



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

Atonement.

A
Comparative Study.

Jerusalem Mosses.

Graduation-Thesis.

Hebrew Union College.

May 10, 1894.

Table of Contents.

Chapter I.	Pages
The Origin of Evil & Sin.	1-44
Chapter II.	
The Fall of Man.	15-24.
Chapter III.	
The Mosaic View of Atonement	25-36.
Chapter IV.	
The Christian View " "	37-58
Chapter V.	
The Jewish View (In General)	58-76
Chapter VI.	
Atonement & Redemption	
(a) Atonement (Jewish)	
(b) Redemption (Christian)	
A comparison.	77-96.

Preface.

The doctrine of Atonement is too vast a subject to be thoroughly expounded in a treatise like this. At first I thought to give a complete history of its development in all its phases, considered from the Jewish and Christian standpoints. To carry out adequately the undertaking it was necessary to devote more time and more strenuous labor than a student in school is able to afford. I read a vast amount of literature on the subject of Atonement; and the more I read, the less comprehensible the Christian view has become, and the less systematic I found the Jewish doctrine expounded in literature. On this account I gave up the too arduous task of writing a complete history and gathered only those notes which bear upon the main characteristics that distinguish the Jewish view from the Christian.

I have arranged the Chapters in the way I intended to write the historical development of Atonement. It is hardly necessary to enumerate the books read on this subject. From the small work which I have accomplished it will be seen that the knowledge was gathered from different sources in accordance with the intended purpose to write a more valuable thesis. Thus I would beg kind indulgence to the smallness of the work accomplished; and I hope that it will find favorable acceptance and the required approval of the honorable Faculty of the Hebrew Union College.

Most Respectfully Jerusalem Moss

Chapter I

The Origin of Sin.

As long as men have lived upon earth, ever since they began to think, the question concerning the origin of evil has exercised their minds. Whence comes evil? Whence comes pain? It may be said that all religions, especially the most ancient and profound, are attempts at a satisfactory solution of this problem. The most ancient philosophy is the Indian philosophy of the Vedas. Its theme is the fact of evil. The most widely spread religion is that of Buddha. Its origin is the sorrow of earthly existence. The latest philosophy of our age is that of Schopenhauer, the solitary philosopher of Frankfurt. His mind is constantly exercised with the question of evil. Schopenhauer laid down the doctrine of the best world. Schopenhauer calls this a bitter contempt for the numerous sufferings

of human nature. The theme of his philosophy is the sorrow of life. Our feelings involuntarily associate evil with sin. The testimony of conscience bids us seek the reason of this discord of life in the discord existing in the moral world. All religions have been occupied with the questions of sin, of its origin, of its abolition. The human mind has ever been proposing to itself the inquiry: Whence is moral evil or sin? Upon the answer to this question depends the moral and ethical standard of the religion. In it lies the conception which man has of God and of himself of Divine Providence and of human freedom. The pagan world made God the creator of evil and sin, and ^{thought} of man to be born in sin. No prophetic voice has revealed this teaching. No prophetic voice has told the worshippers of Baal and Moloch to sacrifice their children

in order to obtain forgiveness of sin. It is from Moses that the prophetic voice has come down to us revealing the truth of the origin of sin. The teaching of Moses is distinguished by its practical view in regard to the origin of physical and moral evil. The Hindoo religion ascribes to the absolute Being two opposite powers: one in Brahma, a personified centrifugal force which renders the world a self-manifestation of God, and one in Vishnu, a personified centripetal force, by means of which the deity draws to itself everything that emanates from it. The Greek philosophy and latter the Cabala had similar conceptions (אלוהים מן המין הנקבה). For this reason the highest and noblest aim of the devout Hindoo is to deaden the "self" (man's individuality), the mind as well as the body, and to bring them back to the universal absolute Life.

4

Zoroastrianism from its ethical side approaches the nearest to Mosaism. But like unto Cain and Able it makes Ahriman, the principle of evil, rebel against Hormuzd, the principle of good. And thus the teaching of Zend propounds its doctrine of original sin. The former cosmic harmony is destroyed. Sin becomes infinite. The world is the seat of vice, woe and crime. Two deities of opposite nature are in constant antagonism, and man's destiny is ever to battle against Ahriman, but a battle without any hope for victory. Almost all religions teach that man is born in sin, that nature contains the elements of sin, that God is either the mediate or the immediate cause of sin.

Mosaism alone teaches the opposite doctrine. God is the Jehovah-Elohim. Nature and God

are not one. Neither is God some nebular phantasm. He is the highest, self-existent Being, infinitely above all the works of his creation. He created the world and "saw everything that he had made and behold it was very good". The world is not an emanation, nor a self-manifestation of his existence. It is not a creation that distresses him, nor is it the work of a fallen or non-fallen sub-god. Everything was created of his own free will, good and pure; everything is a manifestation of his sublimity. Man is created in the image of God. God is holy; hates and hates sinners, and man shall be holy like unto Him. "Circumlieth at the door; and unto thee is its desire, but thou canst rule over it." (Genesis 4. 7). In such a creation, under such a perfect Being, and in a human being, created in the image of God, how can original sin have existence?

The teachings of Moses most decidedly deny the existence of original sin. Some Christian theologians find in the word Nephesh (פֶּשַׁע) the meaning of an original unpure, sinful tendency, equivalent to the Greek word *καρμίνη*. Thus in order to substantiate their own doctrine about original sin they attempt to ascribe to Moses a pagan principle. It is true that in Nephesh lies the origin of sin, but this Nephesh is not possessed by an inherent sinful tendency. The tendency to sin, the liability to do wrong may be inherent, but not the sinful tendency, not the wrongful liability. The Mosaic idea of the constitution of man is a perfectly simple and popular one. Common observation teaches us that man is a creature composed of a visible bodily frame informed by an invisible something which is believed to be connected with thought, feeling and will.

Such is the conception given in the Bible, (in the Old Testament). Body and flesh are not conceived of as impure. They contain no inherent tendency to sin. If they do, the word "sin" has no meaning. In the decalogue the commandment "thou shalt not covet" (7th commandment) shows clearly that there is no inherent tendency to sin. This conception distinguishes the teachings of Moses from all other systems of religions. According to the view of the Old Testament sin and virtue are the products of the free human will, God is never the originator of sin, but He endowed mankind with the abilities to become the originator of sin and virtue.

There is still another distinction to be drawn between the teachings of the Old Testament and those of other religions. The pagan world looks upon moral evil and physical evil coming from God himself.

Original sin by itself is already a physical evil. The Old Testament on the other hand distinguishes between physical evil and moral. It makes God the originator of the first and man the originator of the latter.

"Forming the light and creating darkness, making peace and creating evil: I the Lord do all these things." (Is 45. 7). "Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord have not done it?" (Amos 3. 6). "Everything comes from Heaven except the fear or veneration of Heaven," emphasizes the Talmud in the words:

וְכָל שֶׁנֶּחֱמָה בְּיָד הָאֱלֹהִים, כֻּלָּם בְּיָד הָאָדָם. (Berachoth 33b). This distinction between physical and moral evil solves the problem of the origin of sin. Sin is the violation of harmony between the physical part and moral or spiritual part of human nature. The root of sin

harmonious order of the absolute Being. If one human being wrongs the other, it was done under the guidance of divine Providence, but the wrong-doer deserves punishment, because of the violation of his own inner spiritual harmony. This inference may be drawn from Genesis 15, 13, 14: "Know of a surety, that thy seed shall be a strangers in a land which is not theirs, and they will make them serve, and they will afflict them four hundred years. And also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge." Another verse teaches the same lesson: "Though ye thought evil against me, God meant it unto good in order to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save alive a numerous people." (Genesis 50, 20).

The Talmud contradicts this Biblical view of the nature of sin. It holds the opinion that sin

destroys the cosmic harmony: "The world was created by means of ten words. God could have done it by one, but to avenge more fully the wrongs of the wicked who destroy the world that was created by ten words, and to reward the righteous who keep up the world created by ten words". (Aboth 5.1). The Talmud ascribes to God a certain passiveness; he permits the consequences of sin to propagate in order to punish the sinner in the world to come (from the first pains). The Talmud also pays more attention to the act of sin than to the motive thereof, to the objectivity of it than to the subjectivity. It tends even to exempt from capital punishment the murderer who killed a person of bodily deformity and of very short vitality. (See Cholin 116 and Sanhedrin 78a). The Talmud again differs from

the Old Testament in regard to the origin of physical evil. It makes it the natural consequence of sin and exists in the world as a retribution. (Berachoth 5b)

Morassism on the other hand looks upon physical evil as a source of moral instructions. "And thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God hath led thee these forty years in the wilderness in order to afflict thee, to prove thee, to know what is in thy heart, whether thou wouldst keep his commandments or not. (Deut. 8, 2). The whole of the book of Job is a presentation of the origin of physical evil. The friends of Job present the view held by the Talmud, namely, that evil is the punishment of sin. But their view is refuted, and it is shown that evil exists for the development of the moral

nature of man. Satan is presented there as sitting in council of the Almighty. This fact proves, that he is not the personification of moral evil, nor a fallen angel that holds sway over mankind, but that he is the personification of physical evil and exists in order to strengthen the moral sense; he also stands for the inherent tendency to commit a moral wrong and may be subdued by the other tendency to do the right. In Zechariah the Satan assumes a different aspect. There is discernible already a foreign, non-Jewish, element, that probably crept in from Babylonia. The figure of the great spiritual adversary of the nation seems here to be in the act of taking shape. But in

no wise does the Biblical Satan represent the Persian Ahriman. In Job, in Zechariah as well as in 2 Samuel and 1 Chron. the Satan is either a mere angel or an impure creature of man, in both cases he is subject to the allmighty power of God and to the moral strength of man, created in the image of God; in a later presentation he is the figurative נִסְיוֹן, "that lieth at the door; and unto man is its desire, but he can rule over it."

Chapter II

15

The Fall of Man.

From the previous analysis of the nature of sin it is seen that the Old Testament does not teach that sin is a nature, but that it is a tendency. It is described as a weakness, a fault, blindness and folly. It is an inclination which constantly allures men to wrong-doing, but it is not invincible; it can be overcome by man's own effort. Such is the teaching of common experience. But there is one chapter (Gen. III.) which created a world of dogmas, which lies at the foundation of the doctrine of Atonement, which appears to offer a history of the origin of sin. It occurs in the body of traditions, which are sharply distinguished in content and

tone from the remainder of the book of Genesis. The story contained in this chapter is a myth, a survival, perhaps, of the dragon of Babylonian myth, who is the antagonist of the gods. No distinct reference to the story is found elsewhere in the Old Testament, which fact contradicts the vast importance that many people ascribe to the story. The narrative corresponds to the general view held by the Old Testament respecting the nature of sin. It intends to account in a mythological way for the existence of the distinction between right and wrong and for the necessity of physical evil. At first it presents man following only his natural instinct and living in the manner all other

17
animals live. By gradual development man learns to distinguish between right and wrong. Then he hears within him the voice of God, the voice of conscience, the voice of remorse, and sorrow and pain follow as natural consequences. Then man becomes like unto God's image, then man is able to reach the highest moral standard, that found its origin in the distinction between the right and the wrong, between the good and the bad, the beautiful and unbeautiful. This idea may underlie the whole story of the serpent, though there are wanting more substantial evidences. Many suppositions, suggestions,

76
comments and criticism are brought forward by theologians of all denominations. But it is surpassingly strange that the whole doctrine of Atonement should be based on the myth of the Atonement as expounded by the Christian faith. The first attempt at a spiritual interpretation of the serpent occurs in the Wisdom of Solomon II 24: "God created man for immortality, and made him to be an image for his own being, but through envy of the devil came death into the world". The interpretation of the third chapter as an exposition of the original sin, of the fall of man, never took deep root in the Hebrew literature. On the contrary the transgression of Adam

and Eve is looked upon by the Talmud and Midrash as an insignificant one. In Schabbath 55^b it is said respecting Adam's sin, עבר מצוה קלה, he transgressed ^{an} unimportant commandment. In Beresh. rabba it is said that God regretted the creation of man out of earthly matter ^{מלכות}, if he were created of heavenly, spiritual substance, he would have been no rebel. In many passages of the Midrash the serpent is called the נחש הקדמון "the ancient serpent" and stands for the satan. According to the Targ. jer. Gen. 3. 6 Eve saw in the serpent the angel of death, Sammael, and she was greatly frightened. That the progress of the idea of satan as tempter was slow seems probable.

not only from the infrequency with which he is introduced, but also from the fact that neither Enoch nor Josephus connects him with the serpent of Genesis.

The New Testament representation of sin varies with different writers, passing from the simple Old Testament view to the conception of evil as the corruption of nature. But without doubt the narrative in Gen. III was accepted with its later interpretation as given in the Wisdom of Solomon; the common view must have been that man fell from purity by the temptation of the devil. The writings of Paul and his school and the fourth gospel contain references to

to the history in Genesis: "By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and thus death passed unto all men, for that all sinned" (Rom. V. 12). "Ye are of your father the devil, and you will to do the desires of your father". (John VIII 44). "Let a woman learn in quietness, in all subjection; but I permit not a woman to teach nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness; for Adam was first formed, then Eve, and Adam was not beguiled, but the woman was beguiled and fell into transgression". (1 Tim. II 11-14)

Though the precise religious significance of Adam's sin is scantily treated in the N. T. there is no doubt as to its affirmation respecting

the corruption of human nature. The synoptic Gospels say nothing of a moral depravity inherent in man. But Paul formulated the doctrine of the natural man's incapacity to do good. "I know that in me, that is in my flesh there dwells no good thing". The mind of the flesh is enmity against God, for it is not and cannot be subject to the law of God, and they that are in the flesh cannot please God": (2 Cor. VIII 7). The propounders of the Christian faith more or less adhere to the principle of original sin and explain the third chapter of Genesis in the way the Apostle Paul does. Since Adam, says Justin, the human race became mortal. Because Adam disobeyed, the

the human race has fallen, according to Premises, under the sway of the devil. In brief it may be summarized that the orthodox Christian Church established three fundamental principles on which its doctrine of Atonement is based:

- (1) that Adam, as the progenitor of the human race forfeited for all future generations the privileges and gifts bestowed upon him by God
- (2) that he introduced sin into human nature that has become the inheritance of mankind
- (3) that in Adam the whole human race has sinned and become deserving of eternal punishment. Thus from a myth the whole doctrine of Atonement was built up, as it will be seen from the following chapters, and

since Christianity is based on this doctrine,
 it may be said that the third Chapter of Genesis
 is the source whence Christianity took its
 origin, for the eternal sin required an eternal
 sacrifice, the fall of the first man קין אדם הראשון
 needed the advent of God in the form of an
 אדם האחר , and Lucifer, the reproduction
 of the Persian Ahiman, and the embodiment
 in the serpent of Genesis, had to be ~~substituted~~
 by another Ormuzd embodied in the Chris-
 tian Savior. Thus the simple and practical view of
 the nature of sin, as held in the Old Testament, differ-
 entiated into the complicate, impracticable
 and groundless doctrine of the Fall of Man and
 Original Sin.

Chapter III

25

The Mosaic View of Atonement.

The Old Testament idea of the constitution of man is a perfectly simple and popular one. Common observation teaches that man is a creature composed of a visible bodily frame informed by an invisible something which is believed to be connected with thought, feeling, will, with all that makes up life. The soul according to the Old Testament conception is primarily that breath which common observation shows to be the universal and inseparable accompaniment of life with all its functions. It is sometimes, therefore, simply the animal life, denoted by the word *Nephesh*. It is this *Nephesh* that is the object of Atonement. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have appointed it for you upon

the altar to make an atonement for your souls, for
the blood it is that maketh atonement for the soul
(Lev. 17. 11). This verse shows that the object of vic-
arious offerings is to bring atonement to the sinner.
The blood of the animal is substituted for that of man.
The Mosaic view of Atonement is in direct cor-
respondence to the view held concerning the nature
of sin. Sin KUN is the disturbance of harmony in man
between the animal and spiritual part of his con-
stitution. Atonement, כִּפּוּר therefore is
nothing else but the removal of this abnormal
condition through the consecration of the sinning
Nephesh to God. The Nephesh, though pure by
its nature, is liable on account of the free will
to become the creator of sin and is alone the

object of Atonement. The whole of man's constitution becomes disturbed from its disharmony between the animal and spiritual nature. This is symbolically remedied by the sprinkling of the blood of the animal upon the altar, virtually by the consecration of the Heifer to the Most Perfect Being. This is the definition of קָרָב that covers only the sin, but does not remove the sin entirely, does not undo the thing already done. The latter is brought about by Sacrificing זָבַח and then it is called קָרָב , which is an act done on the part of God in view of the sincere repentance and reparation of the wrong committed. The sinner thus wrongs only himself, not God, he disturbs the harmony within himself.

and not the cosmic divine harmony of the universe as the Christian theologians maintain. "If thou sin, what dost thou effect against him? or if thy transgressions be multiplied what canst thou do unto him". (Job 35. 6). The sinner is even unable to disturb the harmony among his fellow-men without the predestination of God and can never obtain forgiveness by bringing a mere כפרה.

Man is only the master of his own moral conscience. He can direct it according to his own free will towards the good or the bad path. He alone is responsible, and with it consciousness of the distinction between right and wrong the responsibility increases. Three proofs are brought forward to demonstrate this view of Atonement.

(1) The Bible always uses the accusative form in regard to the wrong-doer himself, but uses the preposition ב or כ in regard to God and fellowman, when they are the objects ^{against} ~~from~~ the wrong, ^{was} committed, as for example, $\text{בא} \text{ תחטא} \text{ כילד}$, חטא לה ולעבדיו, i. e. he sinned in behalf of his relations to God and his servants, but not against God's own being; in regard to himself it is said $\text{והוא נפש} \text{ ונפשו}$. (2) *Notice*

God nor the fellow-man is the person to grant כפרה . (3) The Pentateuch calls always God אלהים and not מלך . Only in the post-Mosaic literature both terms are interchanged. According to the teachings of Moses, therefore, the real atonement can take place only by the aid of God's mercy for the sinner himself. The symbolical atonement alone can

be executed by the priest and vicarious offerings. The Talmudical discussion, whether שלוחי דרחמנא or כהנים or שלוחי דידן is decided in favor of the latter, if the principle of the vicarious offering is taken in consideration. Thus the primitive view respecting atonement was: if the deity was angry, he was to be appeased by a gift; and this gift, when the sense of the moral guilt of sin was better developed, assumed the form of a vicarious offering. It was natural that animal sacrifices should be mainly regarded either as gifts of homage, presented at the court of the divine king, or as satisfactions for offences, as fines payable at the sanctuary. For the old mechanical idea that the deity was appeased by a gift the

prophets desired to substitute the conviction
 of the necessity for repentance and reformation.
 This protest of the prophets represents a most
 important advance in the ethical conception
 of Atonement. "To what purpose is the mul-
 titude of your sacrifices to me? says the Lord,
 I am sated with the burnt-offerings of rams,
 and the fat of fatted beasts; and the blood
 of bullocks, and of sheep, and of he-goats, I
 do not desire." (Isaiah 1. 11). This is the prevailing
 view in the prophetic writings up to the time
 of the return from the Babylonian exile: wrong
 must be put away by an act of will; the right
 must be done; the soul must come into an
 attitude of willing obedience toward God.

then he will pardon the sin and bestow the blessings
 of his favor. This simple ethical conception
 of the escape from sin by an act of the will
 maintained itself through the Old Testament
 times. Down to the close the traditional sacri=
 fices were maintained in the Temple and the
 other sacred places. There was however another
 conception of the way in which sinning man might
 be reconciled to God. It was a natural feeling
 that the sinner suffering atoned for his sin;
 suffering was the punishment of sin; and
 when the just measure had been reached,
 the wrong-doer might hold that the ground
 of the divine displeasure had been removed.
 But this view does not find expression

till the latter part of the exile. "Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her time of service is accomplished that her punishment is accepted, for she has received at the hand of the Lord double for all her sins." (Isa 40. 2). "O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years?" (Zech. 1. 12). The main atoning power, however, was ascribed to the Day of Atonement and sin-offerings. As has already been remarked the element of vicariousness enters into sacrifice as a result of deeper moral consciousness. The ancient mind saw the most definite and

satisfactory atonement for sin in the blood,
 in the life of a victim. The sin-offerings on the
 Day of Atonement expiated sins of different
 natures, the daily offerings-only those that
 are specified in Leviticus, especially those
 that were committed unintentionally ^{וְהָיָה},
 the reason being as Nachmanides maintains
 all sins produce a stain upon the purity of the
 soul, and it is unable to face its Creator,
 until it is cleansed from all sins. Sins
 that are committed intentionally cannot
 be atoned for during every day of the year,
 but only on the Day of Atonement. Another
 class of sins are atoned by sacrifices, namely,
 those are committed out of forgetfulness,

when an unclean body was touched, when one has sworn and forgotten to fulfill the oath, all these are expressly designated with *חטאת*. In general it may be concluded that the Biblical view of Atonement is based on the satisfaction theory, that no provision is made for an atonement for all sins. The offences for which it does provide are, first, sins of ignorance and secondly certain lighter ceremonial offences, failure to testify in a court of justice and false dealings in money-matters. To this must be added the expiation of the great Day of Atonement which was of a purely national character and could have no bearing on individual sins.

Offences other than those above mentioned were regarded as committed against society and were punished accordingly. The Bible in many recognizes the idea of vicarious atonement. Job is said to have offered burnt offerings for all his children, fearing that they might have sinned; the wrath of God against the three friends is turned aside by a similar sacrifice. Thus the Bible represents the prevailing ancient idea of a connection between forgiveness of sin and the blood of an animal sacrifice.

Chapter IV

37

The Christian Doctrine of Atonement.

The idea of Reconciliation is the central point of the Christian doctrine, and it may almost be said of all religions, since it contains the thought on which the necessity of religion is based: of man's separation from God and union with God. In surveying the course of this doctrine, three periods are distinctly marked. The first which may be called the Mythic period, extends from an early point of Christian antiquity to the eleventh century, during a period of nearly a thousand years. During the whole of this time the prevailing idea was of a controversy between Christ and the Devil for the souls of men

and the work of Christ was mainly to redeem men from the power of the devil by paying the ransom due to him on account of their sins. The second is the Scholastic period extending from the eleventh century to the Reformation, and during this period the leading notion was "legal" and the work of Christ was to satisfy the justice of God by paying the debt legally incurred by the sinner. The third is the period from the Reformation to the present time and the leading thought has relation to the "government" of God the work of Christ being mainly to produce an impression on the human mind by manifesting God's hatred of sin, his respect for

his law or his forgiving love. Throughout the whole of this time the doctrine is in progress. It passes from the most theoretical to the most practical form. The work of Christ is at first something wholly outward, out of men, out of the world, it is at last wholly inward, a work taking place in the interior soul. It is first objective, it is finally subjective. Atonement is at first a transaction between God and Satan in the supernatural world, then it becomes a transaction between God and man in which God is to be satisfied; and then an influence exercised upon the human mind by which man is to be redeemed. But after

reaching this extreme point of subjectivity a reaction takes place and in the system which has followed from the philosophy of Kant, Schelling and Hegel there has been an attempt to combine the objective and subjective forms, in other words to represent the Atonement as a transaction in which God is reconciled to man as well as man reconciled to God.

In the first period the writers of the early Church take a partial view of the N. T. statements concerning the work of Christ and seizing on a particular class of scriptural expressions construct a theory in accordance with the habits peculiar to their age.

41
The N. T. ascribes a great variety of influences to the death of Christ and uses a multitude of expressions in relation to it. Many of them are highly figurative as where Christians are said to "wash their robes white in the blood of the Lamb" and many are naturally borrowed from the Jewish ritual and sacrifices.

But there are two principal aspects relating to the twofold consequences of sin as separating men from God and as depraving the whole nature. The work of Christ in relation to the first is called in the N. T. reconciliation in relation to the second redemption.

The first removes the guilt of sin, the second its power. By the first men are forgiven

by the second men are cleansed from all unrighteousness. Thus the first of these affects was of too inward subjective and spiritual a character to suit the tone of thought in the early church. They passed by therefore the fact of Reconciliation and took hold of the fact of Redemption, and seizing a single expression of Scripture in relation to this they built their whole theory on its literal application. The word thus taken as the foundation of their system was: "ransom" a word used by Christ of himself (Matt. 20, 28, Mark 10, 45, Titus 11, 14, 1 Peter 1, 18) "A Ransom" they argued, "is paid to deliver captives from the hands of their enemies."

But if Christ gave his as a ransom, to whom did he give it? It must have been to an enemy, and who could this be except the devil?" Thus argued for example Irenaeus contending against the Gnostics who endeavored to take a more spiritual view of the death of Christ. Irenaeus was the first who attempted anything like a doctrinal development of the notion of Redemption. The theory was supported by those texts which speak of a victory over the devil. Origen supplied its defects in the system of Irenaeus and developed its doctrine further. He explains the motives which led the devil to cause the crucifixion of Jesus.

a point which Irenaeus had left in obscurity. Origen regarded good and evil as in constant conflict and considered every good action of a good man as a victory gained over the demoniacal world. Thus was the devil deceived when he caused the death of Christ. He was then obliged to accept his soul as a "ransom" for sinners. The theory thus developed by Irenaeus and Origen held its place for many centuries with little alteration. The right of the devil over men was fully admitted. Augustine regarded it as the right of property. According to him Adam was conquered by the devil in fair fight and made slave to him by the laws of war.

and according to the same laws all his descendants were slaves also. Let the Great considered the devil to have only a tyrannical right. Gregory of Nyssa says that the devil was caught by the "bait of the flesh of Christ, under which the look of the divinity was concealed". This figure of the hook and bait runs through many of the Fathers down to Peter Lombard. Objections were made to this view from time to time by one and another. In fact so long as they clung to the literal idea of redemption they were compelled to return to the view of an atonement offered to the devil.

The second period is that of Scholasticism. But what was scholasticism? Baumgarten Crusius says "the school separating itself from the Church and endeavoring to gain an independent existence". Hegel going deeper says: "first come the church-fathers then the church-doctors" first come those who give life to the Church, then life needed light, then arise those who shall teach it. At the very beginning of this period appears a book which was destined by the power of its author's genius to mark an epoch in theology and especially in the history of this doctrine. Anselm Arch-bishop of Canterbury (born 1034) scholar

and successor of Lonfranc, in his celebrated book "Cur Deus Homo" lays the foundation of the church doctrine of substituted punishment. A realist in Philosophy proving the existence of God by assuming the reality of general ideas in an argument which has been commended by Leibniz and Hegel, he carries into theology the same strong confidence in necessary truths and endeavors to found the doctrine of Atonement on a basis of absolute necessity. He sweeps away with the boldness of an independent thinker the whole doctrine of the rights of the devil declaring that the devil has a right to nothing else.

but to be frustrated. Anselm begins his treatise by asking why was it necessary that God should become man in order to redeem mankind? The answer is not as good as the question. His answer is because only so could the guilt of sin be atoned for. He defines "sin to be not giving to God his due". But man owes God all that comes within the sphere of his free will. Whenever he omits to pay this debt, he dishonors God and commits sin. Man must be enabled to satisfy God for his sin in order that he may be saved. But to satisfy God he must give God more than the universe

that is, more than all that is not God. But only
 God himself is this - therefore God himself must
 make the satisfaction, hence the necessity of the
 incarnation of the son of God or of the God-man.
 To make satisfaction this God-man must pay
 something which he does not himself owe on
 his own account. As a man he owes perfect obedi-
 ence for himself, this cannot be the satisfaction.
 But being a sinless man he is not bound to
 die. His death therefore as the death of a God-
 man is the adequate and proper satisfaction.
 In return for so great a gift the Father bestows
 upon the Son desires, namely, human redem-
 ption. These are the essential steps of the famous
 argument of Anselm. Peter Abelard (from 1077)

the great rationalist of the middle ages criticizes
 and opposes it in his Commentary on Romans.
 With Peter Lombard begins the period of Scholasticism,
 a system-making doctors. Bonaventura
 the seraphic doctor almost adapts Aristotle's
 theory, and then lets it fall by denying the absolute
 necessity of satisfaction. God, he says, being
 omnipotent might have chosen some other
 way. The theory of St. Thomas Aquinas, the
 angelic doctor is chiefly distinguished by his
 doctrine of "satisfactio superabundans". Christ
 has restored to God more than was taken from
 him by human sin. This surplus became after=
 ward a stock of merit belonging to the Church
 and was the ground on which it based its right

of selling indulgences. Opposed to St. Thomas stands Duns Scotus, the subtle doctor, he denies the infinite guilt of sin and the infinite merit of Christ, that God's will is not conditioned by any necessity, but is absolutely supreme. And here is the radical difference between the Scotists and Thomists. The Church however decided in favor of the doctrine of Thomas as seeming most to favor Church authority.

The third great epoch in the Christian doctrine of Atonement commences with the Reformation. The peculiarity of the Protestant Reformation as of all true reformations consists in its being a falling back upon personal

experience. The Reformation was the great turning point where the mind passed from the outward to the inward, from objectivity to subjectivity. The principal difference between the Lutheran theology and that of Anselm was significant of this change: Anselm's doctrine was based in the necessity of the divine nature, Luther's in need of human nature. Anselm asked, how shall God be satisfied? Luther, how shall man be justified? Lutheran theology maintained the doctrine of an infinite evil in sin, but changed the satisfaction of Anselm into an equivalent.

The doctrine of Faustus Socinus and the Socinians may be regarded as the

the great revolt from the doctrinal authority
 of the Church as that of Luther was the result
 from its ecclesiastical authority. Socinianism
 is the extreme of subjectivity. In this system
 the subject (man) becomes self dependant
 and his relation to the object (God) becomes
 an outward one. The argument of Socinus
 against the Church theory of satisfaction begins
 by denying its foundation, the idea of divine
 justice. If God cannot forgive sin without
 a satisfaction he becomes subject to finite
 limitations. Mercy is as much an attribute
 with God as justice, but if we consider
 as absolute then God cannot punish sin
 at all, then satisfaction and forgiveness

mutually exclude each other. Satisfaction pays the debt, how then can it be forgiven? Moreover the idea of punishment involves that of guilt. If transferred to the innocent it ceases to be punishment. Again satisfaction supposes both the justice and the mercy of God in exercise. But the exercise of mercy would be a free pardon, that of justice determined punishment. Every sinner deserves eternal death, the substitute then should endure eternal death for every individual sinner, which is impossible. But in fact Christ did not endure it at all for he rose from the dead in three days and has ascended into heaven. Socinus collects

all the texts referring to the death of Christ or to the forgiveness of sin and arranged them in four classes, placing in the first class the texts which speak of Christ's death as a ransom or redemption, he easily showed that these were to be taken figuratively. In the second class were those which spoke of Christ as dying for the sins of men which he explained as meaning that he died on account of sins. The third class of texts included those in which it is said that Christ took the sins of men on himself or took them away, then either meaning that he has taken them away by bearing them as one may bear the consequences of another's sin

the fourth class included the texts relating to
 Jewish types of sacrifices. Here Loevins clearly
 shows that the sacrifices of the Old Testament
 were not substitutions either really or sym-
 bolically but only certain conditions with
 which God had connected the forgiveness
 of sin. The positive side of his system is
 briefly this. Man is reconciled to God when
 he repents. God is always blameless, man
 alone needs to be changed. He reconciles
 himself by repenting. Repentance in the
 system of Loevins takes the place which
 faith occupies in the Protestant system.
 The attack by Loevins made it necessary
 for the system of Church orthodoxy to shift

its ground, that which it had occupied
 having become no longer tenable. Hence the
 famous theory of Hugo Grotius which has
 been essentially that of modern orthodoxy
 ever since his time. He founds the necessity
 of Christ's death not on the justice of God
 as a creditor but as a ruler. For the legal
 view of the Atonement he substitutes the
 governmental view. Atonement is an
 act of jurisdiction according to which one
 is punished that another may be excused.
 The essence of the theory of Grotius lies in
 the proposition: "God could not forgive
 sin without an act of exemplary punishment"
 Anselm's theory is based on the notion

of divine justice, that of Lucifer on the notion of divine goodness, Irenaeus in his theory neutralizes both. The theory of Irenaeus has on the whole continued to be the most favorite form of modern orthodoxy down to the present time.

Chapter V.

The Jewish View of Atonement.

There is no systematic doctrine of atonement in the Jewish literature. Judaism places for a leading of its teachings, in regard to Atonement.

"The Lord is the immutable, eternal Being, the omnipotent God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in beneficence and truth; keeping kindness unto the thousand

forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin,
but who will by no means clear the guilty."

(Ezekiel 34, 6. 7.). Every sin must bear its disastrous consequences, but the human soul stands in need of reconciliation with God.

A father punishes his child, the punishment is soon forgotten, but the child cannot feel happy as long as the father is angry with him, and even to the child, if it does not feel dis-comforted because of his father's anger. In

such a case Judaism teaches: "return, repent, improve, never commit evil, but away injustice and thou wilt be forgiven, thy Father is reconciled to thee". The whole of the Scriptures is pervaded by this spirit. Numerous passages

are found everywhere impressing the human heart and mind with similar counsels and admonitions. This principle underlies the whole book of Jonah. The synagogue recognizes the importance of this principle by placing it at every confession of sins. "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the man of unrighteousness his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord and he will have mercy upon him, and unto our God, for he will abundantly pardon": (Is. 55. 7.) "My sin do I ever acknowledge unto thee, and my iniquity have I not covered up. I said, I will make confession: and thou truly forgavest the iniquity of my sin" (Ps. 32. 5). Especial

stress is laid upon the eighteenth Chapter of Ezekiel: "And the wicked, when he turneth away from all his sins that he hath committed, and keepeth all my statutes, and doeth justice and righteousness shall surely live, he shall not die. All his transgressions which he hath committed shall not be remembered unto him: through his righteousness which he hath done shall he live." (Ez. 21-23).

Besides these injunctions Judaism lays particular stress upon the Day of Atonement, as concrete means to awaken the conscience of man, to remind him of the wrongs he may have inflicted upon his fellowman, to cause him to repentance, to reformation, to reparation of

it is wrong and self-stimulation. But at all times
 justice embargoes it stimulation: not to
 look upon it. Day of Atonement is at most
 moral means to obtain forgiveness, not to
 help by mere ceremonies, by self-mortification
 to effect Atonement & sin. For the purpose
 the individual engages to read on the
 Day of Atonement at (57, 14 - 58, 14)
 Chapter from David when fasting is said to
 remain unaffected when not connected with the
 removal of impurities and impurities. St. John
 with also deny it efficacy & it Day of Atonement
 must not be a wrong commandment against
 fellow-men: 77A 2X 25714 74 79320 0.71932 0.1171X
 Nitter can it remove before for forgiveness when

האזר אחסא ואשוב אין למפיקין בידו לעשות תשובה. אחסא ויום הכפורים

מכפר' אין יום הכפורים מכפר. On the other hand they

ascribe to sufferings expiatory influences, also to death with preceding repentance. Judaism

does not exclude any one from God's forgiving kindness. אפילו חרב חדה מונחת על צוארך של אדם לא ימנע עצמו

מין הרחמים (Berach. 10, 1). It promises only re=

mission of sins, when in thought, word and act the sinner purifies himself and never

recurs to the same sin. Christianity as we

have seen names the return to God and forgiveness of sin Redemption. At its found=

ation of this Redemption emphasis is laid upon the words of Mark 16.16 "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but

he that believeth not shall be damned." "Who-
 ever believeth in him should not perish, but have
 everlasting life, but he that believeth not is
 condemned already, because he hath not
 believed in the name of the only begotten son
 of God: (John 3, 16-19). This is the stern
 teaching of the Christian Church of all sects.
 Its doctrine, as it has been already said, is based
 on the myth of the third Chapter of Genesis, on
 the groundless assumption of original sin.
 In addition to the sin committed it imputes
 the sins committed by ancestors. No repen-
 tance, no reconsideration, no improvement
 no justice, no piety is able to undo the ori-
 ginal sin and bring forgiveness unto mankind

And yet because of God's mercy he ordained
his Son to become man, to suffer and to die,
and through the death and suffering of the
innocent God-man to bring redemption
to the guilty and sinful. Judaism without
all these dogmas and beliefs offers salvation
unto all mankind, because God is not only
the Creator but also the Redeemer ^{גואל} and
the Sanctifier ^{אני ה' מקדושכם}, and Judaism
does not need any additional belief in
a Trinity in order to offer redemption
of sins. Judaism has no different periods
of development in regard to its doctrine
of Atonement. It always emphasized the
fact that

תשובה ותפלה וצדקה מעבירין את רע הגזירה

Repentance, Prayer and Charity remove
the doom of man. Thus Atonement is de-
pendent on repentance and improvement,
on confession of the sins committed, and upon
the sincere supplication for forgiveness; be-
sides these repentance should actuate to
do charity. These answer the requisites of the
penitent person. Every sin contains spiritual
degradation that leads to the sin, its act
itself and the removal from the divine
will of God. In order to change the degraded
state of the mind confession is necessary,
remorse and remission of sins ^{must} necessarily
follow. In them the consciousness of having acted
wrongly and against God is already manifested

and the soul of its own accord will implore for forgiveness. But all these are not sufficient as long as these inner emotions do not end in charitable deeds. And it is but natural that in תשובה should be contained אכילה and דקדק, but the latter are mentioned only to remind man of their absolute necessity. In regard to the importance of תשובה we need only to quote what Maimonides says in its first paragraph of the first section of הלכות תשובה. He maintains that every sin is forgiven by תשובה, and this consists in perpetual desisting from evil and in confession before God of the sin done. The more fervently and humbly he confesses, the nearer he approaches

God and obtains forgiveness. Maimonides
 also asserts that, ^{at} the time of sacrificial cult
 the sinner could not be forgiven by the mere
 sacrifice without repentance, that even
 those who suffered capital punishment
 did not expiate their crimes without תשובה.
 Since man himself must obtain forgiveness
 by confession, repentance and charitable deeds,
 Judaism could not leave everything to
 man himself. Though it acknowledges the power
 of divine Providence that may lead man
 to confession and repentance, and yet it
 deemed its duty to awaken in the soul of man
 the need of atonement, the feeling and con-
 sciousness of guilt, and to afford man

means to form it away to forgiveness. *John*
 accomplish this and by entering the
 Day of Atonement (071930 011). The meaning
 of forgiveness is imputed to us in it but
 of every true Christian from early childhood
 by the yearly return of the Day of Atonement,
 of the day that is connected to repentance,
 to confession and forgiveness, of the day that
 is called YOM KIPPUR. The day of Atonement
 has therefore two main aspects. First it gives
 it opportunity to connect it larger or
 smaller faults with man because of his
 natured weakness is little to connect during
 the year, second that of sinners of sins and
 absolute forgiveness may awaken and

down the right path. And yet Justice
does not by all means reside in it day
itself any arbitrary power, more or less
formed ~~concern~~ of any strong Justice
Justice in this case would mean its right
and it would destroy a Justice in
Justice. The fact itself guards already
against this confusion. It does not
lack of the day of Attonment, that "it is day
shall make an atonement for you"
shall make an atonement for you. And
make atonement for you" "it is day of attonment
it is as we have seen the Rabbi over and over
again emphasized it necessity of Justice with
it inner remorse and reformation. ~~Justice~~

no influence whatsoever exerts the atoning power of the Day of Atonement upon the wrong-doer when he acted against his fellow man. Thus even on the Day of Atonement it depends entirely upon the individual himself to obtain forgiveness. Likewise the sacrifice that was offered in Temple on the Day of Atonement needed repentance according to Maimonides, and the sacrifices themselves served as mere symbolical expedients to true repentance. Thus on the part of the sinner it is required that he should repent make reparation, perform the prescribed ceremonies and execute charitable deeds. On the other hand on part of God his mercy

is a revealed fact. Since God is holy, perfect, infinite, his mercy is also infinite and perfect, and is exercised together with justice in behalf of the contrite sinner. This is the main essence of Judaism from the very inception, through all periods up to the present time. Too numerous are the passages that may be quoted from the Biblical as well as Rabbinical literature respecting the relation of God's mercy to man that sincerely condoles of his sin. "God is merciful, gracious, forgiving sin and iniquity" is repeatedly mentioned in Pentateuch, Joel, Jonah, - Psalms, in Nehemiah and Chronicles. "Take with you

words, and return to the Lord: say unto him,
 Pardon all our iniquity and accept our return
 to good and let us repay the steeers of sacrifice
 with the prayer of our lips: (Hosea 14. 3). Let
 the wicked forsake his way, and the man of un-
 righteousness his thoughts, and let him return unto
 the Lord, and will have mercy upon him, for
 he will abundantly pardon" (Is 55, 7). "It
 is I that blot out thy transgression for my
 own sake, and thy sins I will not remember"
 (Is 49 25). "My sin do I ever acknowledge unto
 thee, and my iniquity have I not covered up.
 I said, I will make confession because of my
 transgressions unto the Lord: and thou truly
 forgavest the iniquity of my sin." (Ps 32, 5).

Especially noteworthy is the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the Temple "When thy people Israel are struck down before the enemy, because they have sinned against thee, and they return thee to thee, and confess thy name, and pray and make supplication unto thee in this house:

Then do thou hear in heaven, and forgive the sin of thy people Israel." (1 Kings 8, 33). The same is expressed by verses 35, 38, 42, 44 and 46. In brief throughout the whole of the Hebrew literature emphasis is laid on the divine attribute "mercy".

Many people ask the question, how does the conception of divine mercy harmonize with the conception of divine justice? The Hebrew term for justice and clarity is מִשְׁפָּט . This denotes,

that justice is always executed by the divine Providence
 in such a way that it should serve as a source
 of preservation for mankind. It is the justice
 thoroughly pervaded by the spirit of love and
 mercy and charity. Divine justice is essential
 for the well-being of mankind, and the dispensa-
 tion of punishment is suspended, if the end
 is accomplished without it. It is this principle
 that Rabbi Eleazar attempts to expound in
 (Yuma 86^a). The question is asked how are the
 words נקה לא ינקח to be explained? "And exempt
 from punishment those that repent, but
 does not exempt from punishment those who
 do not repent" מנקה הוא לא ינקח ולא ינקח משא"נ שבים.
 It is the teaching of Judaism that with the removal

of ring over Land in Land & removal of punishment
 This fact is shown (in Jerusalem's Macc. II. and
 Yolkut II. P. 31) by the following passage
 from the Rabbinical literature: "Wisdom
 was asked, what should be the punishment
 of the sinner?" It answered: "Evil should follow
 him". Prophecy was asked. "He should die" was
 its answer. The Torah was questioned, what
 shall occur to the sinner? "He shall bring
 a sin-offering and be atoned", it answered.
 God himself was asked what shall be
 the punishment of the sinner? "He shall
 repent, and his sins are forgiven". Thus
 it is that, God is merciful and just and direct
 mankind on the path towards salvation.

Chapter VI

77

Attainment and Redemption.

In nature we notice mighty rivers flowing through continents and dividing them into separate states with distinct nationalities. They form the boundary lines between great empires of hostile propensities against each other. Tracing the sources of these mighty rivers we are surprised to find them in some secluded spot in a wild region. Human history narrates about fierce battles waged, about streams of blood shed, about countries devastated and cities levelled to the ground. Inquiring into the cause of all these bloody wars we are often extremely amazed to find it in some insignificant fact, in some false premise, in some superstitions

creed, myth, legend and slender. There are
 existent Judaism and Christianity, two world-
 wide spread religions with millions of peoples
 for their confessors. Both were and still are con-
 tradictory to each other, as if they were two
 opposite and antagonistic forces of nature,
 as if they were two strangers of distinct climes,
 races and bodily constitutions, strangers with
 bitterest animosities against each other. And
 yet how surpassingly strange it is to find
 the point of divergence to be concentrated
 in a groundless myth that was introduced
 from some other Semitic myth.

Christianity as well as Judaism teach
 of forgiveness of sin. But what opposite

views are maintained by both of them respecting the nature of forgiveness and the nature of sin. They are best characterized by the two words: Attonement and Redemption. The first is taught by Judaism, the second by Christianity. The definition of Attonement is simple and practical. It is the return of man to God by self-improvement and the forgiveness of sin by God because of His mercy. Redemption is the satisfaction offered to divine justice for the sins of mankind by the death of Jesus Christ, by virtue of which all penitent believers in Christ are reconciled to God and freed from the penalties of sin. Attonement is based on the power of free will

of man to become better, to do the right and
avoid the wrong, on the fundamental belief
that God is perfect, merciful and just, that
man was created in the image of God, that
all what God has created is good and that
there is in man an inherent tendency either
to do justice or to commit sin. Redemption
on the other hand presupposes that God is
the creator of sin, that man is born in sin,
that sin is infinite, a second destiny in nature,
that it was necessary for God to sacrifice
an infinite Being in form of a man in order
to redeem, of infinite and original sin,
mankind, that shall believe in all this.
And all this doctrine is based on a false

interpretation of the myth in the third chapter
 of Genesis. The Christian theologians maintain
 that the New Testament is the fulfillment of
 the Old, that the Rabbinical teachings have dis-
 regarded the Mosaic law, because the Mosaic
 law made forgiveness of sin dependent upon
 sin-offerings and the atoning sacrifices of the
 Day of Atonement, and these sacrifices found
 in the death of Christ their object carried out and
 completed. Now the Talmud substituted for the
 sacrificial cult the prayers that are used in
 the synagogues. This was not done accidentally
 but in the most rational manner, so that the
 time and the number of prayers exactly
 corresponded to the time and number of

sacrifices offered formerly in the Temple. In respect to the efficacy of prayers they attributed to them greater significance than to the sacrifices. (Berach. 33). Hence it follows that the sacrifices were not looked upon essentially atoning and that they were mere symbolical presentations to awaken the human conscience, to implant in the human heart reverence, piety and chastity, which may correspondingly be awakened by prayers. Even the sacrifices needed according to Maimonides repentance and confession of sin in order to obtain forgiveness. The question to be asked is: did the Talmud follow in this substitution the Biblical law?

Many Abolitionists have been misled
 above and many others may be misled from
 it. But as well as from it, what is the
 difference to the fact that forgiveness
 is wholly dependent upon the inner action
 upon the change of mind, upon information
 and self-improvement, upon the entire
 spirit and sincere return to God without
 keeping any special impositions upon
 ourselves. Doubtless the changes belong
 to the period of the new heart with, & the
 time of deliverance when the temple was
 built. Then we even know that the
 royal entry & importance of new heart
 with. "And Jesus said: Had it been

as much delight in burnt offerings and
 in sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the
 Lord? Behold to obey is better than
 sacrifice and to attend more than the fat
 of rams. (Isaiah 1, 11). "Thus said the
 Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, add your
 burnt-offerings unto your peace-sacrifices
 and eat the flesh thereof. For I spoke not with
 your fathers, and I commanded them not
 on the day of my bringing them out of the
 land of Egypt concerning burnt offerings
 or sacrifices". (Jeremiah 7, 21-23). From
 this it is evident that the sacrifices were
 not one of the important ordinances
 but one of the symbolical ceremonies.

Especially noteworthy are two Psalms, one of which was undoubtedly composed by David himself, the other by Asaph at the time of Solomon. In the first the singer, having just escaped a great danger by the intervention of God, sings a song of thanksgiving that may stand for a thanksgiving sacrifice:

"Sacrifice and meat-offering thou desirest not - ears hast thou hollowed out unto me - burnt-offering and sin-offering thou demandest not. Then said I, lo, I come, in the roll of the book it is written down for me, To fulfil thy will, O my God, do I desire; and thy law is within my heart." (Ps. 40, 7-9). The singer probably was hindered by his enemies from offering sacrifices, and he with fervent piety dwells upon prayerful

many as a substitution of sacrifices. The other Psalm is the fiftieth which most eloquently speaks of sacrifices as an undesirable thing to the Almighty. The passages from the Prophet Micah may also serve as an illustration. The Prophet seems as if he had Christology in his view and speaks against it in the most powerful and persuasive manner. But the Christian theologians may assert that the Prophets and the Psalmists have misinterpreted the Torah, that the Christian conception of substitution and satisfaction, offered by Christ, is underlying the whole sacrificial cult of the Old Testament, that in Christ the believers find their salvation and redemption because he died for their sins and redeemed

them from eternal death, all this, they maintain, is foretold by the Old Testament's view of substitution.

From the previous Chapter on the "Mosaic View of Atonement" it was seen, that the substitution was only symbolical, that it was valid only for sins committed unintentionally or for those few that are specified in Leviticus, and then it stood only for כפרה for covering the sin but not for נסיו, for forgiveness of sin. Besides this, the idea of substitution is entirely contradictory to the sense of justice. It is acknowledged by all religious people that God is the most just Being. How

then is it possible that He should substitute the innocent for the guilty in his court of justice and make the first suffer punishment for the latter. It is natural for men to suffer because of the sins of their fellow-men. The consequences of sin extend beyond the limits of the sinner because of his being a member of the human family, because of his being a link of the human society. He lives in; this idea underlies the passage:

פֶּקֶד עוֹן אֲבוֹת עַל בָּנֵים. When the father squanders his wealth, the children suffer. The criminal disgraces his whole family. Because of the despotism of one man millions of people suffer from subjection, slavery, and submission.

This adjustment and regulation are not without their beneficent results. The senses of duty and responsibility become more sharply outlined. The punishment grows intenser. The admonition for others stands out as a loving warning.

The conscience in man, in brief, becomes more fully developed, and every individual stands in double relation to himself and to his fellow-beings. All this is the course of human nature.

Why the Creator has ordained it? we cannot tell.

"For not my thoughts are your thoughts, and not your ways are my ways, saith the Lord, For as high as the heavens are above the earth, so high are my ways above your ways, and my thoughts above your thoughts." (Is 55, 8)

But respecting the judicial punishment of the innocent for the guilty Abraham's question may be quoted: "Far be it from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked, and that the righteous should be as the wicked, far be this from thee, shall the Judge of all the earth not exercise justice?" (Gen. 18, 25).

The Christian theologians in defense of their view quote the passage respecting Samsel's punishment for the sin he has committed against Uriyah: "Nevertheless, because thou hast given great cause to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme through this thing, the child that hath been born unto thee shall surely die" (2 Sam. 12, 14). The child

died because of David's sin. And yet no mention is made that the son of David was forgiven through the death of the child. On the contrary Nathan states, before the death of the child occurred, as a matter of fact that "the Lord hath caused thy sin to pass away: thou shalt not die." Other passages are quoted in defense of Redemption: 2 Sam. 24, 10... Ps. 43, 3, 5, 3, 4 and so forth. And all of them are interpreted in such a way that the doctrine of Christ's redemption may fully be established. It would be a tedious task to enter into a minute refutation of all their arguments and forced interpretation of all the passages quoted by them. But there is one main conception

underlying all of them, and this is: anthropomorphism. The Old Testament abounds in anthropomorphic expressions. Every one of them is interpreted by Christianity literally. Every one of them is suggestive of a still greater anthropomorphism. Nor is Judaism exempt from this common tendency. It is but natural that everything should bear the impress of the human mind. Modern poetry and literature in general, abounds in personifications of abstract ideas, in presentations of inanimate things as living beings and vice versa. The word, ⁷⁵⁰, redemption found a living expression in Christ, the word, (5X12) deliverance found in him the

Savior of Mankind, the figurative expressions
 (כשה סטכח יוכל and ונחכרתו כרפא-לנו)
 through his bruises was healing granted
 to us "like the lamb which is led to slaugh-
 ter", suggested the atoning vicarious-
 ness of the Christian Savior. Besides an
 ancient belief or myth, once surrounded
 by a halo of antiquity, seems never to lose
 its strong hold over human mind. The
 pantheistic view of Buddhism found
 an inlet in Christianity, the heathenish
 Ahimsa became embodied in the
 doctrine of Fall of Man and Original
 Sin and in the doctrine of Christian View
 of Atonement. Hence the deep gulf

of separation between Judaism and Christianity with its relentless antagonism and persecuting spirit. And hence the main distinction between Atonement and Redemption.

Another great distinction between the Jewish and Christian doctrines of Atonement consists in the universal character of the first and the narrowness of the latter. One of its fundamental conditions on which the atoning power of Christ rests is the absolute necessity of faith in his redeeming power. Thus the millions of peoples who happened to be born before the Christian era are condemned to eternal spiritual and bodily death

Nor is there any hope of redemption for these
 millions of peoples who are still ignorant
 of the existence of Christ. Judaism on the
 other hand declares universally: the eternal
 Being is merciful and gracious, long-suffering,
 abundant in beneficence and truth,
 Keeping kindness unto the thousandth,
 forgiving iniquity and sin, and no laws =
 talions are set by Ezekiel when he says that
 the wicked, when he turneth away from
 all his sins that he hath committed, and
 keepeth all my statutes to execute
 justice and righteousness shall surely
 live, he shall not die. Likewise respecting
 Nimrod it is said in the book of Jonah:

and God sees their works, that they had
 turned from their evil way: and God
 brought himself of it evil which he had
 spoken that he would do unto them, and
 he did it not." The Psalmist speaks of God
 like as a father loveth his children, as the
 Lord loveth them that fear him, for he
 knows our frame. He remembers that
 we are dust. "Depart from evil and do
 good; seek peace and pursue it. The eyes of the
 Lord are directed unto the righteous: and his
 ears unto their cry. Depart from evil and do
 good; and dwell for evermore. For the Lord
 loveth justice and never forsaketh his
 servants, they are for ever preserved."