A.U.A. Tract no. 58.
- Savage, Minot, What is Christianity ? A.U.A. Tract no. 109.
- Simmons, H., Unitarian Principles, A.U.A. Tract no. 150.
- Statement of Belief, A.U.A. Tract no. 19.
- Statement of Belief, A.U.A. Tract no. 221.
- Sunderland, J., What Do Unitarians Believe ? A.U.A. Tract no. 11.
- Wandte, Charles, What do Unitarians Believe ? A.U.A. Tract no. 8.
- Unitarian Belief Concerning Jesus.
- Bowser, Alexander, Divinity of Christ, The, A.U.A. Tract no. 128.
- Brown, Howard, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, A.U.A. Tract no. 108.
- Brown, Howard, Real Jesus, The, A.U.A. Tract no. 79.
- Hale, Edward, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, A.U.A. Tract no. 133.
- Hale, Edward, What Think Ye of Christ ? A.U.A. Tract no. 131.
- Hatchen, A., What Unitarianism Thinks of Christ, San Francisco.
- Holmes, J., Leadership of Jesus, The, New York, 1910.
- Jaynes, Julian, Place of Jesus in the Religion of Today, A.U.A. Tract no. 134.
- Mott, Herbert, God or Man? A.U.A. Tract no. 123.
- Sunderland, J., Jesus as Humanity's Ideal, A.U.A. Tract no. 139.
- Sunderland, J., Was Jesus God ? A.U.A. Tract no. 135.
- Reports of American Unitarian Association.
- Forbes, Elmer, Social Welfare Work of the Unitarian Churches.
- Wilson, Lewis, Unitarianism and the Missionary Spirit.

Bibliography (Continued)

On History of Unitarianism.

Brown, Howard, Unitarian Church in its Relations with other Protestant Churches, A.U.A. Tract no. 73.

Chadwick, John, Unitarianism and Modern Discovery, A.U.A. Tract no. 154.

Cook, George Willis, Unitarianism in America, Boston, 1902.

Crothers, Samuel, Unitarianism of Thomas Jefferson, The, A.U.A. Tract no. 292.

Eliot, Charles, Progressive Liberalism in the Closing and Opening Century, A.U.A. Tract no. 115.

Eliot, Samuel, Liberal Christianity in the United States, A.U.A. Tract no. 4.

Encyclopedia Britannica,

Belsham, Thomas, vol. 111.
Conway, Moncure, vol. VII.
Emerson, Ralph, vol. lx.
Frothingham, Octavius, vol. XI.
Martineau, James, vol. XVII.
Savage, Minot, vol XXIV.

Everett, Charles, Old Unitarianism and the New, The, in Immortality and Other Essays, Boston, 1902.

Hall, Edward, New Unitarianism, The, in New World, vol. 11, pp.536-551.

Hale, Edward, Unitarianism and Original Congregationalism in New England, A.U.A. Tract no. 57.

Martineau, James, Three Stages of Unitarian Theology, A.U.A. Tract, no. 89.

Schaff,-Herzog, Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, The New,

Arianism, vol. 1.
Athanasian Creed, vol. 1.
Carter, Lane, vol. V.
Chadwick, John, vol. 11.
Channing, William, vol. 111.
Clarke, James Freeman, vol. 111.
Congregationalism, vol. VI.
Jones, Jenkin, vol. VI.
Monarchianism, vol. VII.
Martineau, James, vol. VII.
Nestorius, vol. VII.
Parker, Theodore, vol. VIII.
Socinus, vol. X.
Unitarians, vol. XII.

Bibliography Continued.

Sunderland, J., Story of Channing, A.U.A. Tract no. 295.

On Comparisons of Judaism with Unitarianism.

Enelow, H., Need Jews Become Unitarians, In Adequacy of Judaism, New York, 1920.

Gottheil, Gustav, in Channing Centenary, The, Boston, 1881.

Harris, Maurice, Judaism and Unitarianism, In Sermons by American Rabbis, Chicago, 1896.

Kohler, K. Jewish Question, The, in American Hebrew, vol. 54, pp. 719, 721.

Meyer, Martin, Jesus and the Thought of the World, San Francisco, 1914.

Montefiore, C. Judaism, Unitarianism and Theism, In Papers for Jewish People, no. 1V, London, 1908.

Montefiore, C., Mr. Smith, A Possibility, Jewish Quarterly Review, vol. VI, Old Series, pp. 100-110.

Montefiore, C. Unitarianism and Judaism in their Relations to each other, Jewish Quarterly Review, vol. 1X, pp. 140-253.

Philipson, David, Christian Theism, American Israelite, vol. 36 no. 13, p.4.

Philipson, David, Judaism and Unitarianism, American Israelite, vol. 47, no. 32, p.4.

Straus, Leon, Unitarianism and Judaism, American Israelite, April 29, 1881.

Works on Judaism.

Abrahams, Israel, Judaism, London, 1907.

Cronbach, Abraham, Jewish Views of Christ, South Bend Tribune, Jan. 3, 1920.

Dubnow, S., Jewish History, Philadelphia, 1903.

Enelow, H., Jewish View of Jesus, New York, 1920.

Friedlander, M., Jewish Religion, The, London, 1900.

Friedlander, G., Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount, New York, 1911.

Jewish Encyclopedia, Saul of Tarsus, vol. XI.
Trinity, vol. XII.
Unitarianism, vol. XII.

- Joseph, Morris, Judaism as Creed and Life, London, 1919.
- Kohler, K., Jewish Theology, New York, 1918.
- Lazarus, M., Ethics of Judaism, Philadelphia, 1901.
- Levy, Leonard, Address on Jesus, Pittsburgh, 1912.
- Montefiore, C., Liberal Judaism and Hellenism, London, 1918.
- Montefiore, C., Meaning of Progressive Revelation, The, In Papers for Jewish People, no. VIII, London, 1914.
- Montefiore, C., Old Testament and its Ethical Teachings, The, in papers for Jewish People, no. XV., London, 1917.
- Montefiore, C., Outlines of Liberal Judaism, London, 1912.
- Montefiore, C., Place of Judaism in the Religions of the World, In papers for Jewish People no. XIII, London, 1916.
- Montefiore, C., Professor Cheyne and the Jews, Jewish Quarterly Review, vol. 1. pp. 278-281.
- Schechter, S., Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, New York, 1910.
- Zangwill, I., Position of Judaism, The, North American Review, vol. 160, pp. 425-439.

ABBREVIATIONS.

A.U.A.	American Unitarian Association.
Ber.	Bereshith, or Berachoth.
Channing	Works of William E. Channing.
C.C.A.R.	Central Conference of American Rabbis.
Clarke, Manual,	Clarke, James, Manual of Unitarian Belief.
Emerton.	Emerton, Ephraim, Unitarian Thought.
En. Brit.	Encyclopedia Britannica.
Friedlander, Sources	Friedlander, Gerald, Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount.
Friedlander,	Friedlander, M., Jewish Religion.
Hag.	Haggigah,
H.U.C.	Hebrew Union College.
J. E.	Jewish Encyclopedia.
J.Q.R.	Jewish Quarterly Review
Jer ^s	Jerushalmi
Joseph.	Joseph, M., Judaism as Creed and Life.
Kid.	Kiddushin.
Kohler,	Kohler, K., Jewish Theology.
Lazarus,	Lazarus, M., Ethics of Judaism.
Matt.	Matthew.
Mid.	Midrash.
Mont.	Montefiore.
Mont. " Out "	Montefiore, C., Outlines of Liberal Judaism.
N.A.R.	North American Review.
Parker.	Parker, Theodore, Collected Works.
Pes.	Pesachim.
P.B.	Prayer Book.
Rab.	Rabba.
San.	Shabbath.

ABBREVIATIONS. Continued.

Schechter,

Tal.

v.

Schechter, S. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology.

Talmud.

verse.

PREFACE: PROBLEM AND PLAN.

The Unitarian movement in America presents a problem and a challenge to Judaism, and especially to Reform Judaism. The presence of a sect that is certainly justified in laying claim to humanitarianism, rationalism, and naturalism¹ calls for a treatise proving that it is in no wise superior to Judaism, demonstrating that Judaism is characterized by the same ideal motifs. The close approximation of cardinal tenets in the two sects, coupled with the practical advantages ensuing from membership in the dominant religious system entailing freedom from the practical difficulties attendant upon fellowship in a group that involves its members in practical difficulties with the every day life and organization of modern society, naturally enough has provided the wavering of our faith with a welcome excuse for shaking off the burden of the older religion with its annoying encumbrances and to wrap themselves in the luxuriously free and comfortable fold of the upstart system. The unlettered Jew, mistaking the act of throwing overboard the ballast of outworn Jewish law for the consignment to the elements of the entire freight of the religion, have been lured to quit the stately ship. The invitation to join the Unitarian movement that has rejected the old ridiculous Christian theology and has returned to the original Jewish position naturally will be scouted by all except opportunistic Jews.

The Unitarian movement is of interest to ^{us because} its impartial study of the New Testament and of Jesus is appealing by its dispassionate appeal. And especially noteworthy is Unitarianism by its insistent emphasis on the core of Israel's Weltanschauung.

1. vide Edward H. Hall; "The New Unitarianism" in New World, 11, p. 5.

As the very name of the movement indicates, Unitarianism stresses unification, which ^{to} Zangwill sums up "in broad generalization the intellectual tendency of Israel. In science the Jewish instinct expressing itself for example through Spinoza, seeks for 'one God, one Law, one Element.'¹" Both Unitarians and Jews carry out the new implications that have developed in the idea of unity as a result of the discoveries of science, and seek to enlarge the meaning of that unity.

For these reasons there is a close alliance between Judaism and Unitarianism, and there must be an understanding by all Jews of the tendencies and efforts of the new movement. In point of fact, however, our scholars for the most part have either neglected to give Unitarianism the attention it demands, or they have been grossly unfair in their treatment of the subject. In estimating the worth of any religious system, be it Unitarianism or Judaism, it is no more than just that the student use as his model the finest development of that faith. With but few exceptions those of our scholars who have written or spoken on the subject, have known only of the older Unitarianism, which differs from the New, as does the Judaism of the Hebrew Union College stand apart from that of the earliest reformers of Germany. The broadest and most liberal expressions of Unitarianism are to be found in the tracts issued by the Americal Unitarian Association of Boston. It must be granted that these essays have been published for purposes of propaganda, and therefore give pictures of Unitarians as they appear on dress parade. It is further admitted that

1. "The Position of Judaism" in N.A.R., vol. 160, p.436.

XI.

the proper appreciation of a religious system can be gained by conversation with the man of the street, that will more perfectly reflect the beliefs of the majority than the discourse of the learned, representative addressing the parliament of the world's judgment. We might be oblivious of the sentiments set forth in these tracts as are most of our scholars, and base our evaluation on the unpublished sermons of Unitarian preachers. We might base our conception of Unitarianism solely on the works of Channing or even of the more liberally minded Parker who do not even approach the universalism and highmindedness of the authors of the Unitarian tracts. Then, however, we should be as unjust in our appraisal of Unitarians as are Unitarians in their estimate of Judaism; the golden rule that we gave the world calls for a different method of approach. "It is better to be¹ cursed than to curse," says the Rabbis. The comparison of the two faiths in this thesis will be a sympathetic one. The attitude taken² will be midway between that of Emil G. Hirsch, who knows only of the old Unitarianism of the school of Parker's predecessors, and that of Claud³ G. Montefiore who, playing to Christian galleries, is so far carried away in his effort to placate the Gentile that he is ready to make concessions to Christianity that Christian scholars themselves would make hesitantly, and to represent Unitarianism in such glowing terms that the Unitarian looking at his likeness in the mir-

1. San. 48 b.

2. As revealed in lecture; "Judaism and Unitarianism" to students of H. U. C. 1915.

3. vide Mont.; "Out."; "Liberal Judaism and Hellenism", chap. 11, etc.

XII.

row made by Montefiore would not recognize himself.

No satisfactory and exhaustive comparison of any kind has thus far been made of the high liberalism of the Unitarianism professed by the official organs of the American Unitarian Association, with Judaism, because of the failure on the part of our writers to perceive the growth within the movement from the old to the new Unitarianism. In its inception merely a denial of the trinity, Unitarianism finally carried that negation to its logical conclusion, discarding completely the Calvinistic theology, and asserting the dignity of human nature, the prefectability of society and the goodness of God. However, until recent years the extreme position taken by Parker had not been accepted, and the ties that bound Unitarianism to orthodox Christianity were many and close. Present day non-Unitarian writers single out the defects of this older Unitarianism which they accept as characteristic of the sect today. He who writes on Unitarianism must resist the temptation to compare the weak men and inferior statements of Unitarianism to the strong personalities and superior sayings of Judaism; to accept as representative the view of an older or a reactionary Unitarian. The natural difficulty of learning just what ^a new movement stands for, especially when the movement champions individualism, might easily lead to an uncharitable judgment.

On the other hand, a similar unscientific method applied in the opposite direction might lead to injustice to Judaism. A number of Unitarians may be liberal, each in one particular small point. Take all of these liberal phases, piece them together and possibly one might build up an outlook that might be labeled Unitarian, yet by no means ^{rightly} so-called. The discretion of the student, his sense of the ^{the} spirit of the movement, can be ^{the} only criterion for judgment.

XIII.

Though our opinion is that fairness demands that the comparison be drawn only with the finest exposition of Unitarianism, the historical growth in doctrines will be briefly traced and the withdrawal from positions previously held will be indicated. A complete comparison, however, between Modern Judaism and all phases of Unitarianism is no more possible than is a comparison of ~~Modern~~ Unitarianism with all phases of Judaism. In presenting the Jewish conception of a doctrine the historical development will be given only as a setting for the modern formulation, for ^othrough-going presentation of Jewish theology is not in place in a work of this kind; only the bald statement of the Jewish belief will be presented. Quotations from Jewish literature will be made only the better to explain Jewish conceptions. The interpretations of the Jewish sources advanced by recognized scholars have been accepted. In general, the Jewish outlook that shall run throughout these pages is that set forth in Kohler's "Jewish Theology", ¹ and Schechter's "Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology". ² These two works in spite of the points of contact between Reform and Orthodox Judaism which the two respectively represent, reveal a striking unanimity of opinion. Schechter's interpretations of the Rabbinic literature in the field of which he is supreme tallies in every detail with the construction placed on the Hellenic, apocryphal and pseudoepigraphical literature by Kohler in the domain of which he specializes. Scholarly acumen and close understanding of Jewish sources is a prerequisite to exposition of Jewish belief, because "the true bearing of single features of Jewish literature can be ³ learned only from their relation to the whole."

1. New York, 1918.

2. New York, 1920.

XIV.

The Talmud and other Jewish literature must be sifted and combed, therefore, by authorities, in order that the general trend of thought might be learned. Other popular presentations of Judaism by Morris Joseph,¹ by C. G. Montefiore,² whose work though illuminating is unfounded on any scholarly background, by M. Friedlander,³ who presents the orthodox point of view, by M. Lazarus,⁴ whose presentation of Jewish ethics is without parallel, as well as the brief but comprehensive articles by Israel Abrahams on "Judaism",⁵ and Israel Zangwill on "The Position of Judaism,"⁶ have been utilized throughout in setting forth the Jewish attitude toward doctrines. From these interpretations of Jewish literature certain definite characteristical attitudes and ideas may be drawn as common to all. There is a general tenor, a core of opinion in almost every question, which can be singled out and represented as Jewish. On the basis of the opinions expressed in those standard works the comparison to Unitarianism is made. No attempt will be made to prove the nature of the teachings of Judaism, but the effort will simply be to set forth these conclusions of the scholars about Judaism. Each contention concerning Unitarianism, as well as Judaism, can be supported by numerous references and quotations ^{that cannot be included} within the limits of the thesis. Our Christian

3. Lazarus, 1, p.82. Illustrative of the need of interpretation of sources are cited the two contradictory passages: "Be the tail among lions rather than the head among foxes" (Aboth 4, 15), and "Be the head among foxes rather than the tail among lions". (Tal. Jer. San. 4, 10). l. c. pp. 76,77. cf. Schechter, p. 19.
1. "Judaism as Greed and Life", London, 1912, 3rd edition.
2. "Outlines of Liberal Judaism", London 1912.
3. "The Jewish Religion". London, 1900.
4. "Ethics of Judaism", Philadelphia, 1901.
5. London, 1920.
6. N.A.R., vol. 160, pp. 425-439.

palemicists may dispute our claim that the doctrines we present as Jewish are historically part and parcel of our world outlook. Our claim, however, that such principles were Jewish, whether it be founded or not, is proof sufficient that Judaism today includes such beliefs.

¹ Lazarus, for example, points out that Jewish ethics were always universal. The universalism of our outlook in the past may be called to question, but this very assertion ^{of past broadness} bears proof that Judaism today is characterized by an universalistic ethical system.

The Unitarian movement interests Reform Jews especially because ^{Unitarianism and Reform Judaism} both must bear the same reproaches and fight the same hostile forces that every liberal movement must meet. Like Unitarians, Reform Jews, because of their advanced views, are accused of heterodoxy by the conservatives. They are held to place an exaggerated emphasis on reason, to be exclusively intellectual. This charge is but natural since Reform liberates the intellectual capacities for the discovery and development of religious truth. Like Judaism, however, we believe that ^{Unitarianism} too, "recognizes the value of mystic insight, indefinable intuitions," ² Both sects must meet the contention that their beliefs are mere negations, that their outlooks are those of the orthodox with a certain fraction of the older faiths cut off. The doctrines of Unitarians are called pale negations by their opponents, and the principles of Reform Judaism and, even of Judaism in general, are called colorless since they lack creedal formulation. Both must compensate for the meagerness of doctrines by the richness of the spirit of their service.

1. I, p. 189.

2. Joseph, p. 47.

XVI.

With Reform Judaism Unitarianism has analogies, but with orthodox Judaism there can be no relations. To it, Unitarianism is no problem. The Unitarian could never give assent to the central orthodox dogma of the divinity, perfection and immutability and Mosaic origin of the Pentateuchal Law. The orthodox Jew, on the other hand, would never accept the scientific method, nor refuse to surrender his ceremonials, nor consider departure from the Jewish community life, even should he be moved to look with sympathy upon Unitarianism. As a matter of fact friendly intercourse can never be had by the Orthodox Jew with the people who wrought, and are working, so much suffering on his people. He naturally enough will not be inclined to enter into discussion with his tormentors. Only with the party of Reform can there be any closer affinity. Unitarianism, representing a reaction from the traditionalism of the Christian church, is intimately allied with Reform, the protest against orthodox Judaism.

INTRODUCTION: MEANING AND HISTORY OF UNITARIANISM.

INTRODUCTION: MEANING AND HISTORY

The term "unitarius" makes its first documentary appearance in a decree of a Transylvanian diet in 1600. The term was introduced to Western Europe in the latter part of the seventeenth century in the "Bibliotheca fratrum polonorum", published at Amsterdam. "Unitarian" first appeared in England in the "Brief History" in 1682, and was used to cover all who held to the impersonality of the Divine Being. Unitarianism is a denomination of the Christian Church which arose and developed out of the Reformation as a protest against the doctrine of Trinity, and was crystalized into a separate sect in 1565 with its exclusion from Protestant synods. "Along with the fundamental doctrine certain characteristics have marked its professors, ^{namely} ~~namely~~, a minimizing of essentials, a repugnance to formulated creeds, ~~an~~ ¹ historical study of Scripture, and a large degree of toleration", as well as an interest in social reform.

A history of the Unitarian movement must deal first with the rise of Trinitarianism into which the monotheism of early Christianity degenerated; and then the subsequent gradual return to the original position, by the Unitarians. The early churchmen had no formal creed, but held only to the simple doctrine of the undivided unity of God and the belief in the perfection of the man, Jesus. The deification of Jesus was effected in the second, third and fourth centuries under the influence of many forces. The conception of the divinity of Christ was rooted in the mystical speculations of Alexandria. Gnostic, Neo-Platonic and Oriental ideas of incarnation and Plato's conception of the logos led finally to the consummation of the process, the beginning of which was made in the New Testament. The New Testament dualism, coupled with the notion of the antagonism of spirit and matter held by Plato and Zoroaster, was

1. En. Brit., art. "Unitarianism."

responsible for the growth of the view that God, a superior essence, had to create the world by inferior divinities. The many peoples with whom the Christians came in contact each supported the idea of a divine human in separate manners. The Romans who raised the emperor to an object of worship, the Jews who early expected the coming of the Messiah, the heathen subjects for conversion who knew of gods descending on earth, all made their contribution to the final formulation of the dogmas respecting Christ, so that gradually he was regarded not as subordinate, but as equal with God.

Up to the end of the second century the logos doctrine and the idea that Christ must be thought of in the same way as God ^(were) ~~were~~ not definitely fixed despite the efforts to clinch the matter. There was no formulation of the nature and dignity of Jesus. Conflicting views stood side by side. As in Matthew 28, 19 Jesus was Son of God, Lord and Saviour, born of the Holy Ghost and virgin. The supernatural birth, however, was a mooted question. Certain it is, though, that he ~~was~~ not regarded as the actual God-head. He was either a man in whom the spirit of God, entering at the time of his baptism, dwelt; or he was the ~~heavenly~~ spirit which had become incarnate and manifest, and he became what he was before his miraculous birth. Because of its relationship with the logos philosophy the latter view was ~~the~~ more prevalent.

The danger to monotheism implicit within the whole Christology of the times was perceived by one school, the Monarchians, who resisted the growing doctrine of deification. They expressly taught the unity of God, and asserted the principle of rigid and strict monotheism.

Their primary concern was to prove that Jesus was a man, and thus to maintain monotheism. They were divided into the two groups just spoken of: Dynamistic Monarchianism, or Adoptionism as opposed to Modalistic Monarchianism, regarded the power of spirit of God as in dwelling in the man Jesus, Theodotus of Byzantium, Paul of Samosata, and the historian Eusebius taught that Jesus, born of a virgin through the operation of the Holy Ghost, received no specifically divine essence until after a life of perfect purity the Holy Ghost descended upon him at Baptism so that he became Christ, Though Adoptionism was defeated in the Greek Churches with the ascendancy of the logos Christology, it had a continued existence in Armenia and the Danube country until the tenth century.

Modalistic Monarchianism considered Jesus as the incarnation of the God-head in person. In the West where they were called Patripassians and Monarchians, they held that God the Father was born and suffered and died. The distinction between the Father and the son was conceived to be merely nominal, and the complete identity of the two was accepted. In the East, where they were termed Sabellians they taught the same beliefs, and added that the Father, the son and the Holy Ghost were identical and that God became operative in three different stages, as Father, then as son, and then as Holy Ghost.

These Pre-Nicene schools, though monotheistic, paved the way for the Athanasian and Augustinian Christology. Arius, the opponent of Athanasius claimed that the Father alone is God, He alone is unbegotten, eternal, wise, good, unchangeable; and the ^{at} Jesus is a created being, derived, subordinate in rank, yet more than man, similar and not identical in nature with God, begotten from eternity, but created in time. He dealt only with the rank and nature of Jesus

whom he conceived to be an intermediate being between God and man. He denied that Jesus is "very God of very God", of the same substance as God and declared that he was homoiousion. He reduced him to a creature who was pre-existent before the world. His teachings found representatives in the East, and after a fight for existence and recognition were finally brought up for consideration by Constantine at the Council of Nicea, 325. Constantine who at that time happened to be training with the Trinitarians, for political reasons entered the metaphysical battle-ground of the Eastern church, and pressure applied by him brought about the adoption of the creed; "(We believe) in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only Son, begotten of the Father, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down and was incarnate, and was made man; He suffered and the third day he rose again, and ascended into heaven from thence he cometh to judge the quick and the dead." The eternal deity of Christ was thus affirmed, and Arius was condemned, and banished upon his refusal to sign the creed.

Arius spread his views through his book, "Thalia", and gained a following of heretics. The heresy was tenacious and widely accepted. During a part of the fourth century it was the ruling creed in the Eastern Church. Most of the Teutonic races were at first converted to it. In the West, Arianism was not completely defeated; however, for centuries the Nicene creed found universal acceptance. Several offshoots come forth from Arianism. The Gothic Ulfilas, but more especially Nestorius, subscribed to Arianism. Even before the coming of Nestorius the question as to whether Mary was to be called Mother of God or mother of man was a mooted one. In his "Sermons against the Mother of God", delivered circa 428, Nestorius,

therefore, presented not only his own views; " Mary did not give birth to divinity, but to man, the instrument of divinity". Though condemned by the council of Ephesus in 431, Nestorianism came to the East Syrian Church, was extended to Persia, Arabia, Indiana and China. Nestorians may safely be counted on the Arian side; and in the seventh century were the first to carry Christianity into the far East.

After the expulsion by force of the Arians by Theodosius in 380 Arianism ceased to exist as an organized force. The continuity of Arian views, however, has been preserved thru isolated communities and individuals. Arianism is traceable through the Middle Ages, espoused by the great schoolmen. In the Socinianism of Poland and Transylvania, to be discussed later, Arian beliefs found partial lodgment. In fact, the Unitarianism of a century ago was based largely on Arianism.

The Council of Nicea did not establish the Trinitarian position in its finality. It did not venture to assert the Consubstantiality and personality of Christ as belonging to the Holy Ghost. It was left for the second ecumenical council to proclaim the Holy spirit as co-equal with the Father and Son. By it the doctrine of Trinity secured a foothold. The complete identification and replacement of Christology with the logos idea was not effected, however, until Augustine at the close of the fourth century first championed and presented the orthodox doctrine of trinity. A thorough-going recognition, was not accorded the Trinitarian views by a public and general council in the Christian Church until the time of the fourth Lateran council in 1215. The idea of the orthodox Christian that the Apostles Creed, the rule of Faith during the early Christian centuries, was set forth by the Apostles who enjoined upon the members of the Church the beliefs now characteristic of Orthodoxy, is entirely erroneous; for it was the result of a gradual development,

4. Infra pp. 6 ff.

beginning about the middle of the second century and completed in the fourth century. The textus receptus can be traced to the beginning of the fifth century or the end of the fourth. Similarly the Athanasian Creed, an exposition of the Catholic faith sung at prime every day and attributed to Athanasius, was the culmination of a number of successive councils, was developed in the last half of the fifth and in the sixth centuries.

This review of the history of the early Church shows that Trinitarianism was developed and made a test of fellowship in the Church much later than is commonly believed. Unitarianism therefore is justified in its claim that it represents a return to the Christianity of the early Church. This exposition of the exact position of the early Church was necessary in order that a clear understanding be had of the nature of the religion from which Unitarianism professes to be a historic outgrowth. It was further presented in order that it be perceived that Unitarianism involves a return to a Jewish monotheism vitiated by the accretion of inferior pagan, philosophical and mystical elements.

A complete history of Unitarianism is not available. No writer has dealt with all phases of the growth of the movement, no doubt because of the difficulty in presenting in a small work all the manifold influences that were at ^{work} in the development of the Unitarian outlook on life and religion. Linked with the progress of Unitarianism is the progress of scientific investigation and inquiry, the growth of the spirit of tolerance, the gradual emancipation of the individual from the thralldom of an ecclesiastical hierarchy. In other words, adequately to treat the subject the writer must handle so much material that his work would befuddle the reader.

The material presented in this introduction has been collected from a variety of sources, has been pieced together from fragmentary articles and essays and bound up with a sketch of the political history of ^{the} several countries. The above sketch of early Church history must now be followed by an equally incomplete analysis of the Unitarian aspects of the Reformation.

The Reformation in every country, with its liberation of the rational powers of the individual, was attended by a spirit more or less anti-Trinitarian, by the appearance of individuals of Unitarian temper of mind. Servetus for example worked for the simplification of Christianity. In his "Restoration of Christianity" he set out to prove that primitive Christianity had in it no Trinity. After having incensed Calvin and the other Reformation leaders by his opposition to the Augustinian theology he was burned at the stake (1553).

In Poland, chiefly, anti-Trinitarianism took root. Scattered expressions of heresey appeared there very early. In 1539, in the market place in Cracow, was burned Katharine Vogel, at the age of eighty, wife of a goldsmith and alderman, condemned for denying the deity of Christ and affirming the divine unity. The influence of Georgius Blandrata was a potent element in this concerted movement to revise dogma by reason. Such men and women as Katherine and Blandrata were forerunners to the movement inaugurated by Faustus Socinus, a disciple of his uncle, Laelus Socinus. These two, exiled from intolerant Italy, formulated the first theology that might be called Unitarian. Faustus, like his uncle, was a deep and critical student, but unlike

him was a bitter controversialist. He accepted an invitation to attempt to aid Blandrata in his liberal reform in Transylvania, but on account of the unfavorable conditions there, left for Poland where the Unitarian movement was gaining in political influence. He succeeded finally in bringing about harmony between the various reform groups and in enforcing the acceptance of his own views. The prominence of Socinus in the movement for a more rational interpretation of Christianity gave the name "Socinian" to those who denied the absolute deity of Jesus and total depravity of man, and

affirmed the unity of God, and a spiritual rather than a sacrificial interpretation of Jesus. Socinianism, however, is but a stage in the growth to Unitarianism, and is not to be thought of as Unitarianism in any absolute sense. It adheres strictly to the authority of the Bible and is decidedly supernaturalistic. It affirms the preexistence of matter, the cause of sin. These beliefs received the support of the anti-Trinitarians. Even King Sigismund II. became a convert. Until the death of Socinus Unitarianism was on the ascendancy in Poland. Yet Socinianism, which had flourished in these first decades of the seventeenth century, succumbed to the Catholic reaction started under Sigismund II. Under the influence of the Jesuits, the Socinian school at Racow was suppressed, the teachers were persecuted, the church was taken from the Unitarians and repressive measures generally were introduced. Arianism was forbidden expression under penalty of death. The Racovian catechism begun by Socinus and ^{re}printed at Racow was decreed against. Unitarianism had thriven merely because of propitious circumstances in the form of the presence on the throne of enlightened kings. The death of the movement in Poland took place in 1600 when the adherents were ex-

pelled from the country. Some fled to Holland where they formed a community of some size, some joined the Roman Catholics and some remained secretly protected by Roman Catholics and Protestants. A small group migrated to Transylvania ^{where} they formed a separate community until 1793.

Blandrata, an Italian from Piedmont, left Poland and came to Transylvania in 1563 where he communicated his views to Francis David, the court preacher, who warmly welcomed them and became their zealous advocate. John Sigismund, prince of Transylvania, became a disciple of David's, and in 1568 issued an edict of religious liberty and allowed David to transfer his episcopate from the Calvinists to the anti-Trinitarians. Stephen's successor, Bathory, a ^{Catholic} Catholic, was incensed at David's innovation of abandonment of the worship of Christ and tried him. David died in prison in 1579. The cultus of Christ, however, was accepted by the Unitarians of Transylvania generally. On the other hand, in 1621 a new sect, the "Sabbatarii", arose with the strong Judaic tendencies. They eliminated the worship of Christ and continued in separate existence with that as its distinguishing feature until 1848. The Jesuit reaction to the early liberalism of Transylvania and the oppression like that imposed in Poland was not sufficient to kill the movement in this country. Though the Jesuits nearly ^{dispossessed} ~~dispossessed~~ them of churches, schools, lands and even of civil as well as religious rights, the Unitarians have continued and have flourished under Hungarian rule. The Unitarians of America and of England are entertaining close relationship with this historic body of Unitarians.

In Transylvania and England and America alone have definite and permanent historic Unitarian churches been established. In Germany, Italy, Switzerland and France reformed churches and a liberal spirit have grown up, and even at a very early period there were sporadic cases of declarations of liberalism in those lands. It was in England, however, that Unitarianism assumed a position of prominence. Before the seventeenth century there were many individual expressions of anti-Trinitarianism; but all through the seventeenth century there was felt a strong undercurrent of Unitarian thought. In that century a long line of Unitarians suffered persecution and bore the reproach of the government and the public. Occasionally a work calling for a return to the simple Christianity of the early Church managed to escape the watchful eye of the authorities. Socinian books were declared heretical, and by the ordinance of 1648 denial of the Trinity was made capital. This last measure, however, was a dead letter, Cromwell frequently interfering as in the case John Biddle. Biddle organized a Socinian society, published Unitarian books, and wrote catechisms. He died, however, in prison from starvation under charge of teaching against the trinitarian doctrine. Many felled^{ow} in his footsteps and the names of many Unitarians might be listed. Firmin, Emlyn, Pierce, Taylor, Chillingworth, Tillotson and others wrote and spoke concerning the new religion, pleaded for toleration and liberalism, for the free ~~woman~~ individual interpretation of the perfect truth contained in the Bible. The movement became so powerful that it came to be regarded as a menace, even though the leading figures of the time were Arian or Socinian in their views. Milton was an Arian. Newton wrote anonymously on the Unitar-

ians' side. Locke's "Reasonableness of Christianity" is virtually Unitarian in tone. Samuel Clarke was a great exponent of rational religion. These men, counted orthodox in England, were none the less non-sectarian in their thought, and wished to give religion a basis in common sense and ethical integrity.

In the eighteenth century generally, a broadening of religious thought replaced the narrowness and intolerance that manifested itself in the repressive measures of the seventeenth century. Although Unitarianism was excluded by the operation of the Toleration Act of 1689, and its advocates were threatened with loss of civil rights and imprisonment by the act of 1698, Socinian views found increasing favor in the eighteenth century. The Toleration ^{act} was amended (1779) by substitution of belief in Scripture for belief in the Anglican doctrinal articles. Yet it was not until the year 1813 when the penalties attaching to disbelief in the Trinity were abolished ^{that} and the last disabilities against the Unitarians were removed. Until 1813 the law made it blasphemy to speak against the Trinity; but a more tolerant public sentiment had long rendered the law inoperative. By the Dissenter's chapel act of 1844 the possession of ancient endowments and chapels was ^s secured; and Unitarians received full political rights.

A chronological treatment of the history of Unitarianism would demand ^{that} the religious views of the eighteenth century Unitarians represented by Priestley and Lindsey, be here set forth. In order, however, to contrast ^s the Unitarianism of this older school with that of the newer, we shall present its theology immediately before that of Barker and his followers. We shall now discuss the practical features of the history of English Unitarianism, then discuss Amer-

ican Unitarianism, and then compare the old and the new Unitarianism of England and of America.

In the eighteenth century purely humanitarian Christology was advocated first by Nathaniel Lardner (d.1768), a scholar of no mean ability who, in his "Credibility of the Gospel History" revealed Unitarian sympathies. Lant Carpenter (d.1840) did much to broaden the spirit of English Unitarianism. The rite of baptism seemed to him a superstition, and he substituted for it a form of infant dedication. One of the most vigorous and able writers of his church was Thomas Belsham (d.1829) who sought to make the simple and proper humanity of Christ the acknowledged Unitarian view. James Martineau (d. 1900) rationalized the crudities of his predecessors. He was the most eminent philosopher of the Unitarian school and blended in his system an idealistic rationalism with a refined spiritual mysticism. Though he insists on the use of reason in the treatment of all problems, he accepts as the basis of Christianity a supernatural origin, and takes revelation to mean a communication of faith certified by miracles. He is one of the foremost philosophers of the spirit; his theism is built up on the principle that God reveals himself most clearly in the nature of man. In accordance with the tenor of his philosophy he looked to the personality of Jesus rather than in his precepts for a proof for his identity as revealer of the divine character.

The organization of the movement was effected in 1825 when the British and Foreign Unitarian Association was founded. The National Conference, a purely deliberative body, was founded in 1881. With this gradual recognition Unitarianism was free to develop its potentialities. A broad and tolerant spirit developed that came to be known as Arminianism. It is not a sectarian movement, but is rather

a temper of mind. By it is meant the willingness to have man search for truth and knowledge in a scientific manner and the espousal of a purely natural religion based not on authority but on a thorough use of the rational faculties. The Bible, though it is accepted as a perfect revelation of truth, is nonetheless studied with a critical air. Arminianism simply spells latitudinarianism in religion.

In 1911 there were in Great Britain 378 ministers and 374 churches of which 295 were in England. For the education of ^{their} ministry English Unitarians support Manchester College at Oxford, the Unitarian Home Missionary College and the Presbyterian College. Wales includes 34 churches with ^{its} boundaries and maintains a college at Carmarthen. Overt Unitarianism has never had much vogue in Scotland. There have been liberal thinkers throughout Scottish history yet there are but about ten Unitarian Churches in Scotland. A Unitarian Association was founded in 1813 which functions to some extent today. Irish Unitarianism began in 1726 when the presbytery of Antrim separated from the general synod in order to establish ^{is} worship without subscription to creed. The history of Irish free thought closely parallels that of England, so that it is not necessary to go into a discussion of the various edicts by which freedom was gradually obtained, the various synods affirming the right to religious freedom and the various leaders who bravely insisted upon their rights. There are today about forty churches who are members of the non-subscribing Presbyterian Church of Ireland.

The history of Unitarianism in America includes the same general tendencies, ^{Arminianism} Arminianism, Arianism, anti-tritheism, rationalism and modernism. The chief source of American Unitarianism is to be found in the general movement of the English churches of the seventeenth century toward toleration and rationalism. This and the spirit of individualism developed by the Renaissance, and the tendency to free inquiry that manifested itself in the Protestant Reformation have been the guiding forces in the development of Unitarian thought here in America. The freedom of intercourse of the mother country with the colony was responsible for the suging of English tendencies to this country. To America, at the very beginning, the seeds of Unitarianism were brought on the Mayflower. The Pilgrims, who organized their churches on the basis of broad covenants rather than on narrow creeds, contributed largely to Unitarian development. The Puritan spirit, further, of resistance to arbitrary civil and ecclesiastical was partly emancipatory, ~~authority~~. The excesses of the early Puritans led to a reaction in the shape of a movement for freedom in religion. The powerful book "Government of the New England Churches" by Rev. John Wise was a stirring appeal for democracy, progress and reason in religion. It insisted upon the congregational method of government of church that would grant each church autonomy rather than that of control by an ecclesiastical hierarchy. This work made it possible for Dr. Ebenezer Gay, the first American preacher of Unitarianism, to advance to Unitarian views and to preach them and still retain his pulpit. Many followed in his wake insisting on simplicity, rationality and toleration in religion. Many directed opposition against Jonathan Edwards and the revivals of the day, led by Dr. Charles Chauncey (d. 1787). The Ar-

minian protest against Calvinism clearly demonstrated the rising tide of a broad religious spirit. New influences came to be felt, so that soon after the close of the Revolution many ministers of the Congregational Churches had come to occupy Unitarian ground. The doctrines of Trinity, of total depravity, of deity of Christ, gave way to the view of the Fatherhood of God, an emphasis on righteousness, and the conception of the divinity of Jesus. As results of the liberal thought imported from the continent, of the culture of Harvard College, and of the principles inherent in New England Puritanism, Unitarianism was now established in America. The first official acceptance of Unitarianism on the part of a congregation was the ordination of James Freeman, a decided Unitarian, as rector of King's chapel, Boston (1787). The Prayer book was revised into a mild Unitarian liturgy and Orthodox phrases with reference to Trinity were excised. One after another, churches followed this example, became congregational in polity and Unitarian in belief. Under the influence of Priestley fresh impetus was given to the faith. The appointment of Henry Ware, an avowed Unitarian, as professor at Harvard in 1805 opened up a great controversy between Orthodox and Unitarians with the result that many of the churches of Boston without changing their names embraced Unitarian views. The controversy waxed hot for several years, but the Unitarians usually won out compelling the conservatives to leave the church and organize minority congregations. The liberal spirit fostered by Harvard since the middle of the eighteenth century was finally epitomized in the creation in 1816 of the Divinity School of Cambridge. Unitarian churches were now organized in all the big cities of the East; the Unitarians were able to hold their own against their enemies.

We shall now discuss the stages of Unitarian theology that culminated in the Unitarianism of Parker. The first epoch in the history of modern Unitarian thought is that in which Priestley and Lindsey were leaders. Priestley, the famous discoverer of oxygen, was minister of one of a group of Presbyterian churches that refused to be bound by a creed. Though at first these churches were Orthodox in their beliefs, they could not resist the inroads of Unitarian views that naturally followed their tolerant and liberal platform. Lindsey, however, broke with the Anglican church, and established the first Unitarian Church in England in 1774 in London. Many others followed his example, and his secession proved the beginning of a series of revolts from the national Church. Priestley was not permitted to remain in England. His fearless championship of Socinian views together with his obnoxious political ideas brought upon him persecution. A mob destroyed his books and scientific instruments, and he was forced to flee to America where he spread his views. Priestley was one of the founders of modern Unitarianism both in England and in America. His power in science, in politics, in economy, in history, as well as in exegesis and in theology won for him a wide hearing that he could not have gained were he proficient only in ecclesiastical scholarship. It must not be thought, however, that he closely approached the final beliefs of Unitarianism. He was originally an Orthodox and he retained some of the tenets of Calvinism, believing in the Bible as a divine revelation, and in the miracles as Christ's credentials of authority. He was, for all that, a true humanitarian uttering uncompromisingly his denial of the doctrine of the supernatural birth of Jesus, and rejecting the Trinity and vicarious atonement as unscriptural. Though he held to the Bible as the divine revelation, he did not withhold critical judgment in his study of its contents.

This older Unitarianism was chiefly an intellectual movement, Dogmas were rejected because they did not find any sanction in the Bible, not because they could not win the approval of, and call forth a protest from, the heart. The Unitarianism of the day was a kind of Biblicism. Belsham, for example, brought together the passages in the New Testament teaching the doctrine of Trinity, in order to strengthen the faith of his pupils. To his surprise, however, he found that no such conception could receive conclusive support from the Scriptures. The heretical view sprang, therefore, from the Bible itself.

The religion of these early Unitarianism was characterized by a certain remoteness. This was due partly to the fact that it was the immediate offspring of Arianism. The Arian hardness created a wide gulf between ^{the} persons in the Trinity, each of which stood apart and alone. The Arian conception of revelation was, further, external and artificial and absolute. It was so positive in its nature that it was conceived as deterministic. And this leads over the other force that was responsible for the abstractness of the theology of older Unitarianism; - the necessarianism of Priestley. This first of the three stages of Unitarianism that are to be noted by the scholar: who makes a study of the history of Unitarian theological tenets was marked by a prevalence of the idea of predeterminism. Priestley reduced all causes, and subordinated the whole universe, to God; and to him therefore man is passively a subject of the powers that be. Since God's power alone is absolute, His rule is that of a despotic monarch. No close communion can be established by man with his Maker.

1. Vide James Martineau: "The Three Stages of Unitarian Theology", A.U.A. tract No. 89.

The next two epochs are best indicated by the names of William Channing and Theodore Parker. The early Unitarianism looked chiefly Godward. In natural relationship to the idea of the Fatherhood of God, preached by the older school, Channing emphasized the thought of the sonship of man. The dignity of human nature is the truth most prominently connected with Channing. He redeemed Unitarianism from its merely negative and intellectual status and gave it a spiritual stamp. The power of his personality, his ability as a sermonizer and a theologian, were directed toward modifying the dry determinist philosophy of the Lindsey-Priestly-Belsham group. Partly through his efforts, the religion of causation made way for the religion of conscience. Man, the image of God, was declared to be more than a creature crushed by the power of his God. He opposed the Calvinistic scheme that would undermine the religion of conscience, by a method that was midway between the rational and radical group of Unitarians, and the Orthodox wing. He was, in the first place, averse ^{to} ~~of~~ creeds and doctrinal statements and thus tore down the foundation of the Calvinistic scheme. He taught that the Calvinistic philosophy was not found in the only authority he recognized outside of man, i.e. the Bible. He accepted the New Testament as he interpreted it in toto, and he refused to permit others to bring to him the truths taught by his savior by word of mouth or by creed. The teaching of Christ can become a reality in one's life only if one learns it by original study. Christianity, conscience and reason are at one in the affirmation of the simplicity of the Christian religion. Christ's sinlessness is made all the more significant when his nature is understood to be human, as the New Testament clearly shows it to be. Channing was a reactionary so far as his conception of Jesus is concerned. He found Christ a perfect manifestation of God to man ^{and} at the same time the ideal of humanity who spoke with authority. He firmly believed in his sinlessness, in his miracles and resurrection and pre-existence.

He was, therefore, not a humanitarian like Priestly, but rather an Arian. ^{German to him} He was, if not God, yet the next of kin.

Channing was a potent factor in American Unitarianism. He was in some respects a member of the old school. The entire tenor of his writings reveals him as an insistent defender of the traditional Christian spirit. The summary of his teachings and principles themselves reveals his conservatism, but the tone of his philosophy can be understood only by a reading of some of his works. It must be remembered that in this brief sketch of Unitarian theology it is possible to present only the conclusions to which a reading of the sources lead. Since no impartial judge, no non-Christian, has characterized the writings of the men whom we are treating, we have had to depend solely on ^{our} own intuition and are not able to present opinions of authorities to back our claims. Since the scope of this work will not permit us to include any lengthy excerpts, we must briefly present our own reaction. The following quotations may give an inkling of Channing's outlook on life and religion: "I must learn Christ's truth from Christ himself, as he speaks in the records of his life, and in the men whom he trained up and supernaturally prepared to be his witnesses ^{1.} ~~ess~~ to the world." This reveals his Christian sympathy; "Believe in the mighty power of truth and love. Believe in the omnipotence of Christianity. Believe that Christ lived and died to breathe into his church and into society a diviner spirit than now exists. Believe that the celestial virtue revealed in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ is to become a reality in your own and other's souls." ^{2.}

1. Channing, 11, p.193.

2. *ibid* pp. 185, 286. of also 1, pp. 237, 238; 11, p. 291.

Channing (however) did bring God to man, and taught that He is good, kind, loving and not cruel and revengeful as the Calvinistic system implies. As minister of the Federal Street Church in Boston he led not only the activities of his own congregation but came to be leader of the Unitarian forces in America. In his time the liberal wing of the Congregational churches had become so powerful that the conservative camp tightened up and sought by a determined effort to resist the growing sentiment of liberalism. It was necessary that some one clearly set forth the problem and make plain the issue. In his Baltimore sermon in 1819 Channing cleared up the thinking on both sides, sharpened the distinctions and won thereafter increasing favor with those who had taken no definite stand. He boldly challenged his opponents in this sermon, and in his "Moral Argument against Calvinism" in 1820. In fine we may say: Channing was leader of the Unitarians in America in the formative period, from 1800 to 1835, and he was the most distinguished exponent of the Unitarianism of the day that was chiefly characterized by a semi-supernatural, imperfectly rationalistic philosophy.

The third and last stage of Unitarianism is represented by Theodore Parker. The religion of Parker and his followers may be called the religion of the spirit, a religion that combines the principles of causation and of conscience. A bridge was erected joining God and the world, God and his creatures. A close communion between God and the world was effected. Man might look up to God or might be permeated with the material values. The newer school attained the recognition of the naturalness and universality of man's relation to God.

The divine immanence was the keynote to the new outlook. The earlier Unitarians arrived at the thought of the Fatherhood of God. Their successors preached of the dignity of human nature. The modern Unitarians proclaim the immanence of God in a world, the whole of which He rules from within. Thus the rigidity of the earliest Unitarians was completely lost sight of, and in its place spirituality took the position of prominence. Parker speaks of some ministers of his day who were guided by the spirit of the older Unitarians. "I felt early that the liberal ministers did not do justice to simple religious feelings; to me their teaching seemed to relate too much to outward things, not enough to the inward pious life; their prayers felt cold; but certainly they preached the importance and the religious value of morality. Good works, the test of the true religion, noble character, the proof of salvation, if not spoken, were yet implied in their sermons, spite of their inconsistent and traditionary talk." They inferred that there must be eternal life, not from the substance of human nature, but from the accident of Christ's life and death. This superficial handling of religious problems was characteristic of the men of his day. Some even were skeptical concerning the existence of God, and rested their proof solely on the supernatural revelation recorded in the New Testament. Parker continues: "I thought they lacked the deep, internal feeling of piety, which alone could make (Unitarianism) lasting; certainly they had not that most joyous of all delights. Most powerfully preaching to the understanding, the conscience, and the will, the cry was ever duty! duty! delight, delight! ' ' Rejoice in God, in God ' ' " They were merely deniers; "After denying the Trinity and the deity of Christ, they did not dare affirm the humanity of Jesus, the naturalness of religion to man, the actual or possible

1. X11, p. 311.

2. X11, p. 312.

universality of inspiration and declare that man is not amenable to ecclesiastical authority either the oral Romanⁿ tradition or the written Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, but naturally communing with God, through many faculties, by many elements, has in himself the divine well of water, springing up full of everlasting life¹. "This old viewpoint prevailed. In spite of the teachings of Channing, Unitarianism meant for a vast number simply a rejection of certain doctrines until them thought essential to Christianity, and this rejection was sanctioned mainly on scriptural grounds. In method there was no difference between the two schools. They both set scriptural verse against Scriptural verse, neither going behind the scriptural evidences. Both believed in a supernatural revelation; the only difference was the manner in which that revelation ~~was~~^{was} to be understood. The first need was the overthrow of the doctrine of plenary inspiration; then the full implications of Channing's preachments might be developed. It was Parker who understood the needs of the time and set the process in movement. Yet a variety of influences came to his assistance.

The German language hitherto, unknown was coming to be studied, and through its literature the people were coming to learn of German transcendentalism. This doctrine of intuitive certainty, the glad news of an inward religious sense, the assurance that all religious instincts are universal, captured the minds of all the younger men of the day and proved an effective weapon in breaking away from the bandage of the letter and planting religion in human nature. The influence of transcendentalism on Emerson was so great that it led him to retire from the ministry. He refused to accept the rite of baptism as anything but an act of spiritual remembrance; and this insistence on his part resulted in a breach between himself and the congregation that could never be repaired.

1. *ibid* p.314.

His ideas have since been incorporated by Unitarianism so that he undoubtedly wielded a great influence on the moulding of Unitarian thought. His poetic and romantic transcendentalism was a powerful stimulus to independent religious ^{intuition} ~~institution~~ and emancipation from form and convention. At the same time, this same natural piety was preached to men by Wordsworth in his writings, and also by Carlyle whose works were reprinted in Boston. The books of Coleridge also, in spite of their inaccuracy, did much to liberate enslaved minds from the sharpness of theological terminology. The works of Cousin, too, helped to free the youthful mind from academic and ecclesiastical serfdom. Spiritual religion, however, was translated into terms of practicality by the representatives of the new school.

Parker is the ripest product of Unitarianism, and though, in point of time, he lived earlier than many who have come to be famous as Unitarian preachers, as a matter of fact he anticipated the latest development that Unitarianism could take. He preached a religion that could not be accepted by the men of his day, or even by many who followed him. Yet his outlook may be taken as typical of that of progressive Unitarianism of our time. His fearlessness, his fairness, his spirituality, his universality of vision, his interest in social problems, mark him as an exponent of the highest stage Unitarianism could possibly attain. Though he championed the new idealism he did not assent to all the extravagances of the transcendental movement and shrank from the pantheism of Emerson. He perceived that conservative Unitarians were retreating to outworn positions in reaction to Emerson, and he boldly distinguished between the transient and the permanent in religion. He called men to the absolute religion, Christianity, and asserted that in their general principles Unitarians and other Christians were at one. He

(He
Wells)

He was the great Biblical critic of the day and employed his scholarship to inaugurate the freer critical historical evaluation of the Bible, that the identity of Unitarianism and early Christianity be comprehended. This did not undermine his evaluation of Jesus' teachings as the essence of Christianity. He simply reacted against the reversion of the Unitarians to belief in supernatural revelation and in the miracles of the New Testament. His fearlessness was, too, evidenced in his championship of measures of political and social reform. He, therefore, incurred the disfavor of almost everyone. He condemned the three social forces which he ^{saw} ~~sees~~ in America, the great organized trading power that disregards justice and thinks only of the almighty dollar; the organized ecclesiastical power that promotes belief in superstitions and diverts attention from real spiritual values; the organized literary power, the endowed college and the press which have no original ideas but simply diffuse the opinions of other powers; and the organized political power dominated by the trading power ^{1.} ~~devoid of any freedom~~ ^{2.} of thought. In his last letter to his congregation Theodore Parker frankly tells of the opposition that he encountered as a result of his teachings. The periodicals were shut against him, attempts were made to alienate his congregation from him, he was ostracised, and he could not find any American publishing house to print his works. His preaching is replete with pleas for the betterment of some class of society. He denounced the Mexican war of his day. Heroically he fought slavery. He championed the rights of labor. He urged the emancipation of woman. Channing it is true did denounce social ills yet his stand on practical problems cannot compare with that taken by Parker.

1. vide x11 pp 302-303

2. vide X11

It was Parker who infused an active passion for all philanthropic reform, as well as an ardour of mystical communion with God, into the Unitarian movement.

The other preachers and teachers could add little to the Unitarianism of Parker. James Freeman Clarke united the insistence of inner personal grounds for faith with more historic feeling for the Christian past. Octavius Frothingham, who later became a freethinker, reveals the radical features of western Unitarianism. The East remained dogmatic, and laid more stress on the person of Jesus than did the West. Frothingham, for example, gave up the Lord's Supper, thinking that it ministered to self-satisfaction. Minot Savage, a student of science who found his guides in Darwin and Spencer, could not compare with Parker in influence. He marked a period of decline in Unitarianism in America. Jenkins Lloyd Jones, who later became an independent and withdrew from all denominational affiliations, was like Frothingham, a religious radical. Other noted Unitarian ministers were John White Chadwick, whose writings reveal a scholarly attitude, and Moncure Conway, whose anti-slavery views caused his dismissal at Washington, D.C. and who subsequently came to Cincinnati. In the life time of these men the period of controversy came to an end and made way for the era of flourishing prosperity. Now the movement includes more than the rationalistic outlook that solely characterized it just before and during the time of Parker. The modern period is one of rationalism, recognition of universal religion, and a large acceptance of the results of science.

The Unitarians have an efficient scheme of organization. The systematic and thorough-going methods employed in furthering their views might with profit be studied by the reform Jews of this country. The American Unitarian Association^{was} formed in 1825 " to dif-

fuse the knowledge and promote the interests of pure Christianity". It publishes books, distributes tracts, establishes churches, sustains missionaries. In 1865 the National Conference was organized embracing the churches of the country, while the Association is an organization but of individuals. The preamble to the constitution as amended in 1894 reads: " These churches accept the religion of Jesus, holding, in accordance with his teaching that practical religion is summed up in love to God and love to man. The conference recognizes the fact that its constituency is congregational in tradition and polity. Therefore, it declares that nothing in this constitution is to be construed as an authoritative test; and we cordially invite to our working fellowship any who, while differing from us in belief, are in general sympathy with our spirit and our practical aims". Under its direction local conferences in all parts of the country have been organized. In 1900 " The International Council of Unitarians and other Liberal Religious Thinkers" was formed to open up communication with religious liberals all over the world. It has met several times and has done much to bring into closer union, for exchange of ideas, mutual service, and the promotion of their common aims, the scattered liberal congregations of this world. Unitarian periodicals are found in every section of the country, and they make active propaganda for the cause. Theological seminaries are maintained at Cambridge, Meadville Pennsylvania and Berkeley California, the spirit of which is indicated by the free extension of the privileges of their libraries for the preparation of this thesis.

Both the women and the young people are organized into national bodies. The circulating library of the Alliance of Unitarian and other Christian Women, placed at our disposal books that are necessary for an understanding of Unitarianism. The Unitarian "Post Office Mission" is active in correspondence work with the people of the country. A national Sunday School organization and social service commission care for the activities that fall within their respective spheres. At present there are according to the "Unitarian Year Book" (1919-1920) about five hundred Unitarian churches in this country, four hundred in Great Britain and Ireland, and a hundred and twenty five in Transylvania; in all about one thousand.

CHAPTER ONE : JUDAISM AND UNITARIANISM HAVE
POINTS OF CONTACT.

Judaism has many points of agreement with the daughter religion, Christianity. In this comparison of Judaism with Unitarianism it is necessary that a brief résumé of the points of contact of Judaism with all Christianity be presented, that the likenessess of Judaism with all Christian sects, Unitarianism as well as others, be listed. Though the Gospels divide the Jew from the Christian, the Old Testament, so called, unites them. The fundamental idea, from which all notions of God and of religion are derived, and which we have in common with all other believers in God is that He is the First Cause, the Creator of the universe. Christianity, the offshoot of Judaism, in particular, has many similarities with Judaism for, though it accepted many pagan rites and beliefs, in order the more easily to fulfill its missionary purpose and convert the barbarian, it has none the less retained much of the religion whence it sprang. Both proclaim the doctrine of the "One God, Father and King, spirit and reason, goodness and truth, condition and source of knowledge and righteousness, the one God who 'hears' and 'cares' and 'saves', with whom man, the servant and the child, the creature and the kinsman, can veritably commune. And also the implications include the doctrine of the Future Life, of the Brotherhood of Man, of the service of God through the service of man, of social justice, social compassion and social loving kindness".¹

1. Mont. in "Papers for Jewish People", no. XII, London, 1916.

With Unitarianism as distinct from Orthodox Christianity Reform Judaism has much in common. Both have caught the spirit of modernism. Unitarianism is more than a denial of Trinity, it includes as well a habit of mind. It is a way of thinking rather than a system of thought. It has adjusted religion to the change that has come over the world as a result of nineteenth century developments. "The universal acceptance of the theory of descent with modification since 'The Origin of Species' was published in 1859, the recent triumphs of chemistry and physics....., the rapid progress of democracy since the American Revolution, and the carrying into effect not generally, yet frequently, of the doctrine of human brotherhood, have modified profoundly the thinking world's religious conceptions."¹ As a result of these sweeping changes in the points of view of men, the advanced thinkers who applied this new attitude to religion invested it with attributes that, at least in the Christian church, it had never possessed. The new characteristics may be summed up under three heads; rational belief, social consciousness, and universal outlook. Implicit within Judaism itself was this temper of mind; Reform was but the process of bringing to clear expression forces that lay latent within the Jewish faith. Unitarianism, however, had to cross the spirit of the church, was forced to sever completely the ties that bound it to the parent faith in its espousal of these tendencies.

1. Charles Elliot; A. U. A. tract no. 273, p. 3.

Unitarianism rightly claims to be a rational religion. Casting to the winds all formal authority, Unitarians find their sanction for belief and conduct in the universal reason. Refusing to accept belief resting on the opinions of others, depending on social heritage, springing from tradition, the Unitarian asserts the right of private judgment. It is denied that man is an unworthy factor in the world. Unitarians object to the contemptuous manner in which human reason is spoken of by the orthodox. Reason and conscience are enthroned. The reason, however, of one individual is not taken as absolute, but cumulative reason and the consensus of the competent are proclaimed authoritative. Nor does Unitarianism believe itself able to explain profound problems. Reason does not create religion, but it must be used to guide religious sentiment. The movement is all too frequently misrepresented by its opponents who unjustly charge it with making of the mind a fetish. Though it is true that Unitarians assert that no one is to believe what is contrary to reason, still they grant adequate room for that faith which would leave man to rest certain difficulties with the Power greater than he. There is no inconsistency, then in this position. The Unitarian reacts with horror at any intimation of the will to believe, and maintains that religious truth is not to conflict with any other form of truth, and that all belief is to come to man with an imperative command resulting from the nature of the belief itself; and at the same time trusts implicitly in his God.

The discovery of truth therefore is a divine process. History is the annals of providence. The universal reason is seen in the unfolding of the world order. God's creation is perpetually inspired, changes continually under his guidance. All the world feels that breath of the divine influence, and all races at all times are inspired in their working out of the higher destiny. The revelation of God's

will takes place in an orderly manner, in a way not apart from the ordinary method of growth or of communication of truth. Under God's influence directly the world is ruled, and indirectly through the work of certain men and certain races appointed by Him. Some men, especially gifted, prophets, receive directly the spirit of genius, and feel the touch of an immediate communication. Some races, notably the Jewish, are entrusted with more important duties in the spreading of God's will.

In this process of evolution there are no occult revelations. The only authority is based on scientific inquiry. This method of obtaining truth must be applied to matters religious as well as secular. The conclusions of this system of inquiry cannot work harm on true religion, for there is no line of cleavage between science and religion. True religion is scientific, and all science, since it is truth, is stamped by the religious label. Man's duty is to seek the truth, it is his obligation to engage in free investigation, it is his responsibility to rid his mind of superstitions. Science is seen not to uproot the fundamentals of religion, but rather to confirm them, for it reveals a God of immeasurably greater proportions than was ever conceived of by those who lived before the great era of modern times. The power and domain of God ^{are} ~~is~~ enlarged. His greatness is seen in the order that prevades the whole of creation and in an orderly progress that goes on through all eternity. Once the ^{all} ~~untimate~~ of the theological leaders and the pronouncementoes of a sacred book are called to question, man is enabled at the same time to fix both eyes on religious and secular truths, and not to strain his vision by dividing his attention between two extremes, vastly separated from one another. Unitarianism is ready to accept all truth whenever and wherever revealed. Its position is not definitely marked off; the body of its tenets is not

static.

Unitarians are progressives. Not only do they welcome discovery, but they include in their philosophy a method of truthfinding. They are forward looking, glimpsing the era when perfect truth will be reached. For the consummation of the possibilities within man, for the attainment of ideal views, all are in duty bound to labor. All are to envisage that time, and to acknowledge the principle of growth that is at work in the world. All Unitarians are therefore evolutionists, believing that the world is moving constantly and gradually to better stages, and that the animal world is constantly being provided, under divine wisdom, with adaptations ^{that} ~~and~~ will lead to improvement and larger happiness. The striving on the part of man upward is recognized and blessed by the Unitarians.

Because of this perpetual rise to ever loftier heights, Unitarians do not seek to embody their beliefs in any concrete, hard and fast manner, nor to state them in any final form. They have no body of doctrines, nor creed which they force upon their members. Though there is a general agreement in the essentials, it is but a unity in diversity. No one can make an authoritative and final statement of Unitarian tenets. What formulations of principles have been made are not set forth as conditions to fellowship, for allegiance to creed is not demanded. The Unitarian churches are congregational in policy; but instead of being chartered under a creed, they are based on covenants, simply declarations of spiritual purposes. This method of organization is preferred bause of the obvious pitfalls in the way of the church founded on a creed. Unitarians in all their written statements clearly call attention to the great harm wrought by creeds on the church and on man. They tended to tear the church, to divide religionists into sects marked off from one another by finespun distinctions, to foster antagonism between donominations and to foment persecutions and intolererance.

Petrified creedal systems hinder progress, check thought, promote sluggishness and insincerity. The only faith that God demands is that springing from the heart, not that induced by mechanical subscription to a form of words. Hypocrisy and empty quibbling result from codification of belief. Attention is diverted from character, which is tested solely by external assent to dogmas. True religion must enrich life and promote righteousness and justice. The imposition of creeds on man does not lead to such service and to worship. Service to God lies not in acceptance of doctrines, nor the preformance of proscribed ceremonies. Theological beliefs and ritual demands are too remote from the motives and ideals of daily life to wield any real influence on man. Stress should be laid on aspirations, principles, and attitudes, that can be common to all peoples. There can and ought never be uniformity of religious faith; but there can be a unified goal and a universal endeavour which every religious sect should picture for, and impress upon, its members.

No formal authority is needed for the broad principles of Unitarianism. The autocracy of the Catholic Church and of the Protestant Bible was overthrown at the period of the Reformation. The Bible is regarded not as an infallible authority because of its supernatural revelation. It is not an idol whose every sentence and every feature are to be worshipped. It was not literally inspired, but was sealed with the divine impress because it is a storehouse of religious help. Love and reverence must be given it because it contains the utterances of inspired men. It is sacred because of its contents, because it is the highest revelation of the past to the present, not because it is an infallible oracle of God that must be accepted with unquestioning and unqualified submission. Unitarians insist that Higher Criticism, the application of scientific methods of investigation must be applied to the Bible as well as to other literary and historical compositions.

They are in sympathy with the effort to place the Bible before the world in the form in which it was meant to be placed. Reason and conscience can be the sole arbiters in this work. Myth, fable, and imaginative narration must be distinguished from objective history. Discrimination must be made between the inferior and superior elements, the transitory and the permanent, the universal and that which is due to the age and personality of the writer. The broad and hasty generalizations built up on small foundations are derided. As a result of this critical method, the entire Augustinian theology is declared faulty and is rejected, based as it is on an all too literal interpretation of the story of Adam in the early chapters of Genesis.

Unitarianism protests against and denies the Calvinistic theology. It negates those principles now taken as characteristic of Christianity, which constitute the chief difference between Judaism and Christianity. Calvinism rests on the assumption that man is victim of powers foreign to his own nature, and that he is driven to invent means of escape therefrom. The apparent dualism in man's nature gave rise to the belief in a fall from a pristine state of perfection. This fall represented a triumph of the spiritual element over the material as personified in the person of the devil. Accepting all the implications of the Biblical account of the temptation, orthodox Christianity holds that this guilt has been conveyed to all the descendants of Adam, and that all are inherently and fundamentally sinful. The wrath of God was provoked at the serious infraction of his absolute and express command, and he therefore consigned man to everlasting damnation and eternal punishment. Because of this original sin of Adam and the subsequent guilt imputed to all men, we deserve to incur all the miseries that can be heaped upon us. Yet a release has been provided for us. Since we are utterly unable to convert ourselves through any efforts

of our own, we must receive pardon through the Divine favor. Only because of the irresistible grace of God can man expect to attain even partially to virtue. Certain men are thus saved by God, are chosen capriciously to receive the boon of salvation. Vicariously, by offering himself as a substitute for men, ^{and} by undergoing instead of the entire human race the punishment of God, suffering and death, Christ made atonement for the sin of the world. This Divine being mitigated the anger of a jealous God, who has, therefore, given a conditional pardon and promise of salvation, and that condition is belief in the Christian theology.

Unitarianism takes the story of Adam according to its true meaning, as a diadactic myth urging upon man the need of obedience to God, and accounting for the necessity of toiling for one's livelihood. It repudiates the notion that man is the seat of two rival powers, and asserts in harmony with the beliefs of modern science that he is a unity, harmonious though complex. Man is what he is by virtue of the development of the powers within him. His mind upon birth is a tabula rasa upon which certain lines of ancestral temperament and propensities may be noted, yet which is empty to receive whatever impress the individual himself chooses to make upon it. He is given freedom of will, even though his destiny is controlled by a God who is ^{omniscient} ~~omniscient~~. He, therefore, is morally responsible for his own innocence ~~of~~ guilt, and is accountable for whatever smudges may darken his character. Evil is not a material reality, but is a negation, is the opposite of good, and is distinguished by man from good by the enlightened conscience, which alone decrees the excellence or the blamefullness of lines of conduct. Man is thus restored to the high position given him in the Bible, and again is given his place at the summit of creation by the assertion of his inherent potentialities for goodness, and natural capacities for righteousness.

Unitarians reject the belief that until converted man is under the wrath of God. "The notion that God is finite in His wisdom, justice, love and holiness, only infinite in power to damn, that He is^a jealous, angry, and revengful God, with eternal hell behind Him, wherein He will torture forever the vast majority of His children, and that man is wicked by nature, subject to the wrath of God, and utterly incapable by his own efforts of escaping from it"¹ is foreign to Unitarianism. Unitarianism in contrast to Orthodox Christianity makes God's goodness supreme, believing that he is infinitely good, just, merciful, and fatherly and does not subordinate his goodness to his power. It vigorously denies that God is unlovable, unjust, cruel, as Calvinism implies, and affirms that what punishment is meted out is not vindictive but rather reformatory.

Unitarians deny that a good God would consign his children to eternal damnation, and they emphasize the doctrine of immortality in its stead. Though among Unitarians there is a great diversity of opinion on the nature of the future life, they agree that there is no hell. They are not so certain about the conditions of the next world as the Calvinists, but they still show the influence of their Christian parenthood in that they all are more worried about the issue than are Jewish writers. They all devote much space to the consideration of the subject and some ask questions about the details of the next existence, which of course they are unable to answer. They speculate about the form that individuals will take on at that time; they debate as to whether or not there will be remission of penalties for sin im-

1. Parker, vol. XI, p. 101.

posed on man in this world; they deliberate on many problems that we are content to leave unsettled. They raise many questions that we would not think even of formulating. There is no dogmatic difference between the Jewish and the Unitarian view of the Hereafter, but the orientation is completely different, the one undeniably Jewish and the other unmistakeably Christian.

Salvation, according to the Unitarian view, does not come to man, magically, automatically by an arbitrary act on the part of God. It is attained by character, and atonement is secured not by propitiation, but by appropriation of the divine truth. Regeneration is rebirth, the act of coming into the world anew, as ^a pure being, purged of sin by repentance and sincere resolutions of reform. Between destiny and preparation, atonement and forgiveness, there is a very close conjunction. Reform is effected by the return to the human life, by the release of the proclivities for goodness that had temporarily been thwarted. The sense of estrangement is to be banished by the re-formation of one's life, and salvation is brought about by any force that heals and brings man closer to his God. Thus the way to salvation is open to all, and is not limited to the few who happen to be subjects of the Divine grace. And this atonement is rendered further-reaching than the pardon of the Calvinistic system in that the punishment to man for his trespasses is not permanent but temporary, lasting only so long as he is not repentant.

The doctrine of vicarious atonement, the belief that by one specific act of divine compassion, in a manner attested to by miracles, this fallen world was restored to its original harmony with its creator, is scouted by the Unitarians. In the first place the Unitarian conception of the world process as one of the orderly development precludes the possibility of a God punishing and forgiving outside of the do-

main of natural law, moved simply by his own inclinations, unfounded on any rational purpose. Though some few Unitarians of today, and many of the past believe in miracles,¹ the preponderating opinion is that God rules the world by immutable laws. Further, the denial of miracles and the rejection of Calvinism are inseparable, for without the miracle, for instance, of the virgin birth "there would be no reconciliation between God and man, such as is needed to save man from perpetual opposition with the will of God."² The refusal to grant the possibility of miracles removes from the Calvinistic system the very foundations upon which it rests, by repudiating the notion that at any specific time the relation of God to his world was changed, and by proving some of the features of the system as mythical and fanciful.

The fundamental presupposition in the Calvinistic conception is that acceptance of the mysterious influence of the semi-divine character of Jesus, his sacrifices rather than the victories of each man in his daily conflicts, secure for man absolution from sin and perfection of life. The whole idea rests on the conception of Christ as a God, upon the intervention of a divine being before God. In other words the system rests on the belief in the Trinity. This doctrine, that there are three infinite and equal persons possessing supreme divinity, called the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that each of these three has his own particular consciousness, will and perceptions,

1. e.g. Channing, who because of his belief in the New Testament as an infallible and authoritative work, accepts such stories as that of the resurrection of Christ etc.

2. Emerson, p.48.

is confusing, injurious to the doctrine of unity, and is subversive of the principle of the need of supreme reference to a power greater than man. The cardinal tenet of Unitarianism and the original single justification for its existence was its protest against this doctrine.

Judaism is a rational religion. In fact it has been criticized on the ground that it assigns to reason too prominent a place. True, in some portions of our literature we are cautioned against applying investigation to some esoteric principles.¹ In general, the exercise of capacities is encouraged. The Orthodox Jew, however, looks with suspicion upon the use of rational faculties for fear that some of the original tenets of his faith be undermined. Friedlander in his work disparages reason, and lays constant emphasis on the limitations of the mind. The correctness of our reasoning is subject to doubt. We cannot understand the operation of miracles because we are unable to comprehend the workings of God. For the same reason we cannot expect to understand the mystery of revelation, nor the supernatural impulse at work in inspiration. Resurrection, and the details of the doctrine of the Messianic age, retribution, and other dogmas must remain forever veiled from our clear apprehension. Should we find apparent contradictions in the Bible, we have either misinterpreted or our reason has erred. The Bible never changes, but science does; hence God's law as revealed to Moses commands absolute and unquestioning obedience.² This blind faith and this readiness to assign difficult problems to the "hidden things"

1. Mid. Ber 1,13 advises to refrain from speculation about problems dealing with conditions before creation.
2. I.c. pp. 169-174. et al. Compare this with Kohler's willingness to accept the results of all scientific research, no matter what conclusions may follow. cf. p.4.

are not characteristic of Reform Judaism. Carrying forward the spirit of the rationalist Maimonides, ~~and taking over the scientific spirit of the rationalist Maimonides~~, and taking over the scientific spirit of modern times, we assert that no man is permitted to surrender his private judgment, nor is he to suppress his own opinions¹. We say "Happy is he ^{who} comes to heaven with his learning²," and stress learning of an independent nature. While insisting on the free use of reason, we do not deify the powers of the brain. We admit feeling and emotion and spiritual experience in the religious life. The limitations of the mind in the discovery of absolute truth are readily acknowledged. The criticism levied by Crecas on Maimonides' system, that it is based³ entirely on speculative knowledge, rather than upon love as well, defends us from the charge that Judaism is a minimum of religion and a negation of spiritual aspirations.

Truth was revealed therefore by the unfolding of the universal reason and revelation includes "all human thought and belief."⁴ The communication of God's will has been made to every human being, and each individual who develops his potentialities contributes to the onward march of civilization. The race of man "has progressed and is progressing from a poorer righteousness to a richer righteousness and from lower, cruder, more erroneous ideas about God to higher, purer, and truer ideas about him."⁵ "Man the child of God will eventually grow to maturity, and partake of the nature of the Parent. We reject the idea of a supernatural revelation of God, and insist that, though sudden flashes of inspiration come over certain men and certain races,

1. cf. Schechter: "Studies", First Series, p 178.
2. Pes. 50 a
3. Kohler, p. 25
4. ibid. p. 24.
5. Mont.: "Out", p 121.

truth is attained gradually through the slow comprehension by man of his duties to the furtherance of social development.

The divine spirit is thus at work in every process leading to the betterment of mankind, and aids man in his effort to see the world clearly, as a whole. The complete unification of all activities under one head is to be effected as part of the divine world economy. All phases of existence are to lead to the same end. Man is to use all his capacities in his service to God. Art, religion, science are to reveal the same process in the world. A close alliance of science and every branch of knowledge with religion is an inevitable outcome of this conception of the world process. Judaism recognizes all truth as divine truth. The Talmud formulates two benedictions to be recited when meeting men renowned for their wisdom. If the sage be an Israelite the form is, "Blessed be He who imparted of his Wisdom to them that fear him." If he be a Gentile, and distinguished for secular knowledge, then the benediction runs, "Blessed be He who has imparted of his wisdom to flesh and blood." Reform Judaism has, therefore, justification for accepting the results of modern research.

The idea of the need by man to contribute to the growth of the social organism nullifies any notion of the world as a sealed book, of a universe already completed. Judaism, since it covers all of life and sanctions any means of discovering truth, must be a progressive religion. The Jewish law or faith is capable of continuous improvement. Even Friedlander, who goes so far as to assert that the dietary laws should be the same today as they were at the time of Moses, admits that the ethical principles are capable of development, and that "the moral standard rises with the progress of civilization."

1. Vide 'Mont.: "The Meaning of Progressive Revelation", in "Papers for Jewish People", No. VIII. of Singer: P.B. p 291. Ber 58 a.

2. op. cit. p. 237.

Contrary to the Orthodox view, Reform maintains that the religion of the Torah marked the conclusion of a long process of development. Even after its codification, progress in religion continued to mark the history of the people of Israel. Scholars have shown that the evolution of the Jewish God conception covered a long period of years. Originally idolaters and polytheists, our ancestors, on the return from Egypt professed a national God in a henotheistic religion. This national God finally prevailed in the struggle against the other gods at the time of the destruction of the homeland, Palestine, when God was recognized as the Lord of all peoples since, were he God only of Israel, the downfall of his people would have connoted a betrayal of his trust. After the exile this new universal element, the idea of justice and love, ^{believed in a} this God of all the world, was blended with the ancient traditional national one, the conception of God of Israel who chose the children of Jacob as the people in whom his law was to find lodgment, together to produce Judaism. This sketch of this one segment of our past is sufficient to indicate the progressive nature of our history. All periods are characterized by this same spirit. Let us take for example the Talmudic era, taken as typical of the arbitrariness and fixity of Jewish belief. One Rabbinical saying that every interpretation of the Law advanced by a man of exemplary conscientiousness has as its source the revelation at Mt. Sinai ¹ would seem to ^{prove} defend this attitude of receptivity to new truth as representative of traditional Judaism. Jehudah the Saint once resolved on an innovation involving the relaxation of a scriptural law. He answered the reproach of the ^{conservatives} conversation by

1. Tal. Jer. Hag. I 76.

by citing the example of Hezekiah who broke to pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made because it had become an object of idolatry.¹ Judaism is thus prevented from stagnation by its ready adaptability to changed conditions. It does not claim to possess final and absolute truth, but to include a core of high principles in the spirit of which it asks man and mankind to act. In these essentials Judaism is united. Despite ~~the~~ extreme individualism, ~~of~~ the Rabbis "are more distinguished by the consensus of opinion² than by dissensions." "The historical continuity of the universal spirit and its oneness are admirably maintained."³

"Apart from a few leading ideas the Jewish creed has always been in a fluid condition, and Judaism leaves us free to construct our own theology so long as we do not trench upon certain easily recognized principles which, because they are wrought into the very fabric of the religion, could not be discarded without destroying the religion itself."⁴ Judaism has not sought to incorporate its ideas in creeds, partly because it is more than a theology; it is a life, including more than intellectual elements. Its outlook cannot be set forth in words. Just as the man in perfect health lives and acts without awareness of his functions, so Israel has a Weltanschauung⁵ of which it is not conscious. "With God as a reality, revelation as a fact, the Torah as a rule of life, and the Hope of redemption as a most vivid expectation, they feel no need for formulating their dogmas into a creed, which... is repeated not because we believe, but that we may believe." Liberal Judaism today, like traditional Judaism, has no dogmatic fixity.

1. Chulin 6 b.
2. Schechter, preface p xi.
3. Lazarus, I, p. 89
4. e. g. dogmas such as existence of God, providence, appointment of Israel. Joseph, pp. 41, 42.
5. Schechter pp. 12, 13.

"Within a certain measure of definiteness and agreement there must¹ be room for diversity and for development. "The view of Judaism in this regard has been almost identical throughout the ages. The Bible never commands us to believe nor does it make demands of a declaration or recital of a creed. "No tribunal is appointed for² inquiring whether the belief of a man is right or wrong; no punishment is inflicted or threatened for want of belief." And the Rabbis, too, refrained from enjoining dogmas on the people. They converted neither folklore nor speculation into rigid dogmas, Their very absence of consistency bears proof to the absence of a recognized body of doctrine. What enunciations they did make of theology came forth spasmodically prompted by impulses, and were made in prayer, or in sermons or exhortations. The tenor of such formulations naturally vary according to the particular impulse that was responsible for the expression of faith. Short summaries of faith may be found in the Talmud,³ and schemes of more or less elaborate schemes of necessary Jewish belief were put forth by great Jewish teachers. "But all such schemes, differing as they did from each other, were put forth on the individual responsibility⁴ of their respective authors, never in the name of the Jewish Church." And these later formulations came into being only when contact with non-believers rendered at least a faint line of demarkation necessary.

1. Mont.: "Out" p. 20x ff.
2. Friedlander, p. 19.
3. cf. Kohler, p. 20x ff.
4. Joseph, p. 41

Judaism has never cramped its devotees with strait-laced, ready made systems of thought, nor burdened them with intellectual impositions. For Judaism has "never assigned to creed the important position that it holds in the Christian Church."¹ So it is that Dr. Kohler tells us that after he accepted the suggestion to write his "Jewish Theology" he had not a single work before him that might serve as a pattern or as a guide.² Judaism has spared its members the embarrassment of being thrown to the horn of dilemma where one might accede to a creed that would spell moral suicide or sever relations with the group and attain intellectual freedom. Subscription to creed is not a condition to fellowship in our community. Ties of blood stronger than those of belief bind us to our fellows. By birth we automatically become Jews, and the only dogma we need profess is that God is, that he makes known his demands in no uncertain tones and that we owe to Him devoted service and faithful obedience.

The Jew need hearken to the dictation of no ecclesiastical body that might make formulation of belief, nor of any priest vested with the divine spirit, a representative of God's will. We never had an authoritative body to pass ^{and} enforce belief, nor are our leaders men with sacramental offices and powers. Religious truth carries in itself the appeal for belief. In contradistinction to the Orthodox view that the ten commands for example have intrinsic worth on account of the peculiar manner of revelation and that a divine communication might be attested for its correctness only

¹ Kohler, preface p. vii

² ibid. p. viii

by the trustworthiness of the privileged revealer,¹ we hold that the excellence of the Bible alone is proof of its inspiration. "The gauge of inspiration can only be the actual contents of the words together with their effects for goodness, and the contents of the words including their originality, power, beauty."² "The claim of the Scriptures rest essentially upon the truth of their teachings."³ "All these things which have heretofore been taken as facts because related in the sacred books or other traditional sources are viewed today with critical eyes and are now regarded as more or less coloured by human judgment. In other words we have learned to distinguish between subjective and objective truth."⁴ We therefore distinguish between the different strata^{ol} of the Bible, and recognize them as products of different ages, rejecting the older idea of a single, perfectly revealed law. At the same time we do not discredit nor minimize the importance of the spiritual truths contained in this repository of religious truth. For us, to point out the mistakes of the Biblical writers would be as absurd as it would be for the child mounted on an adult's shoulders to call attention to the fact that he is taller than the man holding him.⁵ Friedlander, though he grants the possibility of mistakes on the part of the copyists, insists that the contents are entirely true and objectively historical.⁶

1. cf. Friedlander, p. 47, p 247.
2. Mont.: "Out" p. 175.
3. Joseph, p. 25.
4. Kohler, pp. 3, 4.
5. Mont.: "Out" p. 175.
6. cf. p. 55 ff.

Judaism need only reaffirm the principles that it has carried forward ^{during} the ages, in order to declare its unalterable opposition to the Calvinistic scheme. Nothing in our philosophy can be construed to lead to the notion that the materialistic phase of existence is regarded as evil simply because it springs from man's own self. Natural impulses only when misdirected call for purging and cleansing. The noblest elements in life owe claim to existence to the natural instincts of man. "If we turn to the consideration of human nature, we find that Judaism nowhere considers it unholy, or unclean or godless. The play of instincts is the original source of activities." This doctrine of the goodness of human nature leads to the demand that, though impulses be curbed, they be not denied nor suppressed. Created in the image of God, man partakes of the purity of the essence of his Maker. The sensuous, therefore, Judaism sanctified. On the other hand, "Christianity was an abolition of the sensuous. In the result, Christianity succeeded only in abolishing it from religion, not from life. No priestly pitchfork has ever expelled human nature." The entire human personality is divine. The soul is not the exclusive residence of God in man. The entire being of the individual came forth pure from God. Man has the freedom of will to make of this body a noble self or a degraded one. Passions, no matter how deep and powerful, may be overcome by the power of the individual. Among the Rabbis was a semblance of a doctrine of imputed sins, but this they palliated in many places. For example, the children

1 Lazarus, II, 105, 106.

2 Zangwill; "Position of Judaism", N.A.R., vol. p. 434.

are made to suffer for the sins of their father only when they perpetuate the wicked deeds of the parents.¹ The doctrine of the zechuth aboth, of imputed righteousness, may also be found in our literature. These two conceptions, "have, however, never attained such significance either in Jewish theology, or in Jewish conscience as it is generally assumed. By a happy inconsistency, so characteristic of Rabbinic theology, the importance of these doctrines is reduced to very small proportions,"² and the prophetic view of individual responsibility is generally accepted.³ The Talmud in numerous places asserts the doctrines of freedom of will and of individual responsibility.⁴ Our view is that except for ancestral temperament and environmental influences there are no determining forces at work in influencing man's decisions and actions. By his own action man chooses to direct his energies toward the performance of good or of evil. Sin does not constitute an objective reality, a force that is ever-ready to grip man in its clutches. It is a straying from the path of goodness, a foolish aberration from the right way, a defiance of the will of God; and its source is not without but within the human heart. It never is personified as a power from whose clutch man cannot extricate himself by his own efforts.⁵ It always is a test of loyalty to

1. San. 27 b. cf. Schechter, pp. 185, 186.
2. ibid. p. 170
3. Ezekiel 18, 20 vs Ex. 20, 5.
4. Megilla 25 a; Shab. 104; et al.
5. San. 38 a; Mid. Ber 1, 19; et al.
6. Sotah 3 a.

God, and a discipline that man might strengthen his resistance to evil, and it is always within man's power to prevail over it. Judaism never believed in an evil one who might obtain complete mastery over man's soul and rob him of his freedom. True, the Talmudists did not deny the existence of demons, yet they constantly sought to minimize their importance. Satan never became a force hindering man from pursuit of the good. He never became God's rival, for God is sovereign both over the powers of good and the forces of evil. He made both light and darkness, and made it possible for man to sin and to acquit himself well. Judaism never had to invent a Christ who might overcome the influence of God on man. Sin is of man's own making; and therefore, the doctrine concerning it does not call for an elaborate system with provisions for removing it from ^{his} man's makeup, and for permitting God to release man from its thralldom. Judaism is not centered about a method of redemption. It does provide an antidote for sin, but that is the practice of the high principles enunciated in the Torah. Man is forever to whip up the yetzer hatov, the inclination to do well, against the inclination to sin. The entire conception of the nature of man breeds optimism and cheer, rather than resignation or asceticism. So great is the joyful enthusiasm of the Jew for the things of the world that he believes that "for everything in heaven, there is an earthly duplicate which is more beloved to God."

- 1 Gen. 4, 7.
- 2 Isa. 45, 7.
- 3 vide Kid. 30 b/
- 4 Ber. 5 a.
- 5 Ex. Rab. 33, 4

The God of Judaism is not a God of wrath who, because of a single transgression of an individual, would condemn his people to everlasting punishment. It is true that the Bible frequently refers to His wrath and anger. Yet these terms refer to his absolute insistence on righteousness, and his jealous determination to lay stress upon his principles of truth and holiness. The true wrath of God is that torment and suffering that are experienced in the soul of man as a result of ungodly conduct. The Bible further lays repeated emphasis on the conception of justice, which, according to Christian theologians negates the idea of his mercy. Justice however is as necessary for the world's government as is mercy, and all our theologies devote just as much space to the exposition of God's attributes of mercy, long suffering, condescension, love and compassion, as they do to the necessity for equalization of opportunity and fairness in society. The principle of love is delivered from reduction to a pale, colorless, impractical concept, by its association with justice, its frame is given substantial support by the attribute of righteousness. We are perfectly justified in our claim that the God of Judaism as opposed to the God of the Calvinistic system is one of goodness who manifests and cherishes genuine solicitude for the welfare of his children. Not even an individual sinner, much less the majority of mankind, is to be turned over to eternal punishment at the hands of God. The Jewish doctrine of retribution went through many stages but finally shaking off all unethical excrescences, it came to assume a strictly spiritual and rational nature.

1. vide Kohler, p. 248 seq.

We now know that in this world man's acts are rewarded or punished; we realize that the sphere in which retribution may take place is within the subjective self of the individual. No material retribution holds forth promises or threats for men of spiritual bent of mind. The spiritual reward that is the immediate accompaniment of virtue and the mental punishment that at once pursues vice alone concerns us, as well as the Unitarians. The virtuous life is itself its own reward. We need look to no hereafter for an equalization of the joys of life. In fact Judaism only at a very late date when persecutions forced the question; will there be any respite from persecution? developed any doctrine of the future life. The early disregard of the future life has characterized the Jew to this day. The prophetic insistence upon justice and righteousness here in the social world has always taken precedence over the Pharisaic doctrine of the after-life. The immortality of the soul Reform Judaism asserts, repudiating the orthodox national doctrine of the resurrection; yet the details of the life in the hereafter are left to others to supply.

Reward and vindication at the hands of God for virtuous conduct Judaism holds forth to man, not salvation from a state of inherent sinfulness by subscription to a creedal system. Judaism demands conduct not confession, hallowed life and not hollow creed. It has more to say about human behavior. The words of our lips create no angels, but man's virtuous acts do. "Each deed well done summons from on high an angel that watches over the doer."¹ Only by love to God and right action to man can we expect to obtain salvation. God judges all men by

1. Ex. Rab. 32, 6.

their acts alone. Divine grace is a spur to noble achievement rather than the accompaniment of acceptance of metaphysical dogmas. The requirements of man are summarized in the current expression attributed to Simon the Just; "Upon three things Law, Divine Service and Charity rests the ideal order of the world."¹ Stress is laid on conduct, for we understand that religious belief is no bar to universal enlightenment. Conversion to Judaism itself does not spell the attainment of salvation; the life of the convert is the deciding factor. None of the five principles adopted by the Central Conference of America Rabbis in 1896 for confession for the prospective proselyte² may be taken to imply that the newcomer will secure absolution from sin and assurance of eternal salvation by his acceptance of the new faith. Judaism knows of no formal system for securing salvation. No belief in the atonement of another for one's sins can be ferreted out of any portion of our literature.³ Regeneration, a restoration of the body to its former unity with God, a return to the path whence man has strayed, and the enthronement of the law of God that had been violated in one's heart constitutes the method of securing forgiveness. This return by means of sincere repentance and resolutions of future virtuous conduct is open to all.

Any such scheme as the Calvinistic one with a miracle at its center must be rejected by us. Though the orthodox Jew dismisses the subject of miracle with his reiteration of his oft repeated position that

1. Aboth 1, 2.

2. viz., 1) God the only one, 2) Man His image, 3) Immortality of the soul, 4) Retribution, Israel's mission.

3. Neumark, however, calls attention to a belief in vicarious atonement held by some Jews of the past, e.g. Crescas who holds Jacob to be the atoning personality. This ~~statement~~ must be made with regard to the Jewish conception: remission only for past sins is granted, while obliteration of sins to be committed in the future is promised in the Christian scheme. cf. class room notes 1920.

Some ideas about vicarious atonement are found also in Talmudic Literature - with the above restriction

the ways of God are past finding out, our view is that the world order is a fixed arrangement, and that all nature "declares the glory of God" by its regular course.² The Rabbis perceive the difficulty involved in the belief of miracles which signify the upsetting of the rules of nature, and, therefore claim that God provided for the various miracles of history at the time of creation.³ Throughout Jewish writings there is scarcely a case where a miracle is taken to lend validity to a statement or an opinion. "In the whole of Rabbinic literature there is not one single instance on record that a Rabbi was ever asked by his colleagues to demonstrate the soundness of his doctrine, or the truth of a disputed halachic case, by performing a miracle."⁴

The idea of Christ therefore is thoroughly un-Jewish, and the doctrine of Trinity resting thereon can never command credence with Jews. Jewish monotheism could never sanction any theology built upon this principle that is subversive of its leitmotif . . . Unitarianism is simply a reversion to the old Jewish conception of God. Unitarians must remember that the Jews developed and bore to the world that principle of unity to which their very name owes its origin and ^{from} to which its whole philosophy derives its life. It is true that Unitarianism has been wronged at the hands of its enemies who have carried their objection that Unitarianism is but a series of denials to ridiculous extremes, and have centered the opposition on that one point. It is nevertheless certain that Judaism has the advantage over Unitarianism in that it need not refute but rather reassert, that it need not defend but rather uphold, that it need not argue but asseverate. Reform Judaism

1. Friedlander, pp. 46 ff.
2. Ps. 19, 1.
3. Gen. Rab. 5, 4. cf. Kohler, p. 161.
4. Schechter, pp. 6, 7.

is not so much a breaking away as it is a development and a growth out of certain forces that rest inherent in Jewish history and thought. It bears forward the spirit of the past, and perpetuates the teachings of a group of men who gave to Judaism its final formulation. A logical continuation of the religion of the prophets, it is not a protest against the entire temper of Judaism nor a crossing of the fundamentals of its faith. It simply adds links to a chain that was forged at the very dawn of Israel's history, the work on which had been retarded during unpropitious seasons. The mould that had formed about the religion that had been preserved throughout many centuries was but the inevitable result of its long existence. Implicit within the ancestral faith were all the forces that, joined with the tendencies of modern times, would build up a world outlook that satisfies. Montefiore, although in general all too conciliatory to Unitarianism, at this juncture is most illuminating; "To the outsider Unitarianism seems to some extent to bear the defect of being in its essence rather negative than positive; it seems to need the existence of Orthodox or Trinitarian Christianity as its foil. It lives by its very protest against that which it repudiates as false. The existence of the false appears necessary for its keen and effective acceptance of the true. Judaism, on the other hand, persistently affirms, it is no dissenting branch of any other religion, but, so far as its own positive teaching goes, is independent of the existence of every other faith. It did not gain and it need not preserve its distinctiveness so much by emphasizing what it dissents from as by maintaining what it affirms. In its reformed or liberal wing it does not stand or fall by the criticism that may be passed on the date of any one book or on the teaching of any one man. It can largely modify its outward embodiment without losing its essential connection with the parent stem. It is not too

Closely connected with the prevailing religion of civilization to become entangled or mixed up in it. It is the left wing of a body which is itself Unitarian, and therefore clearly and fully marked off from every faith which in that respect is other than its own.¹ Unlike Montefiore, we do not believe that Unitarianism today is only a protest against the mother faith, and that its whole philosophy is one of denial; our stand is that Unitarianism meets a decidedly unfavorable situation in that it must expend so much energy in attempting to justify, to vindicate and to defend itself against its enemies who are far more vehement against it than they are against the Jewish religion, since Judaism lays no pretenses at partaking of Christian identity. The American Unitarian Association must devote almost all its pamphlets to defining its position, rather than to propagating religious sentiment and ideas. The popular attitude to Unitarianism is a great obstacle in the way of its realizing the powers for good that rest in the movement. Reform Judaism, too, must face the charge that it is more intent upon the release of rational powers than it is upon the creation of a religious mind, that it is concerned more with a denial of Scriptural infallibility and the rejection of superstitions than with the generation of spiritual sentiments and emotions. The difference is one of degree. The Unitarian lays himself open to the charge at more sides. He must tear down more structures and therefore must meet the onslaughts of more original landowners. He must destroy a whole city, we need demolish but one house. He must remove the cornerstone, we need part only with unsightly ornamental trimmings. All Jews can point with pride to their own past.

1. art. "Unitarianism and Judaism"; J.Q.R., LX, P. 251.

That Unitarianism is concerned with the social aspects of religion has been denied by Hirsch and other Jewish scholars. The general opinion among Jews is that Unitarianism is characterized by "other-worldness"; that since life is held to be a preparation for the hereafter in view of the inability of humans to throw off the burden of the inherited original sin, Unitarians are of the opinion that what is religious is not connected with this world. The Unitarian belief, according to most writers, is that the world is corrupt and must therefore be looked upon with resignation, that is to be sighed over. The basis of such a conception of Unitarianism is the position of the older school of which mention has been made;¹ Statements may be multiplied to demonstrate that the attitude generally assumed is incorrectly applied to modern Unitarianism. "The world is not a pitfall nor a vale of tears. It is a divinely constituted sphere for moral action and satisfying growth for the soul. It is a great thing to live."² In recent Unitarian writings there is no such trend of feeling. Possibly the pulpit utterances of ministers may justify such a criticism, but the printed works show no such tenor of mind. The Unitarian movement undoubtedly before the dawn of the modern era was not social in its outlook. The nineteenth century, however, brought with it the social sense. The new body of learning called sociology gave rise to a changed conception of society. No longer was the human community looked upon as a sand heap, as a group of disparate elements; but it came to be regarded as an organism deriving strength from the perfect functioning and perfect healthfulness of each organ and limb, and contributing in turn life blood to each of its parts. The new science taught that society must prevent, rather than attempt to cure social

1. vide supra pp. 15ff.

2. A.U.A. tract no. 258, p. 3.

disease. Unitarianism has certainly caught this new vision. Parker, one of the first of the new Unitarians puts the problem this way; "There is a hole in the dim lit public bridge, where many fall through and perish; our mercy pulls a few out of the water; it does not stop the hole, nor light the bridge, nor warn man of the peril. We need the great charity that palliates effects of wrong and the greater justice which removes the cause."¹ Instead, therefore, of reconciling the multitude to a state of misery in this world by deceptive promises of comforts and rewards in the next, Unitarianism seeks to rehabilitate the individual and to mould society so that injustice and poverty be impossible. Sin it attributes not to the innate perversity of man's nature, but to physical or mental hereditary defects ^{re} of environmental influences, to unwise and unjust industrial working conditions. Religion is conceived of not in terms of individual, but of social happiness and betterment. The modern conception of society as an organism called for a changed religion to meet the needs of man, and Unitarianism made answer by adapting Christianity to the requirements. The enlarged horizon of man who now lived in a world not of individualistic industrialism but of cooperative and specialized production called for a corresponding magnification of the sphere of religion. The field of Christianity was extended so that it came to include all of life, thus breaking down the dualism of the Calvinistic system, so did it come to recognize that service to man must embrace not merely extending a helping hand to one individual but contributing one's share toward the betterment of the whole social fabric. The essence of religion is goodness, purity and righteousness. And this goodness must be made manifest in a manner that is both purely motivated and wisely displayed.

1. Parker, XII, p. 303.

The Unitarian church today, therefore, is devoted to social improvement, and Unitarians are urged to cooperate with every attempt to elevate and uplift humanity. They hope by enlisting the active enthusiasm of every one to bring about an era of perfect justice when God's will on earth will be done. Unitarianism asks its members to make God's Kingdom come here on earth. This ideal is not permitted hazily to drift about in the clouds, but is rendered substantial by definite aims in the organization of the Unitarian Churches. We admit that Unitarians are entitled to credit for the work they have done along the lines of social service and grant that their programs have a place in the church of today; that Unitarians are rendering excellent service in civic and philanthropic movements for the common good; that Unitarians are conscious of the obligation to community betterment resting upon them. That from the very beginning its most active members have been interested in humanitarian work, and that there were inaugurated in the home of the Unitarian movement, Boston, many of the reforms that have distinguished our time, lend support to ^{the} Unitarian claim of Humanitarianism. Horace Mann, a leader of the Reform in education, John Pierpont, fearless advocate of temperance, William Channing and Theodore Parker, fierce denouncers of slavery, Dorothea Dix, reformer of Prisons and insane asylums, Dr. Howe, the friend of the blind, were all Unitarians. The pulpit, though not a forum for the discussion of economic reform, nonetheless has always been for Unitarians a place where the cause of justice might always find a champion. Parker in his own words "Took pains to state the facts of poverty, drunkenness, ignorance, prostitution, crime, to show their cause, their effect, and their mode of cure, leaving it to others to do the practical work." ¹ ^S Similarly Channing

1. *ibid.* pp.305.

"after long preaching the dignity of man as an abstraction, and piety as a purely inward life, began to apply his sublime doctrines to actual life in the individual, the state and the church. In the name of Christianity the great American Unitarian called for the reform of the drunkard, the elevation of the poor, the instruction of the ignorant, and above all for the liberation of the American slave."¹ So firm is their belief that the Fatherhood of God demands as a forerunner the Brotherhood of man, that in the Unitarian pulpit "nine-tenths of the sermons preached have immediate reference to the improvement of the condition of the people who are addressed."² In all this, however, the dignity of the pulpit has been maintained. Parker, for example, though he treated political subjects in the pulpit, was not partisan. He espoused the cause of disinterested justice.³ He felt certain that his stand was beyond reproach, and he scathingly denounced the timid ministers of the day who constantly spoke about "sin" as an abstract entity, but had not a word to say about "Sins".

Many Unitarian churches maintain institutional or social work of their own. In order that the principle, "The Church is not a lecture room alone" may be not an empty statement, Unitarians provide in various ways for educational and charitable work. Other churches cooperate with other institutions and individuals for the support of works of social value. Still others serve the community entirely through their membership, undertaking practically nothing as organizations.⁴ Especially active are Unitarians in the Associated Charities. These activities reflect the insistence that is everywhere laid by Unitarians on civic righteousness, social

1. Ibid. pp. 277, 278.

2. A. U. A. tract no. 91, p. 14.

3. Parker, XII, p. 325.

4. vide A. U. A. report. "Social Welfare Work of the Unitarian Churches."

progress, and the response of the day-to-day needs of society.

Unitarians are more concerned about the social phase of their activities than they are on missionizing work. It is true that missions are located in Japan, Indiana, Italy, Egypt, Iceland, Australia and New Zealand. Such missions are concerned not with conversion, with bringing the natives around to an acceptance of formulated belief, but are interested primarily in the dissemination

of truth and freedom and the betterment of social conditions. This Unitarians hope to effect by education of the masses, by promotion of the spirit of freedom of thought on all subjects, religious and secular, by philanthropic activity and by Americanization work with foreigners in this country. Not a proselyting body, Unitarianism is devoted to the spreading of principles rather than the enforcement of creeds. They do not seek to multiply the number of people who think their way, but to effect the triumph of religion itself. The substance of Unitarian claims in this line is that their efforts are directed toward nation-making rather than church organization.

Judaism need hardly defend itself against the charge that its religion is not social. The very charge made against it that its ethics and philosophy are materialistic, designed to bring about only the prosperity of the individual here in this world proves that our religion's function is to secure for man the best possible conditions for living. Compared to Orthodox Christianity, Judaism is a practical religion, since it is centered on this world with its social relationships rather than upon the other world and the individuals deliverance thereto.

The pictures painted by the Rabbis are pictures of material well-being, for the very reason that the Jew despairing of ever witnessing an ideal state of society in his life time looked naturally enough to the future for a readjustment of the proper values. Since " the Kingdom of God is inconsistent with the state of social misery, engendered through poverty and want", it must include all material conditions that are so essential for complete happiness. The elimination of poverty was to be an important feature of the ideal world, and since the Jewish people were the persecuted and mistreated race they saw in the horoscope of the future a world that would be characterized by perfect equality and absolute justice.

The spirit of democracy and love for the masses was due to forces more fundamental, however, than the reaction to the hostility of the peoples of the world. At the dawn of their history the people of Israel were nomads, and part of the heritage of the desert was a passion for liberty and the love for freedom. Democracy was due to the very structural makeup of the Hebrews as free and independent wanderers of the plains. The instinct for unity, for strong group solidarity, interest in the well being of each individual of the group are survivals of this early period of history.

81.
Kent maintains that the birth of democracy is to be noted in the earliest period of Israelitish history, and he traces the growth of this principle, through Biblical history, beginning with the Bedouin period and brought to its finest form under the prophets.

80. Schechter, p. 110

81. Charles Foster Kent, art; " Birth of Democracy" in Yale Review, October. 1919.

In the spirit of Israel's cosmopolitan and humanitarian outlook they brought forth a code of ethics so far reaching in its democratic implications that it was taken as a prototype for the constitution of this country. The social legislation of the Bible, its provisions for the poor, reveal the Hebrew effort to bring all of life, economic and political under the sway of the divine law. The wealth of democratic institutions that were Israel's from the very beginning were utilized at first to establish justice and equity within the confines of the land of Palestine, and then, under Prophetic influences were formulated that they might bear the same spiritual truths to all mankind. The people of Israel were to form a fraternity united under God for the purpose of disseminating these same high principles to the world that were at work in its own organization from the very beginning. It was the Jewish people, therefore, who gave to the world the principle of social justice. Lazarus, in his "Ethics"^{1.} most clearly points out that Israel's ethics were social because of its early consciousness of a mission which demanded that it be an ideal community of justice and fairness before it sets out to teach the world.

This prophetic ideal was further developed by the Rabbis. They wove a network of legalism about the people that was designed to establish justice as the cornerstone of the structure reared by their progenitors. "Those who increase the price of food by artificial means, who give false measure, who lend on usury, and keep back the corn from the market are classed by the Rabbis with the blasphemers and hypocrites, and God will never forget their works."^{2.}

1. I 33 ff.; II 176 ff.

2. Cf. Schechter, p. 113.

" The elders of the city and the judges are to enforce the law
 83.
 and protect against crime. God's wrath is stirred at the viola-
 tion of his principles of humanity and he associates himself with
 84.
 the righteous who establish his will of justice.

Instinct within every Jewish community is an exalted concep-
 tion of charity. The fortunate are responsible for the unfortu-
 nate; the poor have a claim on the rich. The higher the station of
 man, the greater his responsibility to dispense charity. The motive
 for the aiding of the poor that has always been behind the Jewish
 conception of charity is without parallel among the historic relig-
 ions. Liberality ^{was} ~~is~~ not the result of a sense of duty with the Greeks
 and Romans, but was prompted by a desire for prestige and for polit-
 ical favor with the masses. The extreme compassion and pity of the
 Hindus, and the colorless love and sacramental almsgiving of the
 church cannot compare with the insistence upon righteousness that
 85.
 runs throughout Jewish literature. The gentle, considerate note
 that goes with the performance of charitable deeds finds its expres-
 sion in a Talmudic verse; " Better is he who smiles to his friend
 86.
 than he who gives him milk to drink. " The method adopted by the
 Berlin Jewish Community to supply mourners who are prevented from
 working by the rites of respect to the dead, ^{with provisions} without any knowledge
 on the part of the recipients of such assistance is typical of Jew-
 87.
 ish spirit of philanthropy.

83. *ibid.* 193.

84. Lazarus, 1, p. 17.

85. Kohler; class room notes, 1921.

86. Kethuboth 111 b.

87. Lazarus, 1, p. 53

The Jew has always felt his responsibility to the community. No less ridiculous a figure to the Jew^{is} he who fails to meet his obligations to society, than the man who would bore a hole in a section of a ship simply because it was the portion allotted to him. Judaism, therefore, did not have to await the coming of the nineteenth century to develop a religion of social implications, neither was it necessary for it to ~~delay~~ the promulgation of a code of democracy until the time of ^{men} ~~the world~~ came to acknowledge the interdependence of man on man in the economic world. Perceiving the spiritual union of man it proceeded at once to seek to effect this spiritual union that came ultimately to entail a social or practical union. Uninterruptedly it taught and developed this principle of social justice. The perfectability of the entire group it sought at an early date to effect. It realized that⁸⁸ "poverty follows the poverty stricken", and that the only cure for wrong is the elimination of the causes of injustice. Man's motives were to be purged and his heart was to be enthralled with the need of pursuing just ends. Those who held property are but tenants, and must convert it into a blessing by proper usage. The entire world belongs to God, and must be sanctified by the performance of justice thereon.

Judaism is not concerned with the salvation of the individual in the hereafter but demands that "each work towards establishing the visible kingdom of God in the present world."⁸⁹ And since the individual always finds himself in relations with his fellows he must render service to his fellow^y by aiding him directly and by supporting all the institutions that will provide for his happiness.

88. Chulin 105 b.

89. Schechter, p. 79

Loyalty to country and patriotism are therefore incumbent on all. The only aim of God in creating the world was to establish peace⁹⁰ among men, and not to secure bliss for isolated individuals in another world. Ethics are thus bound indissolubly with religion, and reference to God is made throughout our Bible in order to urge the claims of the moral.⁹¹ This truth, the need of the association of morality and religion, was given to the world largely through the influence^x of the Hebrew prophets.

Judaism today in the spirit of the prophets champions all movements leading to social betterment. We have declared ourselves allied to certain practical methods for improving the conditions of labor and of adjusting the use of capital. The Central Conference of American Rabbis, meeting in 1920, declared itself in sympathy with certain specific reforms in our industrial organization that will bring about better working conditions for those who are in economic serfdom. The Jewish pulpit now as always pleads the cause of any who are oppressed. The fearlessness of Parker is ~~not~~ excelled by Einhorn who openly in a slave market at Baltimore denounced a condition of society that allows men to deal with human beings as with chattel. "We must not leave these problems and this reform, outside our Jewish thought", says Montefiore of the movement for social betterment, "We must re-⁹²gard them even as merely broadly human and not specifically Jewish.

90. Num. Rab. 12,4.

91. cf. Lev. 19, 2.

92. "Out", p. 267. The idea that Judaism colors the whole life of its members and makes its influence felt in all activities of the individual, and is thus social in that it links religion and life is developed in chp. IV.

Judaism today makes no efforts at missionizing. We do accept proselytes who come to us of their own volition and we have provided a form for their admittance into our fold, yet we do not stimulate conversion. "The Jewish idea of a 'mission' is not that of fussy activity, of imposing verbal beliefs upon savages, whose vision of life is quite other. One may influence one's time by simply being."^{93.} "It was not by force of arms or by persuasion that (the Israelites) were to influence the whole earth, but by setting an example of noble pure and holy conduct"^{94.} Thus Israel is less a missionizing people than are the Unitarians a missionizing sect. The Jew's is a missionary religion only insofar as it is a social religion, a religion of a people that is exemplary in social virtues of justice and righteousness. Judaism is not in the least a missionary religion in the technical sense of the term, but is a faith that will prevail by the conquering power of its truths alone. It aims not to bring all people under its national banner, but hopes to win all peoples to unite under God to form a spiritual fraternity. It has a dream of a world united. It pictures society not as a group the members of which are bound together by statutes and laws, but as a federation consolidated with no other motive save to respond to the inner behest to serve God, to bring to play all the finer instincts and emotions in ideal relationships. The Jewish religion is that faith which holds as its supreme justification for existence a call to the realization of the highest elements in man by directing them to their Source, by bringing them into close union with God, the personification of all high ideals.

93. Zangwill, N.A.R., vol. 160, p. 430.

94. Friedlander, p. 156.

There was a time when Judaism was proselytizing - Christianity is the result. N.

Unitarians have a universal vision, believing that the work of the Church is " to reform the vicious, to educate the ignorant, to strengthen the weak and to cooperate in all attempts to elevate and improve society, they look forward to the time when all churches shall unite together in the purpose of doing good, so that at last God's kingdom may come, and his will be done on earth. They conceive it their duty, therefore, to deliver themselves from the evils of sectarianism and narrow sectionalism, and devote themselves to the development of a whole human race. Since all men are potentially equal spiritually and children of a common Father, religion must base its appeal and its teachings on the universal moral and religious sense. (In the political world, as well as in the spiritual, the members of all faiths have equal standing and must be placed on an equal footing. The Unitarian church makes effort to be the union of those who desire to cultivate to the fullest their moral and spiritual natures, and to share with others the good which they have discovered. The church they define as an " organized effort to teach men to love God and to live as members of one great family. " The services of Unitarians if reflective of their attitude toward God and men, should be free from doctrinal discussion, but replete with earnest outpourings of trustful hearts, free from mournful tone and affected gravity, but marked by the dignity and enthusiasm of devout hearts.

95. Clerke; " Manual", p.47.

96. A. U. A. tract no. 221.

The worship is meant to be so catholic that all might feel themselves at home in the Unitarian churches. Its Christian tone is not disclaimed, as the retention of the rites of baptism and the Lord's supper tho not as sacraments but as symbols, indicates. In fact the church is defined by one as " a union of those who come together to help each other to live a Christian life." ^{97.} Still, Unitarians " believe in a Catholocity that expresses itself not in outward unity and uniformity, but in the spirit of charity towards all and in the humility which is willing to learn of all whatever worthy thing they have to teach. Unitarians will not assume that any single form of the Church is holier or more Catholic than another on the strength of its own assertions. They believe that a church can be holy only insofar as its members are leading holy lives and they place their primary emphasis on the holiness of living." ^{98.} Formalism and the superstitious imputation of sacramental power to certain ritualistic acts of priests or laymen are decried by Unitarians.

Unitarians do not claim a monopoly on these root-truths and imperial sentiments. Still, though every religious system is acknowledged as possessor of a divine spark of truth, Christianity is heralded as the simplest and most inclusive religion of the world. It is true that some writers are absurdly partial to Christianity, yet this vein of universalism is to be noted side by side with the chauvendistic temper.

97. Clarke; " Manual", p. 47.

98. Emerton, p. 227.

Unitarianism is not arrogant nor boastful about its own particular denomination, but it is impressed with the stateliness and all - importance of the religion of the Christians. It does not, however, go so far as to Orthodox Christians in maintaining that only the believers will be saved. " We believe that the really good man is in the way of salvation, whatever may be his outward form of religion. Whoever seeks to do the will of God, and to be faithful and just to man, whether he be heathen or Christian, we believe will be accepted by
99.
God.

The spirit of liberalism is extended to all peoples and is not confined to the Unitarians alone. " Liberal Christianity means that we should not only be willing that others should differ from us, but ready to help them to inquire freely, even if their inquiries lead them to believe what we consider erroneous," ^{100.} says even the conservative Unitarian Clarke. All are granted intellectual freedom to find the truth anywhere and everywhere. Others who disagree with Unitarian tenets are tolerated, and their opinions granted a sympathetic hearing. The Unitarian therefore wishes freedom for himself and grants that same liberty to others. Toleration accompanied the movement and, it is claimed, was born with the birth of Unitarianism. (101) From its very inception, in the catechism of Faustus Socinus, one of the earliest Unitarians, persecution is condemned.

We freely grant that Unitarians are justified in laying claim to universalism as a primary characteristic of their religion. Moved by the call of the modern spirit, Unitarians are working commendably toward the inauguration of the reign of universal fellowship.

991 Clarke: " Manual" , p. 55.

100 ibid, p.46.

101 vide J. Bury; " History of Freedom of Thought", p.94.

The International Councils of Liberals held under the auspices of Unitarians in Boston, London, Amsterdam, Geneva and Berlin are prophetic of the possibilities that lay within the movement. International peace and justice, citizenship and commerce, are keynotes to many of the public statements of Unitarians. With its declaration of principle; "Whatever may be the divine plan for man's existence here or hereafter it must include all men,"^{102.} the Unitarians have within themselves a powerful appeal to all peoples and all religious sects. The faith that "finds the service of God in helpfulness to man, the way to heaven in the path of righteousness, the pure salvation in perfected manhood, the only authority in love and reason, an adequate basis of religious organization in a common purpose to be good, and to do good; all truth its scripture, all men its field and fellowship, all loving souls its saints and ministers, a kingdom of heaven for all on earth its ideal and aspiration,"^{103.} is admirably fitted to send into the world the man who will meet its ideal requirements*, "a man who demands freedom for himself and grants the same liberty to his neighbor, who bestows his love broadly regardless of sect, fellowships all seekers for trust and labors for man on account of his need rather than his creed."^{104.} It is all the more fitted to carry out its high aims since it "feels in mankind as a whole an essential unity expressing itself under indefinitely diverse forms" and understands that it is not essential "that the process of salvation be similar in detail for all men or for all men in all ages."^{105.}

102. Emerson, p. 83

103. A.U.A. tract no. 2, p. 60,

104. *ibid.* p. 62

105. Emerson, p. 84.

That Unitarianism in general lightly esteems Judaism must not influence us in our estimation of its worth. Though it denies to Judaism the right to call itself an universal religion, we must not rob it of its just title to universalism. The fact remains, in spite of the almost unanimous affirmation of Unitarians and others to the contrary, that Judaism is an universal religion, that its world embracing outlook is a historical reality. Since there is such strong feeling on the part of the Gentile world on this question, with a very good reason, we shall devote some length to an exposition of the universalistic features of Jewish religion. The subject will be treated later¹ ~~(vide pp. 119 ff.)~~ in connection with a discussion of the merits and demerits of the New Testament ^rReligion since upon that question hinges the entire justification ~~for~~ Christianity.

1. vide pp 119 ff.

CHAPTER 11.

JUDAISM AND UNITARIANISM ENTERTAIN DIFFERENT
ATTITUDES TOWARD JESUS.

Were it not for the mistaken attitude Christians had ^{to} of Judaism in the past there would have been no theoretical foundation for Christianity. Since Christianity sprang into being because of the need that was alleged to ^{have been} felt for a new religion on account of the insufficiencies of the old, Unitariansism, if it is to be Christian, must carry forth that misunderstanding of Jewish ethics, theology and history. Christianity is built on a misrepresentation of Judaism. For that reason the vast part played by Judaism in the history of the world is for the most part completely overlooked by Unitarians. Judaism they do not recognize as the leader of men. Some honor Judaism, but only for its contribution of the figure of Jesus to the world. A few of the Unitarians with scholarly bent of mind do perceive that the Jews gave to the world the basis of all modern religious systems. James Freeman Clarke in the frontispiece of his work on "The Ten Great Religions" gives Judaism a unique tribute. The growth of the religious systems of the world is portrayed in diagrammatic form. The representation is a circle from the center of which radiate the various sects like the spokes of a wheel. The hub of that wheel symbolizes the monotheism of the Hebrews; Parker admits, though ungraciously, that "under the guidance of the divine Providence, the great and beautiful doctrine of one God for the Hebrews seems very early embraced by the great Jewish lawgiver. Moses' name is ploughed deep into the history of the world. His influence can never die. It must have been a vast soul, endowed with moral and religious genius to a degree extraordinary among men, which at the early age could attempt to found a society on the doctrine and worship of one national God." He speaks highly of the Jews in this sentence: "For fifteen hundred years the Jews, a nation scattered and peeled, and exposed to most degrading influences in true relig-

106. vol. 1, p. 63.

107.
 ion have been above the Christians." Bits of appreciation are scattered throughout Unitarian Literature. The Bible is spoken of as "the most complete record of a nation hearkening to the voice of God to be found in any literature".
 108. Credit is occasionally given to the social preachments of the prophets.
 109. Emerson gives beautiful appreciation to our faith in these words: "What gave to the Hebrew people its specific claim to the attention of the world was its capacity for stripping away from the conception of the deity all merely decorative and external elements and rising to the thought of Deity pure and simple as the sole guide and light of men. In its highest moment Hebrew prophecy, touched a level no other ever reached, and even its lower expressions reveal a striving after spiritual clearness such as no other religious literature can furnish".
 110. Some few Unitarians show sympathetic understanding of the contribution of Reform Judaism to Americanism and to religion in general.
 111. In the main, however, Unitarians adopt the same attitude towards Jews as Orthodox Christians, intent only on vindicating the superior claims of their faith, and therefore singling out passages of inferior worth and representing them (as bent only on praising what Christianity has done and Judaism has not done)^{as} typical, overlooking completely the high lights of our literature. Unitarianism could not afford to look charitably on Judaism, for any one who places a fair judgment on Judaism, ipso facto tears down the foundations upon which Christianity is built. The distinguishing feature between Judaism and Christianity is the conception held by each faith of the religion of the Jews.

107. *ibid* XII, p. 333.

108. A. U. A. tract no. 14.

109. A. U. A. tract no. 51, p. 10

110. pp. 137, 138.

111. A. U. A. tract no. 4, p. 12

The superior elements in Christianity represented as advances over Judaism are, in fact, and always have been Jewish. The attitude then to Judaism is all-important, for if the Christian contentions are borne out then the Jewish religion of a necessity had to be displaced by Christianity if truth was to prevail. " If it be true that the religious teaching of Jesus was so new, so out of the line of previous Jewish teachers, so perfect and stainless, so complete and comprehensive, that it cannot be regarded as anything less than a new religion, the seceder from Orthodox Christianity should and must pitch his tent within the Unitarian camp." ^{112.} If this assumption, though, be incorrect then there is no superiority of Unitarianism over Judaism.

The ethical system of the Jews is represented in an altogether unfavorable light. It, we are told, was concerned with the past, with what had been said in revelation at Sinai, and offered no room for improvement or progress. Tradition was given a place of all too great importance, and religion thus degenerated into conventionality and formalism. The people never came to see that the real motive for conduct must be love, the universal experience. Moses did lay down the command to love one's neighbor and God, yet this law was never understood nor fulfilled in all its implications. The crux of the criticism against the Jewish ethical system is found in the insistence upon law that is to be found in the Bible and Talmud. The people were unable to rise to religious heights because they were too intent upon complete mastery of the law, and upon making hairbreadth distinctions in their study of the Bible. The new sanction ^{to be} was not the authority of a law, but the impositions of a transcendental God. " Right was not right because the law said so, nor because in some distant

112. Mont., J.Q.R., VI, p. 108.

past a compact had been made between a race and a God who belonged to it, nor because the state standing for the race had, laid down this or that rule with its safeguards and its penalties." ^{113.} This last implied characterization of Judaism from one who elsewhere pays it the highest tribute, and who is of both scholarly acumen and universalistic outlook may be taken as typical. Fear of penalties imposed as a result of infraction of the law, and adherence to the letter of the law alone, we are told, were the motives at work in the hearts of the Jewish people. There was no real social feeling, no real sacrificing love for one's fellows. The inner voice was not heard by the Israelites. Their religion was concerned only with actions, with ceremonies and ritual. Their worship was pietistic and did not spring from the spiritual self. They made mechanical exhibitions of piety because of the prominence given to sacerdotal principles. They stressed righteousness, rather than love, the external rather than the internal. Their outlook was thisworldly, and their vision was directed only toward material prosperity and well being.

These ethical conceptions, or unethical superstitions, Christians claim, were the logical outgrowth of the Jewish theology. The theological picture was one of theocratic despotism. The idea of the Fatherhood of God was relegated to the background, and the power of a transcendent ruler occupied the foreground of attention. This faroff deity was feared, for he was withdrawn by nature and distance so far that he could sustain no affectional relationships with man. By their special covenant with a partial God, in which they made promises of worshipping Him, the Hebrews avoided the wrath of God, and

113. Emerson, p. 152.

were enabled to escape the consequences of the fall of the first man. He was a God of rigid justice who could not be moved to have consideration for man nor to show interest and love for him. He might be gracious but to one group of people, to his chosen ones, the Israelites.

The God of the Jews was an exclusively national one. He ^{was} ~~is~~ wrathful even to his own people, how much the more to outsiders. The Jews did not have a God of infinite perfectibility who ruled over the entire universe. It was left for Christianity to transcend this old narrow system. The Jews, overcome with a sense of their own importance because of their belief of the intimate attachment of God with them, were bigoted, intolerant, clannish, exclusive. The God of the Jews is Creator and Lord of Heaven and earth, but he is always represented as the Father only of the Jews and not of all the peoples. Prejudice and superstitious race pride characterize the entire history of the Jews. Narrow dogmatism that could only be shunned by the non-Jew was the keynote to their theology. The current belief about Judaism is that it was at the time of Jesus a survival that would have to succumb to Christianity because of its nominalistic and nationalistic nature. ^{The} Jewish origin of the religion of the prophets is entirely forgotten by the Unitarians; and the high ethical and universalistic tone of the Talmud could hardly be appreciated by those who derive their knowledge of that compendium of Jewish knowledge from secondary sources. Because of the limitations of the prevailing monotheistic religion, Unitarians tell us, there was need for a radical change instituted by a great reformer and a perfect teacher. He would lift men above the barriers of race and state, and transport them to a kingdom where the divine demands would be incumbent on all.

His teaching was rooted in Judaism but transcended it. Mankind was
114.
prepared for a new dispensation.

That this conception of Judaism is erroneous has been partially demonstrated in the pages dealing with the social aspects of Judaism. The detailed refutation of the charges and contentions will be treated later in proving that the New Testament doctrine of the Fatherhood of God is taken over directly from Jewish sources.
115.

The Unitarian belief concerning Jesus is vastly different from that of Orthodoxy. The Unitarians reject the Christology that was added to Judaism. With regard^{to} the Jewish attitude to Christology it was said, "It is against the spurious claims that he (Jesus) was in a special manner the only-begotten son of God, that he was the world's redeemer, that the shedding of his blood, when he was involuntarily sentenced to death meant the world's atonement, that he realized in himself the conditions of Israel's promised Messiah, it is against these and similar teachings that we set our faces as did our fathers."
116.

Unitarians are fully in accord with these sentiments; though conservative Unitarians accept the miracles performed by Jesus and some hold that he was pre-existent and angelic, they all unite in rejecting his divinity and hold that he was godlike only in life and character.

114. This opinion of Judaism of the Christian centuries as well as that of today is almost universal with Unitarians. cf. in particular A.U.A. tract no. 133, p. 5; Emerton, p. 152; Parker, 1, p. 62, X, pp. 17, 18, XII, 294, XIV, p. 319, et, al.

115. Vide infra Chap. IV.

116. J. L. Levy, address, Dec. 22, 1912.

He is regarded by almost all as a created being, finite and below God in nature and person. The idea that he stood, a unique being, ranking between man and God, supernaturally born and endowed with final authority is rapidly disappearing from Unitarian thought. The prevailing view is that he was born with natural qualities differing only in degree from those of other men, that his "character was a growth, and that by experiences and processes similar to our own he rose out of sin and error into the serene strength of an untemptable manhood;- that his word is authoritative in no other wise than as it is true, and that his mission was to instruct, emancipate, spiritualize, and so redeem humanity" 117. The sacrificial interpretation of his death is rejected; and it is denied that the blood of Jesus made God propitious. The assumption that rests at the bottom of the old theology that God will heed prayer only if wrapt in sacraments, or if addressed to him thru Jesus Christ, disappears, and in its stead is affirmed the accessibility of God to all children's prayer. Jesus was a man with only human abilities; he did not possess the attributes of Deity; he was not the Infinite Creator. Unitarians go into the church history of the first Christian centuries and show, just as we indicated in the introduction, that the belief of the early Church was Unitarian, was that Jesus was human and that the God-head was a unit. They also make careful analysis of the New Testament attempting to disprove the contention that the doctrine of the trinity is taught there, to show that all interpretations leading to this conclusion are false and that any verses expressly support^{ing} the claims of the Trinitarians are spurious.

Jesus is always represented as inferior to God and not God himself. The Old Testament, Unitarians show, does not contain predictions of Jesus which prove that he is God. The passages in the prophets that are taken as containing reference to Jesus are studied and the proper conclusions are reached, conclusions that concur with the Jewish interpretations of the passages. 118. Many proofs are advanced to support the Unitarian idea of the essential humanity of Jesus and to refute the notion that God entered his frame in order thus to achieve his purpose of redemption. The assertion constantly reiterated is that Jesus is divine because he was the most human man, the one in whom the universal spirit of man, the ideal type of manhood, found its lodgment. The objection to Orthodoxy is always that the imputation of metaphysical greatness to Jesus throws into the background the spiritual perfection of the man.

Unitarians use every means and every device possible to exalt the personality of Jesus. In the usual Christian style they use much time and space in their fruitless glorification of his name. We do not object to praising characters, and holding up noble personalities for exemplification. We do revolt, though, against the empty, meaningless, baseless, futile claims of majestic excellence for ^aman, when those claims are made with no moral ^{end,} and when they are simply streams of words that come smoothly from the preachers' lips or the writers' pens. It strikes us as a tremendous and extravagant waste of time to devote whole pages of manuscript to asseverations of perfect purity for a man who lived in the past.

118. viz. Isa. 7, 14; 9, 6 etc.

The personality of Jesus, however, gives Unitarian preachers a chance to use language, phraseology, and oratory. High sounding figures, saccharine tributes of superlative adjectives do not stimulate the man of today. The preachers vie with each other in sophomoric adulations of the figure of Jesus about whom they constantly prate. They exhaust the vocabulary of its words of praise by their all too frequent extollations of "humanity's savior" and the "light of the world". We see an inconsistency in this constant abstract glorification of an individual on the one hand and the repeated claims of possession of a social religion, interested in the wellbeing of society, intent chiefly on problems of practical import, bent mainly on dealing with concrete issues, on the other. The soarings of the imagination and the fanciful flights of rhetoric seem entirely at variance with the spirit of the movement. We have little patience with the idle ranting of saintly ascetics from whose facile pen flow trite and colorless cant as readily as do theological and abstract ideas aimed to bolster up the claims for superiority of a man (whose life history is known only in its bare outlines) issue from the mouth.

Every Unitarian preacher feels called upon to deliver himself on the spiritual preeminence of Jesus periodically, and whenever space is needed to fill up empty pages of manuscript he calls upon the muse to inspire him with new figures to apply to the one who cannot be seen for the mass of labels and descriptions already tacked on to him.

Jesus is the "very loftiest ideal of life and character that religion

has given the world", or he is the embodiment of "the most perfect goodness the world has any history of."

119. A.U.A. tract no. 139, p. 2.

120. A.U.A. tract no. 128, p. 7.

His work differed from that of other leaders in " the nobility of its
ideals and conceptions and the greater range of its effectiveness. ^{120.}

Since he was the greatest among men he is the revelation of God. The
very incarnation of the Godhead itself^{he} disclosed the meaning of the
Fatherhood by his teaching and living. He brought perfect truth to
the world. " As, when gazing into a clear lake at mid-day, we see not
the water itself, but an image of the heavens pictured in its peace-
ful stillness, so looking into the pure soul of Jesus, we behold in it
spiritual depth, not the man of Nazareth, but the Over-Soul in which
we live." ^{121.}

The strength of this unique man was so great that he
left an indelible impression on the world. He is " the herald of
the Fatherhood of God, the revealer of the dignity of human nature,
the spiritual leader of the world, the great luminous example of
manly goodness." ^{122.} And so on ad infinitum. A very few Unitarians
admit that possibly in some moments he opposed the divine will; ^{123.} but
the great majority unite in describing him as a perfect example of
goodness, so perfect a type of manhood that he is a mediator between
God and man, a unique teacher by his actions of the love man should
cherish for man. An ideal illustration of the relation between man
and God, he was also the fullest expression of the universal spirit of
humanity, a ripened product of human nature. He is master of the
world by virtue of his wonderful excellence and transcendent nobil-
ity. He is a witness to God by his revelation of the possibilities
within man. Even Theodore Parker, the Biblical student, the scholar,
the man of common-sense and practical religion ^{used} was his learning and
his wisdom in this art of raising Jesus up to the highest pinnacle of
heaven.

120. A.U.A. tract no. 123, p.7,

121. A.U.A. tract no. 128, p.8,

122. A.U.A. tract no. 134, pp 15, 16

123. e.g. Emerson. vide p. 165.

"Above all men do I bow my face before that august personage, Jesus of Nazareth, who seems to have had the strength of man and the softness of woman."^{124.} "He is worshipped as a God. It is no wonder, good men worship the best thing they know, and call it God. No wonder that men soon learned to know Jesus as a God and then as God Himself."^{125.} "He is the greatest person of the ages; the proudest achievement of the human race. He was the greatest fact in the whole history of man"^{126.} If a man of sober judgment and scholarly insight goes to such extremes in his praise of Jesus, the men of lesser abilities following in his footsteps will naturally carry the veneration into more than hero worship, and ~~to~~ devote themselves with greater ardour and zeal to the defecation of his character.

We hold that Unitarianism gives to Jesus, to the personal acceptance of the grandeur of his life, an unwonted prominence. To Unitarians, Jesus, if not God, is at any rate more than man. He is more than the flower of humanity. To his word is attached an importance accorded to no other being. Notwithstanding the repeated claims to Unity we must say that they "adore and show reverence to another being, in a manner and to a degree which according to the ideas of an Israelite, is due to God alone and becomes idolatry when offered to any other being whatsoever";^{127.} This is the reaction of a Jewish layman. The urge to follow Jesus certainly mitigates the importance of the command to worship God as an ideal. If Jesus saves men, even though it be by his natural influence on their hearts and lives,

11, p. 313. (124.)

111, pp. 12, 13 {125}

111, p. 13 {126}

127. Leon Straus, art "Unitarianism and Judaism" American Isr. Apr. 2-1881

teaches them, shows them their sin and demonstrates the kingdom of God, then certainly God himself is relegated to a position of small importance when it comes to governing the motives of men. Man does not need another man, a historical figure, to "save" him by his teachings, to lead him by his life. The Christ ideal becomes under the Unitarian influence even a more characteristic feature of Christianity, and Jesus becomes a symbol more attractive to modern man than the Christ of old. The emphasis is the same, only the attention is shifted from one phase of the subject to another. Discipleship to Christ receives a place of greater prominence even than it did in Calvinism for here it involves a mode of action as well as a tenor of mind. The spirit of love revealed in Jesus is the atoning factor, and he is help^mless to the soul by the appeal of his life, rather than by the appeal of his death and the theology that grew concerning it. The character and teaching of Jesus is made more vital and creative than before in that his personality wields a greater influence on man. His life rather than his person is brought to bear on the activities of the individual and of society. The need, therefore, of reverence and love for him is repeated ad nauseam in almost all Unitarian writings. The cross remains the symbol, but is transferred from a scene of payment of sins to a scene where the possible achievement of the soul is demonstrated. It did not purchase God's love for us, but demonstrated how man can enrich his life. Unitarianism like Christianity, is built up upon the enthusiasm for a person. One man is singled out as the well-beloved of God, as The son of God, and we are asked to conform to the spirit of his life. His divine life demands and justifies adoration,

We must trust in him because he saw all truth, understood the way to perfect existence. In Him the Godlike and the human met and embraced. In Him was a perfect union of the human and divine. He showed what God is in human terms. He was the organ through which God was made known to man. People naturally pay homage to Jesus because he was kinder, more generous and wise than was the God of the Old Testament. The son they saw greater than the creator and ^{there}fore paid him homage. In Unitarianism is to be noted a survival of that old worship of Christ. The history of Unitarianism reveals a gradual process of breaking down the doctrine of the trinity and then of breaking down the divinity of Christ. In the latest stage, however, there is still an element of worship accorded to a man. At first the "Son of God" was taken as a figure of speech, and then the divine man was taken as the man most divine. Slowly he was made more human, he was no longer believed to be born miraculously nor able to perform miracles. The cause for his position of high veneration was his sinfulness and nobility of character. Still with all its rationalization there remains at the core of the movement the deification of man. In the latest ^t stage of its growth there is still an element of worship accorded to a man.

The sweeping assertion that Jesus is the only perfect man, and he, the model, must be imitated in as absolute a fashion as the Christ of the older theology was to be ^ollowed, creates a wide gulf between Jews and Unitarians.

So long as Unitarianism or any sect is tinged by such a colouring, by such an insistence upon the influence of a divine man, about whom empty theological and absurdly flattering terms are used, so long will it be held in light esteem by Jews. And this persistent apparent ignoring of the message of the great teacher on the part of Jews will stamp them as heretics in the eyes of Unitarians. We cannot see in the extollation of Jesus, any force for the betterment of individuals or of society. We stress rather the virtues themselves, rather than the figure of a man who is alleged to embody those virtues in his life. We see no need for erecting the whole structure of a religious system upon the personality of a man who lived thousands of years ago. We are not even certain of his existence much less his nobility of character. Most of our scholars do believe that Jesus existed. And some Jews do hold that he was a moral exemplar. Yet at least in the minds of some " the question of the historical Jesus is still too much involved in controversy to admit of answering finally and absolutely 'yes' or 'no' " ^{128.} Claude Montefiore maintains that Jesus is such a splendid reflection on our people, that he would appropriate Him as a Jew even now. As a matter of fact, the records about Jesus are so confused that it is impossible to declare him a pattern. There are four pictures of Jesus given in the Gospels. In one he is a faithful Jew, in another a Christian caring little for Jewish peculiarities, in another a combination of these two types, and ⁱⁿ still another he is the incarnation of the logos. ^{129.} The inaccuracy of the account of Jesus' life and teachings is further borne out by the fact that the Gospels were not written by eyewitnesses of the events narrated, that they were written not in the language used by Jesus, nor in the land

128. Abraham Cronbach, South Bend Tribune, Jan. 3, 1920.

129. E. G. Hirsch, Lecture, 1915.

in which the events transpired. Further Philo, makes no mention of Jesus, and other contemporaries, completely oblivious of his existence, pass over the history of the time in which he lived. It seems therefore unreasonable to take a man whose life history is shrouded in such uncertainty as the pattern of perfect manhood. It must be granted, however, that all this doubt concerning Jesus' activity does not affect nor invalidate the ideals attributed to him. "We may if we please call the ideal life, the life of Christ. But to call the life of the historic Jesus the flawless, exemplar, the essence, the completion, the fulness, of the absolutely perfect seems to me," says he who is ready to give Jesus and his teachings a position of higher importance than that given them by any Jewish writer, "exaggerated and impossible. It is not so much that there are one or two holes to pick in what we know. It is that what we do know, is so extremely small.^{129.} "There is a paucity of material, and some of the material is uncertain"^{131.} Most of our Rabbis freely give Jesus credit for what of the nobility of his character is known to them; but they insist upon a critical estimate. "We must distinguish between Jesus of Nazareth, the Jewish teacher and pious Rabbi; the gentle son of Joseph and Mary of Bethlehem; the martyr who died for his convictions' sake; the minister, who to uplift them, gladly went among prostitutes and drunkards; who, to serve them, nobly consorted with the outcast poor and despised sinners; the lovable and inspiring character who lived a life of glory to God, who preached peace on earth, and manifested good will

129. Friedlander: "Sources", preface p. xix. Hirsch lecture H.U.C. 1915.

130. vide Mont: "Liberal Judaism and Hellenism", pp. 124. 125

131. ibid.

toward men, we must differentiate between him and the Jesus as he is commonly known today.^{132.} The willingness of Jews to give Jesus a high place among teachers of the world is a comparatively recent concession. Before the last half of the last century~~es~~ it was considered almost blasphemous even to mention the name of him who wrought indirectly so much suffering on the Jew. With the lowering of the barriers against the Jew, came a more generous attitude toward the founder of Christianity. Now the tender sympathy of Jesus for humanity at large^{133.} is acknowledged generally by Reform Judaism. That Jesus taught a new religion, however, or that he wished to overthrow the old, that he was not a devout Jew and that he crossed the spirit of his Jewish forebears is denied by all Jews.^{134.} Jesus Christ was created by early Christians to provide authority for the abrogation of the old law and religion and to give the new religion a historical setting and origin.

For these reasons we cannot reverence Jesus. Further, Jews cling to the doctrine of the self consciousness of God. The line marking off the Father from the child, God from man must be distinct. There is no advantage to be gained by breaking down the distinction between the human and the divine. Judaism "if it asserts the communion and kin^d-ship" between man and God lays no less stress upon the difference."^{135.} The doctrine of partial incarnation of God in Jesus, is un-Jewish as well as confusing. Man according to it so closely approximates God that it is difficult to define the limits of each. The very definition of God as man's ideal, as personification of the highest elements, as a deification of the best in man, is undermined by setting before man as a pattern for conduct one who is as ideal as God himself.

132. J. Leonard Levy, address, Dec. 22, 1912, p. 6.

133. vide Kohler, p. 434.

134. vide especially Enelow: "Jewish View of Jesus", N.Y., 1920.

135. Mont. "Out", p. 304.

Perfection is unattainable for man, even though man is to seek to become Godlike. No man is holy. "God is the only single being that is holy. And this view held by Judaism is confirmed in its literature by the simple fact that throughout the Scriptures the only ethically holy person referred to in the singular is God. Neither Moses nor Elijah, neither high priest nor singer, receives the appellation, the holy one. God alone is the Holy one"^{136.} Though the Patriarchs are considered in Rabbinic literature as the greatest and the most weighty among Israel, they are not considered absolutely perfect; therefore^{137.} they could not stand the judgment of God. No man no matter how great is more than human.^{141.} Perfection calls for worship, and worship is to be directed to God alone. The worship of one God has never been interrupted in Israel. In every benediction the utterance of the Tetragrammaton is demanded in order that it be understood that the blessing is meant for the one God and for no other being.^{138.} Neither an individual nor his memory were to be accorded religious worship. A man was not even to be idolized as a hero. "Israel's intense monotheism could never compromise with hero worship, whether of Jesus or Mahomet. While the fact that Jesus is really God for half the world is in itself sufficient to exclude him from the synagogue."^{139.}

As a matter of fact the story of the man Jesus does not tally with the descriptions given him by Unitarians; nor does he meet the standards set up by Judaism for perfection. We fail to see in him either a God, or a prophet, or a competent lawgiver, or a teacher with a new message.

136. Lazarus, 11, pp. 177. 178.

137. vide Schechter, pp. 173, 174. 138. Vide. Schechter pp. 44, 45.

141. The human frailties even of Moses are emphasized by the Rabbis. vide Kohler footnote b.p. 46.

139. M. Harris: "Judaism & Unitarianism" C.C.A.R. Sermons Chicago 1896.

Montefiore, however, is willing to accept Jesus as the last of the prophets, as one even who improved upon their message. Friedlander, in his "Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount", throughout takes issue with Montefiore, accuses him of drawing upon, and knowledge ^{144.} only of, Christian sources, and concludes that Jesus' frequent use of the term 'Son of man', his opposition to wealth, his conflict with the kingdom of Satan, his belief in demons, his preference for celibacy, his hostility to the Pharisees who rejected the apocalyptic teaching, all these features ^{force} use to see in Jesus not a prophet but an apocalyptic dreamer and teacher, who, in time applied his own ^{145.} teachings to himself and believed himself to be the Messiah." Friedlander deals with the subject fearlessly, not hesitating to make claims for Judaism that might provoke the displeasure of the Gentiles, backing up each contention by definite facts. He strenuously objects to the granting of the title, "prophet" to Jesus because he denies that Jesus added anything of any value to the religion of the Jews. Plainly Jesus' teaching is apocalyptic as shown by his message "the ^{146.} Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Jesus' repeated emphasis on himself, his many teachings about himself rather than about God, ^{147,} show him to be a messenger of an altogether different type from the prophets. He was thus not a model of manhood, but rather a dreamer and a visionary, not an ideal protagonist of the cause of right, but an imaginative mystic.

A perfect man is one whose actions square with his preachments. Jesus, we are told, taught in its finest form the lesson of love. Yet he did not always show charity and love and generosity to his fellow men.

144. cf. l.c. preface pp. xxiii-xxvi etc.

145. ibid, p. 3.

146. Matt. 4, 17, cf. Friedlander, l.c.p.4.

147. cf. John, 5, 19; 6, 35.

He advanced the doctrine of fellowship by extending it to his enemies; but, ^{not} only did he fail to treat them with a kindly air, he failed to show courtesy and respect even to his family. He manifested contempt and anger toward his mother and brothers. He looked upon his fellows with anger. He does not reflect the higher law of love in his statement; "think not that I came to send peace on the earth, etc." He was not peace loving in his relations with the Gentile woman. He decreed destruction on the city not accepting him. The Gospels give no instance of Jesus showing love to his opponents, and he had ample opportunity, ^{to do so} in his dealings with the Pharisees and Scribes. Instead of loving them, his enemies, as he commands, or praying for these who attacked him, he condemned them to everlasting damnation. He denounced them for rejecting him, and denied their right to criticize him. He told them that unless they accepted Him they would die in their sins. He damned them in these words: "Ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers, how shall ye escape the judgment of hell?" He stigmatized them ^{as} "hypocrites", "whited sepulchres", "offspring of vipers", "an evil and adulterous generation, and blinding guides." Unitarians defend the fierceness of the hostility of Jesus by stressing the sinfulness of the people he was denouncing and insisting that impatience with wrong is a necessary feeling in a great reformer.

- 148. Mark 3, 31 ff.
- 149. Mark 3, 5.
- 151. Matt. 10, 34-36.
- 152. *ibid.* 15, 26.
- ~~150. Luke 19, 27.~~
- 153. *ibid.* 10, 15. *vide also* Luke 19, 27.
- 154. *ibid.* 5, 44.
- 155. John 5, 17.
- 156. *ibid.* 8, 24.
- 157. Matt. 23, 33.
- 158. *ibid.* 6, 2; 15, 7.
- 159. *ibid.* 23, 27.
- 160. *ibid.* v. 33.
- 161. *ibid.* 12, 39.
- 162. *ibid.* 15, 14.

Even so, the fact remains that Jesus preached against violent measures, and commanded that his disciples love and not hate. His act of calling his enemies "hypocrites" (meaning "evil deceivers") is hardly in consonance with the tenor of his demands. Even a Jew, who does not insist on passive non-resistance, would condemn such an attitude as ungenerous and harsh.

Jesus did not meet the requirements Judaism places on the ideal man. The first command in our Bible is the one enjoining propagation, and the insistence throughout our history has been on ideal family relationships. To the Jew the unmarried are not the complete men. Extra-Biblical sources as well as Biblical show that Jesus even recommended absolute continence. His complete disregard for family ties is seen in his refusal to see his mother when she wished to see him. Of his doctrine of renunciation more will be said in the next chapter.

Between the precepts and the practise of a perfect man there can be no discrepancy. Jesus, though he forbids swearing, frequently emphasizes his statements, by "Aye, I say unto you." Though the English Bible renders this by "Verily I say unto you" its true meaning, "Amen", is in reality an oath. Another example of his inconsistency is seen in the fact that he prayed at great length, using the same words over and over again, that he recited the customary prayers at meals, and recommended, and well as persisted in, importunity in prayer; all this is in express contradiction to his admonition against lengthy prayers and the use of repetitions in prayer.

163. Gen. 1, 28.

164. cf. Friedlander: "Sources" p. 52.

165. Mark. 3, 31 ff.

166. Matt. 5, 33-37.

167. Luke, 6, 12.

168. Matt. 26, 44; Mark 14, 39

169. Luke 22, 7; Mark 14, 22; Matt 26, 26; John 7, 1.

170. Luke 11, 8.

171. ibid 18, 1-8.

172. Matt 6, 7, 8.

Some of these contradictions are of course due to the fact that the New Testament is of composite origin. Some of the passages quoted, however, certainly conflict with others written contemporaneously.

Fully aware of the limitations of each individual in the world, we see the danger in assigning a position of too great importance to any one man or to his teaching. The Jewish religion, therefore, is not centered about any single individual. No one person developed perfect Judaism. It is not "the creation of a single person either prophet or a man with divine claims" ^{140.} Even Montefiore says "The very doctrine of progress helps to prevent me from finding perfection ^{142.} in the religious doctrine of any man or any book" The proclamation of the new religion by Jesus did not bring final truth to the world, nor did his merits automatically bring us into close communion with God. Only the love and service of God, independent of any authority of perfect man, can bring the divine into human life. "Though we recognize his uniqueness and grandeur, we are convinced that he is not sufficient to all our needs. Jesus himself turned to the Prophets of Israel for light on the profoundest questions of life" ^{143.} We cannot permit Christianity to arrogate unto itself the claim of being an absolute religion. The ideal state of society is to be inaugurated not by one group of people acting in the spirit of one of its founders, but is to be ushered in as a result of the cooperative righteousness of all peoples.

140. Kohler, pp. 16, 17.

142. "Papers for Jewish People" no. XII, p.19 London, 1916.

143. Eneleu, "Adequacy of Judaism", N.Y. 1920, p.76

Eneleu

Absolute truth has been promulgated by no people, but will be approached finally through the contributions of each race and each individual. Unitarianism ^{believes} its claim that it is not arrogant nor haughty. It is modest about the achievements and tenets of its own sect, but is most extravagant in its boasts about Christianity as a whole. Yet this is not the only inconsistency in the Unitarian position.

CHAPTER 111.

JUDAISM AND UNITARIANISM TAKE OPPOSITE VIEWS
CONCERNING THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Christian religion is based on the teaching of the perfect man, Jesus, contained in the New Testament. The greatness of the man is affirmed by Unitarians, and the perfection of his teachings is asseverated. The absolute truth is embodied in the New Testament. It is the clearest revelation of God, for Jesus brought new spiritual potencies to bear in his life. In the story of his activities and in the account of his statements, there is strikingly illustrated a new, a grander and more tender thought of God. He revealed the dignity of human nature, and gave to us all our finest thoughts about God. The foremost teacher of truth, he first set down as the epitome of all truth the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. He revealed certain principles that have not only been accepted by Christianity, but have been incorporated as the charter of its existence. The perfect religion was revealed, a faith that expelled all that was imperfect and temporary in Judaism, accepted all that was good in the parent faith, and added much of permanent and substantial value. In his character and his teaching Jesus was unique and original. The chief contribution of Christianity is the ideal of Jesus' life. From his life and his conduct Christianity receives its sanction. He gave finality to all religious endeavor. His authority is supreme. "God delegates authority to men just in proportion to their power of truth, and their power of goodness to their being and their life. So God spoke in Jesus, as he taught the perfect religion, anticipated developed, but never yet transcended." Every effort and device to impress on ~~the~~ members the perfection of Jesus and his ideas are made by Unitarians, as by all Christians. The surrounding atmosphere is painted in black, in order that the luminous figure might stand out more prominently. Judaism of the time of Jesus is lightly esteemed and contemned.

The false representation and false accusations, however, alone do not constitute our reasons for rejecting the New Testament. The nature of some of its contents is such that it cannot claim acceptance either by Jews or any other thinking individuals.

It must be admitted here, before we go into the analysis of the un-Jewish and anti-Jewish features of the New Testament, that Unitarians on many occasions show themselves to be opposed to the belief we shall set forth as characteristic of the New Testament. They declare themselves to be in the fellowship of all those who insist upon rigid monotheism, who protest against the ideas of non-resistance self abnegation, ascetism, otherworldliness, and narrowness of spiritual outlook. Yet it is none-the-less certain that, as devout believers in the doctrines of the New Testament, they must affirm these very principles which they declare they reject. The Unitarians in their writings do not stress these elements that we shall list as Un-Jewish, impracticable, and narrow. All we may say about their position is that it is inconsistent, and that if their main principles be carried to their natural outcome they would be found subversive of the ideas enunciated in the New Testament, accepted as characteristic and fundamental to Christianity.

The New Testament is shot through with conceptions that divide it from any Jewish work, and set it in unequivocal opposition to the spirit of Judaism. The foremost principle of Judaism is its monotheism. In the New Testament this cardinal doctrine of Judaism is repudiated.

A noticeable declension of monotheism results from the representation of Jesus as a divine king. This is the essence of Paul's theology. And even in the Synoptic Gospels Jesus is the supreme master, and authoritative teacher. Jesus comes to reveal the word of God, not to give his conception of religious truth. The Talmud advances the opinion of an individual Rabbi in this manner: "One might think that this is the opinion of the Biblical text, but I offer the following as the correct interpretation." Jesus, however, comes to uproot what was previously held to be religious truth, solely on the basis of his own understanding and authority. A weakening of the unity of God follows inevitably with the exaltation of a man into partnership with deity. The purity of our monotheism is debased. The ^{contention} ~~convention~~ of the Unitarians to the contrary notwithstanding, it remains as indubitable truth that in the New Testament are to be noticed traces of the beginning of the deification of Jesus. Jews have always spoken reverently of God's words, and have promised salvation through obedience to His absolute moral demands. No Rabbi ever said, "Every ¹⁷⁴ one who heareth these words of mine and doeth them" shall be saved. To our ancestors God has always commanded the supreme obedience and the perfect service. The highest martyrdom is the Kiddush Hashem, that suffered on behalf of God. In contrast, the New Testament has it that ¹⁷⁵ those who are persecuted and reproached for Jesus' sake are happy. Such a sacrifice is certainly less beautiful than the offering of life for the principles demanded by God. All the books of the New Testament, but especially the fourth Gospel, make inroads on our monotheism. The mysticism of the book of John, its doctrine of spiritual rebirth, its dualism and conception of predestination

174. Matt. 7, 24.

175. Matt. 5, 11; Mark, 35; Luke 22, 23.

seriously impair the strength of the Jewish ethical monotheism. Throughout, Jesus the divine son, displaces God. Jesus invites the weary to come and find rest under his influence. His claim to have perfect knowledge of all things, and his ability to reveal God to whomsoever he wishes, we take as a presumptuous arrogation of power that rightfully belongs to God alone. His pretenses at ability to forgive sin were denied by his opponents. Of the efficacy of his vicarious atonement he is convinced. Jesus becomes a sort of an intermediary between God and man in whose name men must address their prayers to God. Anything asked in His name will be granted. To summarize; the New Testament obscures the Jewish belief in the one supreme God, with its emphasis on Jesus, The son of God. Judaism holds that every human being is a child of his Maker.

A further modification of Jewish monotheism has resulted from the dualism of the New Testament. The Evil One, Satan, or the Devil, is the author of man's temptation. Judaism does not know of a power as the source of evil, an entity possessing independent existence of its own. The seat of evil and sin is man's own heart which is not a force acting counter to God's will. Jesus, however, seems to speak as though the one great object of every individual's life were to avoid hell, to escape the powers for evil. On account of the activities of the Evil one, but few can find the way to life. Though many shall seek to enter the way to salvation, but few shall be able to find it. The Jewish conception is that the desire to enter entitles a man to find God's grace. The hold of this power of evil on man prevents

176. Matt. 11, 28.

177. ibid. v. 27.

178. Mark 2, 7.

179. Mark 10, 45.

180. John 16, 23, 24, 26.

181. ibid 14, 13, 14.

182. Luke 10, 22; Matt. 26, 64ff; 24, 42.

183. Matt. 13, 19; John 4, 3, 18.

184. vide Kohler, chap. "Satan and the Spirits of Evil" also Schechter pp. 250 seq.

185. cf. Matt. 6, 13.

186. ibid, 13, 14; Luke, 13, 24.

him from attaining perfect manhood, say Christians. In Judaism stress is laid on the doctrine of freewill. In New Testament Christianity the emphasis is shifted to the theory of predestination. God arbitrarily has chosen the elect, so that he has predert¹⁸⁷ermined the fate of the sons of men. God chooses such individuals not on the basis of merit but simply as a matter of caprice. With the advent of Jesus into the world, according to John, there was a sifting process by which those who are "of Jesus", who are accepted by him, will ^{be} set apart from the ¹⁸⁸ great masses of the people. Through his intercession, they would be able to secure grace at the throne of God. In this last, the apocalyptic nature of the New Testament is clearly brought out. It must be borne in mind that Jesus' system was meant to obtain only in the comparatively brief period elapsing until the coming of the Kingdom. So brief was to be that period that in it the individual would not have time to display his loyalty to God by cer¹⁸⁹emonial acts of public prayer, fasting and almsgiving. The only condition for salvation was personal acceptance of Jesus and his teachings.

Since the rules of ethics that Jesus pronounced were intended to cover only the interim before the Kingdom, they cannot be expected to be a sufficient guide for conduct now, many years after the time Jesus had anticipated for the end of the world. "The teaching of Jesus was conditioned by his firm belief that the existing human society was ¹⁹⁰ about to come to an end." The principles he set forth, therefore, designed as they ^{were} were for the brief span of years before the end, are impractical. Jesus demanded a morality of angels, not of men.

187. cf. Matt. 25,34; Mark 13, 20; Luke 18,7; Matt. 13,38,43;20,1-6
vide Friedlander: "Sources" pp.240 ff.

188. vide John 15,19; 13,1; 17,9 et. al.

189. Matt. 6,5,6.

190. Friedlander; "Sources, p. 14.

His was a one sided, exaggerated attitude. The study of his ethics is interesting to the student of history; but his policy is not workable. As a system of ethics it is worthless. It ^{has been} may be objected that a morality taking account of human limitations is conducive to no high standard of manhood, and that "ideals that can be fulfilled are not ideals at all"^{191.} On the other hand, however, it is certain that man can be inspired by a religious philosophy only if it is definitely linked with conditions in this world, and when no great gulf is created between the actual and the possible.

The clue to the proper understanding of Jesus' ethics, then, lies in his belief that the end of the world was imminent, and that it therefore was not worth while for man to insist on his rights, that the best course was to follow the line of least resistance which is the line of non-resistance. There was no sense in opposing evil, since in the very near future all evil would vanish. Though Judaism does not accept the justalionis, it permits its devotees to resist wrong and to fight evil. Punishment of the criminal, resistance of the invader, however, have no place in Jesus' teaching. He denied the right¹⁹² even of the state to exact penalty. Judaism would not have us offend^{193,} those who offend us, but it would insist that we espouse the cause of justice. Resistance to evil and ^{of} the wrongdoer is necessary in society as it is now constituted. We must face facts as they are. The doctrine of non-resistance is not accepted in spite of Jesus' teaching and the alleged acceptance of the New Testament by a very large portion of the world's inhabitants. Non-resistance^{as} the guiding

191. Mont. "Liberal Judaism and Hellenism" p.105.

192. Matt. 5, 38-42.

193. Vide. Shab. 88 b. cf. Fridlander, p. 310.

principle of the life of one individual is, therefore, an impossibility. Hence there can be no ethical life if non-resistance is the keynote to the ethical life, since it is impossible to refrain from resisting evil. Rather than permit ourselves to be mistreated and persecuted, we should prefer to work for the recognition of the principals of justice. Jesus, though, denies the claim that society makes^{194.} for justice by his opposition to oaths. All the processes for securing justice, for bringing about perfect relationships in the world - are scorned and depreciated.

Judaism makes no impossible demands of man. It knows that we live in a world of actual life, and therefore seeks to make men of body and flesh Godlike. It would never ask us not to resist and only to love.^{195.} Love of enemies is a physical impossibility. We can be just and kind to our opponents. And our law demands that we give aid to our enemies when in need,¹⁹⁶ to restore their lost property, and to give them food when hungry. It does not, however, command us to love our enemies. To be moved by a deep seated disgust for vice and impurity, is the righteous man's natural feeling. Intolerance and impatience of sin are the accompaniments of virtue. We must not cherish the desire to avenge our wrongs, but we are justified in aiding in the apprehension of all wrongdoers. Love is a potent force in the world, but its twin, justice, is not to be overlooked. We must not in our opposition to New Testament ethics be lured into claiming that a God of justice is superior to a God of love. We believe that Mont-

194. Matt. 5, 33-37

195. ibid, vv, 38-48.

196. vide Mont. " Out " pp. 341, 342.

efiore is justified in objecting to the stand taken by Jewish scholars in answering Christian polemicists by maintaining the superiority of justice as over against love. " The human ideal must be loving righteousness, or righteous love. And God himself must be the perfection of both. 197. The Christian would have us thwart our instincts and live in a manner that is entirely unnatural, and govern our conduct by a standard that could never be applied to man of God.

In continuance of the doctrine of non-resistance is the conception of renunciation. Because the devil is identified with the world, man must shun the material and regard the creation of God as a scene where he is continually being tempted. Supreme devotion and complete surrender to the higher principle are demanded, and denial and repudiation of the things of this world are enjoined. One is to be heedless of the needs of the body and of the wants of one's family. Absolute faith must be reposed in a God who can provide the needs of all. No effort, therefore, on the part of man is necessary in order that one may receive what of advantages life holds for him. Man must scorn 198. completely the material needs of ordinary life. Judaism would have us trust in God who upholds all who hope in him, but it would never condemn a man for concern about the necessities for himself and family. It could not sanction worry about material prosperity in the future, nor would it stress the material phase of existence to the exclusion of emphasis on the spiritual needs of man. The Rabbis never curbed natural habits and tendencies, but they attempted to purify, to limit and modify them. Extreme solicitude for the things of

197. *ibid.* p. 338. cf. m. Reichler; "Jewish Conception of Justice" and S. Cohon, "Love, Human and Divine in Post-Biblical Literature" in C.C.A.R. Year Books, vol. XXIX, respectively.

198. cf. Luke 12, 22-31; Matt 6, 25-34 (and xxvii)

the world they never condoned; but idleness or lack of initiative in the struggle for existence was never encouraged.

Such great aversion has Jesus for the things of this world, that he advocates complete self denial. The conflict with the lusts and vices of the world can be waged only by self abnegation. The only claim that man must recognize is the claim of the highest. All other interests he must dispel from his mind. Jesus, therefore, demands that all his disciples seek poverty, ¹⁹⁹ sell all their possessions, and shun property and wealth. He blesses those who are poverty stricken ²⁰⁰ and promises them, but not the rich, a place in heaven. Judaism does not command man to be satisfied with the condition of poverty, but insists that measures be taken to relieve distress and ameliorate the social order. Jesus is led to take this extreme position of commending poverty because he aimed to reach the poor and to include them in his discipleship. In this, however, he has produced the impression that property and wealth are curses. Judaism does not embrace this ascetic ideal in its ethical system. Reason tells us that a complete dissolution of society would take place if Jesus' teachings were taken seriously. Wealth and property are necessary for the continued well-being of the world. ^{They are} ~~It is~~ far from being a part of the evil one. Money ²⁰¹ in itself is neither good nor evil, It is a gift of God to be used ^{204.} in such a manner as to conduce to the betterment of the world. Misuse and abuse of wealth beget wrongdoing; but devotion of wealth to good and useful causes leads to virtue. The Jew is happy with the world

199. Matt. 19, 21; Luke 14, 33.

200. Matt. T, 3; 19, 24.

201. vs. Luke 16, 9, 11.

204. cf. Proverbs 3, 9 and Rabbinical comments.

order as it is, and endeavor to make the best use of all the means placed at his disposal. The rich man is not accursed, but is granted ample opportunity to serve the world. Unlike the Christians, or even the early Essenses, we maintain that wealth brings untold blessings if rightly used. It provides man with a chance to effect good or the opportunity to work harm; he must employ it in the service of God to whom ^{it} they belong. ^{202.} Other possessions are of more worth than wealth, ²⁰³ but it is not to be renounced for that reason. When pursued as an end in itself, it leads to selfishness, but when sought as a means for securing the wellbeing of ourselves and society it begets the spirit of altruism. The Christian attitude to wealth is based on the conception that the less a man concerns himself with the things of the world the more spiritual he is. The Jewish idea is that the forces of nature are to be hallowed by man. "Wealth is the tribute nature pays for the subjugation of nature. It is a trust we cannot hold. ^{205.} With it comes increased responsibility." The Jewish view is healthy and masculine.

There seems to be little doubt that the New Testament ethics are not social, that they lead to the ascetic ideal, and to a pessimism of the type represented by Schopenhauer. In fact Schopenhauer justifies his philosophy by the authority of the New Testament. He affirms that the spirit of the New Testament is indeniably ascetic and is based on the denial of the will to live. Candidly he admits that man must turn his back on the world, and that, with the New Testament the denial of the will to live is the way for redemption. ^{215.} The New Testament does not urge us to make the world more just and more desirable a residence for man. The Rabbis, on the other hand, made strenuous

202. vide. Haggai 2,8.

203. vide Aboth 4,1.

205. E. G. Hirsch, Lecture at H.U.C. 1915.

215. vide his "Studies in Pessimism".

efforts to prevent poverty, so to mould the community that it would not
 206. allow a man to be poor. The Christian Bible does not deal with political or social life. Its ethics are impractical when applied to the state. Unlike the Jewish system, it does not provide an adequate basis both for political and individual life. It maintains a negative even positively antagonistic attitude to the state. It differentiates between the "world of Caesar" and that of God, for the former of which Jesus has no respect. We, however, hold that the state
 207 is a means of expressing the humanities.

Man, according to New Testament, must renounce the affairs of the world. Its denial of the right to hold property and its passive attitude to the state would lead to anarchy and political confusion. The principle of renunciation applied to man in his family relations would break up one of the most powerful social institutions, the home. A man must renounce his family ties if he would be a follower
 208. of Jesus, he must hate all his blood relatives. Jesus unequivocally
 209. shows his belief that celibacy is to be preferred. He makes effort to release man from the marital bond by decreeing that divorce is permissible only in case of fornication and that no one may marry a
 210. divorced woman. Divorce is not encouraged by Jews; in fact the Bible
 211. speaks against it. Judaism, however, provides a release from
 212. the slavery of an unhappy union. The beauty of the spirit of the Jewish home is acknowledged by almost all. This sanctification of the home was effected by insistence on the divine origin of the marital
 213. bond.

206. cf. Schechter, p. 112.

207. vide Kohler, p. 320.

208. Matt. 10, 37; Luke 9, 59; 14, 26; Mark 3, 33 etc.

209. vide Matt. 19, 10-12; Luke 20, 34, 35.

210. Matt. 5, 31, 32, the older parallel of which omits "saving for the cause of fornication": Mark 10, 2-11.

211. Malachi 2, 16. 212. cf. Friedlander "Sources" pp 52 seq.

213. vide Kohler, p. 316.

The hallowing of the home and of all life was brought about through conscious effort to ennoble all human activities. Opposed to the practical and common sense ethics of Judaism are the New Testament ethics, " a hot house growth that cannot flourish in the outside world ²¹⁴

Another un-Jewish feature of the New Testament is its narrowness. Though ^{the} contention of the Christians is that theirs is a universal and Israel's is an exclusively national religion, it is none-the-less true that a universal attitude is not sustained in the New Testament and that the Jewish outlook is world embracing. All who believe in the Messiah, Jesus, are on an equal footing, no matter what their race ^{216.} or social position. Those however who do not give assent to the teachings of Jesus, who do not believe in him, are not included in the scheme of salvation. All the believers are " sons of God", ^{217.} and this sonship is limited to them. The mystery of divine truth is unfolded only to those who are given the boon of clear understanding by Jesus. ^{218.} Jesus gives the benefit of his advice and teachings to a limited few of the Israelites, not even to the whole people. All out- ^{219.} side the small group are without rights. They will not enter the Kingdom of heaven. ^{220.} Only a few are permitted to enter the gate of ²²¹ heaven, the few upon whom God decided to show favor from the beginning ²²² The chosen few will be saved. ^{223.} The Pharisees and the Scribes will be ^{224.} denied entrance to heaven, That they not learn the mystery connected with gaining admittance, the teachings of Jesus were revealed in a secret form. ²²⁵ The use by Jesus of the word " dogs" in connection with ²²⁶ the heathen does not reveal any universal sympathy for all humans,

214. Hirsch, Lecture at H.U.C. 1915.

216. cf. Romans 3, 29; 10, 12; Galations 2, 28.

217. John 5, 24.

218. cf. Mark 4, 11; 12.

219. vide. Matt. 7, 6; Revelations 22, 15.

220. Matt. 7, 13, 14; Luke 13, 24,

220. Matt. 22, 2-14; Luke 13, 24

222. Matt. 25, 34.

223. Matt. 20, 1-6; Mark 13, 20

224. Matt. 5, 20

225. Mark 4, 11.

226. Matt. 15, 26, etc.

but does show that the Kingdom of Heaven was only for Jesus' followers, and that all others were without the pale of the favored. The members of the group were to show each other love, but there is no proof that that feeling was to be made manifest to the members of any other group. That the Jewish outlook was an universal one, higher than this of the New Testament will be demonstrated in the following chapter.

Gerald Friedlander in his " Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount" goes into careful study of the sermon and shows that Jewish teaching is equal to that accredited to Jesus, and outstrips it, and that it is the source upon which the writers of the New Testament drew. In spite of this free use of Jewish principles, the New Testament, he claims, represents no advance over the ethics of Leviticus XIX, with its commands for reverence of parents, observance of Sabbath, giving of charity, speaking of truth, practice of justice in business, honor to the aged, display of justice to rich and poor in the law, love of neighbor and stranger, and prohibition of talebearing and bearing of malice. " It does not seem to me," says he, " that this moral code need fear comparison in holiness with any other teaching." His analysis of the contents of the sermon on the mount and his comparison of it with the contents of the Jewish literature of the time convinced him that all the good features of that sermon can be found in Jewish sources. Friedlander is able to give parallels, the equal of, or surpassing the excellence of each idea in the Sermon. Since the claim

227. cf. Friedlander; " Sources", p. 42,

228. l.c. p. 85.

is often made that it is unjust to compare the New Testament with the Talmud ^{which} contains words of Rabbis who lived long after Jesus, Friedlander gives much attention to the apocalyptic and pseudo-epigraphic works. His results are based on the facts, and he ^{therefore} does not hesitate to come forth with bold assertions of the inferiority of the New Testament teachings to those of Jewish sages. Unlike Montefiore he attacks the subject without thought of appeasing the Gentile. Fearlessly he asserts that "four fifths of the Sermon on the Mount is exclusively Jewish", and he conclusively proves the truth of his contention. He points out many Hebraisms, definite and unique combinations of words, many parallels in thoughts, ideas, and many sentences in the New Testament similar to those in the Old. He denies ^s that there is any flash of genius in the New Testament, going so far as to claim that even some of the inferior elements were taken from isolated expressions of inferior transitory Jewish ideas. So for example the attitude toward divorce is a reflection of the opinion of the rigorous school of Shamai. That there is nothing original in the New Testament is the sweeping statement of this English scholar. His treatment of the subject is in reaction to the extreme conciliatory handling of the problem by Montefiore. We, however, should choose the mean between the two extremes, taking the stand defended by Ebelow in his "Jewish View of Jesus".

Friedlander finds Jewish phrases tallying with each phrase in the Lord's Prayer and in the Doxology. He further shows that Ezekiel XXXVI, 23-31 contains the same arrangement of ideas found in the Lord's Prayer. The prohibition against bearing anger, the command that first reconciliation be made with one's neighbor and then with God, the ^{demand} demand for the avoidance of lustful thoughts, the protest against the use of oaths

229, l.c., p.266.

and insistence upon sincerity of speech, the imposition of love as a guiding principle, the lesson of forgiveness, the depreciating of formalism and stressing of righteousness and charity manifested without display, Friedlander demonstrates are all contained in Jewish sources, and presented there in a manner wholly satisfactory, pleasing and sufficiently emphatic. Passages showing that this is true are multiplied by Friedlander; for every idea he has many analogous references. As an example, we quote this; Corresponding to " Judge not, that ye²³⁰ be not judged," is the higher and much earlier saying " Judge all²³¹ men in the scale of merit" which besides being practical and possible and positive, is based on no selfish motive. All our scholars go into great detail to show that the Golden Rule is not superior²³² to the similar formulations found in Jewish literature. The Biblical²³³ source and the Rabbinic parallels, we agree, with Friedlander carry not nearly so conclusive a proof of the Jewish origin of the Golden Rule as does the verse in Tobit: " And what thou thyself hatest, do²³⁴ to no man". This is identical with the New Testament version, and definitely settles the Jewish origin of the motto. We do not believe that the negative form of Hillel is nearly so forceful as the positive of the New Testament and its Jewish sources. The judgment of Jewish polemicists too often is warped in their effort to show the superiority of their religion. In this instance at any rate, fairness does not ^{mitigate}mitigate against the claims of superiority for the teaching of our faith.

230. Matt. 7, 1.

231. Aboth, 1, 6.

232. Lev. 19,

233. Shabb. 31 a; Aboth, 1, 2, 2, 15, 17; Aboth de Rabbi Nathan 16, pp. 60, 62 ed. Schecheter, cf. Kohler, p. 484

234. op. cit. 4, 15.

The New Testament writers plagiarized and misrepresented the Jewish teachings. Jesus pretends to give a new law when he says, "Every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger." That prohibition against anger, however, is found in the old law which he condemns. ^{235.} Matthew V, 38 leaves the impression that the Jews insisted on the lex talionis. As a matter of fact the principle of retaliation was never practised in Israel: The Pharisees of whom Jesus thinks so little substituted very early a monetary fine instead of physical punishment. The children of Israel were told to "be pliant ^{236.} of disposition, and yielding in impressment". The most perfect example of a deliberate distortion of truth and misrepresentation of fact is the statement that the old law would have us hate our enemies. ^{237.} Throughout, in Bible and in Talmud, we are told to manifest kindly interest in the stranger and in our fellowmen. The Pharisees are painted as lovers of money in order to more fully ^{238.} incite the ire of the poor/disciples against them. ^{239.} The motive for this misrepresentation of the Pharisees was to discredit their law and their faith in order that the new religion might be seen to rise to greater heights. We condemn the early Christians for their ungenerous attitude and deny their claims that they have carried forward the great teachings of the Old Testament, so-called. Most of our scholars are ready to recognize in the New Testament a formulation of religious truth that possessess some merits, ^{240.} that it put some old truths in a fresh

235. Matt. 5, 21, 22,

236. In Aboth, 3, 16.

237. Friedlander: "Sources", pp. 65 seq. and passages there quoted.

238. vide Matt. 5, 43,

239. Deut. 23, 7, et. al. cf. Kohler, chap. "The Stranger and the Proselytic" Friedlander: "Sources", pp. 71 ff.

240. Luke 16, 14 ff. vide Friedlander: "Sources", p. 203.

manner; and are free to admit that in the story^{of} Jesus is to be seen the life narrative a teacher who commands admiration for the way in which he carried the personal note in his preaching^{and} for the commendable sympathy he displayed for the masses. We must not forget, however, that Christianity vitiated the truths of Judaism, that it confuses spirituality with renunciation, and that the new Bible is more likely to lead to otherworldliness and the dualism of religion and life than the original book of the Hebrews. Further, the early Hebrews must be admired as pioneers who gave to the world the fundamentals of religious truth. Once they had evolved a spiritual religion, it was a simple matter for Christianity to make, or attempt to make, improvements, and to endepen the spiritual significance of the early conceptions. The Old Testament will forever be revered as the book containing the beliefs in a righteous and loving God, in the need of service of God through goodness and justice and of the sanctification of life through religion, law and duty, in the divine forgiveness and human repentance, the possibility of spiritual communion with God and of spiritual joy and happiness. No book could advance beyond these conceptions enough to warrant granting it a position of importance equal to, or greater than, the Bible of the people of Israel. The New Testament is a religious book, but is not a Bible. Its limitations themselves afford sufficient justification for a refusal on our part to accept it. Then again, it is one thing to accept a work like the Old Testament that presents supreme truths in spite of inferior elements, and it is quite another to accept another book as a Bible the worth of whose contributions over the Old Testament is certainly subject to doubt, and whose contents assuredly contain many elements of an inferior value. The old inheri-

ance we embrace with affection yet the new book we cannot revere as a record of the discovery of religious truth by our progenitors. We can overlook the unevennesses in a book that has been the sacred property of our community for thousands of years; but we cannot look with the same indulgence on the product of the minds of another community. And it seems to Jews that the errors of the New Testament are more closely connected with its essential teachings than are the mistaken conceptions of the Old Testament. For these reasons the New Testament forms an insuperable barrier between Jews and Unitarians.

CHAPTER FOUR.

JUDAISM & UNITARIANISM HOLD CONTRADICTORY
CONCEPTIONS OF THE ORIGINALITY OF THEIR RESPEC-
TIVE TEACHING.

The Christian Bible has no justification for existence, for the fundamental presupposition upon which its claim¹ for existence rests is false, i.e., the inferiority of Judaism which is neither a religion of the heart, nor one of ~~the~~ universal applica-
~~tion-it is claimed.~~ Christians take great pains to show up the limitations of the New Testament, in order to bolster up their claim of originality for their Bible. In order to prove that Jesus teaches a new law, it is necessary to falsify the old.

The Jewish law is pictured as one not conducive to an elevated life. Sin exists only through the law which develops hypocrisy. The night of legalism is believed to have enveloped the Jews of the pre-Christian Centuries just as it does those of today. As a matter of fact, "legalism was neither the evil thing commonly imagined nor did it lead to the evil consequences assumed by theologians. Nor has it ever constituted the whole religion of the Jew as declared by most critics."² The Pharisees, who are represented as the protagonists of the law, were not, as Christians have us believe, teachers of the law of hatred toward enemy, exponents of the view of God as a transcendental being, defenders of legalism and outwardness. These Pharisees about whom such unjust charges are made, of all members of the religious systems of the world, alone had special laws for providing the inalienable rights and privileges of the poor. Further, the word "Torah" is not adequately rendered by the word "law." The Jew when he spoke of Torah referred to religious teaching of any kind. At times it is refer-

1. Schechter, p. 117.

2. vide Friedlander: "Sources", pp. 98, 99.

red only to the Five Books of Moses, but even they do not include only ^{1.} legal code devoid of moral elements. The story of Israel's past is narrated for definite, didactic purposes that are well known. It abounds with extra-legal matter. ^{2.} The Torah is the sum total of religious knowledge to the Jew and as such it is revered. The revelation included the unfolding of all spiritual factors that would play a part in history.

Judaism is not the product of the Torah, of a system of law revealed at one time by God. It is rather the result of a process of development that reached a climax in the Bible. ^{3.} It is not a system already existent in its final form. The Rabbis themselves call attention to the growth of the religion and allowed room for further development. ^{4.} Tradition was to guide conscience and not to fetter it. New measures may be introduced under its spirit. It is not the tradition itself that has hold on us; it is the nature of that tradition. "Judaism every where clearly advances the thought that not because God has ordained it, is a law, moral; but because it is moral, therefore God ordained it." ^{5.} "The moral law does not exist by virtue of a divine act or authoritative fiat; it flows from the essence of God's being, from his absolute and infinite moral nature." ^{6.} The law is nothing despotic nor arbitrary, but comes with an appeal of its own. "Moral laws are not laws because they are written; they are written because they are moral." ^{7.} This attitude is made further reaching today. The entire Bible is taken on its own merits; judgment and criticism are the sole determiners of worth. The flexibility of the law is indispensable for progress. The divine truth did not cease at any time in our past. ^{8.} The Pharisees themselves made additions to the law, and adjusted it to the needs of the time.

The Talmud is usually taken as a work replete with casuistical and

1. Schechter, pp. 109 ff. 4. cf. Lazarus, l. pp. 70, 71
 2. cf. Kohler, p. 355. 5. ibid. pp. 111, 112.
 3. ibid, p. 11. 6. ibid, 112, 113 (8) vide Joseph, pp 30 ff
 7. ibid, p. 119

ritualistic distinction. " The superficial mind often saw nothing more in this book than the babble of refined casuistry, of a reasoning and subtle superstition. It failed to perceive the vital force in consequence of which Jewish thought was enabled to pass through the intellectual night of the Middle Ages without being extinguished. This conviction rested in the profound conviction that the cult does not constitute the whole of Judaism, that it is but the external and transitory sign recognized by those to whom the truth has been entrusted, but absolutely distinct from this truth itself which is eternal and universal, which is the all in all, and which is destined some day to be the common property of mankind.¹ Schechter, the representative of the conservatives, proposes this as an article of Faith in addition to the thirteen articles of Maimoni: " I believe that Judaism is , in the first instance, a divine religion, not a mere complex of racial peculiarities and tribal customs."² This spirit is to be felt in all of Jewish literature. The Law bears not an impersonal relationship with the individual. With its universal, moral basis, it possesses a vividness, a freshness, a directness of appeal that preserve a sense of intimate association on the part of the people with religious truth.

Acceptance of a higher law does not spell intellectual stupor. The admission that there is a law and a power greater, older, and loftier than man himself is at the very core of the religious attitude. Man wins freedom only through the recognition of the claims of the highest. The moral law does not compel obedience for any other reason than the imperative appeal it carries within itself.

1. Darmstetter; " History of the Jews " in " Selected Essays ", London, 1895, pp. . 59, 260.

2. Studies, First Series, p. 180.

an appeal that is absolute. The law of God is not absolute in the sense that it is immutable in all its external forms. The Torah to the Jews is a guide, and specific problems are to be decided in the spirit of this general law. The Torah did not lay down laws, but principles.^{1.} The Jews are not to obey only the letter of the law. The scope of the Ten Commandments is enlarged so that they include a whole host of sundry attitudes and actions. For example, he who puts his fellow to blush in public is almost guilty of shedding blood.^{2.} The attitude of reverence must characterize all practice and study of the law. The man who reads the Torah diligently without the fear of God before him is condemned by the Rabbis.^{3.} The place of law in the regulation of conduct is not to be disputed by any one; still the imposition of a body of definite laws for modern use could not be tolerated by us; the Central Conference of American Rabbis in 1906 rejected promptly the suggestion of such a project.

Not only is it considered imperative for the Jew to recognize the higher law, but is esteemed a privilege to place oneself under such domination. Israel feels a sense of ease and delight in the fulfilment of the law. The yoke of God's kingdom is not a burden, but it affords an opportunity to demonstrate loyalty by conduct. The law was not a curse to the Jew, but a source of light.^{4.} Though the words, "Law" and Commandment" sound formidable and rigorous, they were the very soul of the Jewish people. The burden of the law was refined, purified, until service to God came to be regarded as the "Service of the heart".⁵ The technical term for this joy accompanying the carrying out of law, is ~~called~~ the Simcha shel Mitzvah,

1. Nachmani to Deut. 6, 18,

2. cf. Friedlander: "Sources", pp. 229 ff.

3. Shab. 31 a. cf. Joseph p. 388.

4. vide Schechter, p. 137.

and denotes the blessing that is the crown of those who willingly place themselves under the sway of the divine demands. In the Sabbath joy is reflected this attitude. Though the Rabbis multiply commands to observe in connection with the Sabbath, it never became puritanic. This is an anomaly of Judaism that is not to be understood except by one conversant with Judaism. The entire conception is full of contradictions. The Sabbath, though entailing many restrictions, carries with it a joyful note to the Jew.

The Rabbis laced a network of legalism around the people enveloping their every act. They hedged the Jews about with moral restraints. They emancipated the powers of the individual and directed them toward building up the holy life. The ~~air~~ of the laws ~~was~~ to create a community of holiness. All of man's instincts were placed under the control of the divine. The sphere of religion was made all-inclusive. The taming of desires, the discipline of the body are powerful influences in moral growth. The complete sanctification of all life by religion ^{was} ~~was~~ thus effected through this subordination of all activities to the spirit of the religion. Joy and health were breathed into the people. The commands providing for ritual holiness were but aimed to produce spiritual holiness in the community. Singleness of purpose was effected through the law; the entire people were to be made pure ^{1.} through the commandments.

The people of Israel after the homeland, the material house of clay, crumbled, were converted into a spiritual fraternity. Fealty to the Father in heaven took the place of loyalty to the fatherland. This process was effected through law. Israel became a people assembled
1. cf. Gen. Rab. 44.

for purposes of holiness, of morality; and since morality can have meaning only in social relationship, the people devoted themselves to the creation of a body of law that would call into being a perfectly just commonwealth. Since the Israelites were to form a community of holiness they employed their energies toward establishing peace and justice as the foundations of their organization, that the solidarity and union of the group be not affected by dispute and injustice. The people ^{were} ~~were~~ entrusted with a priesthood, ~~were~~ to form a community with no other aim save to respond to the impelling motives of bringing themselves and all mankind under the rulership of a Divine Master.^{1.}

The motive for obeying the behests of God, the spring for conduct is not, as Christians, claim, the hope for reward and the fear of punishment. The law is to be performed *leshemo*^{2.} for its own sake. We assert that the very absence of material advantage in virtues, oblivion of personal interests, sheer respect for values of integral worth, alone invest morality with meaning. The law is to be obeyed without ulterior motive, without hope for profit, without promptings of ambition. The entire spirit of Jewish ethics is that obedience should be a willingness to act dutifully under the absence^{3.} of external pressure and the force of environmental stimulation.^{2.} "The highest service is disinterested service, the highest obedience that which is uninfluenced by the thought of recompense."^{3.} The many passages that might be quoted from Talmud and Bible to bear out this point, may be placed^{4.} along side of the New Testament assurances of reward for righteousness,^{4.} and pictures of a materialistic conception of Messianic age, and the promises of a reward in heaven.^{5.} The presence of these conceptions,

1. vide Kohler, chap. "Israel, the People of the Law".

2. vide Schechter, pp. 163 ff.; Lazarus 11, p. 46.

3. Joseph, p. 138.

4. Matt. 6, 2-4,

5. Matt. 22, 2-14; Luke, 14, 16-24; etc.

6. 1. xet 1113

in the Christian Bible certainly parallels the occasional appearance of like notions in our literature.¹ It is not true that we insist only on actions, on righteousness rather than upon motives, and purity of purpose. "The Jewish doctrine of ethics is not a doctrine of material possessions. If the good things of life are referred to they are brought of a s advantageous consequences of moral conduct, not as the purpose aimed at nor as the motive.² Salvation does not depend on the number of commandments we fulfill, nor is it indicated by the external prosperity of the individual. Judaism is an inner religion as much as is Christianity. The importance of the Attitude we acknowledge in our expressions of belief. Our prayer must not be formal, and must be directed in genuine reverence to God. Schechter and Friedlander cite many statements from the Talmud and Hellenistic literature to show how little the capacity of the Jew for praying devoutly was affected by the rubrics prescribed for the form in which it must be couched.³ Repentance is an indispensable prerequisite for reconciliation after sin, say all our teachers. All our writers point out the danger of concentrating too much attention upon ceremonial, ritual and form, and urge upon their readers the importance of inner character.⁴ In even the sacrificial system stress was laid on the purity of intention.⁵ "According to Rabbinical teaching, the path to salvation to this world, and bliss in the next is open to all. Religious observances, the Temple, the sacrificial service, are not indispensable conditions of the attainment of the goal. Moral purity and a loving heart are the only requirements." It is not possible to give even a small list of

1. Lazarus 1, p. 165. It might be added that the New Testament does not entirely omit the external phase of religious worship. Prayer, almsgiving and fasting are included, as well as inner disposition in service of God. cf. Matt. 5, 16; 6, 1-4.
2. vide Schechter, pp. 156-158; Friedlander: "Sources", pp. 115-117.
3. vide Mont. "Out" pp. 216, 217; Friedlander p. 334; Joseph pp. 356-357;
4. Kohler, p. 241; Schechter, p. 303.
5. Schechter, p. 297
6. Lazarus 1, pp. 207, 208

There are more passages to the contrary. The writer hears of them in the class-room and he ought to have interpreted them *1.*

passages defending this position, or the Jewish stand on other controverted questions, in this thesis. One example will suffice to show that the spirit of the Talmud was not characterized by insistence on form, but was by emphasis on motive; Talmud Kiddushin ^{1.} says that "one son may give his parents luxuries and be responsible for his unhappiness. Another may require that he perform manual labor, and still contribute to his bliss in the world to come". The motive prompting action is always taken into consideration. ~~That~~ ^{2.} the importance attached to ceremony did not permit the Rabbis to overlook humanitarian measures is to be noticed in the provision that the convert whose brothers died because of the rite of circumcision is absolved from the duty of undergoing that operation. ^{3.} A further attack is made on the ethics of Judaism on the ground that it enjoins merely a negative set of rules on man, stresses only avoidance ^{of evil and not a response to the} power of God's spirit within him. The only positive injunctions imposed by Judaism, we are told, are those concerning ritual and form. In the first place, it must be noted that a positive act of the will is needed in order to curb an incipient desire to do wrong. There is therefore something positive in a negative command itself. We admit, too, that shunning of wrong must be coupled with performance of good. The Rabbis derive the need of both sides of the question in morality from the verse, "Depart from evil and do good." ^{4.} Both types of commands must be included in any moral system. The New Testament too, like every other code of ethics, includes prohibitions as well as positive injunctions.

All actions, however, are valuable only in proportion to the spirit of love from which they flow. The heart of the worshipper must be projected in his service of God. Integrity of the inner self is de-

1. op. cit. 30 b. 31 a.

2. Hulin 4 b.

3. Ps. 34, 14. Avodah Zarah 18 b 19 a. cf. Schechter, p. 167

4. Matt. 5, 34, 39; 6, 1, 19; etc.

manded by the Rabbis as a forerunner to prayer and worship.^{1.} The law includes the free and lofty requirement of aspiration of the heart to religious heights. The law of love was first proclaimed by Israel as the basis for all conduct. The law of love of neighbor is developed so that it demands sympathetic and kindly treatment and generous attitude toward all of one's fellowmen.^{2.} "Of preaching sincerity, of extolling the duty of 'inwardness' the Rabbis were never weary. 'One thing God requires above all, the heart.' The whole worth of a benevolent deed lies in the love that inspires it. The essence of goodness is good intent. 'Who-so serves God from any motive save love of service is a sordid and useless creature; better had he never been borne.^{3.}' The whole of Jewish teaching serves to emphasize the need of perfectly motivated service. The law strongly reenforces that requirement. The duties of the Jew who has received the commands of God are all the more incumbent^{on him} because he possesses the earliest and clearest formulations of what is required of Him.^{4.}

" Among the features of the Kingdom (of God) the fear of God and the love of one's neighbor are found to be prominent.^{5.} The mainspring of the service of God must be love.^{6.} " The highest triumph of God-consciousness is attained in love of God^{7.}". This love is to lead to no other advantage save the desire to follow and to emulate the Pattern of Goodness. We are to be attached to Him by an emotional bond and are to be bound to him by a mystical communion. The love of man for God with its corollary, the love of neighbor, has always been for Jews

1. cf. Lazarus 11, pp.60 ff. Friedlander: "Sources", pp.64,66 and passages quoted in both places.

2. cf. Kohler, chap. "Ethics": M. Joseph: "Jewish Ethics" chap. in "Religious Systems of the World", London, 1911.

3. San. 106 b. Succah 49 b. Megillah 20 a, Ber. 179. cf Joseph p.358

4. cf. Kiddushin 31 a.

{ 6. vide Deut. 6,5; 10,12, etc.

5. Schechter, p. 92.

{ 7. Kohler, p. 31.

the simplest epitome of religion. The love for God naturally leads to the desire to serve Him, and the perfect service is the love of men for one another. Universal love is justified by Jewish teachers on the high ground of the unity of human nature; in the sermon on the Mount the basis, lower than that of Judaism, is the unity of nature.¹ Our conception, revealed throughout^{is that} the presence of the universal God in the soul of each man is the spur that leads ^{him} ~~man~~ to love all nature and all his fellowbeings. The attitude of love must be cherished toward neighbor, toward stranger, toward all men.² Even the enemy must be shown consideration. Yet the principle of love demands also thought of one's personal honor and self-esteem: the enemy, therefore, is not to be accorded the same tenderness that is bestowed on the friend. It must, however, impel man to manifest a brotherly feeling to all his brothers, to all the members of the human family.

The heritage of man from his heavenly Father is the ability to love as He loves. The love to be borne toward one's fellows is to be modeled after that of God for his creatures, his human children. The intercourse and relationships that obtain in the family are the earthly examples of the fellowship and the child^{sh}ship that are to characterize the attitude of God to man and man to God. Christian scholars speak often of Jewish servitude as compared with Christian sonship. They, Unitarians and all others, claim that Christianity first taught the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God. The designation of God as Father, though, runs through our Bible, our Talmud, our prayers and all our literature. The Jewish conception has always been that all who know God and His demands are called His children. All men are sons of God according to Jews, not only those who follow the teachings of any one group of individual. G. Friedlander cites a whole host of passages to prove

1. Vide Matt. 5, 45.

2.. vide Joseph, pp. 395 seq. and passages there quoted.

that the conception of the Fatherhood of God was the current idea of the Jews who were contemporaneous with Jesus^{1.} We therefore deny that Jesus taught anything new in proclaiming that God was the Father, and refuse to grant that he added in the least to the implications of the conception already acknowledged. The fact is beyond dispute that long before the time of Jesus and up to the date of His career on earth, Jewish writers used the term with its full universal applications. That there is a Father in Heaven who loves his children is the whole burden of the Jewish Bible. "The term 'Father' or 'Our Father who is in Heaven, or 'My Father who is in heaven' is one of the most frequent in the Jewish Prayer Book and the subsequent liturgy."^{2.} God's only demand is that we accept Him and his demands as a child respects his Father and his wishes.^{3.} Trust in God, assurance that He will pardon iniquity, happiness from the knowledge of his nearness are all immediate resultants from the conception of God as Father.

The love of God for men is affirmed by all our teachers. He watches over his creatures and guards those made in His image. His mercy and longsuffering are qualities that are reflected in his kindly and sympathetic attitude to the children. The attribute of love and compassion are necessary to hold in check the principles of justice. The parent, however, who displays unrestricted love to the child abuses him and eventually works harm on his personality. God watches over the world to see that its honor and dignity are upheld, and he sternly refuses to condone wrong and weakness of moral life. The two terms for Deity most frequently used in the Bible are taken by the Rabbis to be expressive separately of the two phases of God's nature, the attribute of mercy and that of justice. If life is to possess meaning it must not be ruled by any weakness nor forgiving grace. Stamina, fairness, virility are

1. l.c. pp. 78 ff.

2. Schechter, p. 55

3. vide Kohler, chap. "Man, the Child of God".

breathed into the world by the attribute of justice. The social order to endure must be based upon certain righteous measures; the punishment of the wicked, the recognition of the individual's right to enjoy the fruits ^{need to} or taste the bitter results of his conduct. In all this, however, the merciful God is ever ready to assist the sinner and to aid those seeking assistance. The principle of love is behind all the phenomena of life, working to produce for man perfect happiness and the possibility for a complete existence. God, therefore, has created evil and sin, not in opposition to Himself, but as a disciplinary measure, avoidance and shunning of which lead to meaningful virtue. The Jewish love of God, far from being inferior to the Christian love, is more intense and covers a larger field. Jesus says, "Let him who is without sin ^{1.} throw the first stone." Compare this to the action of the Jewish sage who, in the name of God, forgives a woman who has led a life of shame because she was repented. ^{2.} We give to love an important position in our theology, but we do not make it the exclusive governing principle of the world. We understand that God's justice and his love are two aspects of the same thing, that they are but different sides of the same attribute. This explains why the Gentile sees in the Bible and in other expressions of Judaism what he takes to be ~~and a belief in~~ an attitude ^{a belief in} of fear, ^{3.} a wrathful God. As a matter of fact, we are not to be afraid of Him, but are to revere His principles. When overcome with a sense of wonderment at the commands and ^{principle} essence of God, man does not fear His God. The so-called "fear of God" is simply awe for the presence that fills all the world. The current notion of the Gentile that the God of the Jews is a transcendent God, one who is afar off, who does not enter into intimate relationship with his creatures, is

1. John, 8, 7.

2. Mid. Rab. Ecclesiastes, 1.8.

3. vide Kohler, chap "God's Wrath" ; Schechter pp. 118. ff.

entirely unfounded. He is not ~~too~~ high for us, so that we cannot worship him. " To the Jew God was at one and the same time above, beyond,^{1.} and within the world, its soul and its life.^{2.} He is both immanent and transcendent, for the two qualities are not mutually exclusive. He is in heaven and also on earth. The conception of a personal God naturally led to a belief in ^{some} habitation for Him. And since he was also pictured as lofty and high above man, He was naturally assigned a place in Heaven as His home. By a fortunate ^{inconsistency} ~~inconsistency~~, however, he was never regarded as ^{aloof} ~~aloof~~ or as so far distant from man that the possibility of worship and intimate communion was precluded. The many passages quoted by Schechter to bear out this point conclusively demonstrates that those who differ with him have not based their opinion on a first hand knowledge of the sources. God is not remote from His creation. Though "immeasurably exalted above all human conceptions of His nature, God is yet very near to the soul³ He has made. He is never-the-less immanent in Men's lives, responsive to e very sincere prayer, to every earnest aspiration after Him."^{2.} The two types of attributes of God that we re-

cognize, metaphysical and moral, bear out the truth of the assertion that Judaism ^{professes} ~~recognizes~~ a God who is both immanent and transcendent.

The conception of the immanence of God in all men together with the idea of the Fatherhood of God leads to a universal outlook. Judaism is not a narrow group bound together only by ties of race or by a common social heritage. Judaism has been a universal religion from its very beginning. The very fact that the Bible, the record of the earliest history of the Hebrews is accepted as a religious guide for all the peoples of the world proves that our religion is not hemmed in by boundaries of race and of nationalism. The dogma that is the core

1.. Schechter, p. 75,

2. Joseph pp. 77 ff. and passages there quoted.

of Judaism, the unity of God, leads naturally to the belief in the unity of man, of all men. All our teachers derive this lesson from the Bible. Akiba who took the command of love of neighbor as the chief commandment, and Ben Azai who maintained that "This is the book of the generations of man" contains an all-comprehensive principle, were both conscious of the universalism of the Bible as its foremost feature.^{1.}

The lessons of the Bible are all couched in broadly human terms. The same law applied to both Hebrew and outsider. Micah lays down his requirements not as obligatory for Jew, but as binding for ~~all~~^{each} man.^{2.} The moral order described in our literature is one that is established by the contributions of all the members of society who obey the behests of the universal inner voice. The covenant "writ in the inward parts and in the hearts", that covenant "unto the nations"^{3.} is to bind all men to the universal Father. All alike are links in the chain of the spiritual ~~spirit~~^{growth}. The stranger, the proselyte, the poor are recognized as members of that spiritual fraternity.^{4.} The vexation, mistreatment, and robbery of the stranger are prohibited. They ~~are~~^{are} all included as sons of the common Father. Israel's Kingdom is a spiritual imperialism. It seeks to make all men subjects of the laws of God. All men are to be members of the ideal world order. Even though they do not associate themselves with the community of Israel, even though they do not see spiritual truth in its simple purity, they will not be consigned to the limbo of oblivion for their ignorance of our conception of the nature of religious demands. Our Judaism is universal. We hold ~~they~~^{it} a "National religion is an absurdity."^{5.} We are at one with the nations of the world, differing only in the simplicity of the service we require of men. "The national, as contrasted with the universal aspect of

1. vide Lazarus 1 pp. 193-14.

2. ibid, Where other quotations of like import are given also. Micah 6,9

3. Jeremiah 31,30-32

4. vide Kohler, chap. "Stranger and Proselyte".

5. vide Kohler, chap. "Names of God".

6. Mont. "Out" p.293

Judaism is on the wane. Many Jewish liturgies have, for instance, eliminated the prayers for the restoration of sacrifices and several have removed or spiritualized the petitions for the recovery of the Jewish nationality. Modern reformed Judaism is a universalistic Judaism. It lays stress on the function of Israel the Servant, as a Light to the nations. It tends to eliminate those ceremonies and beliefs which are less compatible with a universal than with a racial religion.^{1.} The change of the name of Deity from Jahveh, a proper name, to Adonai "The Lord" was of vast significance, for it meant in ancient times the change ^{from} ~~from~~ a national religion to a universal religion, from an appeal by a God of one people to ^{that of} a Lord of all the world who ~~de-~~mands, welling up from the collective heart of the world, were to be incumbent on all peoples. God desires the worship of all men; but, should they not dedicate their lives to Him, he is not vindictive. He does not rejoice in the fall or misfortune of the wicked. He therefore silenced the angels who would break forth into songs of rejoicing with the ~~drawing~~ ^{2.} of Pharoah's hosts. The book of Jonah was written ~~at~~ a time of opposition to Gentiles to enforce the lesson that God gives all peoples, Jews and non-Jews, an opportunity to repent. Those who will not repent, alone are sometimes consigned by the Rabbis to doom. The righteous of all peoples, however, are granted a share in the ^{3.} world to come.

In all of Jewish teachings and in the general tenor of our writings, the universal note is sounded clearly. God is kindly disposed to all peoples not only to Israel. The early tribalism gave way to prophetic universalism. Similarly the race spirit attached to Judaism inevitably succumbed to the universal implications of the religion. Still without connivance or duplicity, the Jew has carried his whole freight

1. Abrahams "Judaism", p. 44,

2. San. 39 b.

3. vide Kohler, p. 125.

forward, old and inferior as well as new and superior elements. Gentile critics, therefore, have partial justification and basis for their claim that the God of Israel was, and therefore is, a tribal, non-moral Deity, intent only on furthering the interests of his Chosen People, backing them in peace times and leading them at the crucial war period. Attempts to mitigate the seeming harshness and the apparent egotism of certain portions of our Bible are futile. We must perceive in the Bible the dramatic story of the growth of a people that emerged from a lower to a higher state of civilization and knowledge of God. Why need we be chagrined that together with the gems of religious thought there be found the clods of earth whence they have been taken? Israel's God at the dawn of its history was a national one. What early religion was universal? Reason, critical insight, historical sense, must be called upon in order that a true appreciation may be had of the progressive unfolding of religious truth by Israel, the record of which is preserved in the Bible.^{1.}

God is not partial to Israel. Neither does it enjoy any special monopoly on the goodness of the Deity. Birth, blood, descent, constitute no justifiable basis for superiority on the part of the Jew. Only for the development of the cardinal principles of religion is Israel deserving of credit. "To the ideal, to spiritual attainments, to ethical convictions, an immeasurably loftier place is assigned than to birth, race or blood. The highest round of the moral ladder to which man and the Israelite can mount is that occupied by the prophets."^{2.} Israel is simply one of God's peoples. The fact that many of Israel's heroes, and wise men, David and Onkelos for example, were descended from non-Jews shows that the Jews do not believe themselves to be the

1. vide I. Zangwill: "Chosen Peoples" New York, 1919.

2. Lazarus, l. p. 210

only people to whom truth is revealed. Salvation is not conditioned upon membership in the Jewish community. God's grace rests on other peoples as well as on the Israelitish race. " The non-Jew has no need to become a convert to Judaism. Either he lives in accordance with moral principles, in which case he can dispense with creed, or he is lacking in purity and elevation of moral conviction, which cannot be replaced by creed.^{1.} The only way in which Israel was favored above the other nations was that it, even in its particularistic phase, was filled with the universal ideal, the requirement that mankind reach the highest spiritual goal. The only way by which Israel can obtain immortality is through the Torah, through practise^x and obedience to the divine demands. Only through absolute subordination to the supreme law of God, our Rabbis tell us, does Israel win God's grace. In numerous place they limit the statement that Israel is God's child to such times that Israel conducts itself as such.^{2.} The acceptance by the people of the Torah followed immediately upon the rejection by the other peoples of the onerous demands therein made on men.^{3.} Israel's devotion to the ^{CAUSE} cause of God secures only spiritual advantages. " The effects of Israel's election are purely religious and moral. In styling ourselves God's people we do not claim to possess any worldly advantage or even any special share of the divine love. Worldly advantage every one must needs forego who takes upon himself the yoke of God's service.^{4.} The Torah, revealed in no-man's land,^{5.} is therefore the property of all the world. Israel's promulgation of its teachings constitute no possession of a magic passport to heaven. God's protection is afforded to all men whether they be Ethiopians or Hebrews.^{6.} Only one's life-conduct determines his status with God.

1. ibid. p. 212.

2. Kid. 38 a; at. al

3. vide Schechter, p. 60

4. Joseph, p. 153.

5. vide Lazarus, 1, p. 30

6. cf. Amos 9, 7.

Righteousness, holiness and goodness are the sources of the ideal life upon which all men may draw.^{1.} The law of God is revealed to "Man", not to priest, to Levite, to Israelite,^{2.} to anyone who obeys the universal law. We look forward to a time when our religious principles will be in the hands of all peoples, when they will not be limited to the possession of one group, when they will be acknowledged by all men who will receive divine grace through their acceptance of God's law. The Rabbis explain away the partiality suggested to Numbers 11, 14 by interpreting the words "Yisa ponim" to mean "remove His anger". And they add, punning on the phrase "noso ponim": "Just as the Israelites consider me, so shall I be ^{considerate} of them".^{3.} The comparison of Israel to olive oil that will not mix with other liquids, but always remains on the surface is borne out only when it executes the will of God.^{4.} Israel can prevail only when it looks up to God with reverence and devotion, and reveals its worshipful attitude in its service of fellowmen.

Permeated with the idea of the need of building up a holy community, Israel sought to realize its ideal. Unencumbered by political organization the people were enabled to devote all their energies to their mission, the furtherance of the universal law of God. This purpose of its existence was not realized at the time of the advent of Jesus nor has it been achieved in our day. Israel, must, therefore live on, seeking to perpetuate the principles it early learned. The picture

1. Friedlander: "Sources" p. 241.

2. Schechter, p. 133

3. Mid. Rab. ad. loc.

4. Mid. Rab. Ex. 36,1.

painted by the Jewish sages has not been brought to fulfillment. All men do not recognize the one God: they do not combine religious ideals with moral action; they do not love God, their neighbor, and the stranger; they do not show justice and compassion to their fellows; they have not clean hands and a pure heart. Since these root-truths of Judaism are not understood in our day, there is need of Israel continuing in separate existence and seeking to teach by example these lessons of our Bible. The universalism of the Kingdom is its outstanding feature. Our scholars bring manifold references from literature contemporaneous with ~~that~~ the sayings attributed to Christ and show that the conception of Israel as a priest^{1.}people whose duty it is to bring all mankind under the sway of God's dominion was prevalent at the time of Jesus. The belief in the mission leading to the hope for an ideal community under the leadership of the Messiah, a community of material prosperity, did flourish in some circles; yet ultimately it became associated with the idea of a universal Kingdom. Schechter advances his opinion that the union of the two was fortunate in that it gave to the conception a certain definiteness and reality that otherwise it would not have possessed.^{3.} "Judaism points to God's Kingdom on earth as the goal and hope of mankind, to a world in which all men and nations shall turn away from idolatry and wickedness and become united in their recognition of the sovereignty of God, the Holy one, as proclaimed by Israel. His servant and herald, the Messiah of the Nations.^{2.}" The universalism of the prophetic idea of the mission gradually superseded the older national conception of the Kingdom

1. Friedlander: "Sources", pp. 105 ff. 140, 227, 242, 337 ff. et al
2. Kohler, p. 332.
3. op. cit. Chap. Kingdom of God.

that led to the doctrine of resurrection, ^{now} retained by Orthodox Jews. The resolutions of the Central Conference of American Rabbis adopted in 1869 and 1885 show the present day interpretation of the mission: "The messianic aim of Israel is not the restoration of the Old Jewish State under a descendant of David, involving a second separation from the nations of the earth, but the union of all children of God in the confession of the unity of God, so as to realize the unity of all national creatures and their call to moral sanctification." Israel had opportunity after the destruction of the homeland to demonstrate the supreme power of the truth it professed by dissociating it from the state and positing to it a separate existence. Ibsen, in one of his letters, advances the incident of the absence of a Jewish state as the reason for the high state of civilization reached by Israel.^{1.} The disinterested objectivity of the Jewish world outlook, its universal and non-material nature are responsible for the absence of chauvenism from the ideal world philosophy of Judaism. Israel's mission is purely religious. The Jew's is no worldly vocation; he has been called not for empire, for earthly power, for conquest, but for the distribution of the spiritual riches that have been entrusted to Him.^{2.} That the people of Israel almost from the very beginning conceived themselves to be chosen to bring about the Kingdom of God and that finally this conception was purified and refined until its note became universal and spiritual are indisputable facts. The basis of this claim of a mission, is the claim of a certain hereditary preeminence in matters of religion. It is known that the ^{peoples} races, though in the main equally endowed mentally and

1. F. Chandler: Aspects of Modern Drama, New York, 1916.
2. Joseph, p. 158.

physically, are characterized by temperaments differing substantially from each other. The predisposition, the mental tendencies of Israel have been directed along spiritual lines. Though we clearly see and understand the justification for these our contentions, we are ready to assume for the sake of argument that Israel, despite its own asseveration, is not so endowed. Even so, the very fact that ^{Jews} ~~we~~ have in the past persistently lain claim to such a current of thought running through ^{their} ~~our~~ history, though the arguments adduced ~~be~~ ^{are} specious, is proof sufficient that these who make those assertions are possessed of such a conception, that their interpretation of Israel's history is that of a people who, thrown forward by the force of the past, aims for world domination on behalf of its universal religious and ethical principles; that they are true universalists. This, coupled with their liberal attitude toward all religions and all peoples, refutes the charge of exclusiveness levied at them.

We are ready to acknowledge the good work and the excellent features of Christianity and Mohammedanism. We understand that the perfect world order can be achieved only through the cooperative efforts of all groups, ^{2.} and perceive in the histories of other peoples contributions to civilization along the respective lines of their abilities and proclivities. ^{3.} Further "Judaism manifests a mighty impulse to come into ^{close} contact with the various civilized nations, partly in order to disseminate among them its sublime truths, appealing alike to mind and heart, ^{partly} ~~partly~~ to clarify and deepen those truths by assimilating the wisdom and culture of these very nations. For we know that " every

1. cf. Kohler, section dealing with Israel and the World.

2. vide Kohler, p. 226.

3. ibid, p. 18

4. ibid. p. 9

religion contains the truth and is therefore deserving of our respect. It is the divine methods of giving expression to that truth which constitute the points of difference between the various religions, and which give them their various degrees of truthfulness. For in regard to their fundamental ideas all religions are identical.^{1.} In treating Christianity and Judaism in their relations to Judaism Dr. Kohler is ready to credit each with its merits, and to grant that both have contributed much to the spreading of Israel's principles.^{2.} The revelation of God is not limited to our Bible, but the disclosure of truth is contained in the sacred books of other peoples, as well in the universal conscience, and in the stories told by nature everywhere.^{3.} "It must be remembered that inspiration is not confined to one race and to one age. We may devoutly believe that to many races and many ages God has granted help."^{4.} Judaism is therefore a system sanctifying all history, all life and all humanity. "Judaism which is neither a religious nor national system solely, but aims to be a covenant with God uniting all peoples, lays claim to be no exclusive truth and makes its appeal to no single group of mankind."^{5.}

This analysis of the ethics and the theology of Judaism conclusively demonstrates the validity of the contention that ours is a universal religion. We show ourselves to parallel the Unitarian universalism, we vindicate ourselves against the mistaken attitude taken towards us by Unitarians and misrepresentations made of us by the New Testament. We show that the conception of the Fatherhood of God colors our ethics and our theology, and that it was a motif original with us. This is the spirit of the Jewish past, the spirit of universal love, jus-

1. Joseph, p. 8.

2. Kohler, chap. "Christianity and Mohammedanism".

3. Joseph, p. 116.

4. Mont. "Out" p. 120.

5. Kohler, p. 322.

tice and righteousness. The Jew incarnates these principles, and receives them as the heritage of the generations that have preceded him.

CHAPTER FIVE: Conclusion,

UNITARIANISM IS CHRISTIANITY, NOT JUDAISM.

Unitarians deny that Judaism is a universal religion with a high ethical system. They belittle and pity us for our narrow interests, and deny that we have a mission. They cannot understand why we persist since the function of Judaism (according to them ceased with the coming of Christ, They have as little conception of Jewish history and development as the Paulinians, denying absolutely that we now have any purpose on earth. This disparagement of Judaism, typical of all Christians, shows that the Unitarians have a Christian and not a Jewish attitude upon life. All appeals and all ^{approaches} approaches are made and justified through ~~ought~~ the personality of Jesus, his conduct and his statements. The very purpose and aim of the American Unitarian Association is avowedly Christian. The statement of purpose is appended to almost all the tracts published by that organization: "The object of the American Unitarian Association shall be to diffuse the knowledge and promote the interests of pure Christianity; and all Unitarian Christians shall be invited to unite and cooperate with it for that purpose." Repeatedly in conferences have Unitarians reaffirmed their Christian discipleship always holding themselves to be a body of believers upon the Christian foundation and with the Christian church. The covenant that is coming into increasing favor with Unitarians as the basis of the individual Churches' organization and policy is: "In the love of truth and the spirit of Jesus Christ, we unite for the worship of Christ and the service of man" The Unitarians describe their system as "the Christian side of the broader scientific movement of our time,"^{1.} and call themselves the "liberals of the Christian Church"^{2.} Unitarianism is "the simplest expression of the Christian religion."^{3.} All definitions of

1. J. Allen "Liberal Movement in Theology" p. 116.

2. J. Orr: "Unitarianism in Modern Times" P. 216.

3. A. U.A. Tract no. 248, p. 5.

the movement show that Unitarians conceive themselves to be loyal Christians.

Unitarianism makes no pretense at being anything other than an offshoot of the Christian Church. Unitarians resent the implication that they set out to destroy Orthodox Christianity, but maintain that they ^{are} simply carrying forth the spirit of the mother faith adapting it to ~~the~~ changes in civilization. Constantly their writers defend themselves against charges of heresy and un-Christian point of view. The doctrine of Trinity is rejected only because it is not essential to the Christian life. The Unitarians are indignant at those who charge them with infidelity and who would deny them the right to apply the name "Christian" to their teaching. They, who pray in Christ's name and sing hymns in ~~His~~ honor, vigorously proclaim their love for Him they call Master. They, staunch adherents to the teachings of the New Testament and of primitive Christian doctrines, are enraged at those Christians who refuse to grant their allegiance to the religion of Christ.

Unitarians are loyal Christians. Though they have relations with Judaism there is no doubt that the points of connection ^{they} ~~the~~ bears with Christianity are closer and more numerous than are those with Judaism. In fact, the intense love the Unitarians cherish for Christianity is the chief feature distinguishing their religion from ours. Their writers are obsessed with the greatness of Christianity for which they make extravagant claims. So far are they carried away in their extollations of the religion of Christ that they deliberately, even the fairest of them, omit making mention of the contribution made to the world's progress by Judaism. "Sometimes" we are told, "as in the cases of Christianity and Islam, the appeal to the unity of God prevails".

The Christian religion ~~is~~ the greatest and most spiritual faith man has ever known. Its teachings alone can win salvation for men. Its body of principles will always remain ^{unchanged} ~~the same~~; it exists eternal in the constitution of the soul of God and therefore will always be the same. If Jesus had proclaimed his teachings independent of the Old Testament, with only the authority of a human being, in any other land outside of Palestine, the appeal still would have been the grandest ever made in the history of mankind. If the voice of Christianity be silenced the world's greatest influence for good would be destroyed. Christianity by virtue of the fulness of its teachings, takes precedence over all the religions of the world. " Christianity is the highest revelation of God." ^{1.} Such ridiculously exaggerated claims are made for Christianity and such deprecatory appraisals on Judaism are set that there is no question of partiality on the one hand and prejudice on the other. We cannot admit that " Christian truth is infinite," ^{2.} and need not prove the superiority of Judaism over Christianity in order to disprove the veracity of that statement. The nature of perfect and final truth is not Jewish nor Christian and the complexion of the world is not exclusively Jewish nor Christian. " Just as the flower and the fruit which beautify and nurture creation are products alike of the soil beneath and the sun above, so is our entire civilization no more Christian than it is Jewish, no more Aryan than it is Semitic. It is the blending of Eastern and Western culture, of the Hellenic and Hebraic spirit." ^{3.}

1. Parker, XIV, p. 318.

2. Channing, II, p. 293.

3. Kohler, American Hebrew, vol. 54, pp. 719-721.

Unitarianism is characterized by a Christian attitude and colouring. In ^{treating} ~~comparing~~ the two religious systems, Judaism and Unitarianism, because of personal bias and the impossibility of learning the whole truth, it is difficult fairly and correctly to compare the two theologies. There is, however, no mistaking the general tenor and trend of thought. Unmistakably the orientation ^{of Unitarianism} is Christian. Because of their antecedents, Unitarians cling to Christian memories, sentiments and traditions. They cannot rid themselves of their sympathies and their rearings. The glamor of the old belief, in spite of the scientific outlook and the subsequent dethronement of Jesus from the divine throne, is responsible for the reverence given ^{him} ~~Jesus~~. By the force of "sentimental association and historic background", ^{1.} Unitarians are overcome with a sense of the sublime excellence of Jesus. No matter how many examples of like martyrdom, nor how many analogous spiritual statements may be adduced, Unitarians will continue to see in the death of Jesus and in his teachings the incarnation of nobility and truth itself. The importance attached to his words and his teachings that is imputed to ^{those of} ~~no~~ other figure of history is due solely to the power of the influence of the past. The whole emphasis on Christ reveals the Christian spirit. His personality is reflected throughout Unitarian philosophy. The idea of salvation through Him has been rationalized, yet it still partakes of a Christian character. The spirit of Christianity is demonstrated and fostered by the retention by Unitarians of some Christian ceremonies.

The Church,^a "union of those who come together to help each other to live a Christian life,"^{1.} is a Christian institution. It would lead its members to stand worshipping by the cross of Christ. The following of the Cross, the symbol of Christianity, is the symbol of Unitarianism. Unitarians "must place (themselves) near (Jesus), see him, hear him, follow him from his cross."^{2.} "There is a sight granted to the pure mind, of the cross of Christ, which makes privations and sufferings in the cause of his truth, seem light."^{3.} The Christian ceremonies reflect a ^{psychology} psychology. These ceremonies separate the Jew from the Unitarian, for their appeal is foreign to the Jew. The Lord's Supper, as a "^{re-}Reminder of the life and death of Jesus,"^{4.} maintains "a living sense of our personal relation to Jesus as teacher and friend"^{5.} It, however, like the rite of Baptism, which is the only other of the main Catholic ceremonies that is practised, possesses no sacramental value, no power in itself dissociated from the attitude of the worshipper. Baptism, too, is a symbol. It "expresses the desire that the infant or adult baptized may be surrounded by those outward Christian influences which conduce to purity of character and conduct."^{6.} The conception of the Sabbath as a day of extra solemnity differs from the Jewish idea of the Sabbath, and reveals the Christian basis of Unitarianism.^{7.} The Christian orientation is revealed in the phraseology^{with} which the writers couch their ideas. Unitarians have broken with the objectionable Christian theology, yet they have not dispensed with the decorative methods of presenting religious principles employed by their predecessors. Their beliefs are robed in the same manner as the dogmas of Orthodoxy.

1. James Clarke; "Manual" p. 47.

2. Channing, 11, p. 293

3. ibid, p. 286

4. Emerson, p. 245

5. J. Clarke; "Manual" p. 48

6. ibid. p. 47

7. vide Rudolph Lupo, art "Why is the American Synagogue a Failure?" American Jewish Chronicle, March 1, 1918. cf also Abrahams, "Jewish life in the middle ages, chapl and chap. in Kohler "Synag. and its Insti."

The unnatural, nauseating, constant use of colorless adjectives of pale and lifeless love cannot appeal to men with masculine blood in their veins. Ideas are presented in the same general way used by the older school. In calling men to the spiritual life, the emphasis is still laid on the need for leaving the life of the flesh. Evil is personified in the person of the devil; true^{1.}, he is only a personification, and not a power, yet his very presence within Unitarianism is an inferior feature of the movement. The attitude is reflected in such paragraphs as this: "It is a good thing for a man to be born into the flesh and wear it awhile, and after he had done his work it is a good thing for him to be born out of the flesh, and live elsewhere, and if we live natural lives, we shall one day be glad to die out of the body, and shall only regret the fact because we leave our friends^{1.} grieving with some natural tears in their eyes." Unitarians reject the doctrine of original sin, yet they speak repeatedly of the imperfections of man, labeling them all sinners. They must put the old principle in a new form; they dare not ~~or~~ reject it completely. They must explain the old views, and for that reason they reveal an attitude unacceptable to Jews. Since they must apologize for their stand, they do not stand firmly on the ground of truth. Each individual writer may not be characterized by a thoroughly unacceptable attitude, yet each one reveals a Christological taint at some point in his theology. Some of these characteristics are not anti-Jewish, but they certainly may be termed unJewish. For example a Jew would never refer in this strain to the love of God^{2.} "That dear love which sends the sun so sweetly round the world^{2.}" Such words would produce no reaction on his fellow Jews. This same indefinable attitude is evidenced by the veneration of the New Testament as a

1. Parker XIV, p. 234. cf also ibid, pp. 83, 84

2. ibid, p. 10

perfect book, and by the consequent constant reference to it as a sanction for conduct and belief. Jews can never be moved by such tedious quotations from a book that to ^{them} ~~them~~, though containing some virtues can not be regarded as the epitome of religious truth.

The spirit of the past is with Unitarianism. And naturally, so, for the movement has been linked with Christianity from its inception and has never broken away from it. Unitarianism has developed within the Christian Church as a protest against Trinitarianism, and "the preponderating influence of the parent faith still abides".^{1.} Unitarianism preserves the continuity of the progressive life of the Christian centuries. The entire background is Christian. Unitarians freely grant that they owe their existence to the mother faith. "In fact Unitarians' most cherished ideas came into shape through a rational process within the lines of orthodox Christianity, and they have no desire to repudiate the paternity of these ideas. They yield to no one in their admiration and devotion to the person of him to whom all Christians, no matter ^x what diversities turn as to their Master and Guide."^{2.}

Unitarianism is anti-Jewish in that it is hostile to Judaism and in that it places Christian over against Jewish claims. Further, it is non-Jewish in that it lacks the Jewish psychology. Its attitude toward Jesus and the New Testament is false, and it lacks a certain mental temper that Jews proudly possess. There could be no error in our interpretation of the Unitarian outlook on life, and there can be no mistake

1. J. E. Art: "Unitarianism"

2. Emerson, pp. 174, 175.

in our thesis that there exists a certain charaderistical Jewish mental vision. The elements of a historical consciousness, including a ^{thorough} thorough-going conception of a mission, of a race or group awareness, of a spiritual turn of mind, are integral parts of the Jewish psychology. This heritage of the past differs vitally from the inheritance of the Unitarians. The two methods of approach ^{cross} cross each other at right angles and cannot form a straight line. " Reform Judaismsm and Unitarianism are distinct religions because of the historic and sympathetic divergences which react both on doctrine and on practise." Differences of this nature are further-reaching even than logical distinctions. The mental drives, urges, propensities of the two religions differ radically, so radically, that we ^{feel} feel that the dissimilarities are chiefly psychological rather than theological.

The past has moulded our beliefs. We are therefore exponents of an historical consciousness. Of such great importance is this foundation in the past that if the Jewish leaders were all removed, the Jew would still persist. If the Unitarian leaders were removed, however, Unitarianism would cease. " Every Jew incarnates the Jewish past." The sense of ^{pride} responsibility arising from the awareness of the great heritage leads to a sense of responsibility in each Jew to proclaim his faith. Thus the Jew has a great past and a great future. The Unitarian, holding that the perfect truth already was revealed, has no future, and lacks the greatness of a past like that of Israel. The historical consciousness is the might and mystery of the Jew's persistence.

This history of the Jew is a history of a people steadily furthering and propagating religious truth. Each Jew of the past " represents a stone in the structure of our faith and all were needed to make the glorious whole. The growth of our conception of God makes our monotheism

1.M. Harris, C.C.A.R. Sermons, p. 281

2.H. G. Hirsch, H.U.C. Lecture, 1915.

more intense.^{1.} A name connoting three thousand years of spiritual development is a potent argument in favor of our truths. The identification of the destinies of Jews with moral and religious ideals throughout the centuries has built up a soul of intense devotional nature. Unitarian and Jew possess different temperaments; "because a different past has moulded them, a different allegiance holds them."^{2.} Each therefore sees the same principle in a light that is different, though the nature of the difference is hard to define. The feelings and emotions do not coincide. And religious knowledge is not a matter of rational judgment. It is experience, "an internal conviction attained by processes of thought and incomings or inrushes of feelings which are not learned from a book, but are acquired in life."^{3.} A people that has learned through its own history the need of servile dependence on the Higher Principle, and the importance of alliance with the cause of God is best qualified to know and to teach the meaning of worship and service, and will interpret religious truth in a unique way. The distinction may be one of stress rather, than of content, or of intensity of feeling rather than of subject matter. A mere statement of the doctrine of the unity of God and the need of worship does not exhaust the content of Jewish theology. "One cannot live on essences; one wants body, colour, form. There is a distinctly Jewish doctrine of God and His relation to man with which the bare and bald skeleton of his existence, unity and righteousness must be filled out. And so with Jewish ethics."^{4.}

Of the memory of the past, Jews are proud. It serves as an inspiration. The history of the devotion of the Jewish people, our ancestors, stretching back almost to the beginning of history, the record of the

1. M. Harris, C.C. A. R. Sermons, p. 277.

2. Mont. "Liberal Judaism and Hellenism", p. 83

3. Mont. "Out" pp. 159 seq.

4. Mont. Papers for Jewish People "no. LV, pp. 7, 8. London 1908

nation that has suffered and lived for a religious ideal, the annals of a race of intentional benefactors to mankind is the cause of our Jewish pride. " It is good for us to feel that we have a history, that behind the Jew of this twentieth century there stretches a living chain of generations connecting him by manifold links with the far off past.¹ Pride of, and enthusiasm for, the teachings, that are called " Jewish " are resultants of the knowledge that they are the venerated inheritance of our people. " This marvelous past gives a significance to Judaism's position that is shared and can be shared by no other religious organization. The unbending monotheism of the Jew makes him the classical standard bearer of this truth.²"

The historical consciousness is a binding force with Jews in spite of its indefinable nature. The Jewish spirit, the product of many ages, the outcome of many hundreds of influences, is impalpable; yet it is all the more part of us because of its assimilation and gradual infiltration into our beings. Since it is a syncretism, a historic percipitate, it pervades the whole of Jewish philosophy. Bathed in it are all the members of Jewry today, as well as were those of the past. Since all Jews are historic exponents of that pure monotheism, they form a community bound together by the identity of their interests. The historical consciousness, a " certain complex of ideas and physisic predispositions," "the deposit left by the aggregate of historical impressions".³ Composed alike of physical, intellectual and moral elements, of habits and views, of emotions and impressions, nursed into being and perfection by the hereditary instinct active for thousand of years, this historical consciousness is a remarkably puzzling and complex psychic phenomenon³.

1. Joseph, p. 197.

2. D. Philipson, American Israelite, vol. 47, no. 32, p. 4.

3. Dubnow: " Jewish History " , pp. 27 ff.

Its effects on us, however, are known. " By our common memory of a great stirring past and heroic deeds on the battle-fields of the spirit, by the exalted historical mission allotted to us, by our thorn-strewn pilgrim's path, our martyrdom assumed for the sake of our principles, by such moral ties, we Jews are bound fast to one another.¹

" The only description ^{applicable} applicable to the Jewish people is 'the historical nation of all times' a description bringing into relief the contrast between it and all other nations of modern and ancient times, whose historical existence either came to an end in days long past, or began at a date comparatively recent. And granted that there are 'Historical and unhistorical' peoples, then it is beyond dispute that the Jewish people deserves to be called 'the most historical' (histori-²cissimus)".

Jews are animated with the desire to preserve the memory of this past that is such a compelling force in the determination of their outlook, and are possessed of the desire to seek to render this impalpable attitude understandable. The historic consciousness is nourished by historic ceremonies and ancient institutions. These festivals and customs maintain a bond of union with the past. " The commemoration of the past deepens while exercising our historic sympathies: it helps us to feel our kinship with the great souls of our race of a by-gone day; it makes us realize our dignity as members of the great house of Israel."³ The institutions of the synagogue by their historic appeal have an important psychological effect on the Jew. Any other ceremonial system could not produce the same reaction on the descendants of Israel. The Jewishness, the distinctive nature of the forms of our faith, would likewise be lost on any outside of our group.

1. *ibid.* p. 28.

2. *ibid.* p. 10.

3. Joseph, pp. 198, 199.

Though Judaism is a universal religion, it, none-the-less, includes these particularistic elements because of sentiment. The traditional force of the institutions of the synagogue are recognized by all Jews. They differ only in the nature and number of the forms accepted. With the orthodox we agree that " what one has been accustomed to for a long time, or even from his earliest youth, is deeply impressed on the heart and is not readily surrendered"¹. The specific note of a Jewish form is to be observed in the institution of the synagogue itself. The Christian church bears no relationship to the Jewish Temple which is a "house of meeting" " a house of prayer", and a "house of study"². The Jewish synagogue with its social phases, with its optimistic atmosphere, is entirely different from the Christian Church with its oppressive severity and dull solemnity. The entire tone of Jewish ceremonies differs from that of Christian. The Jewish life plays such an important part in Judaism because of the attitude toward fundamental ideas implicit within it. We do not hold that forms constitute the highest method of displaying religious sentiments, but we do maintain that Jewish ceremonials possess a unique character. If a Jew therefore feels the need of religious rites he can find satisfaction only in the institutions of the synagogue.

The spirit reflected in the synagogue has persisted throughout Jewish history. By the law of motion Israel has been thrown forward by the spirit of its past and has preserved its religious outlook.³ "Among the Jews the continuity of spirit has been almost unbroken in historical times." This cultus, made objective, has been transmitted from generation to generation. And this continuity of spirit has formed a communal bond embracing all the members of the group.

1. Friedlander, p. 420.

2. Vide note 7. b.p. 137.

3. Lazarus, 11, p. 192

It grew up primarily from the realization of the intrinsic worth of the message Israel was bearing, but was strengthened by other influences. The common mores, common prayer, instruction, participation in aesthetic pleasure of a musical or dramatic nature, a national festival, a national misfortune¹ welded the individuals into a community, the members of which were strongly knit to each other.^{1.} A national soul² was possible because the people's principles were built up on a single book, and all further development was based on the fundamentals contained in that Bible. An orderly, progressive, unified development therefore took place. Progress was possible, but arbitrary divergencies from the high spirit of the past were rendered impossible because of this accepted weltanschauung.

The continuity of spirit and all elements characteristically Jewish bind Jews together socially. This group feeling has been heightened by a variety of other forces. The belief in the Zachuth Aboth, in the imputed merit of the progenitors of the race, served to establish the sense of historic continuity.^{2.} The notion of the covenant with God^{3.} strengthened the Jewish group solidarity. the fact that the Jews are members both of a religious union and of a racial entity conduces to strong loyalty to the same ideals. The presence of all the features, any one of which is sufficient to render a number of individuals a nation, has served to develop a strong sense of group consciousness, viz. a single geographical area as a homeland, a common racial tie, unity of language, religion and culture and finally common traditions of joy and suffering. It is admitted by all scholars that this last is the most important element in the consideration of nationality, and in the ^{case} ~~case~~ of the Jew it is dominant. The Jewish national spirit has

1. Lazarus 11.

2. vide Schechter, pp. 183, 184

3. vide Kohler, chap. "God's Covenant."

been fanned by frequent persecutions, and has been heightened by a rich inheritance of memories and the desire to preserve them^{1.} The Nationalist today stresses this national phase of Israel's existence. He emphasizes the importance of preserving the identity of the people as such, losing sight of the fact that it is our ideals we are in duty bound to preserve and that for this mission alone we have been permitted to live. We would stress the other side of Israel's philosophy, the universal outlook, calling attention to our world mission, pointing back to the teachings of the prophets who had visions of a universal kingdom of God. At the same time, however, we must recognize in the group feeling of the Jew a powerful mental drive. The national spirit will live on, and the problem is how to preserve the brotherhood of Israel without losing sight of the brotherhood of man. Logically, by virtue of its superiority, the universal spirit should prevail, but it meets a most powerful solvent in this national force. Our task is to utilize the group feeling for the proper purposes, to appeal through it for an endeavor to realize our universal mission. A certain self consciousness is indeed justifiable, even advantageous and its effects must be reckoned with.

The national feeling, tamed, ^{resolves} resolves itself into a strong sense of self-identity. The Jew feels that he is a Jew, that he is a member of a separate group. However he may succeed in attaching himself to the loyalties of city and country, he is still a member of a group, a religious group. This is the folk psychology of the Jew. He wishes to maintain his identity. For that reason he would not so willingly invite a Unitarian to address his congregation. The inertia of this self consciousness of the Jew, if nothing else, will prevent him from

1. vide I. Zangwill: "Principle of Nationalities" N.Y. 1917.

joining the Unitarian ranks. The average Jew is a Jew, and does not speculate about his reason for being a member of the Jewish community. He accepts as facts the separate existence of his group, the force of its customs and the hold of his religion upon him, since they conduce to moral ends. Since it functions, Judaism is accepted. Abrahams¹ puts this quite clearly : " The modern aplogists for all religions rarely belong to the rank and file. Whether it be Harnack for Christianity or Montefiore² for Judaism, the vindicators stand far above the average of the believers whose faith they are vindicating. The average man needs no defense for a religion which enables him to live and thrive materially and spiritually. The importance of this consideration is very great. Restricting our attention to Judaism, it is clear that it still offers ideals to many, prescribes and enforces a moral law, teaches a satisfactory doctrine of God. If so, then it is futile to discuss whether Judaism is still necessary. Can the world afford to surrender a single one of its forces for good ? If there are 10,000,000 of men, women and children who live, and live not ignobly, by Judaism, can it be contended that Judaism is obsolete ? The first, the main justification of Judaism is its continued efficiency, its proved power still¹ to control and inspire many millions of human lives." The ability of Judaism to meet the needs of its members and the strong sense of self awareness will by themselves, independent of the superiority of Jewish doctrines, continue to hold Jews loyal to their faith.

This same sense of group solidarity lends meaning to Jewish customs. The traditional method of solemnizing marriage and of commem-
 1. " Judaism" London 1904, pp. 96,97

orating death will be employed as long as there are Jews. The Jew would never consider a marriage ceremony performed by any one other than a Rabbi as binding. Public worship will never have meaning for him unless it be in the community of his fellow Jews. Because of the power of the past, because of the strong group feeling, because of the sentiment attached to the processes characteristic of his group for centuries, the Jew can be affected and stimulated religiously only by Jewish approaches. The Jew is a Jew because he wishes to be a Jew, and he is attached to Jewish life for no better reason. Man is a creature of emotion, more than of reason. And especially in matters of religion does sentiment hold the position of dominance. We can reach one type of pupil in one way: we must employ a different presentation of the same facts in order to reach another. If one appeals to a Jew he may best approach him on the basis of an Old Testament story; to a Christian on the basis of a New Testament passage. Common experience tells us that emotions and prejudices are so deeply seated psychologically that they can only with difficulty be eradicated. Unitarianism can never provide the Jew with the holy associations, the tender memories, and the abiding charm of Jewish life. Judaism is not a system of tribal, particularistic, non-moral customs, of rites that conduce to no individual betterment; neither is it a body of national feelings nor is it based on group loyalty; The spiritual ideal and the material life however are closely bound together in the Jewish philosophy.

"The social and the religious life of the Jew are inseparable.

Religion for us Judaism-colours all life, and gives to it a peculiar

note.¹ Each religion is a whole in the minds of its adherents; it continues and develops as a whole. The Jewish life is permeated with the

1. Mont: "Papers for Jewish People" no. XII, p. 11.

spirit of the Jewish religion, a religion built up by the contributions of each teacher of the past. A religion is not presented in all its aspects, nor explained fully in its creedal system. "A religion is a system by which one regulates his life in all its phases. For this reason it becomes bound up with social institutions."^{1.} The life of the Jew reflects at every turn its Jewish character. The personalities of the members of any religious sect are completely saturated with the spirit of that sect. The Jew, since he makes but a faint line of demarkation between the secular and religious, is more completely enveloped in the folds of his faith than ^{are} the member of any other religious faith.^{2.} The Unitarian, too, however, is firmly attached to the parent faith. The two attitudes can never be reconciled. They differ from one another as day does from night.

The Jews conceived themselves to be a body aiming to incarnate the idea of service to God, to embody the principles of righteousness and justice, of reverence and worship. They have tried to reveal these principles in their social life and in their history. They are to be the servants of God, are to form the priest people that is to demonstrate and illustrate the kind of service God demands of man. The consciousness of such an effort in the past begets a like enthusiasm today. For "If the history of Israel has no dynamic significance, supplies no hint ^{walking} as to the destiny of humanity, then is life indeed a ^{3.} walking shadow." The great past behind Israel gives its members a great advantage. "There is something more satisfying in a religion which links the present with the past, and accentuates God's part in the gradual acquisition ^{of} truth than in a religion which starts

1. M. Harris, C.C.A.R. Sermons, p. 284.

2. vide Lazarus, 1, p. 190; 11, p. 29.

3. Zangwill, N.A.R. vol. 160, pp. 425, 426.

de novo, and seems rather the creation of man's intelligence rather than the outgrowth of his spiritual need.^{1.} Israel is a people bearing forward the message of the past improving on it and developing it. The heritage of the past is not honored merely because it comes with the dignity of age, but because of its intrinsic worth, because of its possibilities for bringing about a better order of things.

Our conclusion is that there can be no advantage for Jews in leaving the religion of their fathers to join themselves to a faith affirming the same principles it developed, a faith coming to the original position of Judaism by growth from a religion that was but a vitiated form of Judaism. Not only is Judaism possessed of all the superior features of Unitarianism; it has as its own an appeal than which there can be none stronger. We rejoice that the sublimity of our teachings is being approached by a group of Christians, and feel proud that finally our teachings are receiving support and vindication. Unitarianism is rendering vast service by propagating the spirit of Israel's past, and by introducing the modern attitude to Christianity. Reform Judaism and Unitarianism are sympathetic toward each other because of the community of this interest. The work of Unitarianism in liberalizing the Christian church is heartily indorsed by us. Our mission is to carry on this same effort in the Jewish Synagogue and to continue preaching in the spirit of the universalism of our prophets and Rabbis. Unitarians may effect that reform within Christianity, and Reform Judaism within Judaism proper, each at the same time ministering to the spiritual needs of its members in the manner peculiar to the parent faith.

Each should promote that relationship of the individual with God that will lead to the service of Him throughout^a life of holiness and of righteousness. We must commend Unitarians for their fearless espousal of the truth, and must work for a friendly attitude and interchange of views. We Jews, however, will never join the Unitarian Church. "That any Jews should become Unitarians would be equivalent to asking the ocean to flow back into its tributaries."¹ We must both, Jews and Unitarians, further the weal of mankind by contributing our best in the spirit of our respective movements, within our own special confines. We shall each travel on our own way, with nothing but the most sympathetically cooperative attitude towards each other. "The ancient intensity of that opposition of ideals, when each ideal had yet to develop itself, is no longer necessary, and today their prismatic hues may blend in the white light of the religion of the future."² The God of the nations^{has} permitted the peoples to develop along their respective lines, has sent them forth into the world that they might serve Him. The nations are "the candle sticks of the Lord" each bearing aloft the flame of some ideal. Israel's torch, the flaming pillar of the fire of religious devotion, is to direct the peoples from their homes to the Mount of God. In the future the picture painted by the sage will be brought to dramatic realization: "On that day, all Palestine shall be as sacred as Zion, and all countries as Palestine. All worshippers shall be borne aloft on billowy clouds to the Holy Land, thence to be returned each to his native soil."³

1. M. Harris, C.C.A.R. Sermons, p. 270.
2. I. Zangwill, N.A.R., vol. 160, p. 437.
3. Pesikta Rabbati I.