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The title of this dissertation is, "The Religious Thought of Phillips Brooks, and its Significance."

The purpose of the dissertation is twofold. First, to set forth the religious thought of Brooks, and thereby make a study in miniature of American religious thought of the later nineteenth century. Second, to make some attempt to evaluate the beliefs of Brooks in relation to the thinking of his contemporaries.

By the term "Significance" is meant specifically the extent to which his thought is in keeping with the progressive thinking of the era. The term does not include the effect of his thoughts upon religious thought as a whole. The trends of religious thought in America during the later nineteenth century are not yet understood with sufficient clearness to allow us to say how much any one person influenced those tendencies. Therefore, "significance" is used in the meaning of mirroring the advanced thought of the period.

In order to set forth Brooks's thought it has been necessary to discover just what was being thought in his day. This has been one of the major difficulties in writing the
thesis. No one knew what happened in America during the later nineteenth century in the field of religion. No one knew who were the leaders of that period. The historians had clarified the earlier years of American religious history, setting them forth in such a way that one can determine who were the leaders, and the extent to which the thought of those leaders advanced or retarded religious thought. Likewise, the currents of thought in the twentieth century have been charted with some degree of accuracy. The later nineteenth century still awaits its historian.

In setting forth the progressive religious thought of Brooks's era we have devoted the first chapter of the thesis to an outline of religious thought in America; seeking to indicate the major movements, with the dates of their rise and decline, together with the leaders of the various movements. An attempt is made in each chapter to compare Brooks's thought with the thought of the men who were leaders in similar fields of thought.

When the term, "later nineteenth century" is used in the dissertation it refers specifically to the years 1846 to 1892. The year 1846 marks the beginning of progressive religious thinking in America with the publication of Horace Bushnell's first book. This book was the wedge which began the separation between the theology of Calvin and religion in America. The movement started by this wedge book...
continued to gain strength, but did not attract a large following until the year 1893, when a number of young ministers returned to America following a period of study in Germany. These young men appear to have stimulated the movement of separation so greatly by their emphasis upon the thought of Ritschl, that this year may be taken as the beginning of a new movement. The years 1846 to 1892 thus group themselves as a unit. Brooks’s ministry covered most of this period. He entered his first pastorate in 1859, in the city of Philadelphia. This was the year in which Bashnell ceased his active work. Brooks’s service as Bishop of Massachusetts came to an end with the closing days of 1892, followed by his death in January 1893.

The term "American religious thought" needs some definition. As used in this thesis it refers mainly to the thought which was current in the New England states, and in the adjoining states. This limitation to a locality is not arbitrary. It is due to the pressure of economic circumstances upon religion in the remainder of the country. The western part of the country was still so close to the pioneering days, and the struggle to settle the country and wrest a living from the soil was so pressing, that they made little contribution to religious thought until after the period under discussion. The southern part of the country was in the throes of a reconstruction era in which they were
trying to recover from the effects of the War Between the States, and the overthrow of an agrarian civilization based upon forced labor, so that they made little contribution to religious thought in this era. The only portion of the country which had leisure enough to make advances in religious thought was the north-eastern section. Most of Brooks's ministry was in Boston, which is near the center of this section.

In treating the subject, the thesis divides itself into five parts. The first chapter seeks to outline the religious thought of the period in which Brooks preached. The next four parts set forth his own thought: first, as it is related to Jesus; second, his theory of tolerance between religious faiths and groups; third, his belief in the progressive nature of religion; fourth, his genius for preaching. The final division of the paper is an attempt to summarize the results of the study and set forth the significance of his religious thought.

John H. Grey, Jr.

March 19, 1938
CHRONOLOGICAL OUTLINE OF THE LIFE OF PHILLIPS BROOKS

1836  Born, Boston, Massachusetts
1855  Graduated Harvard University
       Taught One Year in Boston Latin School
1859  Graduated, Episcopal Theological Seminary,
       Alexandria, Virginia
       Began Pastorate, Church of the Advent, Philadelphia
1861  Began Pastorate, Church of the Holy Trinity,
       Philadelphia
1864  Refused Chair of Ecclesiastical History in the
       Philadelphia Divinity School
1865  First national recognition through prayer at
       Harvard University's Service of Commemoration
       Year in Europe and Palestine
1867  Refused Presidency of Episcopal Theological Seminary,
       Cambridge, Massachusetts
1868  Declined first call to Trinity Church, Boston
1869  Began Pastorate, Trinity Church, Boston
1873  Refused nomination for Bishop of Massachusetts
1874  Preached in Westminster Abbey. Also in 1880, 1885,
       1892, and 1887
1877  Delivered Yale Lectures on Preaching
       Harvard University conferred degree of Doctor of Divinity
1878  Published first volume of sermons
1879  Bohlen Lectures on "The Influence of Jesus"
1880  Preached at Windsor Castle before Queen Victoria
1881  Refused Professorship in University of Pennsylvania
       Published second volume of sermons
       Oxford University conferred degree of Doctor of Divinity
1882  Year in Europe and Asia

-------------
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Lectures on &quot;Tolerance&quot; delivered in New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Elected to first Board of Preachers, Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Visit to the Orient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Elected Bishop of Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Died, Boston, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter I

THE BACKGROUND OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN AMERICA

The theology of John Calvin dominated the religious thought of the American people for the first two and a half centuries of their history. It entered with the Pilgrims who landed on Plymouth Rock in 1620, and held its position against all contenders until the closing years of the nineteenth century. Even at that late date it yielded ground slowly before the advance of scientific discoveries and the literary criticism of the Bible.

Throughout the first century of this period the sway of Calvinism was disputed, but not seriously hindered, by the Established Church which had arrived in the Colonies earlier in the century when the Virginia settlers landed at Jamestown in 1607.

The first real threat to its control of the religious life came with the introduction of Arminianism in the early part of the eighteenth century. This new belief was hailed as an arch foe which must be destroyed at any cost, and in the attempt to purge the religious atmosphere there was
born a modified form of the Calvinistic theology, which became known as the Edwardsian, or New England Theology. This modified form largely replaced the older Calvinism, and assumed the leading role for the next one hundred and fifty years.

This New England school of theology derived its name from the fact that it grew up among the Congregationalists, who were in the main confined to the New England section of the country. The year of its birth was 1734 when Jonathan Edwards began his constructive theological work. The peak of its activities and influence came a few years before the War between the States (1861-64.) Following this period a decline set in and after 1880 the school rapidly disappeared. Its last great exponent was Edwards Amasa Park, who retired from the chair of theology in (1) Andover Seminary in 1881. During the years of its strength it had become the dominant school of thought among the Congregationalists; had led to a division among the Presbyterians in resulting/the creation of a new denomination, the New School Presbyterians (1838-69), and had founded all the seminaries of the Congregationalists and several of the Presbyterians. Foster, its historian, defines it as, "the Calvinism of

(1) The Life of Edwards Amasa Park, J. H. Foster, N.Y. 1936, Pg. 256
Westminster and Dort, modified by a more ethical conception of God; by a new emphasis on the liberty, ability and responsibility of man; by a restriction of moral quality to man in distinction from nature; and by the theory that the constitutive principle of virtue is benevolence."

Much of this theology took shape during the Great Awakening of 1740, which was led by Edwards and Whitefield. Both men set for themselves the task of weeding out Arminianism by showing that the Bible was on the side of the Calvinists. Such an exposure would mean the doom of any theology. No one can question the sincerity of purpose which spurred these men. They felt Arminianism to be a power which would overturn the very foundations of religion itself. To them it was not a choice between two schools of thought within religion: it was a choice between religion and a false belief. Therefore Arminianism must go.

This attempt to subdue the brethren of a different faith begat in the Edwardsian Theology its tragic flaw. It became a negative system. The avowed purpose was to overthrow an enemy, and therefore the search was not a search for the truth, but for the weakness in the defense of the enemy. The basic assumptions of Calvin were neither questioned nor examined. The truth in the position of the Arminians was

not taken into account. The result was that Edwards and his followers set forth a new way of defending the old system. They established a school of thought, but did not carry New England forward toward a broader theology.

This whole school of theology has been exhaustively treated by Foster in a work which traces the origin and spread of the various teachings. It will serve our purpose to show some of the tenets which differ from Calvinism proper, and which explain some of the developments in the time of Phillips Brooks.

One of these was the idea of conversion. Something in the earnestness of Edwards and Whitefield impelled men to action as a result of their preaching. It came to be accepted as perfectly normal that immediate and violent conversions should accompany their preaching. There is no evidence in the writings of Edwards to show that he believed this to be the only kind of entrance into the Christian life. However, it came to be accepted as the standard of conversion. By 1846 it had been established so firmly that many held it to be the only manner in which one could be converted, and Horace Bushnell published his *Christian Nurture* to combat the idea. Bushnell held that in contrast to this idea of violent conversion the normal experience of religion is

---

F. H. Foster, Chicago 1907.
that a child in a Christian home should grow up under the teachings of its parents and never know the time when it was not a Christian.

Another point of contrast was the idea of human nature. Edwards wrote quite a treatise on the human will, seeking to avoid the determinism of Calvin. One would hardly expect Edwards to offer a satisfactory solution to the problem of the freedom of the will; for he was a Calvinist by training who was seeking to expose the fallacies of the group who emphasized free will in contrast to the sovereignty of God. Edwards held that a man had a natural ability which was counter checked by a moral inability. Because of the natural ability he was responsible to God for his actions and owed full obedience. His moral inability consisted in opposite motives and inclinations to this natural ability, or in the want of inclination to do the good. It may be argued that this distinction is largely one of the imagination and leaves the question of the will in about the same dilemma as that in which Calvin left it. The distinction served one practical purpose of Edwards; it avoided the older view which allowed no ability to good in man. For our purpose of viewing this era it affords one illustration of the tendency of the New England school to minimize the

ability of man. Therefore, under forensic justification and the imputation to him of both sin and righteousness which were not his own, a man might have much concern over his salvation, but was likely to feel there was little he could do about the matter.

A third difference between the modified form and the older Calvinism was that the former prepared the way for changes in religious thought and the strict Calvinism did not. By the constant modifications of doctrine it impressed upon its followers the necessity of change. True, it was only a change of front, an improvement of argument, an attempt to make the old armor more secure against the darts of the enemy; yet in this it never stood for finality in theology as did the stricter Calvinism. In this way it prepared an attitude in New England which became the fertile soil into which the good seed of progress fell.

The field of religious thought had been invaded by other systems during this battle of the Edwardian and Arminian schools of thought. The last quarter of the eighteenth century brought into prominence the Deism of Paine; the Universalists with their assurance of salvation for all; the Transcendentalists with their belief in the sufficiency of the individual; and the Unitarian movement. The Unitarians really became self-conscious as a group in the first
quarter of the nineteenth century and formed their association in 1825. In this sketch of the era it is sufficient to note their main ideas: the dignity of human nature in opposition to total depravity, salvation by the cultivation of character rather than by a relation of faith to an expiatory atonement, and the intellectual and moral unity of God and man.

The middle of the nineteenth century found men questioning many of the facts of religion which before this had been accepted without argument. There was first of all the old question of conversion, of revivalism. Was the same religious experience necessary for all who came into the church as full members? Was their experience lacking in some essential point if they were not motivated by a terrible sense of guilt and being under the wrath of God?

Secondly: What of the Trinity? Under the disputings of the conservatives and the Unitarians this idea had been either denied entirely or had grown thin and unreal.

The atonement presented a third problem. Did the relation between Christ and the believer find true expression in the governmental theory, or in the theory of substitution, or were the Unitarians really grasping at a truth which as yet had not been clearly understood?

The question of miracles was also a puzzling one. Two theories had been advocated by the religious leaders:
either the miracles were to be accepted as being proved by their inclusion in the Scriptures, or as Coleridge had suggested (6) the character of Christ proved his miraculous power. Both of these theories appeared to be contrary to the recent discoveries of science which was introducing the idea of the universal reign of natural law.

Fifth: an a priori religion. Men had become so accustomed to beginning their religious thinking with the idea of the sovereignty of God that they had not heeded the voice of experience in the lives of religious people. The century had given to the world the inductive method of discovering truth and religion was waiting to have that method applied to its experiences and beliefs.

A sixth point of inquiry was the matter of denominational rivalry. For years men had been emphasizing the points upon which they did not agree, with the result that there had often been bitter feeling between the various faiths. Many were now asking the more important question regarding the matters upon which there was general agreement.

6..Horace Bishnell Preacher and Theologian, T. T. Minger, Boston 1899, pp. 393-94
The first important break within the ranks of the New England Theology came with the first volume of Horace Bushnell's writings in 1846. There had been many other breaks with the system, some of which have already been mentioned, but they can hardly be said to have had a nationwide influence. Unitarianism, for instance, had great influence upon New England, particularly in and around Boston, but it lacked the aggressiveness to change American thought in any large way. The same is true of the Transcendental movement.

Bushnell had taken his training at Yale Divinity School where he came under the influence of Nathaniel W. Taylor who held the chair of theology. Taylor may be ranked as one of the great minds produced by New England, if we judge upon penetration, originality, and constructive force. He made some modifications in the position of Edwards, but he remained a disciple of the modified Calvinism. Bushnell soon became acquainted with Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*, and the acquaintance may have been made while he was at Yale. The *Aids* had been introduced to American readers by President Marsh of the University of Vermont who had it printed at Burlington in 1829. Menger, in his biography of
Bashnell, attributes to this book the impetus which led Bashnell to break with the Edwardsian Theology.

No one has dealt in an adequate manner with the influence of Coleridge, Schleiermacher and Ritschl in the liberalizing of American religious thought. Some have dealt with the subject in part. Most of these treatments agree that Bashnell and those nearest him knew Coleridge much better than they knew the thought of Schleiermacher; in fact, the latter seems to have been little known till late in the century. Since there has been so much emphasis upon Schleiermacher and Ritschl in the twentieth century in America, it would be a valuable addition to church history if someone would investigate the forces which brought into the States the general conclusions of Schleiermacher during a time when Schleiermacher and his thought were little known.

It is probable that such an investigation would bring to light the fact that Bashnell is responsible for spreading the teachings of Coleridge, which in many ways are similar to those of the German, and that, when men had become acquainted with them, they gave the credit to Schleiermacher because they did not know the thought of Coleridge. It is a sad commentary upon much that styles itself thinking, that in Bashnell's

7...Idem. pg. 46

8...Modern Anglican Theology, Riggs, London, 1880, pp. 163-4

Progressive Religious Thought in America, Backham, Boston 1919, pp. 48 - 49

Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America, Birggraaff, Philadelphia 1928, pp. 131-132
own land he has been so ignored and Ritschl so much quoted, and that by those men who historically owe every valuable thought they have to the American.

There are striking likenesses between the thought of Bushnell and Ritschl; both in their parts of departure and in the detailed results. The resemblance is not merely a superficial likeness, but the product of like histories. While Ritschl was an academic scholar and Bushnell a pastor whose atmosphere was more that of a poet, both had been trained in an orthodoxy against which their minds revolted. Both men had been taught by gifted professors of that orthodoxy whose teaching in the main repelled them. Both of them had passed through a period of deep intellectual and spiritual labor and had given birth to a new theology which started with the Christian life as a source and norm, and in expressing their theology used as little metaphysics as possible. Both men concentrated their attention on the atonement of Christ, and arrived at much the same results as to the Trinity and the person of Christ. Of the two Bushnell had points of superiority: he was greater in vivacity, in prophetic vision, in range of thought and depth of religious experience and in his appreciation and retention of the chief elements of historic theology.

9. See a fuller comparison in American Journal of Theology, January 1902, article by Geo. B. Stevens on Bushnell and Ritschl.
Bushnell's first break with the established order grew out of his own religious experience and his work as pastor. The break was over the question of conversion and is set forth in *Christian Nurture*, published in 1846. It is probable that Hitzigl could never have undertaken such a work because of his lack of pastoral experience, and also because he had no adequate doctrine of the new birth. Bushnell had both. He labored in a day when one kind of religious experience received all the emphasis: the conscious conversion of adults. The result of this emphasis was that the normal Christian nurture of the child was neglected. Bushnell felt that this neglect of the gradual development of the child into fuller experience was based on an entirely wrong conception of religion. It was as though the Kingdom of God was to make raids on the kingdom of evil and take captive only those sufficiently ripened in sin to be converted. It was the theory that men were to grow up evil and be dragged into the Kingdom by violent conquest. As pointed out already, this was not the theory of Edwards or Whitefield, but in the years following their work people had sought only for the conversion of those who had an overwhelming sense of being under the wrath of God for their sins. Bushnell did not undervalue the revival meetings in which most of the conversions took place. He was certain that the Spirit of God could work in various ways, and that the Spirit did use these
meetings. His point was made against the feeling that only the one type of religious experience was valid.

He emphasizes the danger of this attitude in making a child look forward to certain years which will come to be regarded as evil in contrast to later years which will be regarded as regenerate. The distinction being made that the sinful years lie before the experience of terror at being under the wrath of God. In opposition to this idea he set forth his thesis, "That a child is to grow up as a Christian and never to know himself as otherwise." To modern ears this sounds as a truism, but only because we have accepted the work of Bishnell so fully that we have made it the basis of our whole program of religious education. We have even gone so far that we are in danger of making the gradual conversion the only valid type and being suspicious of the violent conversion, thereby becoming as far from the truth as the people Bishnell condemned.

A second point of departure was the question of the Trinity. Bishnell preached for a quarter of a century at Hartford, Connecticut. This is not far from Boston, and as his period of pastorate was during the era of the spread of Unitarianism it is evident that his doctrine of the Trinity, like his theory of conversion grew out of his pastoral work. Around him were the two groups with antagonistic theories of the matter.

the Unitarians holding to the idea of anity, and the Calvinists coming dangerously near tri-theism in their opposition. To use geometrical figures, the Unitarians had conceived of God as a vertical line with man, Jesus and God at different points in that line. The Calvinists had conceived of the matter as an equilateral triangle, Father, Son, Spirit.

Bashnell rejected both these conceptions. Against the Unitarians he held to the reality of the Trinity, and against the Calvinists he refused to enter into a discussion of the separation into three persons. His views are expressed in God in Christ (1849). His thought moves between two bases: the impossibility of comprehending the Absolute, and the necessary limitation of any revelation of God to the human capacities for receiving this revelation. While he holds to the reality of the Trinity he feels that it is really an instrument of revelation, and that the persons are likewise instruments of revelation. That is, that it is a device of revelation which is adapted to our human understanding; otherwise we could not grasp the fuller idea of God. However, Bashnell is careful not to limit the Trinity to this modal idea. "I will only say that the trinity, or the three persons, are given to me for the sake of their external expressions, not for the internal investigation of their contents. If I use them rationally or wisely, then I

11. God in Christ, Bashnell, Boston 1849, pp. 139, 148
shall use them according to their object. I must not intrude into their inner nature, either by assertion or denial." Manger, in his biography of Bashnell, takes notice of the charge of Sabellianism raised against Bashnell, and suggests that, if we are to think of Sabellianism as the theory of the divine existence, Bashnell is not a Sabellian, for he will not enter into that mystery. In the sense that the term stands for the self-expressing power of God in the Son who reveals the Father, Bashnell is a Sabellian.

In speaking of Christ, Bashnell held to the unity of his personality, both human and divine. To the New England Theology this position would sound like heresy, for their emphasis, as against the Unitarians, had been upon his divine nature, and they were in the habit of attributing one action to his human nature and another to his divine. Bashnell refused to separate them thus. He points out that the two natures had been separated by theologians to solve certain problems, such as Jesus' ignorance of the time of the second coming. The problems which this separation raises are far more numerous than those which it attempts to solve, for it virtually denies any real unity in Jesus and substitutes a co-partnership in place of the unity. He denies that Jesus' human nature can be regarded as having a separate existence.

12. Idem. pg. 175
so as to live, learn, think, worship, or suffer by itself. He insists upon the fact that Jesus stands in a simple unity as one person. It should be noted that Bushnell is not denying that Jesus had two natures, but he is denying that these natures exist separately so that the one or the other may have acts attributed to it. In this emphasis, he anticipates the work of psychology with its emphasis of the unity of personality. America owes much of its present emphasis upon the humanity of Jesus to Bushnell, for nearly every man in the later years of the century who emphasized the humanity of the Master, had been influenced by Bushnell, or by one of his followers.

A third difference between the thought of Bushnell and the New England Theology was the question of the atonement. The prevailing theology of his day was still forensic, artificial, external. The ethical relations were but feebly perceived and had little emphasis. It is true that the Edwardsians had introduced the emphasis upon virtue as being constituted by benevolence, and this was having some effect. Bushnell expressed his views of the atonement in *Vicarious Sacrifice*, published in 1866. Behind the work of Christ, he puts as the great motive power the love of God. God came to earth because of this love and did what men do when they try to win other men. He entered sympathetically

as well as actually into the lot of men, bore with them, suffered with them, thus showing men that God lives under the same principle of vicarious sacrifice as that which moves men in other relations. The resultant effect upon the believer is the result of moral power, or a power of character in contrast to the idea of force. Thus the work of Christ is not the release of penalties because the compensation has been given, but is to be found in the transformation of character through what he is to their sight and feeling of men. This will be recognized as an early expression of the theory of the atonement which later came to have the title of moral influence theory.

This view of the work of Christ is bound together with Bashnall's idea of sin as the great disorganizer in human life. Sin causes the man to fall into an abnormal state in which he is self-centered and therefore does not realize God as the great fountain of life and character for the soul. Sin does not materially affect the soul's nature, rather the disorder is that of functions which are abused and natural laws provoked to a penal and retributive action by the misdoings of an evil will. The death of Christ arouses the believer so that he realizes his state and allows the normal connections

15. Vicarious Sacrifice. H. Bashnell, N.Y. 1866, pg. 449
with God to be restored by this sacrifice, and thus the righteousness of God is permitted to continue its flow.

A fourth divergence of Bushnell was his view of the discoveries of science, which he incorporated in *Nature and the Supernatural* (1858). His purpose is to show that nature is not one system and that which is called supernatural another system, but that both are parts of the same. Science and religion are therefore two approaches to truth. He feels that there is no conflict between science and religion since both have their common root and harmony in God. Science is to be the handmaid of religion, and religion is the natural foster mother of science. Nature is defined as the realm of force which is controlled by the natural law of cause and effect. The supernatural is the realm of free will which is not in the chain of cause and effect. From the viewpoint of the twentieth century all this looks hopelessly out of date. Yet it was written one year before Darwin issued his *Origin of Species* with development as the new explanation of the relation of various forms of life. Not only was Bushnell far ahead of his day in grasping the service which science was rendering religion: he was making a distinction which later men have used in correlating science and religion in the battle against determinism. He was grasping at the possibilities of personality altering events.

---

17. *Idem.* pg. 18-19
For his own day his distinction helped overcome the dualism of two separate realms of spirit and nature, which were to be interpreted only by revelation in the realm of spirit and by reason in the realm of nature. The separation of the natural and the spiritual had given to the supernatural an arbitrary, unreal character with the result that revelation had almost been confined to the limits of the Bible. Bushnell broke new channels for the thoughts of men. He did not come into contact with evolution in such a way as to grasp its meaning. It is pathetic to think of him standing as it were on the borderland and yet not being led into the new day. Few men would have so clearly grasped the central meaning of the new theory and have traced it to its divine conclusion.

A fifth contribution of Bushnell to the thinking of his day was his emphasis upon Christian experience as the test of religious values. He does not treat experience in the way that later psychologists have done, but uses it in contrast to the theology of his day. This theology used the intellectual approach to reality. Faith was a matter of propositions to be believed and not a matter of a relation to God to be experienced. The revolt of Bushnell against the intellectual approach is to be found in an essay on language in God in Christ. He feels that we have the wrong conception of language, for a word is merely a symbol. It is a symbol of a meaning. It is
not the meaning itself. The confusing of the symbol for the meaning; had resulted in students learning theology, rather than being indwelt into God so that they may gain the meaning which is expressed by the symbol, or word. He frankly admits that he is a mystic and falls back upon "a perceptive power (18) in spiritual life."

While this work of Bashnell became a liberating influence in the religious thought of America, it also became its own stumbling block. Bashnell may be said to have seen truth, not to have laboriously reasoned it out. Thus he fell into an error which in science is regarded as fatal; failing to treat his discoveries as hypotheses, and to subject them to verification before sending them forth. A certain part of this lack of verification may be due to the fact that in the years when his followers would have been revising his thought, and broadening it, they were engaged in another battle which will be dealt with a little later on.

Bashnell made another great mistake. He lacked the historical knowledge to evaluate the statements of Christian doctrine other than his own. After writing his work on the Trinity, he reviews the matter in another work, commenting upon the Nicene Creed: "On a careful study of the creed prepared by this council, as interpreted in the writings of
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Athanasius in defense of it, I confess that I had not sufficiently conceived its import, or the title it has to respect as a Christian document." He might also have admitted that he had not sufficiently conceived the import of the doctrines of his opponents which he had attacked. We shall see some of the trouble created by this lack of historical knowledge in dealing with Brooks's idea of progress.

It would be difficult to maintain the claim that Bushnell was a great theologian. He was rather a seer and a prophet. He was open minded, seeking good in all creeds, even when he did not master those creeds. We may say of him that he challenged men to new habits of thought, and that he spurred the Congregationalists of New England into discovering and appropriating the new thoughts of the age. It may also be said of him that he was the first religious thinker in America to incorporate into his thinking the current findings of science.

Years of Conflict

Through the work of Horace Bushnell the churches of New England had gained a certain amount of freedom. Religious leaders no longer felt it necessary to limit their personal beliefs to a choice inner circle of hearers, and one heard the notes of a new day being sounded from the rooftops. These trumpetings did not come from every community and every leader, for the knowledge gained by the advance guard of liberal thought had not yet penetrated to the general public, or even to the majority of the ministers and teachers, yet the new day was at hand. It was fortunate that the work of Bushnell was beginning to have such a wide influence in leading people to adopt an inquiring attitude toward new ideas, for progress was opening doors leading to in strange directions.

The first cause contributing to the religious progress in these years of 1860-1880 was the War Between the States, which began in 1861. This conflict was the Sturm und Drang of adolescent America, the Gethsemane through which religion passed in bitter conflict as it searched its own soil. No one understands the spirit of our land who misses this great fact: America discovered itself while fighting with itself in a struggle for things which were not material.
bit were spiritual and eternal. The difference between the spirit of America in 1860 and in 1880 is the difference between the youth of sixteen and the man of thirty. Before the war, the popular fancy had demanded the sentimental songs of adolescence, "Annie Laurie," and "Drink to Me Only with Thine Eyes;" after the war, there was a larger note as they sang, "Rally 'Round the Flag," and "Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory of the Coming of the Lord."

Just as the adolescent period for man is a period of spiritual questioning and testing of all things established, so this period of twenty years in the life of adolescent America was a period of darkness of doubt broken by the light of the things which endure. Evolution had made its appearance. Bushnell had not lived long enough to welcome this new theory, but he had prepared the way for its reception; in fact, had it not been for his influence the theory of development would have found few friends. The stricter Calvinists hailed it as a New England witch going forth to disturb the faithful. Charles Hodge of Princeton devoted twenty-four pages of his Systematic Theology to an attack upon the theory, attempting to show that it was utterly inconsistent with the Bible. All of the strict Calvinists appear to have taken the same attitude. Not one of them welcomed the theory.

In spite of all that Ashnell had done the strain was intense. The Copernican theory of the universe had already shown that the earth was but a small bit of matter among an innumerable host of stars. Then came the Darwinian theory which seemed to show that even on this discredited planet, man is but a higher species of animal. But far more serious was the implication that in the unbroken sequence of events, effect following cause, man coming from the animals, the animals from plants, and plants from the earth, with natural selection and the survival of the fittest accounting for all change, there appeared to be no room for God. Along with the degradation of man went the expulsion of God. It appeared that the foundations of the world were out of plumb.

No one has dealt with this period in American thought in anything like an adequate manner. True there have been books on the conflict of science and religion, but they are neither complete nor accurate. One book which should be a guide through this bitter wilderness of conflict is Buckham's *Progressive Religious Thought in America*. The value of the book is limited by the author's belief that liberal thought has come only through those of the Congregationalist Faith. Therefore he has developed the life and work only of those within that denomination. In a large measure he is right in his thesis. Beyond all doubt they were pioneers in the field; but they

were not the only pioneers. Bachmann, for instance, does not deal with Philip Schaff who began his work in America in 1844 and was the main exponent of the Mercersburg Theology, nor with Charles A. Briggs of Union Seminary in New York, or with Streeven of Cambridge Theological Seminary in Boston and his work in Old Testament criticism.

Another book which should point out the landmarks of this period is Barggraaff's *Rise and Development of Liberal Thought* (22) in America. Here again there is the partisanship which leads our guide astray. Barggraaff is not so much interested in discovering the originators of liberal thought, as he is interested in setting forth elements in liberal thought which he regards as erroneous. Therefore he develops the elements in liberal thought which he wishes to attack.

It would require a thesis in itself to set forth many of the forces which were engaged in the struggle of these years. In this brief outline only a few can be indicated and treated in barely sufficient detail to form a background for the life and work of Brooks. Brooks began to preach in Philadelphia in 1859 at the beginning of this period of religious and civil conflict. So that in dealing with his life and work many of these forces will come into the paper. However, it should be admitted here that even treating them as
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they affect his life there will not be space to deal with these developments in such a way as to set forth the extent to which they spelled doom for the old theology, and how far the latter fell through internal atrophy. The materials are available for such a study, and we are perhaps far enough away from that day to evaluate it properly.

The theory of Darwin appears to have spread rapidly in America. It is indicative of the trend, that, in 1861, the little town of Lexington, in Virginia, was much excited over the question. In public debates held in the town, the man who opposed the theory was the Superintendent of the Virginia Military Academy, and the proponent of the theory was the rector of the local Episcopal church. Alexander Winchell of the University of Michigan comments upon the address of Tyndall before the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1874, saying that he, Winchell, was in Switzerland at the time and that it was only upon his return to America that he learned what Tyndall had said and how much commotion the address created throughout the country. Therefore we feel safe to conclude that, in spite of the war and its dreary years of reconstruction which followed, the theories of science were widely known and debated in the States. The question which concerns us is the attitude taken toward these questions.

23. Reports of Franklin Literary Society debates in The Valley Star for 1861, Lexington, Virginia.
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It is evident that many people thought that science was destroying the truth of religion. T. T. Manger, writing in this period says there were many who said it was a choice between Calvinism and Spencer. Indeed the idea persisted for many years and found its best known exponent in William Jennings Bryan, who felt that if one held to evolution he must relinquish the Bible.

It is also evident that the scientists of America were not entirely unanimous in accepting the theory. Winchell quotes P. A. P. Barnard in an article dealing with the laws of disease as saying that science has taken from him his hope of immortality and if this is the best science can give, he would have no more science. However, most of the leading men of science accepted both evolution and religion. Asa Gray, who was the leading scientist of this period in America, prefaced his Darwiniana (1876) with a description of himself, "in his own fashion a Darwinian, philosophically a convinced theist, and religiously an accepter of the creed commonly called the Nicene." Lewis Agassiz was an old man when this period of conflict began and died before the middle of it, but lent his voice to the correlation of science and religion.
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John Fiske, an able interpreter of the philosophy of Spencer, published his *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy* (1874) in which he thought he came to theistic conclusions. He was taken to task by Romanes in his *Candid Examination of Theism* (London 1878) who thought that Fiske's conclusions had nothing in common with theism. Fiske reiterated his ideas in *The Idea of God* (1881), in which he goes beyond his earlier statements and alludes to personal immortality.

Theological seminaries were interested in the question of evolution and invited various scientists to lecture to the students. The Morse lectures for 1884 at Union Seminary in New York were delivered by J. J. Dawson of McGill University on the "Theory of Nature and the Bible," and in 1880 Asa Gray spoke on "Natural Science and Religion" before the Yale Divinity School.

In spite of these contributions of men of science toward the use of evolution in the reconstruction of religion, there was a strong trend toward believing that the theory could be of no use to religion. The trend is more clearly seen in British thought of the same period, but it is as strongly evident in America. Britain had such Christian men of science as Herschel, Brewster, Faraday, Stokes, Clerk-Maxwell, J. Y. Simpson, Tait, Kelvin, and others. In addition Robertson Smith made the most thorough rebuke to Huxley after his Belfast address that has ever been made to a man of science by
an opponent. Smith in a letter to the Northern Whig pointed out error after error made by Tyndall in his facts upon which he built his materialistic interpretation. The letter has never been answered, and yet it was but a straw against the current which was flowing toward materialism.

One of the first ministers to give public support to the theory of evolution was Newman Smyth, who published his Old Faiths in New Light (1877) upon the principles of, "An evolutionary science of nature, an educational philosophy of history, a metaphysical faith in the spiritual unity of the creation."

Henry Ward Beecher was another early advocate of the theory of development. In 1878-79 he was giving a series of lectures in Plymouth Church on the relation of evolution to religion. In these lectures he rejected the plenary and verbal inspiration of the Bible and urged upon his people the idea of God's whole revelation as the gradual and progressive unfolding of purposes toward social and spiritual matters through vast periods of time. In October, 1882, he resigned from the New York and Boston Association of Congregational ministers lest they be accused of acquiescing in the beliefs which he held, and was criticised for holding.
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Another disturbing factor of this era was the higher criticism of the Bible. Not as much opposition fell to its lot because it was not as widely known as the question of evolution, yet it was usually treated as a dangerous enemy. Benjamin W. Bacon says that of his years at the Yale Divinity School (1881-84) that, "the higher criticism was everywhere received not as a friend, but as an enemy...To question the Rabbinic tradition that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch urging the work's own implications was regarded as German rationalism. Still worse was it to point out that the Fourth Gospel, so far from supporting the claim of its editorial appendix...explicitly and systematically refers to this writing in the third person. New light from Scripture was most unwelcome."

It was in this period of conflict that there arose a revival of religion, beginning with the work of Dwight L. Moody, particularly the years 1876-77. In these three years, the lay movement in revivals rose to a peak with evangelistic meetings all over the States, but with the major centers of the work in the largest cities. The movement lasted all through Moody's life and even after his death, in 1899. It had an enormous influence in helping preach the New England Theology out of the land. Moody emphasized the substitu--

tionary theory of the atonement, but he also emphasized the love of God as the great motive power in moving men to accept what Christ had done for them. It was this latter emphasis which had much to do with supplanting the older theology with somewhat of an Arminian emphasis upon the will of man and its part in the purpose of salvation.

It is not possible to separate each force present in this period and say that this one or that was more influential in leading men forward into a new day. It is certain that by 1880 men were beginning to forget their battles against each other and against forces which once seemed destructive, and were bending their energies toward religious rebuilding. The scientific theories played their part in this period by emphasizing the idea of development, and with this emphasis came the new approach to the Bible through the higher criticism. With these two forces was combined the fervency of the Moody revival in giving zest to spiritual vitality at a time when the religious tide was at low ebb.

Religious Reconstruction

Some time within the eighties, there came a change from the years of conflict to the new task of harmonizing the new knowledge which had been gained with the old truths. The spiritual interpretation of the universe was gaining the ascendancy over the materialistic theories which had loomed large to巴士 in previous years. No one seems to know just when this work of rebuilding began. G. B. Smith in his Religious Thought in the Last Quarter Century suggests that it was not until 1890 that men began to take a long look around them and piece together what they knew. He mentions as the leaders of this work, Washington Gladden, David Swing and Lyman Abbott. In another book which is dedicated to the life and work of Wm. Adams Brown, The Church Through Half A Century, it is held that reconstruction began in the nineties, and that in addition to Brown, Henry Churchill King and Wm. Newton Clark were the leaders. Allen in his Life of Phillips Brooks puts the beginning of this work much earlier, suggesting that it was about 1884, the year in which the debate between Spencer and Harrison took place.
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Allen thinks that the debate itself had little to do with the work of reorganization, but that it indicates the temper of the day in that such a debate could be held with the more intelligent supporters in the country feeling sure the spiritual interpretation of life was the correct one. As this paper develops it will be seen that the earlier date of Allen is none too early, for there were men and forces at work even before that time.

It was during the eighties that the strange combination of Moody and Henry Drummond tore the country. Moody, the evangelist of uncritical orthodoxy, and Drummond, the daring interpreter of the new science. In spite of the defects in Drummond's work it had a great influence in showing people that science was not so mischievous as they feared.

It should be noted also that in this period of reconstruction were sown the seeds of two movements which brought much tribulation to Christianity in America. The first was the seed of the fundamentalist controversy which is still not settled. During the work of Moody, Torrey, Sankey and others connected with them, these seeds were sown and in the years of transferring to new ideas in religion there were many who refused to seek new paths and devoted their energies to the Moody schools and followers. The second error, which has its roots lodged in this period, was the theory of necessary development toward the good in the religious life. This was
the theory which led to the easy sort of religion, which met such bitter disappointment in the days of the World War. It came to be held that we were getting better naturally, and that if evolution were given long enough, perfection would follow.

The tendency of the eighties was away from pure theology, such as had held the foreground in past days, toward a deeper study of the Scriptures and a theology based upon these discoveries. With this was combined a larger emphasis upon the actual experience of Christians. There was a shift of attitude toward the Bible; it was not possible to investigate the sources of the Bible, and feel that it was not inerrant. Also, there came a new idea of creation in that the leaders of thought substituted the idea of continuous creation, for that of instantaneous creation out of nothing. The place of man in the purposes of God, the effect of sin, and the meaning of salvation as more than a possession of the individual, came to take on new meaning in these years.

In line with this new emphasis upon the critical study of the Scriptures, is the appearance of German literature and influence. In the back of the 1889 edition of The Freedom of Faith by Manger, Houghton Mifflin, its publishers, included a long list of religious books they had recently published. Among these are Renard's History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament, and Heander's General History of the
Christian Religion and Church. The latter book had been translated from the German by James Torrey of the University of Vermont. Two of the men who helped introduce German thought in this period were Newman and Egbert C. Smyth of the Andover Theological Seminary, both of whom had studied in Germany. Another important man in this connection was Philip Schaff, who left Mercersburg Academy and became professor in Union Seminary in 1870. In 1882 Schaff edited the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge, which was based on the Real-Encyclopaedia of Hauck. Even before this, McClintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature (1867) had appeared and was on the side of progressive scholarship.

Several of the seminaries were introducing courses in critical study of the Bible under such men as C. A. Briggs and Francis Brown at Union, Hugh Scott at Chicago, the Smyth brothers at Andover, and Streenstra at Cambridge. Other leading seminaries took just the opposite stand as evidenced by Shailer Matthews' experience at Newton and B. W. Bacon at Yale, who found only opposition to higher criticism and German thought. This interest on the part of the seminaries is probably the reason that in the late
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eighties and early nineties so many of the young ministers took a year or more of graduate study in Germany. These men returned to America from 1890 to 1896 and began their work as pastors and teachers, which may be the reason that some students of this period suggest that reconstruction in religion came about in the nineties. As a matter of fact these men went to Germany to study because the work of reconstruction was already under way in the country and was demanding that they ground themselves in the methods of critical study so that the work might be carried on.

Among the men leading this movement of rebuilding should be mentioned not only the teachers in the seminaries which we have listed but also at least two men who were preaching the new doctrines from their pulpits: Henry Ward Beecher in Brooklyn and Phillips Brooks in Boston.

One must not be misled into the belief that all the country was welcoming this new day of re-orientation. The strict Calvinists were following men like Charles Hodge and Robert Dabney, who felt that nothing good could come out of Germany. These two men represented a large part of the Presbyterian faith throughout the country. Their position was little changed from the early days when they looked upon the modifications of Edwards as heresy. The progressive movement was largely confined to New England and neighboring states.

Chapter II

THE INCARNATION: CENTER OF BROOKS'S THINKING

Brooks indicates his sympathy with the new theology of his day by centering his thought around the person of Jesus. The older theology had started its thinking with the idea of God as the absolute ruler of the universe and, in the course of exposition, reached the person and work of Jesus which was viewed in the light of their postulates about God. Brooks began his thinking about religion with the fact of Jesus and his interpretation of God and of man's relation to God. The new emphasis in theology was to make the person of Christ central, rather than to lay the emphasis only upon his work, as a part of a plan arranged for man, through the wisdom of God. This was the new Christo-centric movement of the day.

There had been a great deal of discussion about the various theories of the person of Jesus, in America, as was indicated in the first chapter of this thesis paper. While Brooks is not interested in theories about Jesus, but in Jesus himself, he lets it be known that he firmly rejects certain of the theories which have been under discussion. He will
not held with the Unitarians that Jesus is simply a man of enlarged capacities whose reach exceeded that of other men. In one of his Trinity Sunday sermons he refers to the idea of some men that the revised versions of the New Testament have established the view of the Unitarians and done away with the divinity of Jesus. He then emphatically denies that the relation of Jesus to the Father depends upon a few verses. His divinity, "shines through all Christ's thought of himself. It breaks forth in every description of the work He has to do. It burns as the soul of His enthusiasm. It makes the deep solemnity and the awful joy that fill his life. He gathers it around Him, with the most touching reverence for the mystery of His own nature, whenever He calls Himself the Son of God and takes up with hands conscious of a new kind of power (1) the work which the servants of God had failed to do."

It must be remarked. In this connection, that Brooks uses the term divinity not in the sense that the Unitarians used the word, to say that all men are divine, but in the sense which later students use the term deity. The terms deity and divinity are used by other men of his day with no distinction in meaning.

The Transcendentalists had also affected the thinking of people regarding the nature of Jesus. They placed no value

---

upon the personality of Jesus, comparing him with Socrates and emphasizing the authority within the soul of each individual which drew from the teachings of either the truth, regardless of the nature of the teacher. Brooks holds no brief for this idea. In his lectures on the Influence of Jesus, he places considerable emphasis upon the value of the intellect in apprehending the truth of Jesus, but he will not limit the use of the intellect as did the Transcendentalists. "Not from simple brain to simple brain, as the reasoning of Maclay comes to its students, but from total character to total character, comes the New Testament from God to men." Brooks devotes several pages of this book to a comparison of the death scenes of Socrates and Jesus, with the purpose of showing the difference between the two men in their presentation of truth. He holds that the discourse of Socrates is an argument for the immortality of the soul: That it is a search after knowledge, a struggle of the intellect, and that what is known must be discovered and held as an intellectual conviction. However, when Jesus speaks under similar circumstances, all argument disappears. Conviction is not gained by the intellect alone, but by the immediate perception of life by another life. This difference in the methods of the two, Brooks holds to be the difference between convincing the
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intellect and making the man believe. That the secret of the influence of Jesus over men's minds is that where Socrates brings an argument to meet an objection, Jesus always brings a nature to meet a nature, - a whole being which the truth hath filled with strength, to meet another whole being which error hath filled with weakness."

Brooks makes one reference to Renan's *Vie de Jesus* (1863) in which he commends the fresh sense of personal companionship between the disciples and the Master, the group gathered and held about a personal center, and gradually becoming fired with the burning idea which moved that center. In other respects Brooks takes the opposite view of Jesus from Renan's. There is nothing of the emaciated Jesus of contradictory nature, with no strong definite purpose of a mission to the world. Brooks was searching for a stronger religion than his day had found, and he built it around the strength of Jesus: a strength which he had found all sufficient for his own needs.

While we have no record of Brooks reading Strauss's *Leben Jesus* (1835), we have abundant record that he did not agree with the contention of Strauss that little can be known about the individual called Jesus. Brooks can not separate the truths which Jesus taught from the personality of the teacher. Jesus to him was the one perfect example of what humanity may become.
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Another view of Jesus which was current in the days of Brooks was Seeley's *Ecco Homo* (1865). This book did not take into account the Biblical criticism, but accepted the accounts as trustworthy and presented the picture of Jesus as a strong man with a clear view of his work from the very beginning of his teachings, uttering his truths in the light of this conviction of a work to be done and calling into being a society for which he was legislating till the end of time. One gets the impression that the book holds the central secret of Jesus to be his enthusiasm for humanity. Brooks agrees that this is a part of the secret, but goes farther in holding that the thing which dominated and liberated Jesus was his enthusiasm for God. There are other differences in his idea of Jesus and the idea in *Ecco Homo* which will appear later, but in the main his own method in dealing with Jesus is similar to that of Seeley. He waives the questions raised by Biblical criticism in regard to the genuineness and trustworthiness of the New Testament writings as having little practical bearing upon the issue as far as the work of the preacher is concerned.

Having thus dealt negatively with Brooks's idea of the incarnation in pointing out his disagreement with other views, let us turn now to the positive side and set forth his beliefs.

----------
The Incarnation

It may be said that Brooks had no real definition of the nature of the incarnation. When he seeks to define it for his hearers it is always by means of representations. His Christology is vague, because he is not concerned with the incarnation as a theory of divine existence as were men of the past. His concern is with the idea as an aid to the daily living of the men and women to whom he is preaching. The subject is preached, not that men may be convinced that it is true, but that by believing it they may appropriate it for their own living. Therefore it is with the character of Christ that Brooks concerns himself, and the person of Christ is dealt with only as it relates itself to the person.

This concern with the character of Christ in part accounts for his emphasis upon the church year as the ideal outline for preaching about Jesus. He adopted this plan for himself, not only because his denomination suggested the idea, but because it gave him an opportunity each year of dealing with the main events of the Christian life as it was ideally set forth in the life of Jesus.

Brooks emphasized the naturalness of the incarnation, its essential harmony with the ordering of the human life of the world. It was not necessary to deny his divinity to give him
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the human characteristics, nor to overlook his humanity to see and feel the divine. "The wonderful thing about this sense of Divinity, as it appears, to Jesus is its naturalness, the absence of surprise or feeling of violence... this new life into which God comes seems to be the most quietly, naturally human life that was ever seen upon the earth. It glides into its place like sunlight. It seems to make it evident that God and man are so near together, that the meeting of their natures in the life of a God-man is not strange."

This feeling of the naturalness of the advent of God in human life did not lead him to identify that life in its nature with the other messengers which God had sent before. In a sermon dealing with Trinity Sunday he emphasizes the fact that there is a difference between the mission of Jesus and the work which the prophets and others had done. A difference in kind, and not only in degree. This difference he holds to be the fact, that it involves in Him a power to bring the very being of God close to our being, in a way purely His own.... He manifested not simply God's truth, but God: He made the life, the heart, the love of God to be present among men." That is, other messengers of God had brought the truth of God to mankind, but they had been unable to bring God Himself to them.
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In insisting upon the eternal nature of Christ, Brooks has much the same emphasis as Athanasius in his principle of the "Eternal Sonship," In a sermon on "The Eternal Humanity," Brooks deals with the pre-existence of Christ, not for the sake of establishing it as a theory, but to set forth the glory of man in that the ideal for humanity is set forth perfectly in him; therefore those lines which are blurring and dim in our lives as copies of the original can be deepened and ennobled through this ideal. While this sermon illustrates the habit of Brooks of taking a truth and preaching it in the light of human life, it also sets forth one of the few instances in which he goes into the mystery of the incarnation. "Christ says, 'I am eternal.' Now that must mean not only that he has existed and shall exist forever, but also that in the forevers of the past and the future He is eternally Christ; that the special nature in which He relates Himself to us as Savior never had a beginning and never had shall have an end.... That is to say, there are two words: God and Man. One describes pure deity, the other pure humanity. Christ is a word not identical with either, but including both. It is the deity in which the humanity has part; it is the humanity in which the deity resides." In his emphasis upon this union of man and God, Brooks is in sympathy with the thought of his

Sermon written in 1864.
day which refused to make the sharp distinction between the
human and the divine which was made by the older theology.
In this he is following the thought of Bushnell in his God
In Christ (1849,) and is thirty years ahead of G. A. Gordon,
who has the same emphasis in The Christ of Today (1896,) and
twenty years ahead of the book by the professors of Andover
Seminary, Progressive Orthodoxy (1886) which had a large
influence in spreading the views of the new theology which was
arising in New England. Many historians of religions thought
in America have overlooked the work of Brooks and others in
the years between Bushnell and the later men, and have
ascribed to the men of the eighties and nineties the work
which was really done much earlier by the men they have
neglected. Take for instance this passage from the Andover
book: "The personality of Christ existed primarily as a latent
power, as does all other human personality. And as the basis
was complex, so the unfolding process consciousness: never
simply divine, never simply human, never the two in addition,
or collation, or separation, the one remaining unaffected by
the other, never confused, blended, interchanged. That which
is divine shines in and through that which is human: that which
is human possesses and therefore can reveal the divine. It is
like the union of force and matter, without there being inertia
on either side." This is exactly what Brooks said twenty
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years before in his sermon on "The Eternal Humanity," except that the terminology has been brought up to date, and it is set forth in an essay upon the nature of Jesus.

The fact that Brooks did not set forth his ideas upon theology in any one full treatment may be the explanation that so many writers have overlooked his influence upon the thought of his day. His purpose is always to affect the life of the hearer, never to set forth truth for its own sake, but that the truth proclaimed may be the instrument of developing life. Thus when he deals with his ideas of Jesus, he does not go into the metaphysics of the question, but takes up the influence which Jesus had upon life in its several aspects. Had he set forth his ideas in a more formal treatise, such as Sachnell or Gordon, it is probable that historians would have noted the book and heralded it as a stepping stone in progress.

In a long passage in one of his sermons, Brooks speaks upon the purpose of the incarnation. In this passage his emphasis is upon the results to the life of man, and should be taken in addition to what has already been pointed out that the incarnation brought God himself into the life of man, and also in connection with what will later be said regarding the faller work of Christ. Brooks is preaching from John 1:11,12, and lays emphasis upon the words "into His own." "It is in this statement that all humanity is Christ's own that the real meaning and purpose of the Incarnation lie involved. The first
truth is the essential unity of man's life and God's, and so the essential glory of humanity. Christ comes not merely to man, but into man; and that was possible because the manhood into which he entered was 'His own,' had original and fundamental unity with His Godhead, was made in the image of God.... God did become man, and therefore manhood must be essentially capacious of Divinity." The other truth in the purpose of the incarnation to Brooks is that the words, "came unto his own," indicate that he came in answer to an urgent call of need; arguing that in a true sense that everything is a man's own which needs that man, as a child is its parents, not only by the claim of birth and nature, but also by the tie of continental dependence. The incarnation means that to men who were forgetful of their God-like nature Jesus came to show them they were sons of God; and to men who could not do without him, he came because they needed him. Upon these two points of emphasis revolves his idea of the coming of Jesus: That Jesus showed to men their divine completeness in the qualities which he exemplified and filled perfectly the relations which men have with one another and with God.

Burggraaff cites similar teachings in the men of the later

---
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years of the century to show that while the theology of that
day meant to be Christo-centric, it was really anthropocentric.
That is, while the teaching revolved around Jesus, it was
around the human nature of one who was simply a little better
than man, and not in the sense that he was the Son of God in
the sense of the Nicean Creed; That they used Jesus as a
prophetic example of what man might become. In 1896 Gordon
says of his generation: "In the minds of the younger men one
finds metaphysical infirmity and agnosticism joined with the
sincerest homage in the presence of Jesus. The purely ethical
apprehension of Christ is coming to be the fashion, the moral
picture of him in the Gospels, the image of him in feeling and
social reform, while across the sunless wastes of thought no
shadow of him can be discovered."

What was the tendency in Brooks? Since he emphasized the
perfect humanity of Jesus so much in his work, in pointing men
to what they may become, did he help start the trend against
which Gordon and Birggraaff contend? Whether Brooks was
conscious of this trend or not is not as important as the
question whether he laid the way open for men to come naturally
to this attitude.

The answer to this question is not easy to ascertain.

14. *Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America*,
W. Birggraaff. N.Y. 1928, pg. 159

One factor which probably led to this emphasis upon the ethical Christ was the natural swing of emphasis from the divine nature of the Master to the emphasis upon the human. The Calvinists had laid so much emphasis upon one side, not only in a reaction to the Unitarians, but in their whole discussion of the incarnation. Therefore when the emphasis shifted from the transcendence of God to the immanence, and from the supernatural nature of the second person of the Trinity to the points of similarity between his life and that of man, there was likely to be this turning to the life of Jesus as setting forth the fullness of life for man. This tendency would come regardless of how much leading men opposed it. It was a normal swing of the pendulum, a return to a neglected truth of the New Testament.

Brooks did teach that the meaning of the incarnation was the restoration to mankind of the knowledge that man is by nature a child of God, not with, but also another truth which prevents him furthering the idea that Jesus is simply the perfect man. That second truth was the idea of Jesus as a personal force restoring this knowledge to man and also bringing into the life of man a force which had not been there before. Witness his introduction to The Influence of Jesus: "I have been led to think of Christianity, not as a system of doctrine, but as a personal force, behind which and in which there lies one great inspiring idea, which it is the work of the personal force
to impress upon the life of man, with which the personal force is always struggling to fill mankind. The personal force is the nature of Jesus, fall of humanity, fall of divinity, and powerful with a love for man which combines in itself every element that enters into love of the completest kind. The inspiring idea is the fatherhood of God and the childhood of every man to Him. Upon the race and upon the individual Jesus is always bringing into more and more perfect revelation the certain truth that man, and every man, is the child of God. This is the sum of the work of the Incarnation. A hundred other statements regarding it, regarding Him who was incarnate are true; but all statements concerning Him hold their truth within this truth,—that Jesus came to restore the fact of God's fatherhood to man's knowledge, and to its central place of power over man's life. Jesus is mysteriously the Word of God made flesh." Other instances of a similar nature could be cited. They would all show that while Brooks emphasized Jesus as the ideal of humanity, he did not separate this ideal from the idea of Jesus as a personal force enabling man to attain this ideal.

In preaching through the church year, Brooks would come each year to Trinity Sunday. Apparently it found him always ready to preach upon this doctrine; for his volumes of sermons have

---

*Influence of Jesus*, Brooks, N.Y. 1879. pg. 11-12
many sermons and references to the subject of the Trinity. He does not make any particular contribution to the ideas as held by men before him. Like Bashnell, he will not enter into the mystery of the Trinity, but holds that the Trinity is not a burden on the back of a man's faith, but wings on his shoulders enabling him to enter into a luxuriant land full of light and joy.

The Influence of Jesus

This book is the application of Brooks' theory of the incarnation applied to practical living. The theory that Jesus came to give man the consciousness of his divine sonship, and to make that consciousness the motive power within him, to a noble life. The figure of the family life runs as an undertone through the whole work. God as the father of the human race and therefore all men as his children and therefore brothers in this large family. When Brooks speaks of the church as an agency in developing this consciousness of sonship among men, he uses the family idea: "The church spire is nothing after all, but the elevated and prolonged house-roof."

18. Influence of Jesus, Brooks, N.Y. 1879, pg. 130
Likewise the state is, to him, explained by the same idea, "the battlemented city wall is but the enlargement and solidification of the simple fence that encloses the familiar homestead." Duti to God is interpreted in family terms, as is also the development of the Christian social life. In this idea of the Fatherhood of God and man's sonship, Brooks is developing an idea which he probably got from Bushnell and Robertson of Brighton. It was a cardinal principle with Robertson, who used it as a starting point in his idea of the Christian life, and held, with Brooks, the sonship of the whole human race, in contrast with the limited number of the children of God, which was the teaching of the Calvinists.

The book is divided into four lectures which were given in Philadelphia in 1879, under the John Bohlen lectureship. The first lecture deals with the influence of Jesus upon the moral life of man in bringing a new meaning to the idea of duty. Then follow in order, the social life with a new ideal for the relations of man to man, the emotional life with its two aspects of pleasure and suffering, and finally, the intellectual life, which must be combined with all the rest of a man's life, and not allowed to become the dominant part. The chapter on the emotional life will be omitted in treating the lectures as it has least of permanent value, though it must have been

19. Idem. pg. 130

20. Life and Letters of F. W. Robertson, Brooke, N.Y. 1870, pg. 101, for Robertson's reference to this idea,
popular with its hearers, the thesis of the chapter being that pain and pleasure are not life itself, but are merely phenomena.

I. The Moral Life

The influence of Jesus in securing a Christian morality which shall distinguish a believer from those who do not believe, consists, first, in a perfect combination within himself of the pattern of that life and the power to achieve the ideal, and, second, in shifting the basis of morality from the arbitrary will of God or what the mind considers reasonable, to the combination of the two, in seeing that God commands what he does because it is reasonable. This combination of the reason and authority in the basis of morality is an attempt to correct the older emphasis upon the sovereignty of God, to which there had been raised the objection of its arbitrariness, and also the growing tendency of New England to lay emphasis upon the intellect in choosing what it considered rational as the basis of conduct.

Brooks lays great emphasis upon the idea of Father as applied by Jesus to God. A long passage on the Sermon on the Mount is used to bring out this idea of men as the children of a father, rather than subjects of a king. He cites Neander as saying that the Sermon on the Mount is the 'Magna

Charta of the Kingdom of God' and points out that, while this is a fine phrase and, in one sense, completely true, the idea of God which fills the whole discourse is not the idea of a king, but the idea of a father; that we really have, in the Sermon, the passing of kingship into fatherhood. That this was a new idea for the day is indicated by the amount of space Brooks takes up in establishing the principle, fourteen pages being devoted to it.

The pattern of morality is to be the personal nature of God, ultimate and absolute, behind which it is impossible to go. That which is good, is so because it is like Him, and the bad is that which bears no likeness to Him. A man is to be good in order that he may be like his Father. The possibility of likeness to God grows out of the family relation; it is the echo of the Father's nature which is the child's essential heritage. This idea of the essential sonship of man guided the relations of Jesus to the men and women whom he met. As an illustration of this, Brooks cites the story of the Woman Taken in Adultery, and then, "the other woman who came creeping in, with her box of ointment, to anoint the feet of Jesus as he sat sipping with the Pharisee. The same contrast of treatment shines out here. The shocked and scandalized Pharisee cries out, 'This man ought to have known who and what

22..Idem. pp. 27, 26
23..Idem. pg. 28
manner of woman this is? It is 'what manner of woman.' She is one of a class. She is a kind of being, not a being, not one live, loving, despairing woman. But Jesus begins to speak, and instantly there she is! No longer, 'this manner of woman,' but 'this woman.' And then her story comes....and it is told so that the most supercilious guests turn with a wondering recognition of a true human life among them; told so that the poor woman herself, while she cowered with shame and glowed with love, must have thrilled through and through with self-recognition, with a knowledge of herself wholly new but perfectly certain and clear." That this conception of Brooks, that Jesus meant men to value each individual, was not an idea which was widespread, can be seen from the popularity of Kipling's "Recessional," with its scorn of "lesser breeds without the law." This poem deserves a place in the history of western religious thought; for it expresses something that was in the mind of President McKinley when he testified that God had told him to take the Philippines as an aid to religious work. Both events took place in 1899.

The ideal for Christian morals is to be likeness to the Father. This likeness is to be a standard for each child, so that none can speak of another person as if he did not have the privilege of seeking the standard. For the sake of

24. Idem. pg. 39
25. See, for a discussion of this idea, The Ordeal of Western Religion, Paul Hutchinson, Boston 1933, pg. 19
reaching this ideal the Master laid upon men the necessity of self-sacrifice. One kind of moral training which man has known uses self-denial as a punishment; because you have done so much that you should not have done, surrender some of these other things. Another kind of training uses it to express the essential badness of the thing surrendered. "To Jesus self-sacrifice always is a means of freedom...not because you have not deserved to enjoy it, not because it is wicked to enjoy it, but because there is another enjoyment more worthy of your nature, for which the native appetite shall show itself in you the moment that you really layhold of it, therefore let this first inferior enjoyment go." This is the pattern which has been set up for men, it is far different from a code, or a command, it has all the warmth of a personal force commending itself to men in the person of Jesus. It is a standard for all men because of the simple fact that all men are the children of God.

However, there is nothing so tragic as a pattern set before a man which he has no power to attain. This was the tragedy of the young men to whom Gordon referred in the quotation just cited. They had the sincerest homage for Jesus because of the pattern which he set for their lives, but there was a despair in their hearts for they did not know of

26. *Influence of Jesus*, pg. 41, Brooks, N.Y. 1879
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the power to achieve the likeness to the pattern. Brooks continues his lecture on the moral life by a discussion of the motive and power to this ideal. The motive to this ideal he believes to be love, the elevation to its highest power the same filial devotion which operates in the family, a love which has the two elements of admiration for the essential quality of a character and an affection for the character. The power to achieve is the death of Jesus. He refuses to enter into the mystery of that event, and decries the two attitudes which say either that there is no peculiar power in that death, or that its power can be dissected into its elements. "And so it is not of the essential mystery of Christ's powerful death, but of its immediate moral power that I speak. It is the great renewing spectacle of human life. When men look at it, there comes up out of their hearts the pattern of divinity which is there, their sonship to the Holy One; and to attain that holiness, to realize it perfectly, becomes the passion of their lives. And it is love for the sufferer which makes that passion,—love with its two perfect elements perfectly combined. It is admiration for what he is doing, the selflessness, the heroism, the godlike patience. And it is gratitude because he is doing it for us."

Regarding the element of fear which had played so prominent

28. *Influence of Jesus*, pg. 51, Brooks, N.Y. 1879
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a part in the New England Theology, Brooks has no place for the same kind of fear, but he feels that fear is used in leading one to avoid a disaster into which he might fall. "He does not care to inspire fear unless, startled and stirred by danger, the men to whom he speaks can be made to tremble down so deep that the capacity of being all that he wants them to be shall wake out of its slumber and stand upon its feet.... He always shakes the sleepy soul, not as the jailer who raises the wretch upon his execution morning to lead him to his death, but as the watchman who puts the sword into the drowsy soldier's hand that he may go and fight his battle. It as a revelation of blessing by the dreadfulness of its opposite."

II. The Social Life:

Again it is the picture of the family with which Brooks seeks to interpret the influence of Jesus upon human society. He pictures the family into which Jesus was born, and sets forth Jesus as the constructive power of the social life by leading his hearers to see "how his experience from the very beginning opened into successive relationships, and claimed for itself ever larger and yet larger intercourses, that we can get his true idea of how the relationships and intercourses

30. Idem. pg. 67
of all men ought to be built, how the idea of the Divine (31) 
Father may become the shaping and cohesive power of them all."

In dealing with the social life of Jesus he makes a point which was just coming into prominence, the developing self-consciousness of Jesus. The New England Theology had not taken notice of this and had implied that Jesus had the same knowledge as a child as he had as an adult. Brooke argues that the life of Jesus developed from the instinctive impulse of the little child who puts his arms about his mother's neck to the deliberate and reasoned conduct, as did any other being. "I think that it is a most happy sign of the healthy reality which the life of Jesus is gaining in men's thoughts in these our modern days, that this idea of the development of his consciousness, the gradual growth into the knowledge and the use of his own nature, is no longer an idea that bewilders (32) and shocks the believer in the Lord's divinity." Lyman Abbott thinks this idea of the developing self-consciousness of Jesus unusual enough to chronicle in his book on Henry Ward Beecher. He gives a full account of Beecher's statement of a belief similar to Brooks made in October, 1882, before the Congregational ministers of Brooklyn and New York in resigning from their association, lest they be accused of agreeing with (33) his own beliefs.

31. Idem. pg. 77
32. Idem. pg. 78
In the section on the developing social life of Jesus among his friends, makes much of the normalness of pleasure, games and recreations of various sorts. He feels that Jesus went to the homes of his friends to share in their merriment and pleasures for the same reason that we go, to make people know that he was glad because of their happiness. Yet he is sure that Jesus used such opportunities to let people see that they were not only brothers together, but also children together of their Father. Thus at the marriage in Cana while they were enjoying their fellowship together, there came the additional reminder in the new wine that there was a gift which reminded them of their sonship as well as their brotherhood. Or at Bethany in the home of Mary and Martha, as he spoke of the better part in life than the most faithful service to brother or sister, or when the family circle was broken with his dependence upon his Father and their Father to restore it. This message must have come to the people as a welcome breeze from a warm heart, for the influence of puritanism was still strong in the land, and it was considered more admirable to refrain from worldly pleasures than to indulge in them. Washington Gladden reminds us that, in the eighties, it was a hard matter to persuade the boards of Y. M. C. A. groups to put such games as checkers in the buildings.

34. Idem. pp. 91-95
Society, thinks Brooks, is not an end in itself, but the means to the end of the cultivation of character; society exists for the sake of the individual and a man goes into it not to lose, but to find himself. Therefore if Jesus were to judge the society of the day as he did that of his daytime, he would turn away from its sordidness, its impurity; he would pierce the falseness that pervades it. But his greatest criticism would be that he would miss in it the power to cultivate the personal life of the individual by the revelation of the divine side of human existence, which is His ideal of social living. This perfect development of the individual within the whole group is guided by the consciousness that man is the child of God, and this consciousness should be fostered by fellowship with those who recognize themselves as fellowsons of the same Father. In this fellowship Jesus had a balance between solitude and society. In his solitude the sense of his own Sonship developed, and there is the holding back of his life until the Father bids him let it go, the sending forth in society of the life which has grown deeper by the solitude. Solitude makes the consciousness; society develops, multiplies and confirms it. That which would have remained only a quality in him had he stayed in the desert, or on the hillside, becomes a life when he goes forth into the

---

36. *Influence of Jesus*, pg. 98, N.Y. 1879
world, and he quotes Goethe: "A talent shapes itself in
stillness, but a character in the tumult of the world."

Another influence of Jesus upon the social life is his
sense of the solidarity of the human race. He is saved from
the tendency to divide men into classes by his sense of the
value of the individual. He admits that Jesus dealt with
people as they were divided into classes by the men of the
day: publicans, Pharisees, wealthy, and poor. When one listens
to him there is the impression that the class is good or bad
only as it makes the individual good or bad. The final unit
is the man, and that unit of value was never out of the soul
of Jesus. Therefore Brooks thinks that the social reform
of the nineteenth century has missed the mark. It has lost
sight of this final unit of man in its watch over some of the
accidental and temporary combinations of mankind. It has lost
its value of the individual.

It is necessary that one understand what Brooks means by
this idea of the individual. His century has been set forth
as the day of individualism, rugged individualism which
resulted in the elevation of a few individuals and the grinding
into the dirt of millions of other individuals. Therefore to
set forth the idea that Brooks was a champion of individualism

37. Idem. pg. 105
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would be to proclaim him the prop of a pernicious idea which had brought suffering to the very men he would aid. Enough of his belief has been cited above to indicate that his own idea was that which he felt Jesus to have; the value of every individual because he was a child of God. On this basis his objection to social reform is that it loses sight of this essential idea; it submerges the individual in the class.

The thing of value is not the unit of the man, but the collective unit and the plans to salvage that unit. This is directly opposite to what is usually meant by individualism: the right of one individual, or group, to sacrifice the rights of other individuals to gain an end. Individualism placed the emphasis upon some men; Brooks sought to place it upon all men.

"One of the noblest functions of Christianity in the world is to lie behind the class crystallizations of mankind, like a solvent into which they shall return and blend with one another, to crystallize, no doubt, again, but always to be reminded that the classes into which they crystallize are lesser facts than the manhood into which they are repeatedly dissolved."

In this chapter on the social life there is a section on the church. Again the family life is the illustration of the ideal which Jesus has for the church. A body of disciples bound together by the revelation of their human sonship to

39. Idem. pg. 114
the Father. Men may forget all about councils, creeds, and confessions if only they keep the picture of the church as a family held together by their allegiance to God; and they would know that the ministry of the church is not distinct from and above the church, but is only the church itself doing and saying representatively what all the church in its membership has the right and the duty to say and do. The church is but the type of complete humanity, elect, not that it may be saved out of the world, but that the world may be saved by its witness and example of life.

These words were written in 1879 only a few years after the General Convention of the American Episcopal Church of 1874 had sought to give a broader interpretation of the church. Two conflicting ideas of the church had been tending toward separation: the high-church attitude and the group who called themselves evangelicals. The High Church party held that Christ had founded a definite institution, the church, to carry on his work, and that he had supplied it with a definite threefold ministry of bishops, priests and deacons, and that only those who submitted to the church thus constituted and accepted its ministrations could be sure of salvation. The evangelicals stressed the experience of conversion and felt that the sacraments were useful as commemorative services, but not as the regular means of transmitting supernatural grace.

40. Idem. pp. 128-130
They also emphasized the more emotional type of preaching, and used the Wesleyan method of informal assemblies in which various ones led in prayer or recited their experiences. (41)

Brooks does not side with either of these groups as to the nature and function of the church. Allen, in his biography of Brooks, has cited many occasions in which Brooks worked against both the High Churchmen and the Evangelicals. He is really advocating what came to be known as the Broad Church idea which was developing about this time, and of which he became one of the outstanding leaders. The distinguishing traits of this group were: its emphasis upon the comprehensiveness of the church, limiting it neither to the party who would make it wholly Catholic, nor to the group who would rid it of this influence and make it wholly Protestant; also their tendency to minimize differences in dogma and to accept the discoveries of truth in contemporary thought.

Brooks thinks that Jesus has set a new standard for loyalty to society, a larger patriotism than men have dared adopt. It differed from the patriotism of the Athenian and the Roman in that, with Jesus, it is the constant predominance of the sonship to God over the sonship to David, making him always eager for the land of David because of the interests of God.

---

41. For a discussion of the two parties, see A History of the American Episcopal Church, W. W. Manross, N. Y. 1935, pp. 213-218

42. Idem. pp. 306-307
which it enshrined. Patriotism is only a sentiment unless there is the knowledge that the land one loves is really making a contribution to the righteousness and progress of the world. Then one's land becomes the special spot in which one labors for the universal spiritual benefit of mankind.

III. The Intellectual Life:

In this lecture the surprising thing that strikes one is that in a period when the intellect had been so stressed in theology that there should not be a reaction which would minimize the importance of the intellect. Yet Brooks has none of this reaction. He insists that life must be taken as a unit, the intellect given its rightful place; but it is never to be the sole unit or have the supreme place. With him life only can only be complete where there is the balance with each phase having its rightful place.

The word which he uses as a key to the intellectual life of Jesus is the word truth, particularly as it is used in the Gospel of John. Mentioning the fact that however one may enlarge the meaning of the word, it must remain a word of the intellect, he suggests that it indicates an important attitude in Jesus: that he was not only to win man's affections by his kindness, and to govern man's will by his authority, but that

43. Influence of Jesus, pp. 131-53, Brooks, N.Y., 1879
he also wished to persuade man's mind with truth. Therefore
Brooks seeks to find the meaning of truth as used by Jesus.

The purpose of this truth is to give spiritual freedom
to man, a freedom from the tight cords of wickedness which
have twisted themselves around his nature. But this truth is
not mere fact, for Jesus claimed to be the truth. It is not
something around which one can walk and estimate its worth, but
something living and ever taking shape, something spiritual
which can only be known as one perceives it from the inside of
truth by spiritual sympathy. He then identifies this truth
with the character of Jesus through which truth alone can come
to make character in the disciples. The distinctive thing
about this truth is that it can not be the possession of the
intellect only; for in Jesus the intellect never works alone.
It is always combined with the affections and the will. Thus
the truth which the mind discovers must immediately become the
possession of the affections and the will. It can not remain
in the condition of mere knowledge. This idea is illustrated
with a passage which must be from his own experience in his
search for the strength of Jesus upon which he could rely:
"It is a poor and pitiable life indeed that can not understand
in some degree, out of his own history, this experience of the
Temptation and of Gethsemane. Who of us has not bowed his will

44. Idem. pg. 217
to some supreme law, accepted some obedience as the atmosphere in which his life must live, and found at once that his mind's darkness turned to light, and that many a hard question found its answer? Who has not sometimes seemed to see it all as clear as daylight, that not by the sharpening of the intellect to supernatural acuteness, but by the submission of the nature to its true authority, man was at last to conquer truth; that not by agonizing struggles over contradictory evidence, but by the harmony with Him in whom the answers to all our doubts are folded, a harmony with Him brought by obedience to Him, our doubts must be enlightened."

As a summary of the influence of Jesus upon the intellect, he suggests the attitude which Jesus tried to engender in his disciples. A poetic view of the world as opposed to a scientific view: science looking to the world for facts, poetry asking of it influence and character that it may handle the creative soil within instead of the materials which science chooses as its own field. With this there was to go an acknowledged sense of the mystery of life, vast regions which have not yet been explored. Jesus does not abraid the disbelief of certain doctrines as much as the narrow and worldly temper to which the whole world of mystery is impossible; the Sadducee who reduces the world to materialism, or the Pharisee who makes it ceremony and law. In the third place, progress

45. Idem. pg. 231
was to come through the regeneration of men and not through
the reshaping of circumstances, not by the remodelling of
institutions but by the change of character, not by the
suppression of vices but by the destruction of sin. In the
fourth place, they were to seek the values in all people, not
in just some people; and lastly, there must always be the
enlarging of thought from what seems to be an arbitrary law,
to the principle of life behind it. As illustrated in the
Sermon on the Mount when the Master takes case after case and
shows that what seems to be a law for a particular circumstance
has behind it an essential truth: the prohibition of murder
opens into the picture of vigorous and vital peace out of which
all malice and hatred should have faded away.

The result of these intellectual characteristics will be
a type of mental life in which the intellect is plentifally
present, but does not stand alone; for character is the
result which impresses us: a character in which righteousness
and reason so coincide and co-operate that they can not be
separated and fulfill the condition which David loved to
describe, "Mercy and Truth are met together."

Chapter III

TEACHER OF TOLERANCE

The intolerance of the nineteenth century is hard to believe. A. V. C. Allen says that the Rev. W. N. McVickar came near being defeated in the election for the assistant bishop of Pennsylvania because he had listened to the Rev. James Freeman Clark, a prominent Unitarian of Boston. It was asserted by many that McVickar even sat in a prominent position on the speaker's platform while Clark was speaking. Such attentiveness on the part of an Episcopal minister was interpreted by many as indicating Unitarian tendencies; therefore McVickar was eyed with suspicion.

One may perhaps understand this fear of the Unitarians which stirred the churches. They were close to the days of battle in which the Unitarians had gathered to themselves many of the influential leaders of the various communities. It is harder to understand
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why a minister could not fellowship with the Jewish rabbi without his intentions being misunderstood. In Richmond, Virginia, the Rev. Moses D. Hoge was the leading Presbyterian minister. There seems no doubt that, in 1884, he was the most beloved minister in the city. He was invited by the Jewish synagogue of the city to speak at one of their services. Dr. Hoge accepted, feeling that such co-operation would promote a spirit of brotherhood. Instead of this brotherly spirit, the spirit of wrath prompted many leading citizens of Richmond to do battle with him for denying his faith by an act which, to them, indicated he shared the faith of the men who had crucified their Lord.

One incident, better than the others, indicates the prevailing spirit of the later nineteenth century regarding tolerance. It happened in connection with Phillips Brooks's being made Bishop of Massachusetts. Brooks was the outstanding preacher of his denomination. It was, therefore, natural, when, in 1891, the bishopric of Massachusetts became vacant, he should be elected to fill that office. Between the date of his election, April 30, 1891, and July 10, the date on which the elected was confirmed, the spirit of intolerance showed itself. The interval period between the time of election and the time of confirmation

2. Incident related by Mrs. J. P. Fourquarean, Richmond, Virginia.
is from four to six weeks; in Brooks' case it was ten weeks. Those ten weeks were filled with bitter controversy over his fitness for the office. He was accused of being an Arian in theology, of omitting the Nicene Creed, of disbelief in Apostolic Succession, of holding the miracles to be unessential and unimportant in the life of Jesus, of having fellowshiping with other churches, even to the extent of (3) admiring the Rev. James Freeman Clark, of the Unitarians. He was deluged with letters demanding that he state his position regarding various matters of faith and practice.

Today one would regard Brooks as entirely in accord with the beliefs and practices of his church. Such a controversy, however, aids us to gather the temper of the day with its narrow view of what was right and proper for a minister. It appears to have been the common view of churchmen that listening to men of another denomination implied assent to their beliefs. From our vantage point of half a century later, we laugh at the idea of a great denomination waxing bitter over practices which today are the commonplace acts of all men. It seems like child's play of refusing to dance when one piped, or to play funeral when one mourned. To the men of 1891 such matters were of vital concern. They felt that weighty matters depended upon the

3. See pamphlets on "Phillips Brooks' Consecration as Bishop". Episcopal Theological Seminary, Cambridge
outcome of these issues.

Into such a wilderness of trivialities and distinctions came a voice crying, "This is the way of the Lord". In contrast to the view that tolerance could only be based on the uncertainty of truth and therefore that a man could not be earnest and tolerant at the same time, Brooks held that only the earnest man could be tolerant.

"We want to assert most positively that so far from earnest personal conviction and generous tolerance being incompatible with one another, the two are necessary each to each. 'It is the natural feeling of all of us,' said Frederick Maurice in one of those utterances of his which at first sound like paradoxes, and by and by seem to be axioms,—'it is the natural feeling of all of us that charity is founded upon the uncertainty of truth. I believe it to be founded on the certainty.'"

Brooks sided with the Low Church idea of inviting members of other communions to the communion service. In a letter to his brother Arthur, written on May 23, 1873, he upholds his brother's similar practice, to which the Rt. Rev. Henry J. Whitehouse, Bishop of Illinois, had objected. The bishop appears to have assumed the right to forbid Arthur to extend the invitation to members of other churches worshipping in the congregation and urged the principle of "close communion." Brooks wrote: "The position of our Church

4. Tolerance, Brooks, NY 1887, pg. 9
is perfectly clear. The Archbishop of Canterbury himself in the Vance Smith dispute distinctly said that the Collect which touches the question applied only to our own people. The more I think of it the more I hope you will continue it unless it is very clearly desirable to drop it. I would not give it up out of mere courtesy to any man. At the same time it is not so absolutely a thing of principle that it might not be omitted if its use would seriously wound many people and injure the parish. You surely have done right so far. His advice may have got Arthur into more trouble.

A letter from Phillips to Arthur of June 2, 1873 cites an article appearing in the Boston Journal, quoting the Chicago Tribune on the battle between the bishop and rector. The very fact that an attempt at tolerance made good news would make it appear that it was an unusual virtue in the seventies.

Brooks was not content with advice. He put his principle of tolerance into action at the dedication of Trinity Church, Boston, on February 9, 1877. While the service was conducted by the clergy of his church, the clergy of other churches were invited to join in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. An article, by the Rev. O. B. Frothingham appeared in the Unitarian Inquirer complaining that Dr. James Freeman Clark and other liberal ministers had com-
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promised themselves by accepting the invitation. Allen also cites a protest made to the Bishop of Massachusetts regarding this invitation to other ministers. The decision to invite the other ministers was not a hasty one. For some years Brooks had been conscious of the lack of agreement within his denomination regarding the practice of inviting others to the sacrament. Four years before this occasion, he had written to Miss Mitchell of Philadelphia regarding the situation, "One may count upon no end of dreary controversy about whether Christ is willing that Dean Payne Smith should eat the Lord's Supper in an Episcopal church, but not in Dr. Adams's Presbyterian Meetinghouse."

Truly it was a day of "dreary controversy." Heresy trials were common in those days. The Rev. Charles A. Briggs was tried before the Presbytery of New York in 1892 upon eight charges, which were later amended to six, among which was the charge that he denied that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, that Isaiah was the author of the whole book that bears his name. When these and other charges were found to be correct, Briggs was deposed from the ministry.

---
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Into this atmosphere of intolerance Phillips Brooks inserted an entering wedge, his book TOLERANCE. It consisted of two lectures he had delivered to various groups of seminary students. He felt that those objecting to interdenominational fellowship based their objection on the theory that such fellowship was only possible when there was, in part or in whole, a similarity of belief. Therefore, people of varying views could not partake of the same sacrament. To those objectors, fellowship implied identity of belief, and divergent faiths could only result in opposition; not in co-operation.

TOLERANCE begins with the thesis that, contrary to the general belief, firm convictions do not prevent tolerance, but that the only man who can be tolerant is the man of firm beliefs. To Brooks, tolerance was composed of two elements. Both of these elements are essential, and the harmonious blending of the two determines the extent and the quality of tolerance: "The elements are, first, positive conviction; and second, sympathy with men whose convictions differ from our own."

Such utterances must have seemed like paradoxes to his New England audience. Many were descendants of Puritan ancestors who had been persecuted for their beliefs.

11. Tolerance, Brooks, New York, 1887 Pg. 7
and whom in turn, had persecuted those who differed from
them. They had naturally felt that to maintain their faith
they must wage valiant fight against all those disagreeing
with them. Tolerance toward such enemies seemed to lay the
way open to the corruption of their religion as the religion
of Israel was corrupted through contacts with the natives of
Judea. To meet such fear of the corrupting influence of
tolerance, he said: "It would not be strange if we all had
felt such a fear. It would be strange if any of us had
entirely escaped it, so studiously, so constantly, so earnestly
has the world been assured that positive faith and
tolerance have no fellowship with one another. 'The only
foundation for tolerance,' said Charles James Fox, 'is a
degree of scepticism.' Not many months ago a most respected
clergyman of my own town, speaking at a dedication of a
statue of John Harvard in the university which bears his
name, declared of the Puritans by whom that college was
created: 'They were intolerant, as all men, the world over,
in all time, have always been, and will always be, when
they are in solemn earnestness for truth or error.' I think
those are melancholy words. The historical fact is melan-
choly enough. The fact we must grant as mainly true, though
not without fair and notable exceptions; but to foretell that
man will never come to the condition in which he can be

--------
earnest and tolerant at once, - that is beyond all things melancholy; that spreads a darkness over all the future, and obliterates man's brightest hope." 

To show the fallacy of such melancholy reasoning, he sought to point out the results which it would likely produce. To his mind, it would shatter man's hope of progress in the realm of truth, because this belief would prevent one from sympathetically understanding the viewpoint of another who saw truth in a different aspect. Because each one did not agree with as fallacy, we should be prevented from learning and appropriating the measure of truth which he had gained and, thus correcting our own: "to foretell that man will never come to the condition in which he can be earnest and tolerant at once.....condemns mankind to an endless choice between earnest bigotry and tolerant indifference - or, rather to an endless swinging back and forth between the two in hopeless discontent, in everlasting despair of rest."

Tolerance Grows out of the Nature of Truth

Lest someone should object that his idea of tolerance is simply an indifference resulting in kindly
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indulgence, he makes a vivid distinction between tolerance and indulgence. He paints a picture of two men standing on a cliff overlooking the sea. It is none of their concern which way the waves are running, or how they cross and recross each other. Just so are men who look out over the opinions of man. Such men may feel that they are not a part of the currents of opinion and thought that race through civilization. These men have no firm convictions of their own. They are entirely indulgent of the opinions of others. It is nothing to them how others are thinking. 

"And now suppose that one of these men gets a conviction; he becomes thoroughly in earnest for something which he believes is true. What is the immediate result? Almost certainly there comes a chill and a reserve in his indulgence. Now it appears to him to be a dreadful wrong that other men should think so wrongly. All indifference is gone.

Though he makes a distinction between tolerance and indulgence, he retains the thought of indulgence as an element in his theory of tolerance. However, it is not an indulgence based on indifference, or on lack of clearly defined truths. Instead it is an indulgence growing out of the nature of truth itself.

Brooks's view of truth is that truth is so vast a domain that no one person, or group of persons, or theory of existence, can contain all truth. Each may have a large quantity of truth. Some may have more than others. None hate it all. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate the ideas of those whose views seem opposed to your own, for they may have a truth which you have overlooked, or they may throw more light on a truth which you now hold. Now this search for truth involves two things on the part of the searcher, "earnest conviction and personal indulgence." As these two elements of tolerance blend and harmonize we have moral progress among mankind. As a man tempers his personal conviction of truth with a certain allowance of dissent in the opinions of others, he moves forward into phases of truth lacking in his present view by gaining truths from the other. In this way the moral progress of mankind is not an even march: "Not as the ship sails, moving through the water evenly, all together, every part keeping pace with every other part; rather as a man walks, bringing forward first one side and then the other, one side being at any given moment in advance of the other, equilibrium being always lost and re-gained again a little farther on, to be re-lost again immediately: so as the man walks, does the moral progress of mankind advance. Thus it is that conviction of
truth and allowance of dissent are never in perfect balance and proportion to each other; now one and now the other of them is always in advance, as the whole man in this uneven, sidelong fashion moves unsteadily forward toward the time when he shall be tolerant of his fellow men just in proportion to the earnestness with which he holds his own well-proven truth."

To give concreteness to his view of progress he uses the idea of the circles in an eddying stream. There is one point in the circle of the eddy in which the drops of water are going up the stream instead of down. Here the water seems to be losing all it has gained as the other drops of water pass it headed for the sea. Yet they too must go through the same weary circuit, and the drop which appears to be losing will gain the ocean first. So it is with our knowledge of the truth, it passes through the cycle which he calls: "The law of three conditions... of life, death, and the higher life.... Jesus said, 'Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.' 'Whosoever loseth his life for my sake,' he said, 'the same shall save it!' The crude hopefulness of boyhood passes through the disappointments which it is sure to meet, and comes out, if it keeps its health, into the robust and sanguine faith of middle age. A merely traditional religion goes into doubt, and gathers there strength of personal conviction, and comes forth the reasonable religion of a full grown man. Inno-
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ience perishes in temptation, to be born again out of the
fires of virtue. Life, death and resurrection is the law
of life; and bigotry and tolerance can never be deeply un-
derstood unless we know how easy indulgence often has to
die in narrow positive conviction before it can be born
again as the generous tolerance of the thoroughly believing
man."

As a man progresses through these stages, he ar-

ivies as it were at the center of the sphere upon whose
surfaces are described all the faiths of mankind; "At the
center of that sphere sits the Spirit of Truth, of which
all these specific faiths of men are the more or less im-

perfect and distorted utterances. The man who comes into
that central place sits there with the Spirit of Truth and
feels her power going out to the faiths she feeds on every
side. It is in virtue of that centralness which he has
reached that he is able to understand and sympathize with
the whole. Deepen the desert of Sahara to the center of the
earth, and it will know how the Himalayas came to be so
rocky and high. And so the advice to give to every bigot
whom you want to make tolerant man must be, not, 'Hold your
faith more lightly, and make less of it;' but, 'Hold your
faith more profoundly, and make more of it. Get down to

----------

its first spiritual meaning, grasp its fundamental truth. So you will be glad that your brother starts from that same center though he strikes the circumference at quite another point from yours.'"

Brooks seems to have realized that this view of tolerance toward opposing beliefs was open to two objections. Some would say that while one might be tolerant toward the truth which was in his belief, that the individual might have an insincere purpose in holding it. Therefore, one could not be tolerant of his position, for it would bring about more harm than good. The other objection would be that love of truth would not be enough. One may know the nature of truth, may rejoice in the common source from which truth must spring, and yet be callous, cold, and cruel toward the individual holding truth.

To meet this second objection, he says: "True tolerance consists in the love of truth and the love of man, each brought to its perfection and living in perfect harmony with one another; but that these two great affections are perfect and in perfect harmony only when they are subdued and enfolded in the yet greater affection of the love of God. The love of truth alone grows cruel. It has no pity for man. It cries out, 'What matter is a human life tortured or killed..."

for Truth, crashed under the chariot wheels with which she travels to her kingdom? The stake fires and the scaffold belong to it. And the love of man alone grows weak. It trims and molds and travesties the truth to suit men’s whims....

The boy of whom the stranger asked the way to Farmington is the very image of the loge of man that is not mingled and harmonized with love for truth. 'It is eight miles,' the boy replied. 'Are you sure that it is not so far as that?' the weary traveler asked. The boy, with his big heart overrunning with the milk of human kindness, looked at him and replied, 'Well, seeing you are pretty tired, I will call it seven miles.' How much of would-be tolerance has sounded in our ears like that! The love of truth alone is cruel; the love of man alone is weak and sentimental. It is only when truth and man are loved within the love of God, loved for His sake, truth loved as His utterance, man loved as His child, — only then is it that they meet and blend in tolerance. Therefore, it is that absolute and steadfast tolerance, so far from being the enemy of religion, as men have foolishly said, can only come religiously, can never be complete till man completely lives his God.”

-------------

Brooks's real basis for believing that firm convictions will promote tolerance is not only his view of truth, but also his idea of the effect of real convictions. He held that those who objected to his view did so because of their meager idea as to the nature of real convictions.

"A true conviction, anything thoroughly believed, is personal. It becomes a part of the believer's character, as well as a possession of his brain; it makes him another and a deeper man. And every deepening of a human nature centralizes it, so to speak, carries it in, that is, to the center of the sphere upon whose surface are described all the specific (19) faiths of men."

One may be tempted to take exception with him on this point; for the most tolerant often hold firm convictions without having the eyes of their mind illuminated, or the depths of their mind carried to the "center of the sphere where sits the Spirit of Truth".

In answer to the first objection mentioned, that a man may hold a certain truth with insincerity of purpose, he urges one to distinguish between the truth and the holder. Value the truth, but never honor wrongness of purpose. He goes on to warn one of attempting to correct supposedly wrong beliefs in the thought of another by any force other than
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reason. "While I claim the right and duty of arguing with him and trying to show him that I am right and he is wrong, I would not silence him by violence if I could. I would not for the world have him say that he thinks I am right before his reason is convinced." Thus, when a man, in all sincerity, holds beliefs varying from your own, you are not called upon to rejoice in his mistaken beliefs. That is, no one should rejoice that his neighbor is an atheist and denies the truth of God's being, which to us is the glory and inspiration of all life. Tolerance toward him means something different from a joy that he fills out your part of truth with something which denies that which you hold. Tolerance in that case would mean two things: "It means, first, a cordial and thankful recognition of all the good personal character which is in him, including most carefully the frankness and honesty which makes him clearly face, and openly declare, this very atheism which distresses and offends my soul. It means, in the second place, the full acceptance of the idea that it is only by the persuasion of reason that this atheism can be legitimately attacked and overthrown."

Brooks then discusses what he calls the "Hope of tolerance," which we may call the purpose of tolerance. He

has just been discussing John Stuart Mill's book, ON LIBERTY, giving as its hope for tolerance the utilitarian theory of the usefulness of tolerance in giving free expression to the truth needed by men. He not only believes that his work will be "quite in vain unless you see how deeply I believe that the value of tolerance lies in its devoutness. I have tried to show not merely that a man may be cordially tolerant and yet be devoutly spiritual, but also that a man cannot attain to the highest tolerance without being devoutly spiritual. Too long have piety and tolerance seemed to be open foes, or to keep but an armed truce with one another. Too long have young thinkers on religion imagined that it was disloyal to the truth they held, and to the Master whom they loved, to strive after cordial sympathy with and understanding of the earnest men and systems who were farthest from their truth and from their Master. Here is the first hope for tolerance,—not in its wider extent, but for its better kind. It will grow more and more religious. It will be filled with deeper piety. We will not in moral perplexity hope that a man may be tolerant in spite of his devoutness; we shall confidently (22) expect a man to be tolerant because he is devout." When tolerance is looked on in this light, it will be seen as: "the broadest and deepest obedience of the soul to Christ;

---

22. Idem. pp. 46-47
and the fall flower of the ripest piety and of the most
earnest sainthood,"

Pleading the similarity of tolerance and life as an excuse for not having given a definition of tolerance, he says he prefers to live before telling his brethren what life is. As a definition he gives: "The willing consent that other men should hold and express opinions with which we disagree, until they are convinced by reason that those opinions are anathema." He calls attention to five things implied in this definition. First, cordial consent to differ, not a yielding of despair. Second, discrimination, for tolerance is not called on to champion beliefs which it considers erroneous. Third, positive convictions on your part. Fourth, outspoken, earnest discussion in attacking error through reason. Fifth, conscientiousness, patient toward what it counts honest error, utterly impatient toward dishonesty, for there is moral intolerance which must go with intellectual tolerance to give it vigor.

After laying this foundation for tolerance, he discusses the means by which it is to be promoted. He is certain that it can never come by mere indifference. He is

23. Idem. pg. 48
24. Idem. pg. 49
equally sure that it cannot come by selecting a few truths from all religions and blending these into a whole which all men will accept. Such an idea must have been current in his day, for he spent much space in dealing with this view, clinching his argument thus: "Of all the stories of eclecticism, I think that none is more interesting than that of the great Akbar, the mighty Mogul emperor, him whom Max Muller calls, 'the first student of comparative religions.' He lived and died almost three centuries ago; but his story reads like a record of life in one of the great cities of today. In his palace at Agra he held his Friday evenings, when Buddhist, Hindu, Musulman, Sun-worshipper, Fire-worshipper, Jew, Sceptic, all came and argued, and the great monarch sat and stirred the waters, and gathered out of the turmoil whatever pearl was anywhere cast up to the top. He did not exactly, like a modern lady of society, invite a college professor to lecture to her friends upon the Infinite, in her parlor on a summer's afternoon; but he hung a Brahmin in a basket outside his chamber window, and bade him thence discourse to him of Brahma, Vishnu, Rama, and Krishna, till the great Akbar fell asleep. The result was an eclectic faith, a state religion, a thing of shreds and patches, devised by the ingenious monarch, enforced by his authority, accepted by his obsequious courtiers, and dropping to pieces and perishing when he was dead. It was the old first fatal diffi-
acity of eclecticism, that each man wants to make his own selection, and no man can choose for others, but only for himself."

The third way of promotion which he rejects is the idea that one of the present forms of faith shall so overwhelmingly assert its faith and practice that all other forms shall wish to be absorbed. Nor has he any faith in tolerance being promoted through identity of organization among all faiths.

The one way upon which he bases his hopes is in, "the unity of spiritual consecration to a common Lord - so earnestly sought by every soul that, though their apprehension of Him whom they are seeking shall be as various as the lights into which a hundred jewels break the self-same sunlight - the search shall be so deep a fact, so much the deepest fact in every soul, that all souls shall be one with each other in virtue of that simple fact, in virtue of that common reaching after Christ, that common earnestness of loyalty to what they know of Him. This is the only unity which is thoroughly worthy either of God or man." He realizes that as a result of the conditions he lays down tolerance must come by the advancing flood of life which flows into the lives of mankind everywhere. Its hope lies in the advancing spirit—

-----------------
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ality of man. Therefore, he sees no need for anyone to fear the coming of tolerance. Its coming will only be a result of the deeper occupation of the life of man by God. This will rob it of all dangers.

The Practical Application of Tolerance

Brooks suggests two practical applications of tolerance that have to be made by the churches. First, what should be the relation of the church to those outsiders holding truths with which we partially agree; and second, with those with whom we disagree entirely. One naturally says that tolerance toward the first is a good thing. We see the similarity in belief and feel that their truth may be a corrective or spur to our own. On the other hand, how can we be tolerant toward those whose beliefs are diametrically opposed to our own? Is tolerance to be desired toward those?

"The first thing which we can say with regard to that distinction is, that it is one of which we never ought to think that we can be absolutely sure at first sight. Our sense of the value of our way of working, if it is very deep......is almost sure to blur the distinction between the work and the way of doing it, to make the color seem part of the substance, to make the man who is doing the same work in another way appear to be doing another work......The only thing which can keep him absolutely true is such a pure value for the thing..."
itself, such a desire and craving for the success of the essential work, as shall compel it always to stand out before the work sharp and distinguishable from all the ways in which the work is being done."

Regarding those views which we may recognize as possibly presenting other sides of truth than ours, he feels that tolerance is not a difficult matter. God has endowed man with two powers in laying hold of truth. One of these powers is general, the other special. By the first, a man lays hold of truth in its great essential aspects. He gets its general principles. By the second, he lays hold of particular forms of truth and makes them his own. Both these powers have to be kept in balance. If the first overpowers the second, the scholar is apt to become a vague and abstract theorist. The emphasis of the second is apt to narrow him to a meager specialist. Therefore, a man must have both views of truth. He must understand that what he calls other sides of truth are, in reality, other truths. Then he can rejoice in their truth. "I have heard some of our bishops declare with thankfulness and pride that there was no difference of opinion in their dioceses; that all clergy (I suppose they would hardly undertake to answer for all the laity there) thought alike. I know some ministers who want all their

---

parishioners to think after their fashion and are troubled when any of their people show signs of thinking for themselves and holding ideas which the minister does not hold."

Tolerance toward the second class of views, those in radical difference with us, he realizes is a harder matter. He feels that no one is called upon to rejoice in an opinion which he knows to be untrue, as he is called upon to rejoice in other sides of truth. "I am not called upon, nay, I have no right, to be thankful that my neighbor is an atheist, and denies the truth of God's being, which is to me the glory and inspiration of all life. Tolerance toward him means something different from a glad sense that he fills out my partial truth with something which it lacked. Tolerance toward him means two things. It means, first, a cordial and thankful recognition of all the good personal character which there is in him, including most carefully the frankness and honesty which makes him clearly face and openly declare this very atheism which distresses and offends my soul. It means, in the second place, the full acceptance of the idea that it is only by the persuasion of reason that this atheism can be legitimately attacked and overturned. When these two elements, personal respect and confidence in reason only as
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the means of conversion, are present, tolerance is perfect." He feels that one of the worst things about intolerance is that it puts an end to manly controversy. "Calvin can not argue with Servetus when he is putting the fire to the fuel which surrounds his victim at the stake."

It should be understood that Brooks uses the term "reason" in a rather broad sense. It can hardly be argued that he means by it an appeal directed solely to the intellect of the atheistic neighbor, though it can probably be proved that in his early ministry, he placed great emphasis upon this approach to truth. He seems rather to use the term in the broader sense expressed in his famous summary of preaching, "truth through personality." It seems clear that he would include within the limits of the word, "reason", any influence going forth from a beautiful life, and appealing to the emotions or the will of his friend. His great desire is to urge upon his hearers the necessity of fighting truth with truth and error with truth. He wishes them to avoid any other kind of force in changing or silencing views held to be dangerous because of their error.

A more pressing question is the relation of church groups to those outside the church. Must we not say that there are many outside any ecclesiastical organization who
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are just as truly Christian as those within the fold. He pictures each one who truly values his place in the Christian Church as standing in the midst of four concentric circles. These circles represent the different groups of his fellowmen. They sweep around his life in ever-widening circumferences to form the four horizons of his life. "Outermost of all there is the broad circle of humanity. All men, simply as men, are something to this man...Next within this lies the circle of religion - smaller than the other for all men are not religious, but large enough to include all those of every name, of every creed, who count their life the subject and care of a Divine life which is their king. Next within this lies the circle of Christianity, including all those who under any conception of Him and of their duty toward Him, honestly own for their Master, Jesus Christ. And then, inmost of all, there is the circle of the man's own peculiar church, the group of those whose thought and worship is in general identical with his who stands in the center and feels all these four circles surrounding him."

Using this idea of the four circles, the four horizons of a man's life, he makes the distinction between the church and Christianity. That since there is no church in all Christendom but must acknowledge that there are men outside its doors who are Christian, none can call themselves

universal, none can claim identity with Christianity.

He also notes that this fact makes for a certain restlessness within the churches. They have a perpetual striving to widen their own inner circle -- the church circle -- to take in more and more of the horizon of the circle called Christianity.

He does not say that the church should throw open its doors to all men. In fact, he appears to approve of certain limitations on membership which a group may apply to those wishing membership. He faces frankly the fact that we have certain extra-spiritual tests which prevent our identifying ourselves with Christianity: tests of the form of worship, certain beliefs which must be assented to. Till these are removed, no church is even prepared to grasp the offer of universality, of catholicity, if it were offered to her.

"So long as any church is aware that there are Christians to whom she, as she is now constituted, cannot open her doors, she must be more than content - she must be thankful and rejoice - that there are forms of worship and groups of believers in which those Christians for which she has no place may find fellowship with one another and feed their souls with truth. While she is ever trying to make her embrace more large, to bring herself into true identity with the absolute Christianity, she will be glad enough that in the meantime the souls for which she has no place are not to go unhoused, that

--------------
there are other church homes than her own in which they may live, that she is not the whole Church, that in the largest and truest sense the Church, even today, does embrace all servants of Christ in their innumerable divisions."

Penalty for Wrong Beliefs

Brooks then deals with the relation between the question of tolerance and the question of penalty for wrong beliefs. He does not feel that penalties and false beliefs are necessarily connected, though they are usually associated in the history of man. Many people would think that with the passing of the axe and the stake all penalty for differences of religious belief had passed. Some would ask how it is possible to have any idea of punishment, or penalty, under the era of religious freedom as enjoyed today. Brooks points out a penalty commonly inflicted on those holding what we deem to be wrong beliefs. "If it is possible to keep alive the idea — if in some of her teachings the church does keep alive the idea — that wrong opinions about God and Christ and salvation are not merely to show their influence in hampered and harmed lives, but are also to be definitely punished by God as wickedness, then the most terrible form of persecution is still possible." He describes the days in which men shut out false doctrines by the treat of the rack to anyone holding them.
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then dragged through the streets on the way to the stake in
the public square. "What terror had a penalty like that com-
pared with the terror which belongs to this other threat,
which declares or implies that he who believes this or believes
that shall perish everlastingly."

To avoid the connection of penalty and wrong beliefs
in the mind of the church people, Brooks suggests that we need
to realize that God punishes only wickedness: That honest be-
lieves, even though mistaken, cannot be considered wickedness:
"The only ground for us to take is simply the broad ground
that error is not punishable at all. Error is not guilt. The
guilt of error is the fallacy and fiction which has haunted
good men's minds. It has not always stood out plain and clear;
such fictions seldom do. It has been mixed with the thoughts
of the mischievousness of error, and with suspicions of the
maliciousness of error; but always lying in behind, in the cen-
ter of the impulse which made man persecute his brother man
for what he thought, there has been the idea that error was
guilt. We must get rid of that entirely. Error is not like
guilt; error is like disease. Behind disease there may lie
guilt as a cause, — so a man may have been reckless, de-
fiant, sophistical, selfish, wicked in many ways, and so have
plunged himself into error. But he may have fallen into error
without any such wickedness, and even if his error be the
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fruit of wickedness, it is in the wickedness, the moral wrong, and not in the error which has proceeded from it, that the guilt lies. Guilt could be inseparably attached to error only on the assumption that there was on earth some revelation of God's truth so absolutely clear and sure that no honest man could possibly mistake it, — so sure and clear that any man who mistook it must necessarily be wanton and obstinate and disobedient."

In further proof of the view that error is not guilt, he cites the fact that many opponents of error feel called upon to impute unworthy motives to those holding views different from their own. It is, says he, like the Inquisition of old who dressed their victims in grotesque garb as they were led to the stake, so that the people along the streets would forget that they were men, and hoot at them as though they were fiends. So, many opponents of wrong belief today ascribe base purposes to their opponents, as though they must turn error into moral wrong before it can be abused.

The question arises here as to the exact meaning of Brooks's idea that wrong beliefs should entail no persecution or punishment. Some would ask if such a view would prevent a denomination from casting a man from his pulpit if his beliefs differed from the accepted tenets of the standards of

---
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of that church. If, for example, there had been an atheist in the pulpit of Trinity Church when Phillips Brooks was Bishop of Massachusetts, would the Bishop have been prevented from calling such a man before the church courts, and having proved that his views were not in accord with the standards, and having been unable to change the minister's faith by reason, have judged the man unworthy to continue his work and therefore have unfrocked him? In simpler terms, would such a theory prevent heresy trials? Would it prevent the church from removing a teachers from its theological seminaries? How far would such a theory of tolerance demand that we go in practicing the spirit of the Master...

The Results of Tolerance

When once we get rid of the idea that terror in itself is a guilty thing, two good results will follow. First, moral indignation instead of spending itself upon a false scent can be directed against those things which deserve to be condemned. He mentions the fact that often the church has been so busy condemning heretics that she has failed to denounce the cruelty, the hypocrisy, and the corruption which were in her bosom. "Blame given to the blameless makes us very often lenient to the blameworthy."

In the second place, the true results of false be-
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believes will appear. Their results are not that God will eternally damn a man for his wrong opinion, but that such views shut a man out of a great region of joy and growth, rob his nature, and separate him from God. Such results can not make him believe the truth you hold, but they may set him to a more careful search for the truth which he has missed. To re-examine the truth which he has felt he had sufficient evidence to hold, and to take away from the truth which he has not heretofore believed the air of unreality or impossibility which prevents so many from seeking it.

It was an ever-recurring contention of Brooks that truth is not the end to which the church should dedicate itself. Truth is rather the means to that end. The end is character. The truth of our Christian religion is set on moral ends: "And can find a satisfaction with which it can be wholly satisfied only in human character...Christianity then, must hold man as her purpose, truth as the means by which that purpose may be reached; character always behind belief, belief (39) always as the gateway and vestibule to character."

Since the truth is to result in greater character, he has no fear of a free search for truth; yet he realizes that this is not the generally accepted opinion of his church by any means. He knows that many fear such a search, and

39. Idem. pp. 96-97
illust rates it by this story: "It seems that in Westminster Abbey a good many Roman Catholics have been in the habit of coming, on the day of his sainthood, to pray beside the tomb of Edward the Confessor at the old shrine where petitions of devout pilgrims were offered up for centuries. The late Dean Stanley loved the custom; it pleased his catholicity and his historic sense, and he gave it all encouragement. But it seems that it did not so well please one of the old vergers or sextons of the Abbey; and one day when the worshippers were numerous, this venerable official came to one of them, and touching him on the shoulder as he knelt on the ground, said, 'You must go away from here.' The man meekly looked up and replied, 'Why? I am doing no harm.' 'No matter, you must go away,' reiterated the verger. 'But why?' persisted the worshipper, still on his knees. 'I am doing no harm, I am only praying.' But the verger persevered, and gave his most conclusive reason, 'No matter, I tell you, you must go away; this thing must stop. If this thing goes on we shall have people praying all over the Abbey.' There is a sort of verger-Churchman, more sexton than priest, in the house of God who is always for stopping free inquiry, because if this thing goes on we shall have men seeking for truth all over the church of Christ."

-----------

40. Idem. pp. 100-101
He closes his lectures on the theory of tolerance with his views of how one should hold the truth he has gained: "Be more afraid of the littleness than of the largeness of life. Seek with study and prayer for the most clear and confident convictions; and when you have won them, hold them so largely and vitally that they shall be to you, not the walls that separate you from your brethren who have other convictions than yours, but the medium through which you enter into understanding of and sympathy with them, as the ocean, which once was the barrier between the nations, is now the highway for their never-resting ships, and makes the whole world one."

Chapter IV

PROGRESSIVE CHRISTIANITY

The outposts of civilization in one generation often become the settled communities of the next. Likewise the religious pioneers of the nineteenth century used daring phrases and ideas which have become popular expressions in the twentieth century. The same phrases are used but with a different thought content. Therefore caution is needed lest one read into the words of Brooks meanings which had not yet entered the minds of men; meanings that have been attached to those words by later generations.

The progressive nature of Christianity is generally accepted today by religious leaders, and also by the laity. It was not so generally accepted in Brooks's day. That it was not widely accepted in his own denomination is evident from the fact that there were three ideas as to the nature of progress. Each of these ideas had a church party to support and defend it. Two of these parties thought that the era of progress had closed many years before. The smallest group thought that progress in Christianity was continuing even at that day. The Oxford Movement held that progress had ended with the great councils of the fourth century.
The Evangelicals felt that progress had continued past the fourth century, but had come to a climax in the thinkers of the Reformation. The Broad Church Party felt that progress in Christianity was continual. The High Church and the Low Church Parties are not differentiated in this discussion, for the simple reason that their ideas of progress were not clear cut according to High or Low as parties. Their theory was either that of the Oxford Movement or the Evangelicals.

Historians of the American Episcopal Church have not generally been conscious of the fact that this question of the progressive nature of Christianity differentiated these parties. Most of the historians of this Church have overlooked the matter entirely. To understand the significance of Brooks's position it will be necessary to summarize the principles lying behind these parties.

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

In 1633 the first of the so-called "Tracts for the Times" was issued at Oxford. The influence of this group was soon felt in America, and in 1844 the Church of the Advent was organized in Boston upon the principles of the Oxford Movement.

1. Notable exception to this is History of the American Episcopal Church, Manross, NY 1935

2. Essays and Addresses, Brooks, NY 1894, pg. 135
Brooks states that the general principles of this Movement are: "Apostolical succession of the ministry, baptismal regeneration, the eucharistic sacrifice, and Church tradition as a rule of faith. Connected with its doctrinal beliefs there came an increased attention to church ceremonies and an effort to surround the celebration of divine worship with mystery and splendor."

The cardinal principle behind the Oxford Movement was the question of the nature of the Church. Various evils had grown up in the Church and were going uncorrected. Partly as a result of the indifference to these evils Parliament re-suppressed certain bishops in Ireland. The Church of England realized that they stood on dangerous ground. If Parliament could remove whom they wished, it might become evident to Parliament that the Church derived its authority from Parliament. It was necessary to assert an authority which antedated civil power. The feeling of those leading the Movement is illustrated in Atkins's account: "Newman's sensitive nature felt the menace to all that was dear to him, and native to his own strangely compounded spirit, of the forces which were beginning to stir at the end of the first third of the 19th century.....that the Church was in danger of losing both power and prestige - and he always conceived the Church.....as an authority and a reality without which Christianity.....could not lay hold of

3. Idem... p. 135
the world. He felt rather than reasoned that the church could be kept secure only as it took its authority from something more majestic than Parliament and asserted itself the creation of Jesus Christ through unbroken descent from the apostles." The Movement sought to establish for the English Church enough continuity with the Pre-Reformation Church to make it Catholic, with a sufficient recognition of the very evident fact that it was not Roman Catholic. Therefore they chose the fourth century A.D., the era of the great Church Councils, as the strategic ground upon which they could best defend the institutional church.

Now this action is directly based upon the idea of progress in Christianity. The Movement sought to oppose the spirit of the present age with the spirit of a former age. Had they chosen to oppose the spirit of the present age with the ever-living and acting Spirit of God, of which the spirit of each age is at once the adversary and the parody, they would have held another theory of progress. They would have declared that progress was still possible. They would have extended the influence of religion to spheres where it had not before been directed. Had they done this, the Movement would have been a creative departure whose influence it would be impossible to estimate. That they did not do this was because

4. Life of Cardinal Newman, Atkins, NY 1931 pg. 110
they felt that progress ended with the fourth century. To
the ears of such men the cry of "Progressive Christianity"
was anathema.

It has been generally agreed that the Movement had
considerable influence on the American Church. However, no one
seemed to know just how this Church was affected or how important
were the changes which came about. Therefore, it was impossible
to say how much their view of progress affected America.
Manross is the first historian of this denomination to evaluate
the effect of the Movement on the denomination. His belief is
that the results most evident are changes in worship. There
were changes in the furnishings of the church. Formerly there
was no altar of solid design, but a communion table with
recognizable legs. This table was not placed against the east
end of the church but set out from the wall far enough to al­
low the minister to stand behind the table and face the con­
gregation. On this table there would have been no colored
hangings but only the fair linen cloth as required by the
fabric; also there would be no candles, cross, or crucifix.
There would be no vested choir marching in. If there was a
choir, it would be out of sight in the gallery. The only
vestments worn by the rector was a long white surplice while
officiating, and a black gown while preaching. Also the pul­
pit had a more prominent place in the church, and might even
hide the communion table.

........................

6. History of the American Episcopal Church,
Manross, NY, 1935 pp. 126-227
The above changes are mentioned here to show that the influence of the Oxford Movement was widespread in America, not that these changes came about in every church as the direct result of the Movement, but that the general effect was widely felt. The implication being that the emphasis upon the fourth century was also widely felt, with the consequent hostility to any idea of progressive Christianity. The Movement therefore helped make it hard to champion progressive steps.

THE EVANGELICALS

The second group within the American Episcopal Church, the Evangelicals, or conservatives, were also suspicious of the idea of progressive Christianity. This was the group who used the men of the Reformation era as their religious guides. They probably constituted the major portion of the Church in regard to membership.

These felt toward the Reformation just as the men of the Oxford Movement felt toward the church fathers of the fourth century. Here was their era marking the end of progress; it had continued longer than the Piscyites admitted, but had ended with the sixteenth century. Now, it is granted that the Evangelicals would not have stated their position

--------------
in just these words. It is more probable they would have said that the Reformation leaders had expressed Christian truth in final form, which is simply carrying the theory of the Oxford Movement twelve centuries forward in history. The principle behind each remains the same: progress has ended.

A summary of the general tenets of this group is given by Allen in stating the points in which Brooks differed from them. "1. Its view of baptism as a covenant. 2. Its literal theory of inspiration and its conception of Scripture as a whole. 3. Its separation between things secular and sacred; its failure to recognize truth in other religions and in non-Christian men; its indifference to intellectual culture. 4. Its tendency to limit the church to the elect. 5. Its view of salvation as escape from endless punishment. 6. Its insistence upon the necessity of a theory of Atonement in order to salvation. 7. Its insufficient conception of the Incarnation and of the Person of Christ. 8. Its tendency to regard religion too much as a matter of emotions rather than of character and will."

6. Life of Phillips Brooks, Allen, NY, 1900 pg. 668
THE BROAD CHURCH MOVEMENT

The Broad Church Movement arose out of conditions similar to those giving rise to the Oxford Movement. This group was attempting to interpret the belief of the church in terms of modern knowledge. Their position was that progress had not ended. They held that fuller revelations of the truth were granted to the nineteenth century as well as to the fourth and to the sixteenth. They proposed to hold the faith with an open mind amid all the intellectual movements of the age. Reality, rather than antiquity, was their watchword. Old customs should not be considered as binding if the conditions out of which they arose had changed. While this group held strongly to the creed, they looked more doubtfully on the articles and confessions, save as data of a past experience which might serve as a guide to a fuller attainment. They were the champions of progress. They held that the church of the present century was as fully under the guidance of the Spirit as the church of any past century. Therefore, the duty of thinking had not been relegated solely to some past age. The church should hold all past experience as preparation for fuller disclosures and ampler statements of the faith. Progress is the natural expectation of the church.

The Broad Church emphasis came first in England. Men like T. W. Merrill, Robertson of Brighton and the editors
of *Essays and Reviews* were its leaders. Manross says this book was the first public expression of the Broad Church Movement. The influence of this group quickly spread to America and was championed by such men as Henry C. Potter of New York, John Cotton Smith of the Church of the Ascension in New York, Arthur Brooks of the Church of the Incarnation in New York, W. S. Rainsford, Nichols of California, Leighton Parks of Boston, Goodwin of New Haven, Streenstra, E. A. Washburn, H. P. Nash and A. V. C. Allen of the Episcopal Seminary at Cambridge and Phillips Brooks.

One of the earliest results of the Broad Church influence was the organization of the first American Church Congress in 1874. Its object was to obtain a free discussion of issues which were before the church in an assembly which, unlike the general convention, did not have to take action. Another early result of this influence was the attempt of the Theological Seminary at Cambridge to teach some of the results of the critical study of the Bible. The result of this attempt is described by Suter in a paper on the history of the Seminary: "The school began early in its career to arouse that hostility on the part of strict constructionalists and traditionalists. As the years went on this hostility assumed various forms. In Massachusetts, as the graduates of...


8. *Idem...* p. 309
the school in and about Boston multiplied they were imagined by the High Churchmen to constitute a closely knit organization of plotters. It was believed by the more panicky that the purpose of the alumni was to capture and control the diocese for their own purposes, and to institute from Boston as a center a deliberate onslaught on the faith of the church.... Some bishops refused to allow candidates to come to Cambridge and many had to move to another diocese.... Mr. Nathan Matthews, of Boston, tried to buy the school in 1873 so that the High Church could have it."

One wonders how the Episcopal Church in America could have within it three parties holding such divergent views and continue to function as a church. Denominations have split over lesser questions.

The answer lies partly in the relation of this church to its standards. The relation is not the same as in the Church of England where ministers are required to subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles. "In 1799 the question was brought forward concerning the Articles. These had not been bound up with the Prayer Books which had been used in America for more than a generation. They had been thought of as standing on the same ground as the Homilies did, and were little, if at all, known by the people. The Convention went

into a committee of the whole on the subject. When it rose
the chairman reported the following, which they had agreed
upon: "Resolved, that the articles of our faith and religion
as founded on the Holy Scriptures are sufficiently declared
in our Creeds and our Liturgy as set forth in the Book of
Common Prayer, established for the use of the church, and that
further articles do not appear necessary." Unfortunately the
House saw fit to vote against the resolution which it had
just agreed to in committee. Two years later (1801) some
political modifications having been made, they were adopted
as a whole." This difference in attitude accounts for the
lack of emphasis in the American Church upon Essays and Re-
views. In England the book marked the beginning of a more
liberal interpretation of the articles. It was the first in-
stance of liberal scholarship openly taking its stand. The
church in America had been granted this right of liberal in-
terpretation when they were organized.

Another part of the answer lies in the fact that
in the General Convention of 1874, the Church had agreed to
include all these parties. Some had wanted to make the Church
all Catholic, others had wanted to get as far away from the
Roman Catholics as possible. By general agreement it was

10. History of the American Episcopal Church,
McConnell, NY 1899, pg. 275
decided that the church would go to neither extreme but would attempt to bridge the gap between Protestants and Catholics. The principal method of bridging this gap was to be latitude in matters of worship.

A further reason for the wide divergence with regard to church parties is that the American Episcopal Church has been more concerned over matters of ritual than over tenets of belief. The historians of this church have written as though they were obsessed with details of worship and the order of service. The emphasis upon ritual led most ministers of that church to place less importance on differences in belief than did ministers in other churches. One was far more likely to be censured for an impromptu prayer in morning worship, or for allowing a member of another denomination to take communion, than for holding liberal views in theology.

BROOKE'S OWN IDEAS

Much that Brooke had to say of the progressive nature of the Christian religion may be interpreted as a progress of occupation. Truth had been given to men of past ages, but they had not fully understood it. With advancing knowledge, new areas were discovered to which that truth could be applied. "There are two kinds of progress in St. Paul's life, - the one where he is represented as
migrating from one situation to another, the other where...

...he makes deeper entrance into the condition in which he already stands. There is the progress of migration... and there is a progress of occupation." In fact, no one will doubt that Brooks held this view of progress. Many of his day held it. There is nothing new or even exciting about the idea which would lead conservatives to become distrustful. The principle is that as the world grows older we see new implications in the truths which we already have. Yet the idea has been challenged by some who hold that we are permitted to do only what is expressly stated in the Scriptures.

It will be noted that this view of progress, in which one gains a larger grasp of truth he already has, does not preclude the idea that there was a finality about the truth which was delivered to the fathers. Thus, it could be held by the devotees of the Oxford Movement without questioning in the least the utterances of the church fathers of the fourth century. It could also be held by the conservative group, and would allow them full veneration for the forms of faith set forth by the reformers.

Twentieth century disciples of progressive Christianity have realized that such a view of progress is inadequate. It can easily be twisted to meet either the needs of either

--------

11. Life of Phillips Brooks, Allen, NY 1900, quoting p. 496, "Sermon to Graduates Massachusetts Institute of Technology" 1892; similar ideas expressed in Sermons II. Brooks, N.Y. 1881, pg. 39 ff; Essays and Addresses, Brooks, N.Y. 1896 pg. 80, 150
of those seeking to curb the search for truth, or those promoting the search. In other words, it does not distinguish between a progress within the truth already held and a progress from the truth already held to truth as yet unknown. "Nor did Protestantism, with all the Reformation which it wrought, attack the central Catholic conception of a changeless content and formulation of faith. . . . Change there might be in the sense that unrealized potentialities involved in the original deposit might be brought to light - a kind of development which not only protestants, but Catholics like Cardinal Newman have willingly allowed - but whatever had once been stated as the content of faith by the received authorities, was by both Catholics and Protestants regarded as inalterably so."

Let us first ask if Brooks made any distinction between the original deposit of truth to disciples in the time of Jesus, and in the interpretation of that truth as formulated by church authorities of later times. Did he make the mistake of identifying truth and the expression of truth? In an essay on "Orthodoxy", delivered before the Clerics Club, Cambridge, Massachusetts, June 2, 1890, he makes a clear distinction between truth and the form in which truth is expressed. Orthodoxy is defined as "truth as accepted and registered by authority." Therefore to say a thing is not true, neither

13. Essays and Addresses, Brooks, N.Y., 1896, pg. 185
is it orthodox, is to judge it upon two counts, and not upon one. In making the distinction between truth and the crystallisation of truth in formulas he does not go to the extreme of saying that the formulas are unnecessary: "When Paul bids Timothy 'Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me,' he is clearly enough declaring that for the immediate use the truth so far as it is at present known may and must cast itself into a definite and available expression, but his prayer in the next chapter, 'The Lord give thee understanding in all things,' is not therefore a meaningless or hopeless prayer. When Jude exhorts his hearers that they should 'earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints,' he is beyond all doubt asserting that there is an accepted substance of the religion which he and they believe. But no one surely reads that overburdened text aright who does not ever hold in his remembrance that the faith of which Jude speaks is more moral than doctrinal, more personal than abstract, and that being the word of life it can be effectively contended for only as it is constantly expected to open new richness in the advancing relations to the life of men. In that great text, truth and orthodoxy meet and blend, not by the limiting of truth to that which the disciple has already consciously appropriated, but by the enlargement of orthodoxy till it potentially possesses all that is included in and to be infolded from the Word of God....
The evil disposition of orthodoxy was never more perfectly displayed than when St. John himself said to the Lord, "Master, we saw one casting out devils in Thy name, and we forbade him, because he followed not us." 

Having made the distinction between truth and the formulas through which truth may be expressed, Brooks passes on to make the point that the same truth may be expressed in many ways. Therefore, if there may be more than one way to express a truth, the modern attempts at stating truth may have as much value as the attempts made by church councils or church leaders of past ages. In fact, he would go one step farther and say that it is perfectly natural that one age should crystallize truth into certain expressions and that succeeding ages should dissolve those crystals and present them in new forms. "We hear much today about the new theology. It is not a name, it is not a thing to fear. If man is really growing nearer to and not farther away from God, every advancing age must have a new theology." "The same things were true in the days of Augustine or Calvin which are true today; but the Augustine or Calvin who is to know their truth is very different today from what he was in the fifth century, from what he was in the sixteenth century. Therefore of that faith in which the two elements of truth and the believing

15. Idem... pg. 116.
man anite, there is no fixity....Orthodoxy is a false crystallisation which has forever to be broken and redis-solved into life. The vice seems to lie in the whole thought of the Church which is put in charge of the truth, as if it were a ship which carried a deposited thing un-changed from shore to shore, and not as if it were a soil which kept a seed only by turning it into a tree."

All these expressions of Brooks seem to indicate no more than the fact that the same truth must appear different to different men. Their statement of the same truth will not be identical in content or phrasing, because each man finds his truth conditioned by his personality and environment. Hence it is a mistake to think there ever was an age which expressed truth in such a final form that the present age can not alter those forms.

There are other materials in the sermons and addresses of Brooks which appear to indicate a deeper view of progress. An idea that progress in religion involved more than the re-phrasing of already known truths. One difficulty which confronts us in seeking to interpret these materials of his is the fact that he never discusses the question of progress per se. All references to the subject are incidental to other ideas.

The nearest approach to a direct discussion of progress is in the address on "Orthodoxy" from which we have

16. Idem... pp. 191 - 192
quoted. In this address his main purpose is to urge upon the church a change of attitude toward those who, seeking the truth, could not confine that truth within the creational statements of the church. He felt that the church should stimulate this search for truth and welcome a full expression of the discoveries. That when these discoveries had been considered over a sufficient period of time, the church should either adopt them or reject them. The church should not reprove the student for his desire to seek and express the truth.

In seeking to persuade the church to grant this freedom of search he deals with the nature of truth and its revelation to mankind. While this discussion of truth is vital to his argument, it is not his main purpose. That main purpose is the freedom to seek, which the church should grant because of the nature of truth itself. Here, as in all his utterances, Brooks is interested in life, and not in a new idea for its own sake. The life of the people is his goal and the idea is the means of advancing that life. It may even be said that Brooks probably had no definite theory of progress in religion. He certainly is not careful to express himself in such a way that we can classify him in any one category, and, having placed our finger on him, say that this and so are his beliefs. In fact, he often leaves us in doubt as to just what he did believe.
In one respect his utterances are of great importance here. They show us what people around him were thinking. He caught from many sources ideas which others were sowing as seed. He makes these ideas his own, and by a flash of genius jumps to their conclusions without going through each step in a rational process. Thus his ideas may act as a guide to the historian of his period.

He holds that: "Truth will come to seem not a deposit, fixed and limited, but an infinite domain wherein the soul is bidden to range with insatiable desire, guarded only by the care of God above it, and the Spirit of God within it, educated by its mistakes and attaining larger knowledge only as it attains complete parity of purpose and thoroughness of devotion and energy of hope." No clearer statement could be made denying the position that the faith once delivered to the saints was a fixed deposit which could not be altered. Plainly, he is here talking of truth as being so immense that it could not have been revealed at any time to any group. This carries with it the implication that as new truth is discovered it may upset our present views by enlarging them, or even allowing us to see that beliefs we held as truth were erroneous.

A similar idea is expressed in his first volume of sermons published in 1878, in which he declares the final

17...Idem...pg. 196
triumph of Christ over the world will not be accomplished through the imperfect instruments of the church and creed as known at present: "I have no assurance that this Church, this form of worship, nay, even this minute faith which I believe in and which is very dear to me - I have no assurance that this is to conquer the world. I feel very sure that Christ, before he attains his perfect victory, must throw his truth into new and completer forms than any it has yet assumed." If we may infer from the above that Brooks felt that the sum of truth known in his day was small compared to that truth which was to be revealed to mankind, then we may say that his progress in religion, was not only a progress within the truth already received, but also a progress from the known into the unknown. Which brings us to another problem in interpretation. There are at least three views of the meaning of progress as bringing new truths.

THREE THEORIES OF PROGRESS

First, there is the view expressed by John Wright Buckham of progress as the natural development of truth out of that which is known: "Progress does not mean that spiritual truth is shifting and unstable, con-

tainly changing its nature. Unhappily this is the notion of theological progress which prevails among conservatives, and it is against this - and rightly - that they raise their protest. But progress means something very different from fluctuation, or the renunciation of convictions once firmly and clearly grasped. To abandon a conviction once formed is one thing; to reinterpret and enlarge it is another. Progress means not the former but the latter. It means the recognition of the law of development - whose counterpart in the sphere of nature is evolution - as of the very nature of the spiritual life.

"The development is never a destructive but always a conserving process. It holds fast and carries forward all the real gains of experience and reflection - tested, purified, refined, related - and out of them constructs further and larger gains. Nor does the principle of development disturb its character as revelation. It simply recognizes the method of revelation as continuous, accretionary, cumulative, and thus at once saves theology from the curse of becoming static and makes revelation a far more vital and normal reality."

Second, there is the idea of Gerald Birney Smith of Chicago which goes farther than the theory of Backham in...

---

suggesting that truths not implied in the original revelations have been incorporated through contact with various localities in which Christianity acclimated itself. "For example, it is now realized that when the Christian movement pressed from its original Jewish home in Palestine to the Graeco-Roman world around the Mediterranean, a most interesting development of religious ideas and practices took place. The Christianity which emerged with its Catholic ecclesiastical organization and its Nicene theology was the creation of living persons in that ancient world rather than a mere repetition of a biblical pattern. It is true that we see today in this development much that seems to us to indicate 'a corruption' of Christianity by pagan ideas. Nevertheless, there is also much that is still valued by us which owes its origin to the impact of Hellenistic thinking. We are coming to see that original Christianity was radically transformed by the influence of the new environment. Strictly speaking, the doctrine of the Trinity - a doctrine which has usually been regarded as the most important 'Christian' doctrine - is a doctrine which grew up in order to solve peculiarly Hellenistic problems - problems which would have been unintelligible to the Christians of New Testament times. The key words of the Nicene formula are not New Testament words at all."

Third: the view of Ernest Findlay Scott which is similar to that of Smith, but does not limit the borrowing to any one era, rather extending it to each era. This view also lays the emphasis upon the fact that in the revelation of truth given through Jesus there was a something which has determined the tone and color of religion since that time, and that this something has transformed each thing borrowed till the new accretion has become a part of the whole.

"Christianity has never ceased to borrow, and at the same time it remains creative. It does not receive passively what comes to it from without, but changes it with a new meaning. In the first century it thus took hold of the various movements in the Hellenistic world. Influences which at first seemed foreign to it were wrought into its message, and were found in the end to have helped it toward a larger development. In all later times the same process has repeated itself. When the barbarous races swept over the Roman Empire, when the modern world emerged from the Middle Ages, when science and criticism came to their own in the nineteenth century, it was feared that Christianity must perish along with the order of which it seemed to be a part. But in each crisis it shook off the ancient forms in order to manifest itself in new ones. It won to its service the forces that threatened to destroy it, and made them instruments for the unfolding of its message. Thus it has ever been creating for itself a new body."
When we compare it as it is now, with what it was in the beginning, it appears completely changed. There seems to be truth in the contention that it is no longer the religion of Jesus, but a new religion, made up of contributions from an
numbered sources in the course of its two thousand years.
But there has always been something that was inherent in itself. All that has been borrowed has been transformed and quickened by this revelation, given once for all through Jesus Christ."

It is well to keep these three interpretations of progress in mind as we consider the position of Brookes in applying his theory of progress. It must be admitted that we are not likely to find any expression of his which would indicate a theory identical with one of the above. It will be a question of whether or not he was conscious of the implications in progress, and whether or not he makes specific enough statements of facts which will allow us to classify him in accordance with these theories.

APPLYING THE THEORY OF PROGRESS

Brookes's belief that Christianity was by nature progressive led him to take a step which landed upon dangerous ground. In searching for some standard by which one could test the reality of truth, he hit upon the idea that man him-

self is the final test of truth. This is the most radical step Brooks took. It should have brought upon him the venom of his fellow Churchmen who disagreed with his views. It is astonishing that they took no notice of this step. They attacked him, as we shall show later, for denying the deity of Jesus, for emphasizing the humanity of Jesus, for lacking a true idea of the nature of the Church, and accused him of being an heretical Arian, Pelagian, Unitarian, or Universalist. Yet they were never startled when he declared man as the final test of faith truth.

Brooks was led into this step by his recognition of the inadequacy of the infallible authorities proclaimed by other leaders. The Oxford Movement had proclaimed the fathers of the fourth century as the authoritative expression of truth. These men had expressed truth in the language of their day and with an emphasis which was in keeping with the main currents of thought of their day. That is, they were disturbed over the nature of Jesus, and their deliverances emphasized what they considered to be the true nature. In the Reformation era, the emphasis was not upon the nature of Jesus, but upon the place of faith in the Christian life, and also upon defeating the claim of the Roman Church to be the only dispenser of salvation. The weakness of the Oxford Movement was that they had no infallible interpreter of the
fourth century fathers. This weakness led Newman and others to accept the claim of some that the Pope was the only infallible interpreter of Christian truth. The weakness of the Oxford movement is also the weakness of the Reformers who set up the Bible as the infallible guide to truth. Here again is the need for an infallible interpreter of an infallible guide; witness the interpretations of the Bible made by various sects which exactly contradict one another.

Brooks realized the difficulties which beset each position outlined above. He realized also that all creeds of past ages had expressed truth as the men of that age saw it, and that there had arisen the need for further expressions of truth. For instance, in past creeds nothing had been said about the relation of religion to science. This need had not been felt in past ages. Yet there was a present-day need for some guidance for Christians. Rome had the Pope who could give guidance to his adherents. Protestants had the Bible; but the Bible made no claim to teach science, or the relation to science. Therefore, Brooks chose the other position of the Reformers - the responsibility of individual judgement.

In making man the test of truth, he did not make the mistake of severing the individual from all the past generations who have discovered truth. While truth was not to be found by some infallible oracle, it could neither be discovered by each individual working by himself. Rather, it
was to be found "by each mind working conscientiously, yet always using the experience of other minds, past and present; always working and living as part of a great whole, yet always finding the ultimate sanction of every truth for it nowhere short of its own intelligent assent." Again he makes it clear that the past experiences of men are not to be discarded as worthless. It is to be "not the individual alone, but backed by the past surroundings by the present. Yet his personal conscience is the final test. The individual is not like Robinson Crusoe, but like Paul." It is an oft repeated theme of Brooks that the individual must use the past as a foundation stone for further progress. In this way the past will often support truths and add to them others which the individual could not discover for himself.

The individual should have the right of searching for the truth without fear of persecution because he seeks more light. The Church should guarantee this freedom of inquiry. This search for truth by the individual may lead to the conclusion that church organizations and policies of past ages do not minister fully to the life of the present day.

The result must be not suppression of inquiry but the recognition of the principle that "every form of church organization must minister to man's spiritual growth if it is to last."

---
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Church machinery is judged by the individual. If that machinery is found lacking, it must be cast aside.

This is a matter which is easy to grant in regard to church organization. Few would hold that church government is a matter of *jure divino*. However, some feel that creedal statements are matters of divine deliverance. Would Brooks allow the same right of individual judgement in matters of the statements of truth? In his essay on "Authority and Conscience" he states his position. "Are the truths of religion, the truths and doctrines of Christianity, outside and wholly foreign things, having no essential belonging with the soul of man? If so, the principle of authority must be the great principle in the imparting of Christian truth. On the other hand, is Christianity the fulfillment of man's best hopes, the answer to man's deepest need?.....Does Christian truth lie in the soil which it has entered like a seed in the field, each made for each?.....If the answers to all these questions must be strong affirmatives, then the conscience, not the authority must be the final warrant of all Christian truth......That which authority produces when it has done its perfect work is, in the nature of things, not faith, but only assent."

---

The danger in this position is evident. The maxim of Protagoras was that man is the measure of all things. The basis of humanism is that man is sufficient unto himself. The pragmatic test of truth is that those beliefs which prove themselves to be good working values thereby verify themselves, and may be taken as true.

Therefore the question we ask is whether or not Brooks's statements lead the way to these or similar conclusions. One historian of the period asserts that these and similar statements of men in the nineteenth century were inserting the camel's nose of rationalism into the American religious doorway. The particular statement to which Birggraaff takes exception is one made by George A. Gordon: "Man is the measure of all things; he becomes a noble measure because he is able to reproduce the Divine vision; he is the standard of reality when he becomes perfect; and the Christ is the perfect man, and therefore the revelation of the absolute truth and goodness."

The question turns upon the nature of truth. Birggraaff is contending that the leader of the nineteenth century were making truth subjective, that knowledge depends on data which are found by the mind, not made; and these data

are not only the occasions of knowing, but the cause of knowledge. Brooks is clear on this point. "The stars and the elements existed long before and lie far beyond all man's knowledge of them. But man, with his faculty of knowledge, grows capable of receiving ever richer revelations of the skies and the earth. God and God's ways of grace, the Bible and its truths of incarnation and redemption and eternal life, are fixed facts entirely independent of man's knowledge of them. They would shine on like the stars even if no man looked. The principle of authority not only emphasizes their fixity, but insists also that the mind of man must stand in an ever-fixed relation to them. The principle of conscience, accepting their fixity, recognizes and values the element of ever-advancing humanity, and in its ripening power expects, not new truth, but new knowledge of truth, to be emerging from the sea of ignorance forever."

This quotation as to the independent existence of truth conditions the statements of Brooks as to the individual being the final test of truth. It becomes evident that he is struggling with an idea and is not fully able to bring that idea to the light of day. What he appears to be struggling with is the validity of Christian experience. He was wrestling with the problem which Gerald Birney Smith suggests is the

principle concern of progressive religion in the twentieth century: "Modernism is primarily interested not in ascertaining whether a doctrine was originally authorized but rather in discovering whether it is vitally believable by modern men."

It would appear that Brooks is not so much concerned with the nature of truth itself as with the expressions of truth which have been formulated by various ages. His battle is with those who would hang around the necks of men the millstones of creational statements which must not be changed. He is pleading for the conception of truth as the seed sown in good ground which will bring forth a new harvest. He is not arguing the relative nature of truth, but the imperfect understanding of truth by men. He would say that man can no longer believe certain things which were believed in past ages; they have no meaning in his religious life; therefore he should not have them forced on him by an authority outside himself. In this sense man is the measure of what he himself can receive of religious truth.

Attitude Toward the Bible

There is some doubt as to just what Brooks did believe about the Bible. The only discussion of the question
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of inspiration is found in certain notes for a Wednesday
evening lecture in Trinity Church in 1680 and quoted in fall
by Allen in the biography of Brooks. The manuscript it-
self has not been located. It appears that someone did not
consider the notebooks and other materials of sufficient
value to be preserved. Dr. Max Kellner, while teaching at
the Cambridge Seminary, discovered that several barrels of
sermons and notes of the three Brooks brothers who were
preachers had been thrown out by their kinfolks. Among this
material must have been much which Allen used in writing the
biography of Phillips Brooks.

Allen cites the fact that Brooks kept a list of the
books which he read and from the list quotes the following
authors whom Brooks read in connection with Biblical criticism:
Ewald, Klaenen and Wellhausen on the Old Testament, and Keim,
Hausrath, Reuss and Shürer and other modern writers on the
New Testament. If one could locate the notebook containing
this list, it would add a great deal to our knowledge to
search the sermons and addresses prepared following the reading
of these books and note any results of his study. Without the
list it is impossible to discover from the sermons the results.

32. Idem. pg. 509
as the chips from the workshop do not appear in Brooks's sermons. The result is there, but not the methods by which he arrived at the result. However, if the date of his reading of a certain book were known, it would be easier to unravel the evidence regarding his attitude toward the Bible. There would certainly be many references which would take on new light if we could be certain that they followed shortly after the reading, say of Wellhausen. Such results would add to our knowledge of the influence of German criticism on American thought.

As early as 1879 he shows certain results of his study of biblical criticism. In an essay on "The Pulpit and Popular Scepticism" printed in the Princeton Review, he sets forth his belief that the old idea of verbal inspiration of the Bible was no longer tenable since criticism had proved certain texts to be spurious beyond a doubt. He does not list the texts which he would reject as spurious, but the fact that he rejected some is indicative of his progressive attitude toward the Bible. That such a view of the Bible was not widely held at that early date is a generally accepted fact; however, there is evidence to support the idea that it was not
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even as widely held as we often think. In 1884 Brooks delivered an address before the Ninth Congress of the Protestant Episcopal Church on "Authority and Conscience" in which he says: "Another of our own bishops, in an amazing letter, declares that the practical infallibility lies in the present English translation of the Bible, no word of which, he says, 'can be touched either by criticism or by scepticism without disloyalty to the Church, danger to the truth and harm to souls,' not even if the touch he dreads be simply put forth to remove from the New Testament a text of whose spuriousness there is not the shadow of a reasonable doubt."

A further evidence of the progressiveness of Brooks's position is furnished by the trial of Charles Augustus Briggs by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in 1893. Three of the eight charges brought against Briggs had to do with the Scriptures. Charge No. 3 accused him of teaching that "errors may have existed in the original text of the Holy Scriptures, as it came from the authors." Charge No. 5 accused him of teaching that "Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch." Charge No. 6, "that Isaiah is not the author of half the book that bears his name."

---
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All three of these charges were found to be true and Briggs (39) was suspended from the ministry.

Although the position of Brooks regarding the Scriptures is not identical with that of Briggs, there is marked similarity. Brooks held that the original text was by no means free of error: "The story of the Gospels, the acts which Jesus did, the words which Jesus said, these must be taken on the word of those who saw and heard them first, and of the men who heard them from their fathers age after age....Where is the duty of private judgment there? Clearly enough, it is in the free use of criticism. The authenticity of records, the possibility of mistake, the intrusion of prejudice, the partialness of view - these are the fields for conscientious labor." Also, in his only extant lecture on the Bible, to which we have already referred, he says of inspiration: "Does it involve inerring accuracy? Answer, 'No.' Still, in the historic record there may be misstatements of detail. And in the Apostolic development there may be wrong anticipations (like the anticipation of the end of the world), but yet the picture is true."

While Brooks does not discuss the authorship of the
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Pontateach it is likely that he held that Moses was not the
author. He does state: "I am quite convinced that there were
two Isaiahs."

It is evident that Brooks was interested in the re-
results of critical research as it dealt with the Bible. It is
not so clear that he was interested in the science of biology
as it reconstructed the early history of man. That is, there
is no clear statement of Brooks' attitude toward evolution.
There is evidence that he did not take the term "day" in
Genesis to be a literal day and night period, as in his letter
to his brother, the Rev. Arthur Brooks, of March 5, 1877, he
says: "Dr. Tyng preached for us on the afternoon of the first
day, and told us that nobody could be a Christian who didn't
believe that the world was made in six literal days. The
Moses up in the New Tower laughed aloud at the statement." (43)
Then there are other statements which puzzle one as to Brooks's
own position regarding the theory of development. Such a one
is found in his sermon on "The Eternal Humanity" preached in
Philadelphia in 1864. Speaking of the perfect pattern of man
in Christ, he says: "If this truth be so, then we cannot but
feel that there is much in it to enable us to feel rightly with
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where he says this text would exclude him.
regard to every one of the new theories which look to a confusion and a loss of the distinctive type of manhood. We have all had our interest excited by the apparent tendencies of modern science toward a depreciation of what has always been considered the unshared honors of humanity. Wise men come forward and tell us of a course of structural development wherein man becomes not a new creation for whom a new word was spoken from the creative lips, a new gesture made by the creative mind, but merely the present completion of the natural processes of lower natures working up this far by some process of selection whose law is resident within itself. The gorilla in his generations is seen climbing through the gradations of a more and more perfect apehood, to attain the summit of his life in man. 'Man is in structure one with the brutes.' 'All are but coordinated terms of nature's great progression from the formless to the formed; from the inorganic to the organic; from the blind force to conscious intellect and will.' These are the theories men are talking of. However they differ in details, the one first effect of all of them must be the depreciation of the individuality of man, the loss of his special type of being, and inevitably, the confusion of his human responsibility in the intricate series of the apes. What am I? Anything but one link in an endless chain, that over self-moved wheels runs on forever working
out a process so mechanical that in it morality is lost?.....
And then suppose I go to Revelation to see what it can say
about these things. Suppose I find there this sublime truth..
...that however this manifestation of it has been reached.
(italics mine) there is manifest in every man the image of a
pattern-life that is in God."

It is evident that the above quotation could be
forced to mean either that Brooks accepted the fact of man's
development from a lower order, or that it did not matter
what scientists said of man's origin since Revelation asserts
his oneness with God. A close reading of the whole sermon
gives one the impression that he rather accepts the theory
of development, and is struggling against the theory that
must have been prevalent in 1864 that man is no more than a
brute. The emphasis in the sermon is on what man may become
as it is illustrated in the Master.

Another sermon preached in 1866 is equally puzzling:
"The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and
breathed into his nostrile the breath of life, and man became
a living soul." The scene is almost visible before us. We
can almost see the clay-cold figure laid upon the ground, the
corpse which never yet has lived; we can almost feel that
which we cannot see, the awful presence bending above the per­
fected body and sending through all its limbs and organs the
mysterious thrill of life.....I do not know, I can not guess.

44. Sermons, VI, Brooks, N.Y. 1893, quoting 1903 ed.
pp. 315-316
what was the nature of the historical event to which that verse refers. But I do know that it is absolutely true to that great order which pervades the universe. Everywhere the earthly conditions offer their opportunities to the celestial miracle.

What does Brooks mean by "that great order which pervades the universe."? Does he mean natural law? Or does he mean only that the physical is the basis for the spiritual? The sermon does not make it plain which he means.

One of the best indications that he accepted the theory of evolution is in his essay on Martin Luther delivered in 1883. In this he makes the point that while the Reformation was essentially religious, it affected many other areas of life: "It was so wide that when last year Haeckel, the Darwinian, the apostle of the newest science, described in glowing eulogy, at Eisenbach, before the naturalists of the nineteenth century, the triumphs of the great English scientist, he could find no stronger statement than to say that Darwin had carried on the work of Luther and that evolution was the new reformation doctrine.... All this is true."

In one important aspect Brooks was in keeping with the more progressive views of the Bible. That was his belief that
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the Bible was not the revelation of God, but the record of that revelation. "This Christ is the true Revelation of God, and the Bible gets its value from being the description of Christ. The story of a revelation, more properly than a revelation itself.....So the Revelation lies behind the Bible, and the Bible is to the revelation like the sunshine to the sun."

Brooks seems to be making something of the same distinction made by Karl Barth in differentiating between the testimonies of men who underwent great religious experiences and those experiences themselves. Barth in the Prolegomena distinguishes three forms of the Word of God: the form spoken in the world of eternity, the second form being the testimony of man to the Revelation which he has received from God, the third being the content of the message which man gains from the Scriptures and his own experience of God and hands on to others through the sermon or personal testimony.

Moore in his book History of Christian Thought

Since Kant thinks that Lessing is the first one to bring the above distinction into modern thought. That before this influence became felt, religious leaders had confused the testimonies of the men who had the experiences with the revelation

--------
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itself; they had confused the documents with the revelation. Brookes may have been influenced by Lessing in this matter. There are various references to Lessing in Allen's quotations from Brooks's notebooks, and in his accounts of Brooks's journeys in Germany. However he got the idea, it is abundantly clear that he held the Bible itself to be the record of the men who had a personal companion with the transcendent. "If the true revelation of God is in Christ, the Bible is not properly a Revelation, but the History of a Revelation. This is not only a fact but a necessity, for a Person cannot be revealed in a Book, but must find revelation, if at all, in a Person."

Conservative thought in America did not follow the Brooks in that distinction between revelation and record of that experience. Benjamin J. Warfield was professor in Princeton Theological Seminary from 1887 to 1921. In one of his books published in 1927 he says: "Scripture records the distinct to revelations which God gave men in days past, so far as those revelations were intended for permanent and universal use. But it is much more than a record of past revelations. It is in itself the final revelation of God."

It appears that Brooks did not understand the full significance of his idea of the Bible containing errors in the
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statement of facts. This grows out of his confusion in the usage of the word infallible when he means inerrant. This, in the quotation already cited in which he speaks of the bishop declaring that the English translation is infallible, Brooks declares that the texts that are known to be spurious should be deleted. While he uses the term infallible, it is evident that he is speaking of inerrancy. That is, he did not feel that errors of fact altered the truth which the Bible presented. He even says: "Does it involve inerrant accuracy? Answer, 'No.' ... but yet the picture is true." Since that day men have come to realize that when one admits errors of fact, the way is laid open to errors of truth also. Brooks and men of his day did not seem to sense this. Yet here is the beginning of the framework upon which later views of the Bible have been erected.

In one other point Brooks was ahead of his day in his view of the Bible. He was certain that the Bible did not stand or fall with certain institutions which are recorded in the Bible. As early as 1869-72 (exact date unknown) he cried out against saying that the Bible was discredited because of the fall of slavery: "The danger, the terrible danger of false tests! I have been told a hundred times that the Bible must stand or fall with slavery; and John Wesley says, 'Infidels
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know, whether Christians know it or not, that the giving up of witchcraft is in effect giving up the Bible.' Had this idea of Brooks gained wider acceptance it would have saved the country much bitterness in the conflict over evolution.

William Jennings Bryan in his book, *In His Image*, devotes a whole chapter to the idea that one must discard the Bible if he accepts the theory of evolution.

Brooks was positive in his conviction that this progressive view of the Bible would lead to deeper spiritual life and not to shallowness as many feared. In 1885, in an address on the growth of foreign missions during all the past seventy-five years, he says: "We have seen during all these years a deepening of the religious thought of our people. We have seen God lead us into those broad fields of speculation where we once thought it unwise or unsafe to go. We have seen the books of criticism opened and examined freely. We have seen those things which seemed essential to Christianity again and again shown to be only incidental to Christianity....shall we not anticipate without fear that the more Christianity becomes simplified and better known, the more Christianity becomes Christ, and Christian living becomes simply and purely the following of Christ, that the missionary
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spirit shall grow and grow, develop and extend, until in the progress of the simplifying of the Christian faith shall at last come the conversion of the world?"

ATTITUDE TOWARD CREEDS

William Lawrence feels that he is true to the mind of Phillips Brooks when he summarizes the latter's attitude toward church standards thus: "To Phillips Brooks a church with an elaborate creed was a house of bondage; and a church without a creed was unthinkable. He demanded a creed so fundamental and so simple that in the stress of history it could hold the church to the deep truths of the faith and at the same time be continually filled with fresh spiritual thought and interpreted by new revelations of the truth."

Let us examine this summary in the light of Brooks's own statements. In a sermon on "Keeping the Faith" he states three requirements for a creed: breadth, positive evidence and practicalness. As to breadth he says: "It must be a creed broad enough to allow the man to grow within it, to contain and to supply his ever-developing mind and character. It will not be a creed burdened with many details. It will
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consist of large truths and principles, capable of ever-varying applications to ever-varying life. So only can it be clear, strong, positive, and yet leave the soul free to grow within it, may, feed the soul richly and minister to its growth. Now, there are two interpretations possible for the sentence, "It will not be a creed hardened with many details." It may mean no more than a common sense view that people will agree upon principles, but are more likely to divide when those principles are broken down into specific details. Or, it may mean something quite different; the objection to the exactness of statement in a creed, lest such exactness bind one too closely to a certain theory. Take for instance, the Nicene Creed. While this creed states its belief in broad general principles for the most part, it becomes rather exact in its definition of the nature of Jesus: "Begotten of his Father before all worlds....very God of very God; Begotten not made; being of one substance with the Father; By whom all things were made." In this description of the nature of Jesus, the Council of Nice set forth certain theories of his existence; subordination to the Father as to mode of subsistence and operation, unity with the Father as to substance or essence, distinct personality, and pre-existence. The question which we...
raise is whether or not Brooks is objecting to the definiteness of statement, as in this creed, which binds one to certain theories of the nature of the Trinity. Would he advocate instead broad general principles, which would be more open to individual interpretation?

This question was raised when Brooks was elected Bishop of Massachusetts. It was charged that while he used the terms of the Creed, he did not interpret them in keeping with the meaning placed upon those terms by the church in general. The Bishop of Springfield in an open letter to Bishop Doane said of Brooks: "On these terms.....you would admit to the episcopate men, whose lips would take oaths, to which their hearts consented not, who would fill the old bottles with new wine, who would flux creeds and offices with strange meanings, and avow as they rose from their knees interpretations which would shock you.....If the Bishop-elect's religious convictions were to be interpreted by his words and deeds and associations running through a long series of years, then his theological position as to the incarnation seems to be that of an Arian of some sort." Another writer in summarizing the tenets of Brooks says: "His message was distinctly and definitely the message of liberalism, the message

of a Unitarian....I believe that this Christ is not identical with the historical Jesus of Nazareth, but is the great ideal of the divine as manifested in the human."

Allen includes an incident which throws light on Brooks' attitude toward the creeds: "He is recalled at this time (1884) as once entering his study, where friends were waiting for him, throwing his hat across the room indignantly, and refusing to talk. It appeared that he had just come from a conversation on the street with a clergyman of another denomination, who quietly assumed that he was did not believe in the creeds he was in the habit of reciting. He had broken out in moral wrath against the man and against his assumption, asking him if he realized the meaning of what he was saying. To a clergyman who had published a statement to the effect that Mr. Brooks no longer believed in the tenets of his creed, he wrote an emphatic letter, saying plainly that the statements were untrue." In a letter to a candidate for Orders, who was then in Germany, he wrote in 1892 regarding the interpretation of the creeds: "The creed is drawn from the New Testament, and the New Testament declares and emphasizes the peculiar and supreme nature of Christ as outgoing while it fulfills the nature of humanity. It asserts that this, His
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higher nature, involved relations with the outer world more perfect and complete that those which belong to ordinary human lives. This assertion makes the story of what we call the supernatural. And both the entrance on and the departure from our human life are declared to have been in some way marked by circumstances which indicated his superior nature. In neither case is the exact nature of the circumstances made clear, but in both there is the indication of something exceptional, and therefore wonderful, or as we say, miraculous. How this is what our creed expresses, and the ability to repeat the creed implies, therefore, the belief in the higher life of Jesus. That higher life is closely associated with the higher life of man. The divinity of Christ is not separate from his humanity. It is his total nature, which the Church tries to express in the large statements of His birth and death, which it takes from the New Testament."

Added to the above statements should be certain others from his numerous addresses. "I may have seemed in what I have been saying to fall in with the prevalent demand which asks that when it is so hard for men to believe they should be asked to believe just as little as possible; that all the most exacting articles of faith should be cast away, and only those which any weakest faith can master should be left for
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faith to struggle with while faith is so weak. I hold no such foolish, base idea as that." "And, yet, not doubt, there is something real and pressing in the cry we hear everywhere for the curtailing of doctrine. It is very ignorant and blind. The minister must find out what it means more wisely than it knows itself. If he takes it at its word and tries to satisfy it by making doctrine slight and easy, he will, as I have said, defeat his own well-meant bit foolish effort." "Let us set ourselves, friends - we who belong to the Common Church of Christ - let us set ourselves against the false teaching of the times that would disparage theology. Let us set ourselves against the false sentiment that would speak of theological discussion as if it were a thing of the past, a blinder in its day, and something which the world has outgrown. When the world ceases to theologize - to seek for the deepest and inmost truth with regard to the innermost nature of God - there has fallen a palsy upon it."

When we take into account these statements of Brooks, together with the emphatic denial by his biographers, Allen and Lawrence, that he placed upon the creeds an interpretation not in accord with the general interpretation, we find it hard to believe that Brooks did not believe the creeds.
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It would appear that he did not find exactness of statement a stumbling-block. Instead, he placed a positive value upon the creedal statements. "A creed does for theology what the balance did for chemistry, it changes it from pure guesswork to a science. It does not give doctrine less or greater weight. It only puts them into shape and lets us see really what their weight among men is." Or in 1892: "Evidently any statement of belief in which two men or more than two unite must be of sufficient simplicity and breadth to freely hold within itself these vital differences. That is the beauty and value of our Church's Creed. We all believe it, and no two thinking men hold it alike.... The Church has no which unwritten law, no interpretation of her creed to her children must conform. That is a truth concerning her on which we must always insist. She has her creed, in which all her children alike believe, and all believe differently. Thus she keeps the union of identity and variety, which all living things must have. Thus she bids each believer be a sharer in the belief of all, while at the same time he holds his own personal conviction clear. Dogmatism loses the liberty and life of personal conviction, scepticism loses the largeness of the universal faith. The Church, if she holds her creed as a creed ought to be held, is neither dogmatic nor sceptic-

It is evident from the above quotations that Brooks believed a creed should be simple in order that it might receive fresh interpretations with each advance in knowledge. That is, a creed must be capable of being turned into life. This is his idea in an essay on the relation of "Authority and Conscience": "A dogma I take to be a truth packed for transportation.....truth is gathered and compressed in dogma, but the dogma must be opened into truth again, and unfold its native life in richer forms of power before it can be either spiritual medicine or spiritual food. Authority is the ship on which dogma sails. I get my dogma from authority as I get my package from the ship.....Only the dogma which can be opened into truth can live. Only the truth which the soul appropriates gives life."

Brooks had no patience with those who would be continually amending the statements of beliefs, who would build them like bird nests, to be used for only this year: "Such would make it disreputable for any man to say, more than one year hence, 'I have kept the faith'.....surely there is some-
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thing at least as blind in insisting upon change as in insisting upon permanence." Likewise he had no patience with those who resisted change. Speaking of the church fathers, he said, "These men are patterns for our piety, not tyrants of our thought or action." He would have agreed with the modern expression of this idea, "Shall a man whose days are as grass, rise up to say that he has made a statement about him (God) which will not need to be revised?"

The only tenet of his denomination with which he openly broke was that of Apostolic Succession. Although this tenet is not defined in the Prayer Book, it has been accepted as an unwritten law that the episcopate is of apostolic, and hence of divine, origin. One deliverance of his is sufficient to indicate his position. In October 1887 he spoke before the American Church Congress at a meeting held in Louisville, Kentucky. The records of this Congress have been destroyed by fire, but Allen gives this account of Brooks's part in the meeting: "He made a sensation by his speech on the apostolic succession, stating his position with the emphasis and vigor which church congresses are apt to engender. There were hisses in the hall as he spoke. It shows the ecclesiastical
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ire he aroused, that a prominent layman who heard him remarked it would have been a pleasure to assist in throwing him into the Ohio River." A further reaction to this speech appears in the history of Alexandria Seminary, "When Bishop Brooks was chosen Bishop of Massachusetts, Bishop Whittle who loved and admired him... wrote to him that he could not give his consent to his consecration. The reason that he assigned was that shortly before in a lecture, Dr. Brooks had stated that he did not believe the Episcopate was either of Scriptural or apostolical origin."

The Prayer Book in the Episcopal Church occupies much the same position as the Westminster Confession of Faith in the Presbyterian Church. The difference is that the Prayer Book is more concerned with practice and the Confession with belief, or that one leaves a man relatively free to believe as he sees fit but regulated as to church practice, the other gives freedom in practice but seeks regularity in belief. Brooks was never a militant agitator for revision of the Prayer Book. He outlines his ideas as to the value of the Prayer Book in an essay on "Liturgical Growth" delivered in 1881. His main criticism of the inflexibility of the Prayer Book is that it is too restricted in its prayers: that there is a great ne-
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cease toity for the liberty of extemporaneous prayer. He cited the occasion of the great Chicago fire in 1871, which left one hundred thousand people homeless. The General Convention of the Episcopal Church was in session at the time in another city. Upon hearing of the fire, the Convention voted to suspend their work and join in prayer: "What did they do? They knelt down together and read the Litany!... A Church when called upon to pray for a burning city, should have considered it necessary to use a form of prayer in which almost every other kind of human woe is laid before God except the woe of the burning town. It goes straight in the face of common sense of mankind.... If tomorrow the sad news came to us that England's Queen was seriously ill.... we have got to violate the principles of our Church and the genius of the liturgical principle, in the absoluteness with which it is forced continually upon us, before we could offer up our prayers for the honored sovereign of that beloved nation." "I believe in ritual with all my heart. I believe in ritual just exactly as the artist believes in and uses his art..... and because I believe we have the noblest Ritual. I wish to see that Ritual become most effective in commending itself to the hearts of all men..... Therefore I state earnestly my belief that one of the greatest necessities for the growth of the Liturgy in 
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our communion is the breaking in upon the exclusiveness of set forms of worship, and the giving of large freedom and liberty to laity and clergymen, bishops, priests, and deacons, when the occasion calls for it and their souls move them, to go to God, in their churches, at their altars, at their prayer-desks, and pour out their supplications to the Almighty being for the very things they need, instead of being compelled to go in some roundabout way and pray for a thousand other things, and trust omniscience to know the thing that is in their hearts."

Likewise he appeals for the "absolute liberty at any time for a change in the service, in free and immediate adaptation to the conditions in which we find ourselves placed at a moment of the Church's life. Nothing could be worse than to have settled down upon our Prayer-book the palsy of changelessness. I should almost be ready, even if I saw no possibility of change for the better - even if I feared change for the worse - to change for the purpose of establishing the desirableness, the possibility, of the liberty of change. I do not believe our liturgy is flexible enough, when in the memory of those who have been in our Church certainly for not a great many years, there have been a large number of intelligent, thoughtful, conscientious.

-----------
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faithful ministers and laymen of this Church who have left our communion and established a communion of their own, because the Church in which they lived was absolutely unwilling to allow them the use of one word between the covers of the Prayer-book." This is evidently a reference to the Reformed Episcopal Church which was organized in 1873.

**SUMMARY**

Brooks was conscious of the dangers in the idea of progress. He felt that it did not make religion easier and less exacting as so many would think, but that it was a step from the hard to the harder. In a sermon on the "Mitigation of Theology" preached in 1878, he says, "I know that a man has come nearer to the mind of Christ when he thinks that his work in life is to enter into the genius of Christian truth and to be the friend and disciple of Jesus, rather than to satisfy himself of the truth of many inferential propositions drawn from what Christ and his apostles said. But here, again, the believer in this new and better method is all wrong if he thinks that it opens to him an easier or less exacting spiritual experience than that in which he used to live when he was the champion of doctrines and creeds. It

needs a greater man to be a Christian in the spirit than in
the letter of the faith." "The new faith demands a larger
man and a profounder belief than that which went before."

Therefore we turn back to the three theories of
progress outlined in this chapter. Which of them would Brooks
have chosen? It is hardly possible to say. The men of his
day were not conscious of the implications in their statements.
It took later ages to work out these latent ideas. Taking the
question negatively, it is possible to say that nothing in
Brooks's writings would exclude any of the three views. He was
certain that a man's own life colored his knowledge of truth,
and that likewise each age would express truth in different
form and with different emphasis. He also believed that no
one age had a monopoly of the truth, or its expression. It
seems reasonable therefore to believe that he would agree that
today, as before, additional truth is being granted to mankind,
and that some things held as truths by men of past days could
now be seen as half-truths because of advancing knowledge. "I
feel very sure that Christ, before he attains his perfect vic-
tory, must throw his truth into new and completer forms than
any it has yet assumed."

-----------------

77. Sermons, VIII, Brooks, N.Y. 1896, pp. 347-348
78. Idem. pg. 349
Chapter V

A VOICE IN THE WILDERNESS

Nineteenth century America had many good preachers. Every large city had one or more ministers whose reputations were nationwide, and whose churches were filled Sunday after Sunday. The Great Awakening of 1858 brought into prominence Charles Grandison Finney (1792-1875), Lyman Beecher (1775-1863), and Albert Barnes (1798-1870). These men were motivated by a new emphasis. This was the idea that salvation was offered to all men, and men could obtain it by the willingness to receive it. Coupled with this emphasis upon the individual's part in being saved was a new social emphasis growing out of the temperance and anti-slavery movements. These men preached the solidarity of the race, and placed upon the individual the responsibility of his brother's life. Preaching was thus developing a social emphasis and growing closer to daily life.

Following the Great Awakening came a period of spiritual dryness when the streams which had been refreshed by the revival of religion were allowed to run low during the bitterness of the War between the States, and the darkness of the reconstruction period which followed. Washington Gladden was
religious editor of a New York newspaper from 1871-1874, and belonged to a clerical club representative of the ministers of this "City of Churches". "There were twenty-five or thirty men, most of them mentally alert and courageous, and the discussions were apt to be trenchant and enlightening... The discussions of the club were mainly theological, but, as I recall them, they were kept within the lines of the traditional evangelical theology. As yet scarcely a ripple had appeared upon the placid surface of American orthodoxy." Materialism came to the fore during the years which followed; and then, in 1882, began the controversy within the Congregational Church over future probation.

Within this wilderness of dry bones there were many green oases where men proclaimed a joyous and moving gospel. Foremost among the preachers after the Great Awakening was Henry Ward Beecher, for forty years pastor of Plymouth Church in Brooklyn. Beecher had designed his church so that he stood surrounded by his hearers. The pulpit was almost a platform upon which he moved with the utmost freedom, now like a roaring lion and again with the simple tenderness of a man who knew the weakness, as well as the wickedness, of human nature and would have all men know the love of their Father.

---

Richard Salter Storrs (1821-1900) was pastor of the Church of the Pilgrims in New York for over fifty years. He was the champion of catholicity and common sense, and was possessed of majestic eloquence and vivid imagination.

Thomas De Witt Talmage (1832-1894) was pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn for over a quarter of a century. His auditorium held five thousand people and is said to have always been over-crowded. His sermons were printed in three thousand five hundred issues of various journals, and are estimated to have reached twenty-five million people.

William M. Taylor (1829-1895) was pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle for twenty-one years. His volumes of sermons on the parables of Jesus and Bible characters are still read by multitudes. David Swing, of Chicago, resigned his Presbyterian Church (1875) when charged with heresy and built up a strong following while preaching in McVicker's Theatre, and later made the Central Music Hall the great preaching station of the middle west. A man of poetic utterance and reverent insight into the deep things of the spirit, tender sympathy with everything human, a streaming humor, radiant optimism and a keen delight in all things beautiful. Dwight L. Moody (1837-1899) was the greatest of the lay evangelists. He moved two continents by the power of his preaching and brought

---
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brought a million souls into the light of a new relation to Christ. While Moody was not an advanced thinker, his message had little to do with the old ideas of a terrifying God; love was the nature on which he relied.

All of these men, and many others, must be classed as good preachers when judged by their influence on their day. Yet when one asks if they were great preachers, the answer would depend upon the basis of judging. What are the standards by which one must judge a preacher for true greatness?

Must we not judge a preacher upon the same general basis as a writer — by length, breadth, and depth? How long is he remembered by his own congregation, by his own generation? Or does his memory continue down through succeeding ages? How widely did his influence spread? Did it go beyond the confines of his own particular church or denomination? Did it extend over the whole of America, and did it spread beyond the confines of the nation? How deeply is he felt? Did his preaching alter the lives of men, or simply catch their attention? Did his message have about it the a vitality which continues in days to come, elevating and ennobling the streams of life of men who never knew him but still feel his influence? Did he make alive a new order or defend an old one? When a writer measures up to all of these standards, no one would deny him the quality of greatness. Why not the same for a preacher?
In reading the sermons of many of these men one feels that the power was not in what was said, for the sermon often makes poor reading. It is not literature. The forcefulness of the man must have been in his personality and in the manner of his preaching. Only two preachers of this century have left us sermons which rank as literature: Horace Bushnell and Phillips Brooks.

Characteristics as a Preacher.

Phillips Brooks was essentially a preacher. Nothing could turn him aside from devoting his whole self to his work. He was invited to accept a chair in the Philadelphia Divinity School; to become head of the new Episcopal Theological Seminary in Cambridge; to become professor of Christian Ethics and University Preacher for Harvard; to become assistant bishop of Pennsylvania, and declined each that he might continue his preaching. To him preaching was the pearl of great price and he gave up all else that he might keep it.

In personal appearance Brooks also had an advantage. He was a tremendous man, standing well over six feet and weighing two hundred sixty pounds. A massive head and lionine countenance mixed with a certain gentleness gave him command of an audience before he began to speak. His physical appearance
gave one the immediate impression that here was a man who was prepared to put the trumpet to his lips and give forth no uncertain note.

The surest and shortest road to pulpit power is to be what you appear to be. Brooks was conscious of this necessity and made it the great emphasis of his preparation for preaching. Preaching was to him "the bringing of truth through personality." Dr. Robert E. Speer spoke (Chapel Services of Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia, February, 1926) of one of his last addresses being to the men of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew for Massachusetts. Taking as his text Isaiah 52:11, "Be ye clean, ye that bear the vessels of the Lord," Brooks brought to the men as much by himself as by his message, for the men knew that behind those words was a life which was clean. Men attacked him for his views on theology and church practice, but there is no record of an attack on him for any lapse in ethical or spiritual conduct. Henry Ward Beecher suffered a malicious attack by some of his enemies charging him with a lapse in morality. The charge was refuted, but it left a blight upon the life of Beecher because men feared he had not been careful enough to avoid the appearance of evil. Brooks never had any of this suggested against him. Even when some of his enemies were
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throwing against him all the charges they could master to keep him from becoming the Bishop of Massachusetts, not one of them brought forward any charge reflecting upon his character. Men seemed to know that he was what he appeared to be.

Brooks's physical appearance and his personality were wholly in his favor as a preacher. His manner of preaching was at the same time an asset and a liability. Archdeacon Farrar says of him: "He is marred by a certain fervid impetuosity, which reminds the hearer of an express train sweeping all minor obstacles out of its path in its headlong rush. His utterance is exceptionally rapid. He speaks many more words in a minute than our most rapid orators, and reduces reporters to absolute despair. This is so far a defect that it is exceedingly difficult for the hearer to keep pace with the sequence of his thoughts, conveyed, as they often are, in the language of great beauty....He is thoughtful, plain-spoken, fearless, essentially manful and entirely alien from the petty tricks and intrigues which are so often visible in the favorites and faglemen of parties."

Few of Brooks's biographers have given sufficient emphasis to his defects as a speaker. This may be due to the fact that many of them are eulogistic rather than interpretive. However,

there are enough references to these defects to let one see that they were glaring imperfections. "He is great in spite of his infirmities, for such they are. Voice is not resonant, enunciation is not clear, his speech has the rapidity of a mountain torrent. He frequently misses the word wanted, and sometimes flounders in his rhetoric in going back for it. He seldom looks his audience in the eye, but most of the time turns his gaze toward the sounding board above his head. Looking at him close, it seems as if his eyes were turned back in upon himself in his agonized quest to give you the best he could reach in his reflective soul. Gestures are infrequent, and usually awkward. Often he stood with both hands clinched within his surplice upon his breast, as men sometimes lay hold of the lapels of their coats."

Another element besides personality and truth enters into the effectiveness of Brooks's preaching. This is his environment, the temper of his day. All of his preaching was done in the years which mark the downfall of the New England Theology. If we take 1884 as the date at which the reconstruction in theology became necessary and 1892 as the date at which it became popular in America, # we see that his preaching fell in the period before and during this reconstruction. It was a day of cold intellect in which the followers of the New
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England Theology were bolstering their arguments with new proof, but always defending a system. Brooks came forward in this time of cold intellectuality and proclaimed a gospel, instead of defending a system. Like the Scribes of old, men had piled authority upon authority to prove their position to be true, yet it lacked the note of authority. Brooks's preaching brought a spiritual freshness and forthrightness which convinced the heart of man. Religion was to him, and in him, a spring of living water babbling forth fresh each moment to meet the needs of that moment. People who were accustomed to drink at the old cisterns of a dying creed turned eagerly to the sparkle of the living spring. It was this note of authority growing out of his own experience of religion which led Tiffany to say of those who heard him: "They went home feeling that a fresh wind of God had blown freshness and courage and hope and aspiration into their souls."

What was the message which he proclaimed with this freshness and authority? It was centered upon the Incarnation. The life of Jesus formed the framework for his preaching. The church year, being based on this life, fitted Brooks's preaching perfectly. He was always ready for Christmas with its message of God becoming man, or Easter, or Trinity Sunday. All of these gave him an occasion to preach the truths of his

central theme: Jesus had come to earth to show to men God as their father, and that they were the children of God. Therefore, in his preaching he pleaded with his hearers as the children of God to rise to the heights of the divine possibilities within them, and walk as children of the light and of the day. It was a voice in the wilderness. "It does seem to me that the great beauty of the old belief in the divinity of Christ is the faith in the capacity of mankind which it implies. It believes that man is of so godlike a nature that he can hold God, that God can be incarnated in him."

**Comparison with Robertson and Beecher**

It may help us understand Phillips Brooks as a preacher if he is compared with Frederick W. Robertson and Henry Ward Beecher. In making this comparison it will be necessary to make many general statements which we will not attempt to prove because of the lack of space in this thesis. However, the preaching of these three men is so well known that most people will be able to prove or disprove these statements through their own knowledge of the men.

Robertson is marked, first of all, by his penetrating intellect which went to the depths of a subject and unfolded

---

its parts in logical order. With this he combined a large
critical and historical ability. Take as illustration his
sermon on the "Good Shepherd," After stating that as the
words stand in our English translation it is hard to see the
connection between the thoughts that are brought together,
he says that four times in the verse the same word occurs;
three times it is translated "and", the other time it is
translated "even so", and suggests that the difficulty will
be cleared if it is translated "and" in each case, thus making
the verse read: "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep,
and am known of mine as the Father knoweth me, and as I know
the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep." "At once
our Redeemer's thought becomes clear. There is a reciprocal
affection between the Shepherd and the sheep. There is a re­
ciprocal affection between the Father and the Son; and one is
the parallel of the other."

Robertson's next outstanding trait is his spiritual pene­
tration. He searches the human heart with a firm delicacy
that grows out of his own bitter spiritual struggles. While
one may search in vain for personal references in his sermons,
there are some which are autobiographical in much of their ma­
terial. His sermon on "The Loneliness of Christ" is one of
these. He is speaking of the two kinds of solitude; insulation
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in space and isolation of the spirit. This loneliness of soul is felt by two different kinds of men. The first are the self-reliant, who act and resolve alone, who can go sternly through duty and scarcely shrink, let what will be crushed in them. "There is another class of men who live in sympathy. These are affectionate minds who tremble at the thought of being alone: not from want of courage, nor from weakness of intellect comes their dependence upon others, but from the intensity of their affections. It is the trembling spirit of Humanity in them. They want not aid, nor even countenance: but only sympathy. And the trial comes to them not in the shape of fierce struggle, but of chill and utter loneliness, when they are called upon to perform a duty on which the world looks coldly, or to embrace a truth which has not found lodgement yet in the breasts of others."

A third element in the preaching of Robertson is his use of the Bible. He is superior to either Brooks or Beecher in this. His method is almost invariable. He first seeks to let the words speak for themselves; to determine their meaning as they lie on the printed page and as they were first related in their original utterance. Then he seeks the eternal truth in those words, and then he seeks to apply that eternal truth to the situation in the present day.

---

A fourth characteristic of Robertson is his carefalsness of homiletic form. His sermons were worked out in the minutest detail, often written and re-written before a skeleton was made to be used as an outline. As a proof of this, let anyone try to improve his sermon on "The Loneliness of Christ", by adding or by taking away a paragraph, or a sentence, or even a word.

Brooks

Brooks, like Robertson, preached the things which had become real in his own living. His life is not as intimately woven into his message as is that of Robertson, though this may be due to the nature of the message which each proclaimed. Brooks's message was a triumphant proclamation of good tidings. Take, as illustration, his sermon on John 16:22, "And your joy no man taketh from you." He first discusses the fact that much of our joy depends on our fellow men, their praise and co-operation to further that joy, their meddling and littleness to destroy that joy. Here are rarely echoes of his native reticence which often came as a barrier between him and his fellow men. Then he proceeds to set forth an area of joy which evidently has been his own main support, and which he believed Jesus promised to the disciples:
"It is not that these men are to develop some interior strength, or to drift into some region of calm indifference where the influences of their fellowmen shall not touch them any longer. It is that they are to come to a new life with Him. The new joy which is to enter into them, which they are to enter into, is to be distinctly a joy of relationship and not a joy of self-containment, a joy which is to escape the invasion of the men who disturb all other joys by being held in the hand of a stronger being out of which no earthly power shall be able to pluck it away.*

What he proclaimed was set forth with passionate and contagious utterance to a New England audience whose minds were somewhat given to over-definition. Therefore, his conviction made him a divinely empowered messenger bringing to what was best in that New England mind what it most needed: the warmth and fire of an ennobling Christian emotion.

If one places conviction as the foremost element in his preaching, imagination must come next. Here too, he differs sharply from Robertson. He has not the intellectual penetration of Robertson; he is not a close but a broad thinker. He does not begin with a passage of Scripture and pierce beneath it to the eternal principle underlying it; rather, he takes that principle and, following the lines of mental association
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or analogy, gathers together the individual facts under the general principle or law. Perhaps it would be more exact to say that Robertson follows the logical or philosophical treatment of a principle, while Brooks follows the poetical or literary development. As illustrative of this use of the imaginative, take his sermon on Genesis 3:15, "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." His subject is, "The Giant with the Wounded Heel". The giant of his sermon is man as a race, and not as an individual. After expressing his impatience with those who say life is all good or all bad, those who say humanity is a triumphant angel or a hopeless brute, he suggests that God here says that it is neither all good or all bad, "but a wounded, bruised, strong creature, not running and leaping and shout ing, often crawling and creeping in its pain, but....sure ultimately to set its heel upon the adversary's head." "...It is simply amazing when we tell over to ourselves what the powers are which keep civilization today from putting its heel square and fair upon the head of barbarism and finishing it forever. Popular government perverted by demagogues; commerce degraded by the intrusion of fraud; the Church always weakened by hypocrisy; charity perplexed by the fear of imposture and the dread of papereism; is it not just the picture of the giant with the bruised heel,
A third characteristic of Brooks's preaching is his joyousness, his undiscouraged outreach for still loftier things. He knew the other side of life but believed that the Christian religion had the power to transform that side into the joyful triumph of the abundant life. He brings out this belief in his sermon on "The Valley of Baca". Ps. 84:6 "Who passing through the valley of Baca make it a well," and takes as his theme the turning of sorrow into joy. After showing that the theory of compensation as set forth by Emerson is only a half truth which goes against the general tone of the Bible, he goes on to the theory of transformation. The man who passes through the valley of Baca and transforms a dangerous spot into an oasis of refreshment is the one true to the spirit of Christ.

This sense of triumphant joy, of largeness of outlook, runs like an undertone through his LECTURES ON PREACHING. In speaking to the students of "The Preacher and His Work" he says: "I am inclined to think that the trouble of much of our pastoral work is in its pettiness. It is pitched too low.
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a key. It tries to meet the misfortunes of life with comfort and not with inspiration, offering inducements to patience and the suggestions of compensation in this life or another which lies beyond, rather than imparting that higher and stronger tone which will make men despise their sorrows and bear them easily in their search for truth and nobleness, and the release that comes from forgetfulness of self and devotion to the needs of other people. The truest help which one can render to a man who has any of the inevitable burdens of life to carry is not to take his burden off, but to call out his best strength that he may be able to bear it."

It is important to note that Brooke's appeal was not only in his vivacious thought coupled with attractiveness of diction, but also in the fact that he was interpreting religion in terms of the best thinking of the day, and in union with its highest culture, at a time in American history when the keeping of that partnership was vital. Otherwise the strains of the next decades would have dissolved the relation.

---

When we turn to Henry Ward Beecher we find his knowledge of the audience as the prominent characteristic of his preach-
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13. Lectures on Preaching, Brooks, N.Y. 1877, pg. 79
ing. His foremost concern was to get an immediate reaction from the audience. This made him much more of an evangelistic preacher than Brooks or Robertson. It was Beecher's habit to compose his sermon in the presence of the audience. He describes his own process: "I have a dozen or more topics lying loose in my mind through the week; I think of one or another as occasion may serve, I rarely know what theme I shall use until Sunday morning. Then, after breakfast I go to my study as a man goes into his orchard; I feel among these themes as he feels among his apples, to find the ripest and best; the theme which seems most ripe I pluck; then I select my text, analyze my subject, prepare the outline and go into the pulpit to preach it while it is fresh." That Beecher only worked out the outline beforehand, and left the completion of the address till he could be stimulated by the presence of the audience, is true even of his Yale Lectures on Preaching which are stenographic reports of his talks. He did not revise his sermons before they were printed, as he tells us: "I have never read one of my sermons after it was printed that I did not burn to reconstruct and improve it. I have never attempted to rewrite one of them that I did not find it would

lose in freedom and directness more than it gained in literary excellence."

The second trait of his preaching which we would note is his knowledge of human nature. In this he is vastly different from Brooks and Robertson. He knew the things which would appeal to the common man, for he took every opportunity of talking with them. He would ride the ferry boat and talk to the pilot, or ride with the driver of the horse cars. "What do I gain by that? Why my sympathy goes out for these men, and I recognize in them an element of brotherhood....If ever I saw one of these men in my church, I could preach to him, and hit him under the rib with an illustration, much better than if I had not been acquainted with him."

This knowledge of human nature and his desire for immediate reactions in the audience made Beecher a more persuasive preacher than Brooks. Beecher's aim was persuasion, more than conviction; immediate response, more than the slower and more permanent results. This may have been the thing which led Lyman Abbott, who knew both men well, to say, "Beecher is the greatest preacher; but Brooks the greater prophet. It always seemed to me as I listened to Phillips Brooks that he had

---


his head in the clouds, he was seeing a vision, and I felt
the strong impulse lifting me to his greater altitude."

The final comparison we would make between Brooks,
Robertson, and Beecher is their use of the Bible in their
preaching. Robertson is the master in this field, deter-
mining the exact meaning of the passage he wished to discuss,
then the truth behind that, and then applying that truth to
the present. Brooks did not have this intensive study of the
passage. From the text he got a theme, or sometimes he fitted
a text to his theme. Often this theme had no reference
to the original setting. Yet there is no abuse of his material
by drawing inferences which the words will not bear. Beecher
was not even as careful as this in his preparation and use of
Bible material.

Lectures on Preaching

Brooks delivered his Lectures on Preaching to the stu-
dents of the Divinity School of Yale in 1877. The volume
containing these lectures tells as more of the man himself
than all his volumes of sermons. It is, in effect, the
apologia pro sua vita. In it he explains himself by setting
forth in broad outline, and in minute detail, his ideals for
preaching and for those who preach.

-----------
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He defines preaching as, "the bringing of truth through personality" and makes it plain that it is not merely truth and personality, but only the personality which has appropriated the truth, and digested it, which is prepared to preach. It was not sufficient that the truth come into the understanding of the minister and come out through his pen. It must have laid hold of him, and he of it, in such a way that it comes through his character, his affections, his whole intellectual and moral being. Therefore, he felt that the preparation for the ministry was the making of a man. What they received in the divinity school was important, but it would be in the school of daily life that their lives were made. They will need open minds to appropriate out of everything which touches their lives the elements which make for true instruction.

In this emphasis upon the personality of the preachers' laying hold upon everything which will further their work, we have a page from the experience of Brooks himself. His sermons bear evidence that everything which touched his life was examined to see if it could not contribute to his ministry: a street scene in Florence, a sunset among the Alps, a rockhewn temple in India, or a bit of knowledge he had picked up in a German University were brought into his sermons when they
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would make clearer the principle he declared. Along with these illustrations were the searching descriptions of human nature which show as that he knew the inner biographies of all conditions of men. He scrutinized and examined character and motives as did Browning. When he advised his hearers to make all life contribute to their education, he was giving them his own method.

In emphasizing this sifting of all experience to gather from it the "human side of all divinity", Brooks also emphasizes the converse, "the divine side of all humanity." He deplores the fact that many ministers make a sharp distinction in their reading and studies between the secular and the religious. One minister reads only within the narrow realm of technically religious material, has no knowledge of literature, art, or science. Another minister reads in all these realms, but his shelves of books seem to be divided and his personality seems to be separate when he reads the one and then the other; there is no fusion of the two. Each of these men makes the mistake of failing to see the divine side of all humanity. There must be in the true preacher "a conception of our work so large that everything which a true man has any right to do or know may have some help to render it."

To this quality of appropriating all experience, he adds the necessity for hard work. Illustrating this necessity by his experience at the seminary: "I had come from a college where men studied hard, but said nothing about faith. I had never been at a prayer-meeting in my life. The first place I was taken to at the seminary was the prayer-meeting; and never shall I lose the impression of the devoutness with which those men prayed and exhorted one another. Their whole souls seemed exalted and their natures were on fire....On the next day I met some of these same men in a Greek recitation. It would be little to say of some of the devoutest that they had not learnt their lessons. Their whole way showed that they never learnt their lessons; that they had not got hold of the first principles of hard, faithful, conscientious study. The boiler had no connection with the engine."

In speaking of another characteristic of the preacher, Brooks struggles for a name that will fit it; enthusiasm, eloquence, magnetism, a gift for preaching, none of these express the idea which he describes as "the quality that kindles at the sight of men, that feels a keen joy at the meeting of truth and the human mind, and recognizes how God made them for each other. It is the power by which a man loses himself and becomes but the sympathetic atmosphere between truth on one side of him and the man on the other side of him."
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Brooks sums up his idea of the personality of the preacher as: "Fall of the love of Christ, taking all truth and blessing as a trust, in the best sense didactic, hopeful, healthy, and counting health as far as it is in his power a part of his self-concentration; willing, not simply as so many men are, to bear sickness for God's work, but willing to preserve health for God's work; and going to his preaching with the enthusiasm that shows it is what God made him for." *(22)*

When Brooks speaks of the place of preaching in the church, he has a broader view of the whole work of the church than had many men of his day. He realizes that preaching is only one function of the church and that, while it is important, it must never be allowed to become the only one. This is what one would expect from the minister of a church having the service of a liturgy to help bring his congregation into fellowship with God. It is, however, in sharp contrast to the practice of most of the American churches of his day. Worship is a modern discovery so far as most Protestant churches are concerned. From Beecher's lectures on preaching one gets the notion that the preacher has a sermon and nothing else to make the hour of value to his congregation. The primary concern of

22. Idem. pg. 42
23. Idem. pg. 11
Brooks was preaching, but he did not wish preaching to obscure the value of the whole of church worship.

After painting his lofty picture of the ideal set before one who would become a preacher, he lays emphasis upon the fact that all these gifts which exist in a man in any degree can be cultivated. The cultivation of them is usually a long and hard task, and there are no short cuts. "It is so easy to be a John the Baptist, as far as the desert and camel's hair and locusts and wild honey go. But the devoted heart to speak from and the fiery words to speak, are other things." He feels that no man can permanently succeed in this work who cannot make men believe he is pure and devoted, and the only sure and lasting way to make men believe in one's devotion and purity is to be what one wishes to be believed to be.

**The Preacher in His Work.**

This emphasis on the importance of the whole personality of a minister is carried throughout the whole book. In speaking of the minister in relation to his work Brooks again and again emphasizes his theme that it is the whole man devoted to living and proclaiming a full and triumphant message. We have

24. Idem. pg. 24
25. Idem. pg. 51
already quoted his words about the failure of much pastoral work due to pitching it on too low a plane. He warns the students against planning all their work on too narrow a basis; picking some one phase of the work and making that his hobby to the exclusion of other things which are of equal importance. He mentions the fact that some ministers have spent their energies in getting rid of pew rents so that they would have free churches, others have made congregational singing their hobby and make one feel that the walls of wickedness will crumble into dust only every one will sing. These men who have epitomized all the needs of the church and all the requirements of the successful minister into some one experiment are battering at one point in the long citadel of sin and allowing the enemy to concentrate all his forces there to counteract it. The minister must fasten himself to the center of his ministry, not to some point on its circumference.

In speaking of the spirit in which a minister does his work, Brooks emphasizes four things which he holds to be essential. First, count it all joy to be the servant of the people to whom you minister, not in any outworn sense, but in truth call yourself their servant and be such. Second, never allow yourself to feel equal to your work, if such a spirit

26. Ante. pg. 176

grows on one, rush out and try to convert the most hardened sinner. Third, be profoundly honest, never say one word which at the moment you know you do not believe. Fourth, be vital, even the physical vitality must be sought for that you may keep your vitality at its fullest.

In the lecture upon "The Idea of the Sermon" Brooks emphasizes the point that in a sermon there is a mingling of the elements of personal influence and abstract thought, in a different way from that of the author and his book, or the sculptor and his statue; that while a writer may send forth a book into the world to live independently of his character and influence, and the artist may remain hidden while his statue is known, the preacher cannot so separate himself from his sermon. He feels that this is due in part to the fact that a sermon is not a work of art. Art, he holds, contemplates and serves the absolute beauty; there is not of necessity any didactic element in it of setting forth a truth to affect the will of men. On the other hand, the purpose of the sermon must be not only to set forth a truth, but to move the souls of men.

In art, he holds, the purpose is to utter a beautiful thought in beautiful form, with no further purpose than that the thought should be uttered. This an artist would make a

statue of beauty even though it was to be viewed by savages, whose ideas may be those of filth and squalor: the audience would not determine the form. In the sermon however, he holds the purpose to be the moving of the souls of men. Thus the sermon is a tool: an instrument to gain an end.

Now in this idea of the sermon as a tool, how much of the preacher's personality should intrude? He cites two kinds of sermons in which the preacher's personality is prominent. Some sermons are autobiographical in the crassest sense. Every truth which the speaker wishes to illustrate is made plain by some incident in his own experience. Brooks feels that while such incidents used with good taste may often contribute to clarity, on the whole they limit the range of his preaching. A better way, he feels, is that in which the personality is hidden yet felt. As an instance, he cites the works of Robertson, of Brighton. "The personality never maddies the thought. I do not remember one allusion to his own history, one anecdote of his own life; but they are his sermons." For himself Brooks appropriated the method of Robertson. He feels that it is not the most unreserved men who are the most influential, nor the one who forces the facts of his life on you who most puts the spirit of his life into

30. Idem. pg. 112
31. Idem. pg. 119
yro. His sermons are often autobiographical in the sense that the results of his experience are there in a form which one recognizes, but the actual events in that experience are as chips which are left in the workshop when the finished product is brought forth.

**Doctrinal Preaching**

Brooks notes the outcry of his day against doctrinal preaching and the wish for practical preaching. He does not hold the outcry absurd but feels that it is a blind and unintelligent outcry; that behind it is the vague discontent created by the feeling that something is wrong with doctrinal preaching. He feels that behind the outcry is the fact that men who are looking to the preacher for life itself and the inspiration to achieve that life are met with a theory of life. "The idea is that the tenure of certain truths, and not the possession of certain character, is a saving thing. It is the notion that faith consists in the believing of propositions." The minister who has that idea declares truth for its own value and not with direct reference to its results in life. This attitude, he feels, is caused by the confusion

---

32. *Idem.* pg. 126
33. *Idem.* pg. 127
in the minds of ministers as to the nature of saving faith. The preacher who thinks that faith is the holding of truth, will devote himself to save men from believing error and bring them to the knowledge of what is true. On the other hand, the preacher who thinks of truth as a means to the end of character will attempt to bring men into a personal loyalty to Christ.

His own belief is that truth always has character beyond it as its ultimate purpose. Therefore, doctrine must be preached. "Preach it always not that men may believe it, but that men may be saved by believing it." Then men will feel that it is to them the bread of life and rejoice in such preaching.

Another section of this lecture on the "Idea of the Sermon" deals with the subject of the advisability of preaching upon the special conditions of the times. He cites the growing demand for such preaching upon questions of wealth, extravagance, impurity, licentiousness, political corruption and misrule. Then he amazes one who is familiar with his sermons by saying that he believes the demand for such preaching to be absolutely right. This admission is all the more surprising

34..Idem. pg. 129
35..Idem. pg. 137
when we search his printed sermons for any indication that he followed his recommendation and preached upon the issues of the day. There is no sermon dealing with a national or local election, nor is there one which deals with the question of the relation of science to religion. Knowing the inherent honesty of Brooks, one cannot believe that he would advise students to preach sermons which he himself would not preach.

The explanation of what he means by preaching upon timely topics comes in two points which he urges upon his hearers. He first reminds them that in such preaching the individuality of the minister is likely to be more noticeable than in other topics; that one mind will work abstractly and another concretely. One man will see the evil as an all-pervading influence breaking forth in particular instances; another man will visualize evil only in some special vicious act. Both these men will preach against the same evil, and neither of them should feel that the other is failing to deal with evil as a messenger of God.

The second point which he makes is that one must take a large view of the question in deciding upon the method he will use in preaching upon these evils. Particular instances of these social evils are but symptoms of a condition in human nature which lies behind the outward act, and that these

---

symptoms must be dealt with in reference to the unseen conditions which they manifest. Here again we have the note of the large view of preaching: "Strike at the symptom always for the sake of the disease. Rebuke dishonesty, licentiousness, drunkenness, cruelty, extravagance, but always strike in the interest of the soil to which you are a messenger....Never let men feel that you and your gospel would be satisfied with mere decency."

He then goes on to apply this idea of preaching to the question of political preaching. After calling upon them to despise with him all suggestions that a preacher should not preach politics because it may hurt his influence, he begs them to take a large view of politics. They are asked to see in the political condition the indication of the nation's spiritual condition; to trace the local manifestation to a deeper source, and only be satisfied with the larger care, which will not merely secure peace and order, but will seek to make good men. Such preaching, he assures them, will not sound like some article from the daily paper.

"The preaching of Beecher and Brooks, outspoken as it had been on slavery as a moral issue, took for granted the other existing arrangements of American Society."

37. Idem. pg. 139
38. Idem. pg. 141
Chapter VI

CLOTHING RELIGION WITH REALITY

In attempting to evaluate the religious thought of Phillips Brooks, it will first be necessary to admit certain things.

1. He was not a pioneer in religious thought. He did not blaze new trails through the wilderness as did Horace Bushnell. This work required an originality of thought which Brooks did not display. In fact, most of his thinking can be traced back to such men as Maurice, Bushnell, Kingsley, Robertson, Arnold, Whately, McLeod Campbell and others. Brooks was not the kind of thinker who takes the data at hand and from these works out new relations. This requires close thinking, and Brooks was a broad thinker.

2. He was not a constructive theologian. He has no system of thought with all the parts integrated. It is impossible to discover what he did think about certain things: the atonement, for instance. This is partly due to the fact, mentioned in the body of the paper, that Brooks was not interested in belief for its own sake. His interest was in the life of his parishioners. What ministered to their growth, or hindered their development, came into his thinking. He dealt with all thought in the light of its effect upon their lives, and not primarily as it was related to a system.
3. His influence was not so widely felt, at the time, as that of some of his contemporaries. Beecher made many lecture tours, lecturing on the Chautauqua circuits, which were becoming popular. Brooks never went on such a tour. His pulpit was his forum, and from it only he spoke. Even the few essays he wrote and addresses he delivered, were mainly connected with religious occasions. He knew that he was a preacher and gave up all else to further that work. Another reason for the limitation of his influence in his own day was his inclination to avoid controversy. His sermon on Gamaliel illustrated Brooks's own attitude. Gamaliel left the outcome of controversy to God; so did Brooks. His belief was that the minister who dealt most successfully with unbelief was not the one most skillful in proving truth or disproving error, but the one who was most powerful in strengthening the faith in people's lives by the way in which the power of faith was expressed through his own character. His duty was a positive expression of truth through his own personality. While this made for a lasting influence, it did not bring him into as great prominence as that held by some other leaders of his day.

4. Brooks probably knew little of science. He seems to have accepted the theory of evolution, but his interest was not in the theory itself but in its effect upon his people. He was anxious to assure them that, if it were true, it would lead them into a larger life. There is no indication that
he ever made a study of the matter, though he did read various discussions of it. Probably he did not see the inherent conflict between science and religion, as viewing truth from different viewpoints. There seems to be little evidence that he knew much more of Biblical criticism than he knew of science. He did read various books, but we cannot be sure that they made any deep impression upon his thinking. With the exception of the idea of the Bible as a record of revelation, which he may have got from Lessing, we cannot trace any idea of Brooks to his knowledge of science in any of its branches.

**BROOKS' S CONTRIBUTION**

It is evident that Brooks did not advance the frontiers of religious knowledge. We cannot say that there is any new truth which he discovered. However, he made a definite contribution to the religious life of America. This contribution may best be illustrated from the experience of the pioneers of the American wilderness. Pioneering was not completed with the first generation of men who blazed the trails to new parts. The first generation discovers the new territory, they mark out the boundary lines of the land they claim as theirs by right of discovery, and then they begin to clear the land to make room for the crops which they plant. Once the land is cleared, it is known as "new ground." This term applies to land which has been cleared of trees; but the stumps remain in the ground, the roots are still below the surface to send up sprouts, the briars are there also. It is the kind of land
which Jesus described as "thorny ground" in his parable of
the soils; that is, it has latent in it the forces which will
destroy the crop. Now the work of the second generation of
pioneers is to finish preparing the soil for the crops. They
are the ones who really annex the territory to the land which
is already productive in the best sense. They build the roads
in the place of the wagon ruts of the first generation of
pioneers. They bring the markets nearer. They are the ones
who establish the contacts with the portion of the country
which is already settled. They bring to the new values out
of the old, and take back to the old the stimulii of the new,
which helps burst the old wine skins of tradition.

The work of Brooks was that of the pioneer of the second
generation. His task was that of presenting to the people the
ever-advancing thought of his day, making that thought take
its place in the life of a people, lifting the life of the
people up to new levels of truth which the pioneers have dis­
covered. His task was to clothe religion with reality, to
keep religion fresh by interpreting, and popularising the results
which men had gained. It was to bring truth which was newly
discovered into the life of a people. He read the old faiths
in the light of modern thought and sought to help others to
walk in the footsteps of the apostles and prophets with the
aid of the light of present knowledge. Bashnell had opened the eyes of men; Brooks was teaching men how to use them.
The first way in which Brooks clothed religion with reality was by interpreting man to himself in a day of pessimistic uncertainty. Our own day has no conception of the dread, of those days, of the discovery of some truth which would be contrary to Christian faith. It was a day of the materialistic interpretation of the universe, when a new breath of life had come to scientific thought, and with all the sureness of adolescence, it was proclaiming the half-truth as the whole truth. The era has been called the time of faith and doubt, illustrated in the hope, and also the uncertainty, of Tennyson's, "Crossing the Bar,"

I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crost the bar.

It was a day which lacked the positiveness of conviction which Browning put into his poetry. A day which feared the results of the new attitude toward the Bible; of interpreting it as other literature would be interpreted; a day in which the foundations of Calvinistic theology was being battered by a new system of thought.

Brooks's one aim was to impart life; to unveil to man the invisible world, upon which he himself had looked, and which he would have others grasp as they looked upon those things which are invisible and eternal. In this work he was truly a prophet, a forth-teller, speaking of those things which can be seen only from within. His responsibility was to awaken
the God-consciousness within man, to move the will to action and to spur on the questioning soul to find God and to know Him when He was found.

The theme with which Brooks began was the revelation of God made through Jesus. This revelation had also given to man the perfect revelation of himself, the natural son of God. In the life of Jesus were illustrated the heights to which man might reach. In this he recognized a unity in the universe, God and man were interwoven. There was a connection between the spiritual and the material as in a living organism; therefore, all truth must come from God himself, and what seemed to upset faith, was but to enlarge that faith and lead it out into fuller light. It was, therefore, the duty of men to examine that new knowledge and not to suppress it. In this work he was using his genius to interpret to man the truths which had been discovered by others, but which Brooks clothed with reality as he incorporated them into life.

It is in this interpretation of man to himself that Brooks's buoyancy and hope are so apparent. Man might become like Jesus. It was not so important that man might have evolved from some lower form of life; it was evident that his destiny had been revealed in Jesus. That destiny could be achieved through the power of God.

2. Another way in which he clothed religion with reality was his expansive Christian neighborliness. Religion was for him
bigger than creed or denomination. It refused to be fully housed in the thought of any group. It was a possession of all men.

This contribution is the more significant for two reasons. First, his own denomination has never stood for neighborliness; rather, they have been noted for their lack of this broad cooperation in the religious life of America. Second, his emphasis came at a time when there was great bitterness between church groups. During the War between the States (1861-64) many denominations had separated into northern and southern groups. Even today (1935) most of those groups still remain separate, not because of geographical distribution, but because of the bitterness and distrust engendered in past years. In the midst of all this ill feeling, Brooks flung out his banner of neighborliness. He had such confidence in his own faith that he had no hesitation in recognizing and welcoming any ray of truth from all sources. He had such a firm belief in his church that he felt certain she would welcome, with him, truth from the agnostic, from the Calvinist, from the Unitarian. This, it seemed was natural for him to speak in glowing terms of James Freeman Clarke, Unitarian in faith and one of the spiritual leaders of Boston. It did not occur to Brooks that in so speaking he would be held responsible for the theology of Clarke. His purpose was to recognize a character full of love, parity, and self-sacrifice. By such recognition he felt religion would be the fuser.
In this emphasis upon the breadth of religion, with its result of tolerance, Brooks was groping for a truth which men of a later day discovered: the truth that religion is not only a personal experience, but a social force leavening the whole of society. Religion, in his day, was mainly an experience which the individual had with God; by which the life of the individual was enlarged and made more joyous. It was not often a force which led the individual to change the environment around him and alleviate the conditions of those less fortunate. Here, he was laying the foundation upon which such men as Washington Gladden built their social emphasis in religion.

A third way in which he clothed religion with reality was his ability to draw attention to truth, rather than to himself. In this he set a high standard for the ministry. In the many references to Brooks which one finds in present day writings, the emphasis is always upon some truth which he uttered, and not upon the man who spoke the truth. One such reference is that made by the present Dean of Windsor, who in speaking of the necessity to expect great things of the future says, "I remember that great personality, Bishop Phillips Brooks looking at me with glowing eyes, soon after my ordination, and saying, 'How I envy you beginning life when the world is becoming so interesting.'" (1) He remem-

1. The Making of a Man, Dean of Windsor, N.Y. 1936, pg.5
bered the man, but what struck him as significant was the truth which the man uttered. Citations might be multiplied to the same effect but one more will suffice. William Lawrence succeeded Brooks as Bishop of Massachusetts, and says of his early experiences in that office following the death of Brooks: "I found of course a deep sense of personal bereavement and an abounding loyalty to his memory. Rising above these sentiments...were a spiritual temper in the people, a religious enthusiasm, and a consecration to Christ... ...This, it seems to me, was the climax of his powers, that of turning men from himself to Christ, from the preacher to the Master."

When men attempt to chart the course of American religious thought during the later nineteenth century, they will find Brooks as an indicator of the rise and development of the main religious ideas of this period.

2. Life of Phillips Brooks, Lawrence, N.Y. 1930, p. 50
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