

4TH
96

HORACE BUSHNELL'S CONTRIBUTION TO PROGRESSIVE
RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN NEW ENGLAND
AS EXEMPLIFIED
IN HIS THEORY OF FREEDOM

By

GERRIT HELMSTRA

A.B., Hope College

M.A., New York University

S.T.B., Biblical Seminary in New York

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SACRED THEOLOGY
in
The Biblical Seminary in New York

New York, N.Y.
April 1938

BIBLICAL SCHOOL OF
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
HATFIELD, PA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| A. The Importance of the Present Study..... | 1 |
| B. The Purpose of the Present Study..... | 6 |
| C. The Mode of Procedure for Present Study.... | 8 |
| D. Definition of Important Terms Used..... | 10 |
| II. THE THEORY OF FREEDOM AS RELATED TO GOD..... | 11 |
| A. God and Omnipotence..... | 13 |
| B. God and Foreknowledge..... | 21 |
| C. God and Foreordination..... | 26 |
| D. Summary..... | 31 |
| III. THE THEORY OF FREEDOM AS RELATED TO CHRIST..... | 33 |
| A. Christ's Nature..... | 34 |
| B. Christ's Mission..... | 38 |
| C. Christ's Method..... | 43 |
| D. Summary..... | 47 |
| IV. THE THEORY OF FREEDOM AS RELATED TO MAN..... | 49 |
| A. Man as a Personal Being..... | 50 |
| B. Man as a Moral Being..... | 54 |
| C. Man as a Social Being..... | 66 |
| D. Summary..... | 67 |
| V. THE THEORY OF FREEDOM AS RELATED TO SOCIETY..... | 69 |
| A. Man and Nurture..... | 69 |
| B. Man and Environment..... | 73 |
| C. Man and Government..... | 77 |
| D. Summary..... | 82 |
| VI. THE THEORY OF FREEDOM AS RELATED TO NATURE..... | 83 |
| A. The Laws of Nature..... | 83 |
| B. The Influences of Nature..... | 85 |
| C. The Works of Nature..... | 90 |
| D. Summary..... | 93 |
| VII. CONCLUSIONS..... | 95 |
| A. Suggestions..... | 95 |
| B. Criticisms..... | 103 |
| C. Summaries..... | 110 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 113 |

Gift of Author

Jan 1939

21670-

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

A. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PRESENT STUDY.

The importance of the man, Horace Bushnell, in the religious thought and life of America or the world has been touched upon by some historians and writers in the field of theology. Much more, however, has been given to the world by this man than has been recognized thus far.

Very little need be said in the present study about his life. Several good biographies have been written about him, and reference for detailed information about the man is made to Mary Bushnell Cheney's "Life and Letters of Horace Bushnell" and Theodore T. Munger's "Horace Bushnell: Preacher and Theologian." The present study concerns itself with the man's great contributions to religious thought.

It generally is suggested that Horace Bushnell's great contribution is his "Christian Nurture" and his books on the work and person of Christ. The present study is not intended to belittle the importance of his work in these fields. His "Christian Nurture" should be a text-book in every home, and his views on the work and person of Christ rapidly are attaining high eminence in the religious thought of the world. George Albert Cole has said, (1) "If it were necessary to give a date to mark the transition to the modern conception of Christian training, we could not do better than to name the year, 1847, which saw the first

(1) "The Religion of the Mature Mind," p. 305

issue of Horace Bushnell's "Christian Nurture." His "The child is to grow up a Christian and never know himself as being otherwise" is an application to religious training of the notion of returning to nature out of which spring the kindergarten and, in fact, the whole modern movement. It is a declaration of freedom from all those mechanical conceptions which looked upon the child as clay waiting to be molded rather than as a life demanding to grow. Bushnell really grasped the idea that the central fact and aim of education is development of a living organism."

In a class lecture in Mansfield College, Oxford, England, February 6, 1931, Principal Selbie suggested that Horace Bushnell's "Christian Nurture" was the best of its kind and has as much psychology in it as some of the most popular educational books of today. Dr. Selbie continued by saying that Horace Bushnell was the greatest theologian that America has produced. Jonathan Edwards, he stated, was just an echo of Locke and others, (2) but Bushnell was original in his thinking. S. T. Coleridge's "Aids to Reflections" may have given Dr. Bushnell suggestions for his line of thought but, in detail and application, he was a pioneer. It may be true that Ritschl had similar views, but he was just beginning to preach his view (3) when Bushnell was writing and Bushnell did not read German. Also, Dr. Bushnell's views on the person of Christ are divergent from the other two writers.

(2) G. P. Fisher, "History of Christian Doctrine, Period Five," Chapter 2, p. 397

(3) American Journal of Theology, Vol. 6, 1902, p. 35

Principal Wheeler Robinson, Parks Regent College, London, England, was heard to give expression to similar opinions about Horace Bushnell, and it truthfully can be said that Bushnell did for America what Coleridge did for England and Schleiermacher did for Germany. (4) Coleridge tried to save the English church from the death of formalism; Schleiermacher desired to save the German church from rationalism, and Bushnell sought to rescue the New England church from a fusion of both.

Theodore T. Munger's statement, (5) "Nearly every undertaking of Bushnell in theology was an effort to escape some sort of restriction," gives especial importance to the present study. The intellectual atmosphere in New England was filled with different views on the theory of freedom, and something on this subject is found in most of Bushnell's writings. As a boy, he would hear his father protest against views on predestination and total depravity, (6) and it was life in such an atmosphere which laid the foundation for his reaction to the bounds of formal religion. Soon he took issue with Jonathan Edwards' speculative theology on the subject of determinism. Dr. Bushnell broke away from dead dogmas and dealt with living realities in his religious thinking. He emphasized religion of the heart rather than of the mind. Jonathan Edwards, and his views guided the thought of the day, and (7) held that the inward light in

(4) W. Burggraff, "The Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America," p. 132

(5) "Horace Bushnell: Preacher and Theologian," p. 101

(6) "Ibid," p. 8 and Charles R. Brown's article, "Horace Bushnell - A Great Man," Yale Divinity News

(7) W. Burggraff, "The Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America," p. 110

man was from God, a peculiar gift to the soul, while Bushnell suggested that the Gospel came not by way of logic nor reason but rather by "an aesthetic talent, namely, the talent of love, or a sensibility exalted and purified."

Dr. Bushnell speaks of the Gospel as a gift of the imagination. (8) He holds that freedom is possible only in the realm of love. Jonathan Edwards, on the other hand, speaks of liberty or freedom as (9) "the power, opportunity, or advantage that any one has to do as he pleases, or conducting, in any respect, according to his pleasure; without considering how his pleasure comes to be as it is." In this respect, it is evident that Horace Bushnell has made a definite contribution to the subject of freedom.

After speaking about Bushnell's early life, Theodore T. Munger (10) quotes a statement in which Bushnell, referring to the discipline in his home life, reveals the theory of freedom based upon discipline and respect for truth. In a letter addressed to His Holiness, Pope Gregory the sixteenth, (11) Dr. Bushnell asked for a religious liberty which renounced force and slavery as a part of religion. He was strongly opposed to slavery in any form and wrote several articles against it.

The receding wave of French liberalism had somehow gotten hold of Dr. Bushnell, and the old theology and philosophy of his day did not satisfy him. Anything that had a suggestion

(8) "God in Christ", p. 326

(9) "Freedom of Will," p. 424

(10) T.T. Munger, "Horace Bushnell - Preacher and Theologian," p. 11

(11) "Pulpit Talent," p. 242

of restriction or force in it was resented. He wanted a living faith and a vital hope and therefore felt obligated to preach the old gospel in practical ways rather than in theoretical terms. He disliked externalization of religion. Religion had to be a natural, normal experience within man. It was this feeling that gave rise to "Christian Nurture" and to "Nature and Supernatural" as well as to most of his other works. His "Christian Nurture" deals with life as it is and must be lived in a social world, and his "Nature and Supernatural" is an attempt to explain God's relation to man and nature in practical terms. He took man from the realm of the machine, from the realm of the natural and from the laws of cause and effect by making him a supernatural power, with freedom of will and creative energy. "This," says Theodore Munger, (12) "was the announcement that the age was awaiting from the lips of faith." The long debate over the will had come to a practical end, and consciousness was left free to assert its freedom, no longer entangled in theories of motives and natural causation. On the other hand, literature, political freedom and evolution had forced thought up to a point where a new definition of man was required; he must be relegated to the play of natural laws, a thing with things, or lifted into the divine order with God. The incarnation had come to the front and stood ready to be accepted or denied. It could be realized and fulfilled only under a conception of man that should ally him with God; that is, he must be defined as supernatural. This is the work attempted by Bushnell. It will

(12) "Horace Bushnell: Preacher and Theologian," p. 396

not be claimed that he compassed man's nature and fixed his place in this still mysterious world, nor even that he defended his great thesis on wholly defensible grounds; but he enunciated a conception of man, and inferentially of miracles, imperatively needed to save faith from lapsing into Deism, and from longer deferred realization of the incarnation."

Others agree with Munger in this great contribution so well stated. This spiritual view of man with creative will-power can be accepted both by faith and reason. It delivers man from the evanescence of the material world by giving him a place in the eternal order of God's will. This was a change needed, and it is important to remember that Horace Bushnell accomplished it without even creating a schism in New England theology. It is true that he was opposed by some, for a time, but gradually the value of his contribution was appreciated. In fact, he broke more with method than with material.

The importance of the present study has thus been sketched. This section can best be concluded with T. T. Munger's statement: (13)"It will be said of him (H. Bushnell) as Harnack has said of Luther: 'He liberated the natural life and the natural order of things.'"

B. PURPOSE OF PRESENT STUDY.

The very fact that the present study holds that the work of Horace Bushnell in the field of freedom is of such great importance to progressive religious thought in America, should suggest the primary purpose of this writing. The organization

(13) "Horace Bushnell: Preacher and Theologian," p. 414

in systematic order of Dr. Bushnell's material on the subject in hand is the first purpose. It is true that his book, "Nature and Supernatural," contains a general view of freedom, but there is so much upon this subject in other of his writings that it should be co-related. All references to the subject will be collected and compared and thus organized into a systematic whole.

A second purpose is to attempt to show wherein Dr. Bushnell's expressions on the subject of freedom are definite contributions to progressive religious thought in America. To do this, it will be necessary to review the material on this vital subject from the beginning of American history, and, in a sense, the history of the study of freedom. Comparisons of views will be made and enduring values estimated.

A third purpose might be stated in the form of a plea that Bushnell's views on freedom receive their due place in modern religious thought. Jonathan Edwards has too long occupied first place in American theological opinion. At least, many books have been written concerning his theory of freedom, while little has been penned to credit Bushnell's views. At the time of this writing, information is received that Ralph O. Harpole has submitted in manuscript form, for a Ph.D. degree at Yale University, a thesis on "The Development of the Doctrine of Atonement in American Thought from Jonathan Edwards to Horace Bushnell." However, no attempt to evaluate his theory of freedom has been made. While it may be true

that Dr. Bushnell has been severely criticised for his most important work in this field, namely, his "Nature and the Supernatural," it must be remembered that no less an authority in the field of theology than Dr. Charles Hodge says that it (14) "is quite the most able and valuable of Dr. Bushnell's works on theology." Surely if Dr. Hodge is right in his estimation of the book mentioned, then the purpose of the present study is justified.

French liberalism abroad and dogmatic Edwardsism at home gave rise to a need for a more practical theory of freedom. It is held by the present study that Dr. Bushnell met this need and that his contributions to this field of thought demand deeper consideration.

C. MODE OF PROCEDURE FOR PRESENT STUDY.

Having already given space to a discussion of the importance and purpose of the present study, this section will deal briefly with the plan of procedure that will be used in the body and conclusion.

Horace Bushnell's keen conception of God and His relationship to man and things, to the world as it is and to the world as it should be, gives place in the first chapter for a study of the theory of freedom as related to God. Omnipotence, Foreknowledge, and Foreordination will be treated in connection with God's nature and method. In each case, it will be shown that, according to Dr. Bushnell, God is free to do only such things as His nature and method allow.

(14) "Princeton Review," 1859, p. 153

Dr. Bushnell's book, "God in Christ," naturally gives place for a second chapter of a treatment on the theory of freedom as related to Christ. In this chapter, it will be shown that, as God was limited by His nature and method, so, too, Christ is limited by His nature and method, as well as by His mission.

A third chapter will deal with the theory of freedom as related to man. Man will be treated as a personal being, a moral being and a social being. Man will be considered as a supernatural power, in each case, who is free only when he lives in the realm of love and makes his freedom God's will.

The last section of the preceding chapter and the book on "Christian Nurture" express a need for a chapter on the theory of freedom as related to society. This chapter will view man's freedom in relation to nurture, environment and government. Society limits man, and man limits society, and it will be shown that even a supernatural social power is not free in all actions.

The books, "Nature and Supernatural, as Together Constituting the One System of God," and "Moral Uses of Dark Things," contain so much valuable material on the relationship of God and man to nature that it is deemed wise to add a chapter to the present study on the theory of freedom as related to nature. This will be a short chapter dealing with the laws, influences and works of nature and their effect upon the freedom of nature, man and God.

The final chapter will be entitled, "Conclusion," and will attempt to show, under the headings, "Suggestions," "Criticisms"

and "Summaries," the definite contributions to pregressive religious thought in New England that Horace Bushnell has made in his view of freedom.

D. DEFINITION OF IMPORTANT TERMS USED

The term 'free' in the present study is understood to mean "Not subject to an arbitrary external power or authority." Freedom of the will is exemption from necessity in choice or action, and it is held that such exemption has its basis or possibility in the Divine will. The present study holds that the source of all freedom-both human and divine-is in the Divine will.

For God the Divine will is law in that He does not will to do that which is not in accord with His nature. This may be implied in the two definitions we have for sin; namely that sin is lack of conformity to the law of God and lack of conformity to the will of God. According to Dr. Bushnell the law of God is the law of love, and the law of love and the law of right are the same. Righteousness as related to the affections is love, and love as associated with the conscience is righteousness. This is in accord with questions three and four of the Heidelbergh Catechism, and may be regarded as the psychological approach; which is the approach used by Dr. Bushnell.

Free will is regarded as not being under the law of physical and mechanical causation, but rather as being in the realm of supernatural powers. Nature and the Supernatural together constitute the one system of God for governing the universe, and God, Christ, Man and society can find freedom only in or by doing the Divine will.

CHAPTER II

THE THEORY OF FREEDOM AS RELATED TO GOD

Dr. Bushnell's book "Nature and the Supernatural as Together Constituting the one System of God" contains many of his best views on the subject of freedom, and it will be used as a suggestive outline for the organization of the present study. His books, "God in Christ", and "Vicarious Sacrifice", however, will provide the basic material for this and the immediately succeeding chapter.

The title "God in Christ" may sound like the orthodox God-man doctrine as promulgated at Chalcedon in 451, and yet it is held that the author has given a very real contribution to progressive religious thought in New England in this book, as well as in his Moral-influence theory of the Atonement as presented in this and in his "Vicarious Sacrifice." In these books Dr. Bushnell identifies righteousness in God with benevolence, and therefore cannot see that any atonement needs to be made to satisfy God. As stated in the preceding page, righteousness, as transferred into a word of the affections by Dr. Bushnell, is love; and love as translated back into a word of the conscience, is righteousness. The eternal law of right is only another conception of the eternal law of love, and a righteous-loving God must suffer.

In "The New Englander" 1854 (p. 489) (15) Dr. Bushnell says: "After all, God is not a person save in figure, as we shall see at a glance, if we ask what constitutes our idea of a person. This we shall readily answer out of our own consciousness, by saying that" (15) H. Bushnell's "Christ in Theology", p. 134.

person is a conscious being, an agent or intelligent self-active force - exactly what our consciousness conceives to be included in itself. But the moment we begin to recite the inventory of our consciousness, we find that almost every article in it is in such a type of measure and mode that we cannot refer it to God at all. Thus, a person or agent as we conceive the term, drawing on our own consciousness, wills, putting forth successively new determinations of will, without which new determinations, personality is null, and no agency at all. But God never does that; his determinations are all passed even from eternity. So a person thinks, or has successions of thought coming in, as it were, in file, one after another, God never thinks in any such sense, as all his acts are done, so all his thoughts are present contemporaneously from eternity."

At another time, Dr. Bushnell says that (16) "God is expressed but not measured by His works; least of all, by the substances and laws included under the general term, 'Nature'." Referring to the apostle's words: "For in Him all things consist," he holds that the word, 'consist,' (17) means "standing together" and with such a meaning gives expression to the essential and the highest conception of system. In these words is expressed the only true system of God, and they are the basis of his view of the "Nature and Supernatural as Together Constituting the One System of God"(18). The supernatural includes all beings which are called powers that can originate new trains of effects. The other class are called things and

(16) "Nature and Supernatural", p. 42

(17) "Ibid," p. 58

(18) "Ibid," p. 59

refer to such as can only propagate effects under certain laws. At the head of the class called powers is God, as Lord of Hosts, and Creator of all Creation. God is the all-originating power and first cause, "having round Him innumerable orders of intelligence which, though caused to exist by Him, are as truly first causes in their action as He, - starting all their trains of consequences in the same manner."

The preceding quotations give a suggestion of what Dr. Bushnell's line of thought will be like. God is not a person in any natural sense, but He is the first cause in a supernatural sense. The word supernatural is almost synonymous with the word spiritual. Having other first causes 'round Him' is a new expression and gives rise to a study of:

A. GOD AND OMNIPOTENCE AS RELATED TO FREEDOM

The words, (19) "The sovereignty of God has always a relation to means, and we are not authorized to think of it, in any case, as separated from means, "are a very fitting theme for this section. They immediately suggest that sovereignty does not assure absolute freedom. In his "Christ and His Salvation" (20), Dr. Bushnell puts a similar thought thus: "In His moral power, God works, not by what He wills, but by what He is."

I. Freedom as Related to God's Nature in Omnipotence

Again and again, in his text-book on the subject of freedom, this analytical writer tries to bring out the fact

(19) "Christian Nurture," p. 29
(20) p. 151

that God is limited by what He is. (21) To a certain extent, God's nature will be a law to His action, even as ours is a necessary law to us." He continues by suggesting that the law moral is as completely sovereign over God as it is over man. His own words speak best for themselves here: (22) "It is the eternal, necessary law of right or of love; a law that He acknowledges with a ready and full assent forever; that which determines the immutable order, and purity, and glory of His character. --- Moral law then, by the free consent of God, shapes the divine character, and so the character and ends of His government." In view of the fact that God is a morally perfect being, moral perfection or holiness will have to be the end of His being, creation, and government. As Dr. Bushnell suggests, to value perfection or holiness merely as a means to some end, such as happiness, would only make perfection or holiness of less value, rating it as a convenience. Such a thing could hardly be imagined in the character of a holy being. A truly holy being must be holy for the sake of holiness, and, therefore, a holy God is not free to be unholy. A perfect God must be perfect in all His ways; therefore, he cannot be imperfect. (23) "Here, then is what we mean by affirming that all God's supernatural acts, providences, and works, supernatural though they be, will yet be dispensed in all cases by immutable, universal, and fixed laws."

And so one might continue to quote from Dr. Bushnell's writings in an attempt to show that God's freedom is definitely

- (21) "Nature and Supernatural," p. 203
- (22) "Nature and Supernatural," p. 203
- (23) "Ibid," p. 203

affected by His holy and perfect person. Being what He is makes it necessary for Him to do what He does. His end is always the same, and being perfect even obligates suffering. (24)

God's moral sense of perfection makes Him feel pain or suffer in the presence of everything that is not perfect. To look upon the imperfect as merely a disgusting thing is not possible of a perfect being. In accord with Biblical literature, and verified by man's conception of Him, God is displeased with everything that is imperfect, and displeasure - according to modern psychology - suggests pain or suffering. God loathes impurity, and to loathe is to know pain. God hates unrighteousness, and for God to hate is to suffer. And so Dr. Bushnell continues to refer to God's long-suffering patience, compassion, pity and sympathy as necessary reasons for His suffering. Suffering in a moral sense is the greatest and most real agony in the world.

Turning to the text, "God is love," Dr. Bushnell speaks as follows: (25) "As certainly as God is love, the burdens of love must be upon Him. He must bear the lot of his enemies, and even the wrongs of his enemies. In pity, in patience, in sacrifice, in all kinds of holy concern, he must take them on his heart, and be afflicted for them as well as by them. In his greatness, there is no bar to this kind of suffering; he will suffer because he is great, and be great because he suffers."

Much could be said with reference to God's freedom as related to Himself as Love. The divine in humanity seems to verify what Dr. Bushnell has just said and to make it seem

(24) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p.224

(25) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p. 226

unnecessary to attempt to show that love for any one does make it necessary for one to suffer when that loved person abuses one's love or that which is loved. If that principle holds true in the life of a real mother, how much more must it hold true in the life of a God who is said to be love? Love is vicarious in itself, and it is impossible to think of the term without associating it with suffering in one form or another. "God is love," therefore, He must suffer. Dr. Bushnell's contribution on this theme is not new in material, but rather in method. (26)

In speaking of the necessary, everlasting, and ideal - not governmental- law of Right as being before God's will, as a simple thought, Dr. Bushnell holds (27) that merely to think such a law of right is to be in everlasting, necessary, obligation to it. Not that God is under a command or penalty to obey such a law. He Himself is the only being then, and the source of all the forces that are to be. But merely for God to think rightly made His whole nature answer to it in a sublime, self-prompted allegiance. To the question, "Is there anything that God will certainly undertake?", Dr. Bushnell makes answer: (28) "His infinite righteousness contains the answer; for by that he is everlastingly fastened, in profoundest homage, to the law, and about as certainly to the well-being of all moral natures related, with Himself, to the law."

The law of Right, therefore, makes it necessary for God to act along definite lines and to be what He is. A righteous

(26) "Vicarious Sacrifice", p. 226
(27) "Ibid," p. 235
(28) "Ibid," p. 243

God must be right, and righteousness must have a place in His system of government. God is right because He is righteous, and it is impossible for Him to be wrong or to sin. (29) The fact of sin in the world has nothing to do with God's omnipotence. (30) He is omnipotent only with what He is and with what He has instituted. Dr. Bushnell clearly states that God does not desire sin, and, when it takes place, it is against every attribute of "His infinitely beneficent and pure character." (31) At another time, he says: (32) "Nor, if we speak of sin as permitted in this view of God, will it be any otherwise permitted, than as ~~not~~ being prevented, either by the non-creation, or by the uncreating of the race."

Thus far, it has been shown that God's holiness, goodness and righteousness make it necessary for Him to be holy, good and right; and to rule or govern in accord with holiness, goodness and righteousness. That this view of God is not necessarily a contribution to progressive religious thought in America is admitted. Even at the time of Thomas Hooker (1586-1647), who said, (33) "The being of God is a kind of law to His working," men believed that God's nature did limit His actions. It is held, however, that Dr. Bushnell's view of God as the highest supernatural being, in the division of His system of government called powers, is a very worthy contribution to progressive religious thought in America. Such men as L. W. Grensted (34), F. H. Foster (35), and W. Burggraft (36) hold that Dr. Bushnell took another great step in religious thought in his work on the

(29) "Nature and Supernatural", p.p.182, 213ff; (30) Ibid, pp. 74 ff, 121ff; (31) Ibid, p. 74; (32) Ibid, p. 75; (33) "Ecclesiastical Polity," Vol.1, p. 72; (34) Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement, p.339ff.; (35) A Genetic History of the New England Theology; (36) "The Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America"

atonement. It is in his books on this subject that he deals with God's freedom as related to His nature in a new way. The purpose of his "God in Christ" was to show that God is Christ and that Christ is God. The theme of his "Vicarious Sacrifice" brings clearly to one's vision that (37) "such a God in love, must be such a Saviour in suffering.--He could not well be other or less." The word "must" is used again and again with reference to God's work as related to His nature; and the purpose of this section is to show that God is not free to do what He may be able to do, as far as power is concerned, because of His nature. This is a limitation on God's freedom which He has placed upon Himself.

II. Freedom as Related to God's Method in Omnipotence

That God as an omnipotent God can do anything that He or we may imagine is granted (38). It is held, however, that God, as the First Cause, Creator and Governor of the universe, has limited Himself - if it be right to speak of God with limitations - by making men powers or beings that are able to originate new trains of effects; by placing nature, that is things, under certain fixed laws. "Omnipotence," says Dr. Bushnell (39) "is force, and nothing in the nature of force is applicable to the immediate direction or determination of powers." The writer admits that force may affect the means, influences and motives connected with choice; but he maintains that the will, the man himself as a power, can only be managed in a moral way. God made men thus, and man is at liberty to obey or to refuse to obey God. In this way, God has limited Himself in His control

(37) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p. 47; (38) "Forgiveness and Law," p. 79; and "Nature and Supernatural," p. 121; (39) "Ibid," p. 65

over man. Dr. Bushnell does not set a limit on omnipotence. He merely holds that omnipotence as a force is not applicable to a power which is capable of character and responsibility, and is clear of all causation and acts by its own impetus. God as an omnipotent force can do everything, and the view presented by Dr. Bushnell sets no limitation on the power of God. It only shows (40) "that the reason of God's empire excludes, at a certain point, the absolute dominion of force."

In answer to the question as to why God limited Himself by making men powers rather than things, the author suggests that He preferred powers to things, and that He loves character. In other words, (41) God has deliberately chosen to govern man by a system of truth, beauty, love, reason, want, fear and the like. Thus He acts through man's consent; having made him able to act against His will, and capable of breaking allegiance, in order that allegiance may have a meaning and glory when men choose it. Such a system of moral government may influence God's immediate action but it does not influence His eternal purpose.

Having made men moral beings or powers God has made it impossible for Himself to prevent sin. Having given man the power of choice, He gave him the power to choose the wrong as well as the right, and it was certain to God that man would not always choose the right. In fact, on the subject of sin, Dr. Bushnell goes so far as to give utterance to this statement: (42) "And so, doubtless, everywhere, and in all worlds, sin has it in its nature to organize, mount into the ascendant above

(40) "Nature and Supernatural," p. 67; also "Christ and His Salvation," p. 71

(41) "Nature and Supernatural," p. 68

(42) "Nature and Supernatural," p. 99

God and truth, and reign in a kingdom opposite to God."

The theologian does not seem to suggest that all evil or sin finds a head in a person known as Satan. He merely states that God's system or method permits the powers of evil to organize and thus act in opposition to Him. That God will be victorious in His eternal plan for the universe, even though He does not seem to be omnipotent in His present method with man, is made clear in the following sentence: (43) "Nothing which He could have done by omnipotence, no silent peace of compulsion, no unconsenting order of things, made fast by His absolute will, could have given any such impression of His greatness and glory as this loosening of the possibility of evil, in the purpose finally to turn it about by His counsel and transform it by His goodness and patience."

Enough has been said to show that Dr. Bushnell has given a definite contribution to progressive religious thought in America in his view of man as a supernatural power, with a will to choose to obey or to disobey God, and to originate new trains of effects. The doctrine of Calvinism as laid down by Dr. J. Edwards and Dr. Williams (44) made the will absolutely passive, clay in the potter's hands, and by so doing destroyed the will. Surely Dr. Edwards' theory of cause and effect did not suggest any possibility of God's freedom being affected by man's action, and Dr. Edwards' theory dominated American thought in the 18th century (45). That the theory of cause and effect will hold true in the realm of nature is granted. In different parts of his

(43) "Ibid," p. 101

(44) S. T. Coleridge, "Aids to Reflection," p. 115

(45) W. Burggraft, "The Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America," pp. 110, 125

"Nature and Supernatural," he suggests that God has put nature under certain laws, and thus has limited Himself in his power over nature. Others, prior to Dr. Bushnell, however, have made such suggestions, and, in view of the fact that a later chapter of the present study deals with his views on "Freedom as Related to Nature," this section of the present chapter comes to a close.

III. Summary

Thinking of God as the highest supernatural power in existence, the first cause and eternal governor of the universe, it is held that He is not omnipotent in the strictest sense of the word. He is limited by His own nature which is holy, good and righteous, and by the method He has instituted for the governing of the universe, which makes men powers able to obey and disobey Him and capable of originating new trains of effects. Even in the realm of nature, God has instituted certain laws which restrict His control over her actions. God has thus limited Himself deliberately; and while He is veryable to use force, and thus be omnipotent, He prefers powers to things, and character to material. Sin is permitted because God's method permits the possibility and man chooses to have it.

Professor Noah's criticism (46) of Dr. Bushnell's view on God and sin has been answered in this section, and will receive further consideration in the final chapter of the present study.

B. GOD AND FOREKNOWLEDGE AS RELATED TO FREEDOM

In introducing this section, let it be understood that Dr. Bushnell believes that there is no past, present or future

with God. God sees everything as a whole. And yet in thinking of God's freedom as related to His foreknowledge, one is forced to speak of God in human terms. In this connection, therefore, reference is made to Dr. Bushnell's address on language (47). A reading of this address may help in an understanding of this section.

I. Freedom as Related to God's Nature in Foreknowledge

Continuing to think of God as the highest eternal supernatural power, it is evident that what He foreknows He sees as the thing that will or must happen. (48) "He is a being, not who computes but who, by the eternal necessity even of his nature, intuits everything. His foreknowledge does not depend on his will, or the adjustment of motives to make us will thus or thus, but He foreknows everything first conditionally, in the world of possibility, before he creates, or determines anything to be, in the world of fact. Otherwise, all his purposes would be grounded in ignorance, not in wisdom, and his knowledge would consist in following after his will, to learn what his will has blindly determined. This is not the Scripture doctrine which grounds all the purposes of God in his wisdom; that is, in what he perceives by his eternal intuitive foreknowledge of what is contained in all possible systems and combinations before creation--'whom he did foreknow, them he also did predestinate'--'elect, according to the foreknowledge of God.' If, then, God foreknows, or intuitively knows, all that is in the possible system and the possible man, without calculation, he can have little difficulty

(47) "God in Christ", Chap. I

(48) "Nature and Supernatural," p.31

after that in foreknowing the actual man, who is nothing but the possible in the world of possibles, set on foot and become actual in the world of actuals. So far, therefore, as the doctrine of Edwards was contrived to support the certainty of God's foreknowledge, and lay a basis for the systematic government of the world, and the universal sovereignty of God's purposes, it appears to be quite unnecessary."

The preceding quotation has been given in full because it gives expression to Dr. Bushnell's view on foreknowledge as related to God's nature in a most exact way. In fact, the foregoing hardly needs any comment. A God who is eternal can see things only as a whole. A God who is wisdom can know things only as they are from eternity to eternity. A God who is the highest power in a system of powers can foreknow things only as they are in the world of possibles before they become actual in the world of actuals. Foreknowing the possibles, He also foreknows the actuals, and foreknowing these He must act in accord with what He foreknows. Knowing all things from eternity to eternity, He must act in accord with things as He knows them to be. Seeing the whole from beginning to end, He must act so that the whole will be what He sees. Thus it is evident that God is limited in His action because of what He foreknows to be necessary. A holy God has foreknowledge that holiness is the end of His being and government. Therefore, He must be holy. Likewise a good and a righteous God has knowledge beforehand that goodness and righteousness is the end of His being and government. Therefore, He must be good and righteous. God

knowing His nature to be what it is, also foreknows what He will do. His nature gives Him foreknowledge about Himself, and this limits His freedom of action. All things consist in Him. Therefore, all is limited.

That Dr. Bushnell's view on foreknowledge is different from that which Dr. Edwards advanced is evident from the concluding remark in the above quotation. Dr. Edwards and the other theologians of that time did not speak about a world of possibles and a world of actuals in connection with God and Foreknowledge; and it is held that Dr. Bushnell has made a minor contribution to progressive religious thought in America in his view on this subject.

II. Freedom as Related to God's Method in Foreknowledge

It is almost impossible to separate the nature of an omniscient God from His method in dealing with the theory of foreknowledge. His method or system of government is the necessary method because of His nature. The one is the result of the other. An all-knowing God must foreknow that, if one plan or system of government is instituted, the outcome or end will be as He foreknew. There may be possibilities of one thing or another happening along the way, but the end is certain. According to Dr. Bushnell, God has a (48) "complete intuition" of all plans and systems and their possibilities. As an omniscient God, He knows all the possible plans or systems and all that will follow if one plan or system is instituted. It is in this way that He foreknows what will be the final result in the system that He has instituted. Not that He forces men to do

things contrary to their wills in order that His system will work as His foreknowledge indicates it should. As suggested before, force is not applicable in dealing with powers. But God knows men so well that He even foreknows what they will do under certain conditions. By wilfully setting on foot or actualizing the particular system He has motivated, He also has made certain all the evils which He knew or foreknew to be connected with that particular system. Not that the evils are from Him or introduced or appointed by Him. In fact, Dr. Bushnell suggests (49) that it is hardly right to say that they are permitted by Him. God instituted a plan or system which permitted the possibility of evil. The plan did not demand the necessity of evil. Evils come into the world only as they are connected with the best possible plan. The evils "environ" the plan but are not made necessary by it. Man, as a power, chooses evil against the will of God. God, as the highest of supernatural powers, had limited Himself by His method with men. He could not stop evil by force and still be true to His system of government. This is an old thought that was given its proper place in the progressive religious thought of America by Dr. Bushnell.

III. Summary

An omniscient God Who knew Himself to be holy, good and righteous, and, as a God in Whom all things consist, also foreknew that the end of His being and government must be holiness, goodness and righteousness. An omniscient God who knows all the possibilities connected with the system of government He has

(49) "Nature and Supernatural," p. 77

set on foot, also foreknows, because of His knowledge of men, what the actualities will be in the end. Not that He forces certain things upon man to make happen what His foreknowledge indicates should happen. God rather knows men so well that He can foreknow what they will do under certain conditions. There is a world of possibles in God's system, and man's actions can influence God's action, but they cannot influence His eternal purpose. God's actions are, therefore, conditioned by man's actions, and God is not free in His immediate relations with man. God's foreknowledge, as related to His nature and method, thus has put a limit upon His freedom.

To some, Dr. Bushnell's view of foreknowledge does not even give God the ability to foreknow. His new thought of a world of possibles as well as a world of actuals in the so-called mind of God, does not seem to make it possible for God definitely to foreknow just what man actually will do. Such men as Dr. Edwards would only make it possible for God to foreknow the actuals. And yet Dr. Bushnell's world of possibles is necessary if his view of man as a supernatural power is to have any meaning and (50) if man is to have any will at all.

C. GOD AND FOREORDINATION AS RELATED TO FREEDOM

Foreordination and foreknowledge are two words that are very closely associated. According to the popular view, to foreknow that a certain thing is to happen is to foreordain that thing to happen. The apostle writes: "Whom He did foreknow, them He also did predestinate." The one seems to be the almost necessary result of the other. And yet from what has been said

about foreknowledge in the preceding section and from what will be said about foreordination in the present section, it will appear that to foreknow that a certain thing will happen does not necessarily mean that it has been foreordained to happen.

I. Freedom as Related to God's Nature in Foreordination

That a holy, good and righteous God is foreordained by His very nature to be holy, good and righteous is evident from what has already been said. The statement (51), "Such a God in love must be such a Saviour in suffering" shows in what way God is foreordained by what He is to do certain things. In answer to the question, (52) "Do we then assume that Christ, in his vicarious sacrifice, was under obligation to do and suffer just what he did?" Dr. Bushnell says: "Exactly this. Not that he was under obligation to another, but to himself. He was God, fulfilling the obligations of God; just those obligations in the eternal fulfillment of which God's perfections and beatitudes are eternally fashioned." God was under no superior force, nor did man have any claims upon Him. God endured what He did as Christ freely and of His own accord because of His virtue and standards of good. The following statement may show the relationship of this idea to foreordination more clearly, (53) "In these burdens, God, as the Eternal Father, suffered before him (Christ). He had his times and eras appointed, his conditions of preparation, his modes of progress, and the incarnate work was to be done only in the incarnate era; but the design was

(51) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p. 47
(53) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p. 60

(52) "Ibid," p. 58

nevertheless one and the same throughout, and was carried on in the same deep feeling and suffering sympathy, from the first." Again, (54) "The whole deity is in it (the cross), in it from eternity and will to eternity be."

The words, "Those obligations in the eternal fulfillment of which God's perfections and beatitudes are eternally fashioned" suggest **that** certain perfections and beatitudes in God have been, and still may be eternally fashioned in such a way that God is eternally obligated to them. In other words, His perfections and beatitudes foreordain His actions. God's virtue and goodness foreordain the cross for Him; or as Dr. Bushnell puts it elsewhere, (55) "Moral law, we have said, shapes the character of God, and that determines His end."

Thus, holding that God is the same yesterday, today, and forever, the conclusion is reached that His nature has foreordained His end; and God must be and suffer what He is and does suffer. That this view about the cross is a contribution to progressive religious thought in America is granted by L. W. Grensted, W. Burggraft and F. H. Foster.

II. Freedom as Related to God's Method in Foreordination

Dr. Bushnell is very emphatic upon the point that God's plans, purposes and desires are eternal (56). An Eternal God cannot determine new plans because for Him all things are as of one day. (57) "If there be any truth which every Christian ought to assume, as evident beyond all question, it is that God has some eternal plan that includes everything, and puts everything in its place. That He 'foreordains whatsoever comes to pass'

(54) "Ibid," p. 73 (55) "Nature and Supernatural," p. 204 (56) "Christ in Theology," p. 134; "Pulpit Talent," p. 101; "The New Englander of 1854," p. 489 (57) "Nature and Supernatural," p. 75 & "The New Life," p. 2ff

is only another version of the same truth."

The author's whole argument is based upon the thought that, since God has instituted a system of government of which He foreknew the possibilities, workings and results, He thus also foreordained the things that happen.(58) Even the crucifying of Christ was seen as a certain result in the system that had been instituted by God and, in that sense, was foreordained (59). Once having set on foot the system of government He did institute, God, foreknowing what would be the final outcome in each and every thing, foreordained the things that He Himself would have to endure because of the system.

In speaking about the Latin etymology of the word, "Nature," Dr. Bushnell suggests (60) that the nature 'natura' of a thing is the future participle of its being or becoming. There is an "about-to-be" or an "about-to-come-to pass" in the nature of a thing or even in that whole of things which we call "nature." There is a "definite futurity," or as he puts it, "a fixed law of coming to pass, such that, given the thing, or whole of things, all the rest will follow by an inherent necessity." Nature, in other words, is under certain laws which may be thought of as the "immediate actuating power of God" and which were inherent in the substances and were by them determined."

At another time, Dr. Bushnell (61) speaks about nature as being a complete system of causation under fixed laws. But, since laws are but the action of forces representing God's will, the system of nature becomes a symbol of God's regulative mind, and so-called natural consequences are determinations thereof.

(58)"Nature and Supernatural",p;74ff &"Pulpit Talent,"p.299

(59)"Nature and Supernatural",p.102 &"Christian Theology,"p.240

(60)"Nature and Supernatural,"p.20; (61)"Pulpit Talent",p.114

From the preceding references, it is clear that the theory of foreordination is applied in the realm of nature, that is things, as well as in the realm of powers. The words, "and so-called natural consequences are determinations of God's mind," need no explanation. If we are to think of nature as "a realm of complete systematic causation," then it is evident that God has limited Himself in His power over nature by making it such a realm. This view of nature had not been presented before and, therefore, is a contribution to the religious thought of the time. (62) Dr. Charles R. Brown even holds that his view of nature and the world order is today being enlarged upon by such men as Milliken and Eddington, and it is generally admitted that these men are contributing to the progressive religious thought of the present.

III. Summary

Again it is seen that God foreordains because He fore-knows what powers will do under certain conditions and how things will react to certain fixed laws. He foreordains His own being and end by the nature He has taken unto Himself. Holiness comes from a holy being. Goodness comes from a good being. Righteousness comes from a righteous being. Holiness, goodness and righteousness are the three highest attributes that the human mind can conceive and, if these are the highest, and a being, or, as Dr. Bushnell holds, a power is the highest reality known, then certainly such attributes must come from, or have their source in, the highest power imaginable. God is regarded as the highest power in the supernatural world. Being such a power, He

(62) "H. Bushnell - A Great Man," Yale Divinity News, March, 1930

must govern in accord with the system He has instituted. Man is in need of His works of grace but has freedom of choice. Therefore, God can foreordain man's duty and destiny only as He foreknows man. Nature can be acted upon by outside forces, but God has put it under certain fixed laws. Therefore, it acts in accord with law. In this, the truth of Calvinism lies. (63) In such a view, God's will and man's will are realities, and God is free and yet He is not free. In the law of love, He is free, and it is only in the realm of love, goodness, holiness, righteousness and the like that His freedom is complete and His sovereignty is real.

D. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER II

God's omnipotence, foreknowledge and foreordination are all conditioned by His Nature and method. The term, "Omnipotence," implies the idea of force, and, as the highest of supernatural powers, God cannot use force in dealing with such powers. This holds true by virtue of the definition given to the term, 'powers.' Being holy, or holiness itself, God cannot be the opposite; namely, unholy. As suggested in the chapter, God must act in accord with what He is and under the plan He has instituted and, therefore, in the strictest sense of the term, He is not omnipotent. On the other hand, He is omnipotent to do whatsoever He may desire to do because His desires are in tune with His being.

Again, God's foreknowledge is the result of His knowledge. Knowing what powers will do under certain conditions, and what

things must do under fixed laws, He does foreknow the end. Dr. Bushnell's view of a world of possibles, based upon his view of man as a power with freedom of choice, does not seem to give God complete foreknowledge of every step or move in His system. There must be the possibility of choosing one of two ways or things, if freedom of choice is to have any meaning. That God, as the highest supernatural power, is limited by what He foreknows about His own being and method has been shown in Section B of the present chapter. For an eternal God, there is no such thing as time, and God sees a world of possibles and a world of actuals, as a whole, and thus reigns.

Foreordination is based upon what God is and upon what He has instituted. Plant a grain of wheat and the crop must be wheat if all things go in accord with what man knows. In the same way, a Holy God is determined or foreordained to be holy. As wheat under ordinary conditions cannot produce oats, so likewise a holy God cannot produce unholiness and still be true to Himself. As wheat is foreordained to produce wheat, so also is a Holy God foreordained to be holy. Similarly, God has set on foot a certain system that must act in accord with itself if it is to be true to itself. If God is truth, then it should be permissible to expect God to be true to Himself and the system He has motivated to be true to itself. That God has thus foreordained His being and end as well as that of all supernatural powers and of all things, and has thus effected His freedom, has been shown in Section C of the present chapter.

CHAPTER III

THE THEORY OF FREEDOM AS RELATED TO CHRIST

In view of the fact that Dr. Ralph O. Harpole has just finished his thesis on "The Development of the Doctrine of Atonement in American Thought from Jonathan Edwards to Horace Bushnell," the present chapter will not treat in detail Dr. Bushnell's contribution in this field. His view of the atonement will be treated only as it is connected with his view of freedom.

In passing, it should be stated here that the moral view of the atonement was really hinted at in American theology before Horace Bushnell. It finds its first expression in the works of W. E. Channing (64) (1780-1842), but it was not fully developed until Horace Bushnell's book on "Vicarious Sacrifice" was written. W. E. Channing had refused to accept the Calvinistic doctrine of the atonement because it placed all the emphasis upon the substitutionary idea of Christ's suffering, holding that man had peace with God through the "blood of His cross." W. E. Channing, however, did not say with Dr. Bushnell that the cross was a way of reconciling man to God. On this point, he seemed to stand more with Grotius. In his works, however, he does go so far as to say (65) that the blessings of the cross are "the spirit and the character and the love of Jesus, which his death made manifest, and which are preeminently fitted to bind me to him, and to make me partaker of his virtues."

(64)"The Works of W. E. Channing," pp. 245, 322 and LXXVII - VIII
 (65)"The Works of W. E. Channing," LXXVII - VIII

Dr. Bushnell's view of the atonement was, more or less, a reaction against Jonathan Edwards' Governmental Theory of the Atonement, and this latter was the theory of the atonement expressed by so-called New England Theology (66). This theory held that Christ suffered the death of the cross merely to satisfy general justice (67). Dr. Bushnell's view of God as love and as the highest in a realm of supernatural powers, could not include such an idea.

The purpose of the present chapter, therefore, is to show that, according to Dr. Bushnell's view of the atonement, the cross is an experience which is above the realm of legal justice and in the realm of love. His text for this chapter is that often repeated sentence, "Such a God in love, must be such a Saviour in suffering."

A. FREEDOM AS RELATED TO CHRIST'S NATURE

If, according to Dr. Bushnell, (68) God is Christ and Christ is God, it would seem that the present chapter is almost unnecessary. The arguments that were presented in the preceding chapter will have to be repeated in this. To a certain extent, such is the case. If Christ were God, then He was holy and, if He were holy as God, then He could not be unholy. This is set forth in the argument presented about the nature of God in the preceding chapter. An examination of Dr. Bushnell's discussions on this subject, however, does show that there is a difference between God's freedom and Christ's freedom as related to the cross and the world.

(66) W. Burggraff's "Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America," p. 123ff & E. A. Park's "Atonement," pp. 31-37;
 (67) W. Burggraff, p. 128; (68) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p. 47 & "God in Christ"

Taking for granted then that a holy, good and righteous Christ must be likewise in His actions because of His nature, it follows that a Christ who is love must suffer. In this view, Dr. Bushnell seems to have in mind the Christ on the cross; but he also does suggest that, being what he is, Christ found it necessary (69) to suffer, die, and feel the pangs of man's fallen state and its evils in order that He might bring man out of his sins and thus out of their penalties. Love is a "vicarious principle" (70), and Christ who loves, or is love, had to suffer for, or with, those whom He loved. "Nothing is wanting to resolve the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus, but the commonly known, always familiar principle of love, accepted as the fundamental law of duty, even by mankind." Thus it appears that Christ is free only in the realm of love; that is, He is free to do and to go what and where love makes it necessary for Him to do and to go. In a sense then, Christ is a slave to the principle of love. Dr. Bushnell is very clear on this point. The cross was not something optional for Christ, but an obligation. (71) (72)"The law of love made it obligatory for him to be such a Saviour."

Having thus shown that Christ is bound by the law of love, Dr. Bushnell attempts to show that He is limited by the common standards of eternal virtue. (73) "Here then is our first point. When we attempt the cross and sacrifice of Christ, we must bring everything back under the common standards of eternal virtue, and we must find Christ doing and suffering just what he

(69)"Vicarious Sacrifice," pp. 41, 59; (70)"Ibid,"p. 48; (71)"Ibid," p. 305; (72)"Ibid," p. 309; (73)"Ibid," p. 58

ought, or felt that he ought, neither more nor less." In other words, Christ is obligated to suffer just what he does because of what he is. Dr. Bushnell emphasizes the theory that Christ atones for man's sins (74) not by his office, namely as a priest, but by his character; that is, by his willingness to be what he is. Again there was nothing optional in this because Christ had to be what he was and, therefore, do what he did. (75) "He could renounce it only as he could renounce the honors of his own perfect character."

Christ suffers as he does because of the principle of love by which he is bound and because he has a heart that would not permit him to turn away from man and his suffering. The power of love and the perfection of character made the cross necessary for Christ. The following, however, must be understood if Dr. Bushnell's view of the cross is to be appreciated fully. (76) "The beauty and power of his sacrifice is that he suffers morally and because of his simple excellence, and not to fill a contrived place in a scheme of legal justification." Christ was willing to suffer any amount and in any way, but he was not suffering to be over-good, or more than perfect in order that there might be an extra amount of suffering borne which might be applied to Man's account. Christ did not try to furnish a superlative merit, but was only as good as he ought to be and suffered just what he should suffer. There is no scheme of artificial compensations in Christ's suffering. Christ suffers because love and character make it

(74) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p. 106; (75) "Ibid," p. 311; (76) "Ibid," p. 108

necessary for him to do so. At another time, Dr. Bushnell speaks on this point in these words: (77) "This is no new thought, namely, suffering what love requires - no optional, superlative goodness taken up by Christ in the year One, of the Christian era; but the whole deity is in it, in it from eternity. And the short account of all is - 'For God so loved the world.'"

"For God so loved the world" is really a fitting summary for this section. Perfect love has a Gethsemane and a Calvary in it, and Christ being perfect love, therefore, suffered. Christ as God had to enter into all that belongs to love; namely: patience, long suffering, and sacrifice. The cross is an eternal thing for Christ, and he is forever bound by his nature. His freedom lies in obeying the laws of love, and, if doing what one desires is freedom, then Christ is free.

At the conclusion of this section, it should be stated that this essentially vicarious action of the love-principle and its workings, as expressed by Dr. Bushnell, was conceived in part by Jonathan Edwards in his Miscellaneous Observations, page five. Apparently, however, from other statements in his works, Jonathan Edwards did not grasp the full meaning of what he had said. At least, he did not enlarge upon that theme, nor speak in detail about it when on the subject of the atonement. Winfield Burggraff is right when he suggests (78) that Horace Bushnell goes back to the elder Edwards for a basis for his moral view of the atonement, and follows him in denying the truth of the distinction between the active and the passive view of

(77)"Vicarious Sacrifice,"p. 70;(78)"Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America,"p. 158

obedience on the part of Christ. The great difference between the view of the atonement presented by Horace Bushnell and ~~that~~ promulgated by Jonathan Edwards is found in their view of satisfying general justice. The following section will show Horace Bushnell's contribution to progressive religious thought in America as seen in this connection.

B. FREEDOM AS RELATED TO CHRIST'S MISSION

The statement, (79) "There was, in short, no necessary condition of physical suffering implied in His Messiahship," is a fitting introduction to this section. Dr. Bushnell gives expression to the same thought thus: (80) "Christ not here to die, but dies because he is here." In other words, Dr. Bushnell holds that Christ did not die on the cross because it was part of an original plan. As suggested in the section on God and foreordination, God knew man so well that He foreknew that man would choose to crucify Christ. Christ, however, was not obligated to a plan in suffering the death on the cross. He was not fulfilling an office which required the cross. No, Christ was obligated to the eternal principle of love in suffering the death on the cross. Being what he was made the cross necessary. His life and His death are (81) His obedience not to the Father but to eternal love and righteousness which He Himself is.

In speaking of the freedom of Christ, Dr. Bushnell goes one step further and says: (82) "We may even say that He (Christ) is released from the law wherein He was held; but we only mean that the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in Him, by the

(79) "Christ and His Salvation," p. 224; (80) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p. 130; (81) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p. 309; (82) "Ibid," p. 299

free assent of His liberty, outrunning all enforcement. "Such a view of Christ's freedom seems to be in agreement with that expressed by the apostles and gospel writers, as well as with that expressed by Christ Himself on this subject. In this connection, reference is made to the Gospel according to St. John, to the epistle to the Romans, and to the epistle to the Galatians. In John ten, verses seventeen and eighteen, Christ very clearly tells us that He is at liberty to save His life or to lay it down. As far as His obligation to man, or to God, is concerned, Christ is free. He is obligated to Himself, and such an obligation may be freedom. To do that for which our nature calls is freedom in the highest sense.

There is a second contribution that Dr. Bushnell makes in his thought on Christ's freedom as related to His mission. Holding that Christ, by his life, death, and resurrection pre-engages man's feeling, awakens his conscience, and stands before him as a type of the new feeling and life that is to be thus restored, Dr. Bushnell goes on to say (83), "the suffering, life, and death of Jesus are the appropriate and even necessary equipment of his doing force, in what he undertakes for character." Later, Dr. Bushnell devotes two whole chapters to the theme that Christ's sacrifice was absolutely necessary to make Him the moral power He is, and that His whole mission of saving is (84) dependent upon His having become such a power.

In explanation, it should be said that this moral power in Christ is not to be found in His power as an example, not in

(83)" Ibid," p. 155

(84) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p. 169

His power as the revelation of God's love; but rather (85) in His own greatness as God. The incarnation, as well as the cross, was necessary (86) for His greatness to obtain this desired moral power. (87) "His (Christ's) reality is what He expresses, under laws of expression; the power, the great name, he thus obtains under forms of human conduct that make their address to reason, conviction, feeling, passion, sympathy, imagination, faith, and the receptivities generally of moral nature." "Christ's agony on the cross is the climax or summary of this moral power. The vision of Christ on the cross has the greatest power over men.

Dr. Bushnell is quite emphatic in stating that there was nothing penal in the cross; and he claims (88) that all the Scriptural symbols generally help to prove that Christ is here to be a power in character. By being just such a power, Christ purifies, regenerates, re-creates and makes free the souls of men. Nothing more is needed and, therefore, nothing more can be found.

A similar view, but presented in more detail, is expressed in Dr. Bushnell's book, "Christ in Theology"; and since his great contribution in this field is to be found on this very point, it might be well to review this book briefly for thoughts on the theme of this section and for answers to criticisms that were made of the view presented.

Dr. Bushnell does not hesitate to reject (89) the idea that Christ suffers evil as a substitute for man, and he is willing to be called a heretic by those who hold that Christ

(85) "Ibid," p. 172; (86) "Ibid," p. 188; (87) "Ibid," p. 214; (88) "Ibid," p. 481; (89) "Christ in Theology," p. 217 & "God in Christ," p. 194

was literally punished for man's sins, and that He suffered penally because of them. Without doubt, he would not feel disturbed over Winfield Burggraff's criticism (90) of him on this point. In fact, in answer to the censure that was showered upon him in his own day, because of his view of Christ's suffering, He simply suggested that most of the New England teachers agree with him in his belief that God merely expresses in the sufferings of Christ what He would express by our punishment, and that the one expression is a substitute for the other as a ground of justification. The only difference between Dr. Bushnell and the other New England teachers is that they do not agree on the mode in which the expression is made.

Again, according to Dr. Bushnell, there is agreement on the thought that Christ's death is not penal but demonstrative. Christ's suffering does not satisfy God's resentment, but it does show His righteousness in the remission of sins. To answer the question, "Why must Christ suffer?", Dr. Bushnell takes the following statement from Baxter's "Family Catechism": "To be an expiatory sacrifice for sin, God thought it not meet, as he was the just and holy Ruler of the world, to forgive sin without such a demonstration of his holiness and justice, as might serve as well to the ends of his government, as if the sinners had suffered themselves."

The one essential point of difference in the view presented by Dr. Bushnell then, is that he maintains that the thing that makes the cross what it is, is the fact that it was incidental, (91) and not the ostentation of suffering, or as the

(90) "The Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America," p. 155
(91) "Christ in Theology," p. 218

direct object of his mission. Christ's mission was that of re-establishing the world and regenerating the souls of men, and the cross was inflicted upon him by men while He was fulfilling His mission. Everything that Christ does in preparing the way of justification for sinners is done merely as a subordinate part of His great work of renewing and quickening the souls of sinners. All this was subordinate but not less necessary. There was, however, (92) nothing of an outward form of sacrifice in the death of Christ. There was a very real spiritual sacrifice in it, and this corresponds to the outward sacrifice of the altar, which was a type or figure of this. The sacrifice on the cross, as on the altar, is made for the benefit of the onlookers rather than for the one sacrificed. In the cross men see God's pure love and perfect character, and such a sight has a definite influence upon them. This conception of the cross is called the "Subjective-objective view," and it holds the cross as operative (93) "wholly on man, but, in order to do this with greater efficiency, as representatively operative on God." Thus the ground of justification really is subjectively prepared in man (94) by producing in him a consciousness of the sacredness of laws which sense is awakened in him by the life and death of Christ.

Finally, (95) if Christ is God, then there would be nothing of virtue or power in the cross if Christ died on it to satisfy His own resentment or sense of justice. In fact, there would be selfishness in the cross then and not self-sacrifice. Personally, if it be right to speak of God in such terms, God had nothing to gain for Himself in the cross. His love for mankind made it

(92) "Ibid," p.223; (93)"Ibid," p.225; (94)"Ibid," p.228, also "God in Christ" , p. 254; (95)"Christ in Theology," p. 229

necessary for Him to live and die as He did in Christ in order that men might be won back to His divine life.

The purpose of this section is to show that Christ's mission did not require the cross. Christ was not bound to that mode of suffering by His mission. Being priest, according to Old Testament suggestions, did not obligate Him to the cross. Priesthood did not require crucifixion of its subjects. No more did being the Messiah, as Jesus of Nazareth, obligate Christ to the cross. Being Christ as God did make the cross necessary from eternity; not to satisfy Himself but to be Himself. Holiness, goodness and righteousness in a world of unholiness, badness and unrighteousness must suffer.

Making the cross an incidental or subordinate part in the work of Christ is Dr. Bushnell's contribution to progressive religious thought in America.

C. FREEDOM AS RELATED TO CHRIST'S METHOD

From what has been said in the preceding sections of this study, it will be imagined justly that Christ's method is based upon the law of love. Christ is said to have fulfilled the law by putting love in the heart and to have fulfilled the prophets by establishing a community based upon love. He Himself was guided at all times by love. It is not strange, therefore, that He should give utterance to the laws of love in the gospel of St. Mark, chapter twelve and verses twenty-nine to thirty-one, and speak to the apostle Peter as He did in that last chapter of the gospel according to St. John. Christ lived in the realm of

love always and, in His dealings with man, His method must be the method of love. He is limited, as God was, in His method by what He is, and His own life and death on earth (96) make this method possible for Him.

In speaking of Christ's method, let it be made clear that His relationship to man, or His dealings with man, is primarily involved. Thinking of Him as God, there would be no need of a discussion of His relationship to Him.

Christ's method is best summarized in the invitation, "follow me." This may be a command (97), but it, nevertheless, leaves man free to follow or to refuse to obey. We must like Christ, the Friend, (98) before we will love Christ the Saviour, and when we love Christ the Saviour we will follow and be free." (99) "The Spirit goes with the word and commandment as it does not with the law, wafting us onward and, where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. Nay, the law itself, if we use that word, being in us no more by enforcement, is become the perfect law of liberty." In other words, Christ does not force man to do anything. His method is that of pleading and (100) insinuating everything good. He does not work by a fiat of absolute will (101) as He did in commanding the light to come. Being God, he respects Man's moral nature and does not use force in His dealings with him. "He moves on your consent, by moving on your convictions, wants, sensibilities and sympathies." Later, Dr. Bushnell does suggest (102) that the call, "come unto me," does imply the renouncing of man's own will, world and sin, but

(96) Vicarious Sacrifice, p.226; (97) "Forgiveness and Law," pp.104, 114; (98) Vicarious Sacrifice, p.154; (99) "Forgiveness and Law," p.114; (100) Christ and His Salvation, p.26; (101) "Ibid," p.72; (102) "Christ and His Salvation," p.146

man always is free to heed the call, and, after man has acted sincerely, he finds himself more free. He is freer in that his desires are in accord with what the call demands of him.

The power of the call is in the person of the one who extends it. In the life and death of Christ, the command comes in the form of a person (103) who offers His beauty and greatness to man's choice. As already suggested, man likes Him first, and then loves Him, and in loving Him, finds freedom. At first, man experiences a feeling of repulsion in the presence of the beauty and greatness of Christ because of his own sin. Christ merely stands before man and, in his work of regeneration, does not act upon him. There is something in Christ of goodness and glory which (104) when firmly beheld, "shall go through all inmost distemper and subtilty of sin, as a power of immortal healing." This is Dr. Bushnell's interpretation of the text, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me."

This power over men in the method of Christ reaches its strongest point when Christ is on the cross. The righteousness of God (105) is here seen and felt with a new power, and the sinner in his sin is convicted and held by the sight. At all times, however, Christ is not using any force on man. As a power in the realm of powers and the system that has been instituted, He cannot use force upon men. Christ is limited by Himself, and the system of which He is a part, In His relationship to man.

Dr. Bushnell suggests (106) that the statements, "but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord

(103) "Nature and Supernatural," p.87; (104) "Ibid," p.174;
 (103) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p. 172; (105) "Ibid," Vol. II, p.204;
 (106) "Christ in Theology," p. 292

Jesus" are natural and normal Christian experiences because man is justified and sanctified by faith; and, in both cases, faith takes the new state of freedom and life. Christ, however, is always seen in His work, (107) "acting as a renovating and quickening power, just as he is constantly represented in the scriptures."

And thus we come to the conclusion of the section on Christ's freedom as related to His method, by holding that Christ Himself is bound by what He is and by the method of which He is a part. His method does not destroy man's freedom. He works in the realm of love, and is free only when he does what love demands.

In criticism of this view, Winfield Burggraff (108) suggests that Dr. Bushnell does two things with the Biblical judicial conception of justification. In the first place, he shows that because men forgive without demanding any expiation, or any legal satisfaction, that, therefore, God does likewise. In the second place, he tries to show that the words, "just," "justification" and "justifies," do not have a judicial or legal meaning but purely a moral appellation.

In answering these suggestions of Mr. Burggraff, I would refer to the statements (109) of Dr. Bushnell which make love a law unto itself, that law demanding expiation or being means of atonement. Furthermore, the law of love receives justice and justifies. It would seem that this view is farther from heathenism, as stated by Mr. Burggraff, than the view that represents God as a force that extracts an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. Instead of demoralizing, it brings men to a higher level. Surely, Saint Matthew reveals such ideas in the fifth

(107) "Ibid," p. 298; (108) "Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America," p. 155; (109) "Vicarious Sacrifice," Vol. 2, pp. 10 & 33-92;

chapter of his gospel.

Mr. Bugraff continues to criticise by trying to show that Dr. Bushnell forgets the question of guilt and punishment in connection with sin. The important thing, according to the former, seems to be to reform the man and to destroy all inward resentment. The cost of this experience to him is propiation for man. Since God has always loved, the same thing is true for him. The crucifixion of Christ made no difference here. His suffering because of sin, as thus described, is propiation for man's sin. Christ's life and death are the ground of justification only in that they subjectively prepare in man a state or impression, a sense of the sacredness of law.

In answer to these suggestions, I would refer to Dr. Bushnell's "God in Christ," page two hundred and fourteen, and quote Dr. I. W. Grensted's words: (110) "It would not be true to say that Bushnell wholly ignores the Godward, juridical aspects of atonement, but he quite explicitly assigns to them a secondary position." In a summary sentence, Dr. Grensted says (111), "And thus Bushnell comes to the remarkable result that the death of Christ has nothing directly to do with the atonement. It was due simply to the fact that Christ would do nothing to interfere with God's instituted government and the system of 'retributive causes' upheld thereby."

D. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER III

In giving a general summary of this chapter, the present study cannot do better than to refer to a review made by Professor

(110) "A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement," p. 341
 (111) "Ibid," p. 342

Noah Porter of Dr. Bushnell's theory, "Vicarious Sacrifice," as found in the New Englander of 1866, Vol. 15, page 160.

According to this review, the theological "formula" expressed in Dr. Bushnell's book, "Vicarious Sacrifice," holds that Christ is a sacrifice for us, because, in His life and death, He revealed a sympathy for man which made Him the power of God unto salvation. This sacrifice is "vicarious" in so much that it was undertaken for the good of sinners. This has its foundation in the principles of universal obligation in which the law-precept is duly sanctified, legal enforcements are not impaired and "God's rectoral honor is effectively maintained." The result upon man is that this revelation of God's sympathy and willingness to sacrifice will make righteous the man who believes it, and this is justification by faith. Thus we see that Christ's work triumphs, not in releasing penalties by compensation but by transforming character and rescuing guilty men from the retributive causations provoked by sin. Christ does not provide a remission of sins in the sense of merely letting go, but He executes remission by removing the sins and dispensing the justification of life.

In conclusion, F. H. Foster (112) says, "We need the divine Christ to bear our sins and uphold us by His almighty power; but we need fully as much the condescension, pitying sympathy and fraternal love of our elder Brother, the human Christ. We owe our present realization of this side of Christ very largely to Horace Bushnell."

(112)"A Genetic History of New England Theology,"Page 410

CHAPTER IV

THEORY OF FREEDOM AS RELATED TO MAN

This chapter on The Theory of Freedom as Related to Man, rightly finds its place in the center of the present study, other chapters all being directly connected with the thought in this. It is impossible to speak of a theory of freedom as related to God, Christ, society or even nature without thinking of man. Jonathan Edwards, in fact, entitled his treatise on the theory of freedom, "A Careful and Strict Inquiry into the Prevailing Notions of the Freedom of the Will." "Freedom of the will" was the theme uppermost in the minds of New England theologians, the latter part of the eighteenth and the first part of the nineteenth centuries. Horace Bushnell entitled the treatise which is concerned chiefly with the theory of freedom, "Nature and the Supernatural as Together Constituting the One System of God." In this book, we find his reaction against the prevailing views on this subject as well as his most important contributions to progressive religious thought in America on the subject of freedom as related to man.

President Dwight of Yale University (113) had asserted the fact of freedom of the will, defining sin as selfishness, rejecting imputation and advocating the use of means which had been held to be wicked. All the theologians of the time seemed both to agree and disagree with Edwards and with each other, and all seemed to be inclined to Calvinism. Every step that had

(113) T. T. Munger, "H. Bushnell: Preacher and Theologian," p.39

been made, however, had been retrogressive, and it was not until Dr. N. W. Taylor made his unqualified assertion of the self-determining power of the will that it became apparent that the Armenian postulate had found its way into the citadel of Calvinism. It was into this world of thought that Horace Bushnell presented his theory of man as a supernatural power by virtue of his will.

A. MAN AS A PERSONAL BEING

"The very idea of our personality," says Dr. Bushnell, (114) "is that of a being not under the law of cause and effect, a being supernatural. This one point clearly apprehended, all the difficulties of our subject are at once relieved, if not absolutely and completely removed." These words of Dr. Bushnell state his proposition on the subject in hand. In anticipation that he might be misunderstood, he seeks to prepare his readers by suggesting (115) that there also is a nature in free beings which is regarded "as a motive, cause, or ground of certainty in respect of their actions." He refers to this nature in man as the laws of thought, memory, association and feeling in the human soul, and considers these as being as fixed as the laws governing the heavenly bodies. He maintains, however, that the will is not under the law of cause and effect, and that these functions are, by their laws, in a degree subordinate to the will. Yet, the will, he asserts, thinking of these others in the realm of nature and the will in the realm of the supernatural, is, in turn, affected by them but in nowise do they act

(114) "Nature and Supernatural," p. 25

(115) "Ibid," p. 23

as a causative agency. As the writer states (116), "They are the will's reasons; that in view of which it acts; so that, with a given nature, it may be expected, with a certain qualified degree of confidence, to act thus or thus; but they are never causes on the will, and the choices of the will are never their effects."

Dr. Bushnell seems anxious to make it clear (117) that he does not claim that his view of man as supernatural implies a suspension of the laws of nature. It is only held that men as powers, and not being under the law of cause and effect, are able to "set the causes in nature at work, in new combinations otherwise never occurring, and produce, by our action on nature, results which she, as nature, could never produce by her own internal acting." At another time, the theologian suggests that (118) man, as a human agency, truly may be imagined, in its power over nature, to be sovereign over the process.

The thing that Dr. Bushnell endeavors to make clear, above everything else, is that man is not an item of nature; that is, he is not under the law of cause and effect in his choices. (119) Man stands out clearly as a sovereign and supernatural being, and his definition is, "that he is an original power, acting, not in the line of causality, but from himself." He is not entirely independent of nature in so much that he is separated from it in his actions, for he is in it, surrounded by it, acts through it, and is partially sovereign over it with reference to executing all that he wills in it, but entirely sovereign regarding self-determination. (120) In this connection,

(116) "Ibid," p.23; (117) "Nature and the Supernatural," p.26;
(118) "Ibid," p.27; (119) "Ibid," p.32; (120) "God in Christ," p.98;

Dr. Bushnell goes on to mention that, in certain departments of the soul itself, such as memory, appetite, passion, attention, imagination, association, and disposition, the will of man is limited by the very conditions and qualities which are partially under the laws of cause and effect, and partly subjected to his will by their own laws; so that when man would have any control over them, or make them serve his purpose, he can do so in a qualified sense and degree, by working through their laws. As far as they are concerned, he is pure nature, and is superior to the law of cause and effect in his power of volition at which point his liberty culminates and his administration over his whole nature centers.

With reference to the question about man being restricted in his power of self-determination and, therefore, limited in his executive ability to perform what he wills, more will be said in the following section. At present, reference only is made to some of his thoughts on this theme as related to the subject in hand. "And so," says Dr. Bushnell, (121) "it will be found universally that, however strongly drawn the supposed disadvantages and hindrances to virtue may be, there is, in every mind, a large and positive consciousness of being master of its own choices and responsible for them." Self-determination (122) as related to the will, or power of volition, primarily is indestructible. "It is this gift of power, this originaive liberty" which is the essence of personality and distinguishes the personal in character from that which is natural. Free intelligences (123) are powers, not things, and a power is an agent or force which acts from itself,

(121) "Nature and the Supernatural," p.35; (122) "Ibid," p.36; (123) "Ibid," p.59

without cause, to produce a train of effects. "Powers, acting in liberty, are capable of a double action, to do, or not to do (God, for example in creating man, man in sinning) things can only act in one way, viz., as their law determines." Dr. Bushnell even goes so far as to suggest (124), that God made man as powers and thereby limited His control over them.

In his sermon, "Every Man's Life a Plan of God," Dr. Bushnell suggests (125), that God has a special life-plan for every individual, and that He girds him, consciously, or unconsciously, to do certain things, but man always is able, as a free being, to refuse the thing or place God elects. Such a statement logically brings us to the second section of this chapter.

The purpose of this first section was to show that man is a supernatural power by virtue of his will, and, as such, has the power of self-determination and is responsible for his actions. In his "Work and Play," the writer gives these fitting summarizations: (126) "It is one of the grand distinctions of man, as a free being, that he acts from himself, and not as a being caused to act. On this account, or in virtue of this prerogative, he is responsible." (127) "It has been the great misery of theology, in fact, that it has always been trying to solve the relations of God and man as relations of cause and effect, not perceiving that, while this might be a very good way of accounting for the changes of a dead body, it never is for the changes of a living body, least of all for the actions of a living,

(124) "Ibid," p. 66 and "The New Life," pp. 208, 214; (125) "The New Life," pp. 2, 5; (126) "Work and Play," p. 226; (127) "The New Life," p. 235

choosing man." (128) "In his conscience, man feels the touch of immutable right; by his reason he is made akin to geometry, number, time, space, cause and all necessary ideas; his will is an autocratic force, superior to all conditions."

B. MAN AS A MORAL BEING

Dr. Bushnell really begins his treatise on the theory of freedom, as related to man as a moral being, (129) by making the sentence of consciousness final. He derides the idea of man acting under motives and determined by the strongest motive by suggesting that consciously man is not a fluctuating or inert thing," but a self-terminating agent." (130) Even if man looks for the most powerful motive, the writer asserts, he still is acting as arbitrarily as though he were looking for the weakest, thus differing from Dr. Edwards in his famous treatise on this subject. In fact, the prevailing motive is not necessarily the strongest. Quite likely man never thinks of the superior strength of the motive when making his choice, but merely infers, or speculates about its strength.

Dr. Bushnell elaborates his argument that Dr. Edwards carries the analogy of the "scale-beams," which only can be used in the world of matter into the sphere of mind, and that he is mistaken in his view that human action is determined uniformly by the strongest motive. Dr. Bushnell clearly states (131) "that in all wrong, or blamable actions, we consciously take the weakest motive and the most worthless." Herein lies the real sin of choice, because every reasonable being always should follow the strongest motive,

* (128) "Work and Play," p. 243; (129) "Nature and the Supernatural," p. 28; (130) "Ibid," p. 29; (131) "Ibid," p. 30;

and that motive is eternal good and righteousness. There may be those who will say that the motive that they followed was the strongest, but such appeal to their lusts and passions, and not to their consciousness as reasonable beings should. Furthermore, no thinking person ever has believed that it was the wisest, best and most advantageous thing to try to get the benefits of the wrong choice first and then the right choice later. Dr. Bushnell feels so strongly on this point that he dares to claim (132) that there never was a case of wrong or sinful choice, in which the person concerned really believed that he was choosing the strongest, weightiest, or most valuable motive.

The foregoing view leaves man free in his choice. It does not put him under the law of cause and effect, but under the law of the consciousness of a reasonable being. It does not interfere with the theory of God's foreknowledge, because God does not compute, but intuitively everything. In his own words: (133) "God foreknows everything first conditionally, in the world of possibility, before He creates, or determines anything to be, in the world of fact."

While the will never is restricted in its self-determination, it often is restricted in its executive force or capacity to perform what it wills. The writer enlarges upon this thought by suggesting (134) that "we are under physiological, cerebral limitations; limitations of association, want, condition; limitations of miseducated thought, perverted sensibility, prejudice, superstition; a second nature of evil habit and passion, by which, plainly enough, our capacity of doing or becoming is greatly reduced."

(132) "Nature and the Supernatural," p. 31; (133) "Ibid," p. 31;
 (134) "Ibid," p. 32

After all, is this not the conception we receive from the Christian gospel? Does not the gospel teach that man, in and of himself, is not able to do that which is right and perfect except as he receives power from God?

Let it be known, however, that limiting man's executive ability does not limit his self-determining liberty. Man remains absolutely free as far as his will-power is concerned. Even St. Paul recognized a distinction between volitional self-determination and executive capacity in his Epistle to the Romans, and it is because of this fact that man can be held as a just subject for blame. This is partly true because the capacities, or possibilities of doing, or becoming, have been narrowed by former sin and, in part, for the reason that he does not will the right consciously or struggle after God as he should. Man becomes obligated because of his indebtedness to God and his help from God. (135)

The great truth that Dr. Bushnell is promulgating is the fact that because man is master of his own choices and is responsible for them, (136) there are both virtuous and blame-worthy acts. If man were under the law of cause and effect, he could not be considered as being virtuous or blame-worthy. These attributes then would be applied to the law, or to the things which caused his actions. It is held (137) that man is a creature of faith, and that he as a power, is manageable only in a moral way; that is, (138) "by authority, truth, justice, beauty, that which supposes obligation or command. And this, again supposes

(135) "Nature and the Supernatural," p.33; (136) "Ibid,"p.35ff;
(137) "Ibid," p. 48; (138)"Ibid," p. 65

a consenting obedience, and this a power of non-consent, without which the consent were insignificant." It is suggested that God has planned (139) to reign over His people by such principles as truth, reason, love, want, fear, et cetera, acting upon man's free will; and it is in the fact that man has the right to obey, or disobey that meaning and glory are put into allegiance when man chooses to obey.

Dr. Bushnell speaks of "condition privative" in referring to sin, (140) not as a positive ground, or cause, or necessity of sin; for, as he states, "if there were any natural necessity for sin, it would not be sin." In other words, sin is not the effect of a certain cause, or a necessary fact because of man's nature, but rather is the deliberate choice of his will. (141) The term, "condition privative," is used in referring to "a moral state that is only inchoate or incomplete, lacking something not yet reached, which is necessary to the probable "rejection of evil." This "condition privative" involves the certain lapse into evil, but it does not "produce, infer or make it necessary"; or better, "The condition privative" involves a certain conviction or expectation of the event stated.

In explaining how this "condition privative" works in a free agent, Dr. Bushnell refers first to the law of right (142) which, if man merely thinks, he feels himself eternally bound by it; and man, in choosing wrong, is tempted (143) "not by something positive placed in his way, but by mere condition privative, a perplexing defect of knowledge incident to the fact of his merely begun existence." Thus the writer places man in

(139) "Ibid," p. 68; (140) "Ibid," p. 77; (141) "Nature and the Supernatural," p. 78; (142) "Ibid," p. 80 & "Vicarious Sacrifice," p. 236; (143) "Nature and the Supernatural," p. 82

a position where he must decide between following ideals by which he is "bound" and the desires for knowledge which appeal. The one is the absolute or ideal side of his existence; the other is the contingent or empirical side. Man is guilty if he chooses the latter, even though that desire seems to be the strongest motive; because (144) he is able to choose against the strongest, and he consciously knows that he ought. Thus it seems that Dr. Bushnell denies the value of the theory of the strongest motive completely, and bases all man's actions upon the laws of the highest good, right and love. (145)

Knowing the evil effects of a certain sin will not keep one from committing that same sin a second time. In fact, Dr. Bushnell states (146), "Powers are perfected, or established in their law only by a schooling of their consent." At another time, he says, (147) "Their safety is that, having been dreadfully scorched already by it, they have thoroughly proved what is in it, and extirpated all the fascination of its mystery."

It is not clear whether the writer desires to suggest in this last statement, that after a wrong has been done repeatedly, it no longer appeals, or is a wrong. The former would be the logical conclusion (148), but the question may be raised, is this suggestion true to life? Does not an old wrong become more desirable the oftener it is experienced? As a matter of fact (149), do not some people become slaves to their appetites and lusts after yielding to their appeal the first few times? Furthermore, do not some persons destroy the law of right by continually acting against it? Upon this point, Dr. Bushnell's meaning seems to be

(144) "Ibid,"p.83; (145) "Vicarious Sacrifice,"pp.42,252; (146) "Nature and the Supernatural,"p.59; (147)"Ibid,"p.85; (148)"Nature and the Supernatural,"p.84 ; (149) "Ibid,"p.335;(147)"Work & Play," p.12

somewhat obscure.

He secondly says, in reference to the working of the "condition privative," (150) "It is another condition privative, as regards the moral perfection of powers, that they require empirical training, or course of government, to get them established in the absolute law of duty; and that this empirical training must probably have a certain adverse effect for a time, before it can mature its better results. - - - All the standard ideas require a process or drill, in the field of experience, in order to become matured into characters, or to fashion character in the moulds they supply." With similar words he strives to show that law precedes liberty. Certain duties must be performed and certain things must be done before liberty becomes reality. This is but the New Testament idea of the spirit and the letter of the law, with its solution, in loving Christ. This brings Dr. Bushnell to the third "condition privative" (151) as related to man's security against sin in his social relations of powers. According to the writer, all powers at first are subjected to evil influences which can be prevented finally by the impregnable fortifications of character. Thus it would seem the idea of forgiveness (152) has no meaning unless there is some one to blame who needs forgiveness. To forgive a thing has no meaning and when Mr. Parker (153) speaks of misdirections in connection with sinful actions, he must go one step further and recognize man as a self-determining power and, as such, capable of misdirecting himself and, therefore, guilty. (154) "The transgressor, therefore, is a free power acting against God morally, and physically against the cast of every world and

(150) "Ibid," p.85; (151) "Nature and the Supernatural," p.90; (152) "Ibid," p.118; (153) "Ibid," p.121; (154) "Ibid," p.127 and "Work and Play," p.226

substance of God - acting in or among the worlds and substances as he was not made to act." Sin always disturbs the normal state and has its certain effects upon the soul. It does not destroy the law of the soul, nor does it ruin man's ability, as some theologians (155) seem to think. All the functions of mind and sensibility remain, but are abused, and laws of operation are provoked " to a penal and retributive action." The sad fact of sin is that the will which has committed it cannot of itself repair the damage. Thus, Dr. Bushnell tries to show that the body and soul are a strict unity, and that the harm, which affects one affects the other. He suggests (156) that sin produces a condition of general intemperance. It deletes the power of self-government and seriously disturbs bodily by producing an unnatural state. All this is brought about by the supernatural force, called the human will. (157)

The human will, as has been previously stated, cannot correct, or repair the damage done and it is clear, (158) that the supernatural agency of God in the redemption of the world is needed. There is no remedy in development, or self-reformation. In short, (159) man never can attain true liberty until some power from above takes hold of him and makes him a son of God. So Christ is revealed within the seeker, and the grace of God gives him life and liberty. Man is unable in himself to become what is right before God. God, however, always is ready to help man, and man is guilty when he is not willing to accept the help offered. The normal state of a soul is to be filled with God (160), acted

(155)"Ibid,"p.129; (156)"Nature and the Supernatural," p. 131 and "Vicarious Sacrifice," p. 326; (157)"Nature and the Supernatural," p.166; (158) "Ibid,"p.167; (159) "Ibid,"p.181; (160) "Ibid,"p.182

by God, and held by His will. God, as true virtue, is necessary for all virtue. He is needed because of man's constitution and, in the case of sin, the necessity becomes penal.

The question of man's disability is out of place. It is not a question, "Is he able to free himself from the power of sin?" but "Is he willing to let God into his life?" (161) With God man can do all things, and having the power of God in his life, or at least within his reach, he is responsible according to the power he does, or can, have. Man's ability depends entirely upon his willingness to open himself to the rule of Supreme Power and thus to live. His freedom of the will is simply freedom as a volitional function, and, volitions in themselves cannot regenerate, or constitute character. (162) Holy virtue is a new state and not an act. It is a status from which action may emerge and no exercise of the will can change this state, or determination of the soul, without outside help. It is the will that can offer itself to this outside help from God, and it is only when it so functions that God can instill "a new divine state or principle of action." Man has neither natural or moral ability to regenerate his own state, but he is able to obey God's great moral laws, (163) which act as authority rather than as force. We return to law and are delivered from bondage by accepting the person of Christ and giving ourselves completely to Him. (164) In accepting His person, we keep His commandments, thus finding the liberty of love which fulfills all law. It is the law of the spirit and life of Jesus Christ which makes us free from the law of sin and death.

(161) "Ibid," p.183; (162) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p.424, Vol. 1 and "Nature and the Supernatural," p.184; (163) "Nature and the Supernatural," p.202; (164) "Ibid," p.222, "Vicarious Sacrifice," Vol.1, p.203

In view of the fact that this section is the most important in the thesis, reference is made to some of the outstanding statements made on this subject by the same writer in his other books. In his "Victorious Sacrifice," Vol. 1, page 157 ff., Dr. Bushnell states that God does not accomplish man's salvation in him by fiat-force of omnipotence, because He respects man's will. In His work of regeneration, God may use the "force-principle," (165) as far as it can be used without destroying the personality of man, but to bring about the desired change a power - rather than a force - is necessary, and Christ, in His life, death and resurrection is such a power. Christ is the regenerator of souls (166) not by direct action upon them but by what He is to sight. He draws and wins mankind to something better by His very person.

"Moral Powers," says Dr. Bushnell (167) "supposes the consent of faith-works only by inducement; that is, by impressions, or attractions that may be resisted." Inducement in itself does not win faith or consent until it becomes inspiration. (168) Inspiration bears the soul up into a new world and by making it a Son of God gives it its freedom. The power of justification is felt or experienced when the sinner becomes willing to turn himself over to Christ, thus giving Christ the opportunity to re-create him. (169) The result of trusting of sinner to Saviour demands absolute confidence and produces perfect liberty. (170)

Turning next to Dr. Bushnell's book, "Christ and His Salvation," page twenty-five, we find this thought enlarged. Feeling character and sacrifice take the place of law. Man cannot be

(165) "Vicarious Sacrifice," Vol. 1, p. 168 and "Pulpit Talent," p. 146;
 (166) "Vicarious Sacrifice," Vol. 1, p. 158 and 174; (167) "Vicarious Sacrifice," Vol. 1, p. 403; (168) "Ibid," p. 404 and "New Life," p. 219; (169) (169) "Vicarious Sacrifice," Vol. 1, pp. 423 & 434; (170) "Ibid," p. 435 and 445 - "Vicarious Sacrifice," Vol. 2, p. 217

driven out of sin by some supreme force, but must be led to forsake his sin freely at the call of Christ, and this is done by embracing in trust what in willfulness and ignorance he had rejected. In this way, man becomes dissatisfied with himself as he is more and more won to God. Thus man turns deliberately from the satisfaction he once had in himself to the call of Jesus and finds that that which he thought to be a cross is liberty itself. (171) Even conversion or salvation (172) are made possible by a higher power working in man. In Holy Writ we read, "No man can come to Me, except the Father which hath sent Me draw Him." The work of salvation, however, respects the freedom of the soul by acting in, upon and through its consent. (173) The will cannot manipulate man into holy character, but is needed in the work of salvation. (174) The writer tells a story about a young man who went to a library and found a book entitled, "The Truth of Christianity Demonstrated." Taking the book down, he said, "If this is the truth I ought to believe it and live it and I will." (175) Bushnell calls such an act of the will in response to God's power of influence "Conversion."

"Liberty and discipline, movement from God's centre and movement from our own, sanctified inclination and self-compelling will, are the two great factors thus of Christian life and experience," is a striking way of explaining life in the words of the author. (176) Sometimes, everything seems to go by impulse and inspiration and all life is free; and then at other times "self-compelling discipline of sacrifice and painstaking" (177) are (171) "Christ and His Salvation," p.28; (172) "Ibid," p.65; (173) "Ibid," p.71; (174) "Ibid," p.154; (175) "Ibid," p.172; (176) "Christ and His Salvation," p.178; (177) "Ibid," p.183

needed to regain the grace that was practically lost because of moods of inconstancy and mixtures of evil. In order to place himself back into the gracious relationship with God that he has thus broken, man must purpose or will to order the soul so that God may occupy it and have power over it by inspiration. (178) By performing this act of discipline, man regains his position of liberty. (179) God has made man a responsible being, and he is desirous that man should hold this position of strength and liberty.

In his book, "Sermons on Living Subjects," Dr. Bushnell brings out the same thought on this vital subject. (180) Trusting or believing in God is necessary because man's complete freedom is found in the freedom and sovereignty of God. Religious character is as different from natural character as man's constitution is different from what he does and becomes. Man is responsible for his religious character because it is what the soul's liberty goes after and makes. Surely God is always working in this soul, but only as man wills to heed his presence by willingly serving him. (181)

According to Dr. Bushnell, no one can become a Christian without resting himself in God and thus giving himself over to Him. In fact, the writer goes so far as to say that the person who thus completely forgets himself to be controlled by God will be happy, free and triumphant. To reach this state, we must forget the idea of molding ourselves and be wholly pliant to the will and power of God in faith.

(178) "Ibid," p.185; (179) "Ibid," p.189; (180) "Sermons on Living Subjects," p.60,66,136,137; (181) "God in Christ," p.242

In his sermon, "Duty not measured by our ability," the author states (182) "that men are often, and properly, put under obligation to do that for which they have, in themselves, no present ability--God requires no man to do, without ability to do; but He does not limit His requirement by the measures of previously or inherently contained ability." Apparently in an attempt to answer Jonathan Edwards' theory on natural and moral ability, Dr. Bushnell goes so far as to say that the whole question about natural ability as opposed to moral ability, or qualified by it of gracious ability as a substitute for natural ability, or the equivalent of its restoration -- is a false issue. There is no such thing, and never was, as an ability to holiness, or moral perfection, that is inherent. No one has a natural ability to maintain a state of perfect goodness. Such a state is maintained only by dependence upon God. Saint Paul realized this fact in his Epistle to the Romans. He knew that he could will, but had to depend upon Christ to be and do. In other words, obligation is measured by the power that God will give through faith, and not by inherent ability.

The following concise summary statement for this section is found in Dr. Bushnell's book, "Work and Play," (183): "And yet how evident is it that religion is the only element of perfected freedom and greatness to a soul; for here alone does it finally escape from self, and come into the perfect life of play." This theme is enlarged upon in an article entitled, "Spiritual Economy of Revivals of Religion." (184)

(182) "Sermons on the New Life," p. 253; (183) p. 34; (184) "The Quarterly Christian Spectator," Vol. 10, 1838, p. 141 and "Vicarious Sacrifice," Vol. 1, pp. 42, 48

In this article, the writer seems to hold that the Christian is bound by God's law at all times. God always is faithful and the Christian being under the great principle of love, is under obligation and bound. Thus one sees that the only true theory of freedom, according to Dr. Bushnell, (185) is the theory of determinism.

C. MAN AS A SOCIAL BEING

This section finds its place at the conclusion of the chapter on Man, so that it may serve not only its own purpose, but also as an introduction to the chapter which follows. The theme for this section is found in these words: (186) "How different the condition realized where men are propagated as a race or races: Then are they linked together by a necessary constituent, anticipative love. Moved by this love, the progenitors are immediately set to a work of care and benefaction beautifully opposite to the proper selfishness of their sin." Again we find love as a principle, essentially vicarious, governing our lives in society as well as in religion. Love makes it necessary for the lover to enter into the suffering of the loved. (187) The principle of vicarious sacrifice is universal (188) and somehow has its effect upon all social beings. Man always is a self-determining being, but what he determines is effected by his social contact, and particularly by his feeling for and with his fellowman.

In his article, "The kingdom of Heaven as a Grain of Mustard Seed," (189) Dr. Bushnell suggests another way by which man's freedom is effected. His own statement is, "Character is a power

(185) M.B.Cheney, "Life and Letters of H. Bushnell, p. 192; (186) "Nature and Supernatural," p. 136; (187) "Vicarious Sacrifice," pp. 42, 68 - Vol. 1; (188) "Ibid," pp. 103, 116, 225; (189) "The New Englander," Vol. 2 - 1844, p. 613

over man, to influence their feeling and command their homage. Christian character, in this view of it, is that which by principle and worth and beauty of feeling in one man, approves itself to another, and becomes a controlling and assimilative power over him." In this statement, it is clear that a man's actions will be influenced by the people with whom he associates. This principle may be seen in the practice of hero-worship. Even those who claim that they are not affected by hero-worship nevertheless are influenced by certain strong characters. This influence may enter their lives unconsciously, but is certain of its effect. Too often we think that influence is possible only when conscious and directed. (190x) In the organic unity of the family, and in a real sense of social and national life, there is an unconscious influence. The bond which unites parent with child, teacher with student, captain with soldier, saint with patron, is so intimate that the character, feeling, spirit and principle of the one enters into the life of the other, whether or not they so will it.

Thus this section brings us to the chapter on "The Theory of Freedom as Related to Society." The principle of love, the power of character and the influence of fellowship all affect man's freedom, the present study holding that Bushnell's treatment of these facts is a valuable contribution to progressive religious thought in America.

D. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER IV

Man as a supernatural power is not under the law of cause and effect but acts from himself. Man is a self-determining being

(190x) "Christian Nurture," p. 58

by virtue of his will, and as such is responsible for his relation to God and man. If man merely does what a certain cause makes him do, then there would be nothing virtuous or blame-worthy in his acts. The virtue is in the fact that he chooses to do that which is right, rather than that which is wrong. Social relationships do influence his choice. The only state in which man can find absolute freedom is the state in which discipline has made his desires the will of God.

CHAPTER V

THEORY OF FREEDOM AS RELATED TO SOCIETY

As suggested in the preceding section, there are many factors in social life which have a very definite effect upon man's freedom. Nurture and organic relationships, social contacts and influences, governments and covenants, laws and ideals all are related to the theory of freedom. Individualism, in the sense of one being entirely and absolutely separated from others, is not a reality. (190)

A. FREEDOM AND NURTURE

Dr. Bushnell's little book, "Christian Nurture," will be the guiding text for this chapter. The relationship of parent to child is first treated. In this relationship, there is a certain law of organic connection. This connection is seen in the fact that the religion of the parent usually is the religion of the child. (191) In a sense, the character of the one actually is included in the character of the other. The small child is almost completely under the influence of his parent. His will is theirs, until he passes out of this state of dependence, through different agencies, to the state of independence and self-possession. This separation is gradual and never is perfectly complete, for the parent always has an organic power over the child.

In speaking of virtue, the writer suggests (192) that it rather is a state of being than an act, or series of acts; and a person may be prepared for such a state by causes prior to his own (190) "Christian Nurture," p.16; (191) "Ibid," p.14; (192) "Ibid," p.17

will. The struggle for such a person, then, is to maintain the state by his own will. Virtue is dependent upon will-power, whatever the state of man may be.

All society is organic and the church, the state, the school and the family are organisms possessing a spirit peculiar to themselves. The spirit more or less is hostile or favorable to religious character and, to some extent at least, sovereign over the individual. Much power in the so-called revival of religion is organic, but no less divine. The child, of course, is more under the sway of organic laws, but all men are in its grip. No man can live wholly within and from himself. Individualism per se has been overemphasized and the existence of organic laws has not received the attention it deserves. That children almost entirely are under the wills of their parents is admitted generally, but very few writers on the subject of freedom bring this theory into practical life as Dr. Bushnell has done. It is true that some apparently good Christian parents have unchristian children, but it is suggested that such parents are not really as good Christians as they appear to be (193). Then, too, such children may have been affected more by social contacts than by the organic laws of family. The life of parents, friends and associates are so closely interwoven in the child that it is difficult to state where the influence of one begins or ends. The fact cannot be denied that society has some sovereignty.

Granting or holding that God will help both parent and child, (194) with due respect for the freedom of both, to the

(193)"Ibid," p.29; (194) "Ibid," p. 20

highest state of holy virtue, it must be remembered that the Scriptures suggest (195) that, in a very real sense, the character of the child is derivative from the parent. In other words, the Christian parent has in his character a germ with power, presumptively to reproduce itself in the child. Outside hindrance or Divine Providence make this uncertain, however.

In speaking of regeneration in infant baptism (196) Dr. Bushnell states that it is not actual, but only presumptive and that its reality depends upon the organic laws of family and church; namely, holy living, duty and gracious example. The child does not choose the rite for himself, but the parent, having him, as it were, in his own life, is granted the confidence that his faith and character will be reproduced in the child. Nothing need be said to show how such views would affect the freedom of parent and child. Sincere parents have high ideals for their children and often refrain from doing certain things, not because of themselves, but because of their example. Certainly the individual, as a free moral agent is responsible for his own acts, but relationship to others involves him in the acts of others. In a sense, power of parent over child might be classed under the law of simple contagion. (197) Under this law might be considered acts of will, under parental direction, which involve results of character. The atmosphere of the home becomes an integral part of the life of those who dwell therein, even though the parents may not be agreed. Inversely, it is true that outside influences come into the home and change the character of the child from that of the parent. So we never are completely individual enough to be free from organic connections (195)"Ibid,"pp.22 &24; (196)"Ibid,"p.28; (197) "Ibid," pp.56 & 58

which affect our character. In one sense, we are individuals acting from our own wills. In another sense, we are parts of a whole, or members of a body.

The same principle is carried out in the life of nations. A few leaders make the others do what they will. One generation is the natural offspring of another, and often not only natural but even acquired qualities are passed on by transmission. This is true of a race as well as a family. Man always is affected by those with whom he lives and from whom he receives life. These organic connections may be called the "organic workings" of the family, or race. (198) Bushnell even goes so far as to say, (199) "Qualities of education, habit, feeling, and character have a tendency to grow in, by long continuance, and become thoroughly inbred in the stock."

The nurture of the soul and character is synchronous with that of the body and therefor prenatal. (200) Admitting that the child has a will (201), Dr. Bushnell holds that it cannot become a responsible will until it has become acquainted with the laws, limits and conditions of choice.

In his "Nature and the Supernatural," the writer definitely asserts that since the world is a (202) "moral economy, and is so arranged, under its laws, that retribution follows at the heels of all sin---the aspects of human society and the world are, to a considerable degree, determined." Man, of course, has a will with which he can place himself in the power of God and thus keep himself from sinning and even from suffering retribution.

(198) "Ibid," p.67; "Nature and Supernatural," p.136; (199) "Christian Nurture," p.130; (200) "Christian Nurture," p.148; (201) "Ibid," p.157; (202) "Ibid," p.124; ("Nature and Supernatural," p.178) N. 22.

(203)

Nevertheless, it is true that, under the physiological terms of propagation, society falls as a unit and evil becomes in a sense organic. Society is not a machine, but a supernatural organism with one power acting upon another. (204)

This brings the present section to its last point, namely: Man's organic connection with God. God is more than the totality of the personalities of society. Man, as a supernatural being has a spiritual union with God. Much has been said about man's relation to God in the preceding chapter. Suffice it to add that experience verifies that the supreme supernatural power gives the strength that is necessary for man to overcome the powers of his organic connections in the social world. In a sense, God is the light in the minds that know Him, the life in the hearts that love Him, and the strength in the wills that serve Him. Being this, He works, through individuals, upon society at large, or upon society per se through some natural or supernatural methods. Thus, it is evident that the life of society is more or less controlled by the organic connections within itself and its union to the supernatural power, called "God."

B. FREEDOM AND ENVIRONMENT

The text for this section is found in Dr. Bushmell's "Moral Uses of Dark Things," (205) "Nobody, in fact, believes, speculate as he may, that circumstances or society does everything in us and we nothing." Nevertheless, the environment in which we live has a very definite effect upon our freedom. In this connection, patriotism and the spirit of religious revivals in a nation and

(203) "Ibid," p. 138

(204) "Ibid," p. 320; "Pulpit Talent," p. 115

(205) ~~"Ibid,"~~ p. 187

community, influence people to do certain things which they would not do under absolutely independent circumstances.

(206) All organic bodies, such as states, churches, sects and armies have a spirit of their own, which somewhat regulates their lives and distinguishes them from others. "We use this word spirit," says Dr. Bushnell, (207) "in such cases, to denote a power interfused, a comprehensive will actuating the members, regarding also the common body itself, as a larger and more inclusive individual." Every member of a gang places himself under limitations as far as desire is concerned. Every member of an organization is dominated by the leading spirit. In each case, the man remains a free agent and may choose what he wishes but his associations change his desires. Instead of choosing selfishly, he elects to act for the good of the whole. In other words, the organization, or organism, make him act differently than he would if he were not a part of a body. In a like manner, a parent limits his actions by becoming a parent. In this connection, Dr. Bushnell has this to say, (208) "Now, there is a perpetual working in the family, by which the wills both of the parents and the children are held in exercise, and which, without any design to affect character on one side, or conscious consent on the other, is yet fashioning results of moral quality, as it were, by the joint industry of the house."

The preceding statement is found to be true in modern life. As the father acts, his young son acts, and every conscientious father will choose to do the things that are best for all concerned, rather than those that he personally may most desire. Often, he

may do this unconsciously. A child's behavior is affected by the attitude of his parents. The life of the family is so closely interwoven that it is impossible to overestimate the power of the one over the other. The axiom, "Actions speak louder than words," is a truism pregnant with meaning. The author is so positive on this point that he makes this statement: (209) "Any people that is physiologically advanced in culture, though it be only in a degree beyond another which is mingled with it on strictly equal terms, is sure to live down and finally live out its inferior. Nothing can save the inferior race but a ready and pliant assimilation."

In a similar way, Dr. Bushnell continues to speak of so-called organized and unorganized groups (210) as being made up of souls born of the spirit, thus making a supernatural order in humanity, a spiritual nation. He definitely asserts that good and righteousness will be victorious. The great problem of existence for man is to attain the state of perfection of liberty by training his choice or consent as powers so that they are in complete harmony with God's will and character. (211) In this state, man's will is God's will and God's glory, man's glory. "Persons or powers are creatures, we have seen, who act, not by causality, but by consent; they must, therefore, be set in conditions that invite consent, and treated also in a manner that permits the caprices of liberty."

This training of consent and perfecting of liberty in the issues of character is a preparation for society and (212) "A drill-practice in the principles of society; that is, in truth

(209) "Christian Nurture," p.133; (210) "Ibid," p.140; (211) "Nature and Supernatural," p.70; (212) "Nature and the Supernatural," p.71

in purity, in justice , in patience, forgiveness, love, all the self-renouncing and beneficent virtues. Accordingly, the course of training will itself be social; a trial under, in and by society. The powers will be thrown together in terms of duty as being terms of society, and in terms of society as being terms of duty. Morality and the law of religion respect society and a condition of social well-being, which is the grand felicity of powers. Things have no society or capacity of social relations.--- Love, benefit, sympathy, injury, hatred, thanks, blame, character, worship, faith, all that constitutes the reality of society, whether of men with God or of men with each other, belongs to the fact that we are consciously powers."

Man's will always is respected by God in His system for society, but man's freedom likewise is affected by his relation to God and his fellowmen. God acts upon every member of society and society in turn, influences its individual parts. A race or group may break away from God's control and sin, as well as an individual. As God deals with man, so He deals with society. Man is a power and society is an order of powers, (213) and God does not use force in dealing with either.

Reference is made to virtue and blame only as they are found in one person as he is related in his actions to others. (214) Man reaches the state of virtue by living with others. He is not born perfect. He is made perfect by dwelling with others in the power of God. (215) A supernatural, or superior influence, aid, or power is necessary to keep society from deteriorating "under

(213) "Ibid," p. 74; (214) "Ibid," p. 110; (215) "Ibid," p. 172

the penal mischiefs of sin."

In conclusion, Dr. Bushnell emphasizes the fact that man is a social being and, as such, cannot think of his separate entity. That he is responsible to God for his life as an individual is admitted, but all society is organic and there is a spirit in each organization which is peculiar to itself and a kind of power over those in it. The idea of federal headship and original and imputed sin is made understandable by thinking of man as a supernatural power in a social organism. He is responsible to God as a power and related to man in the continuity of life. Every church, nation and society has a common life beside individual existences. That which happens to a part will affect the whole and that which mars the whole will influence the parts. This is admitted to be true by such an authority as Dr. Charles Hodge. (216)

Thus it is evident that surroundings in which men live partially control their actions. The influence of heredity and environment are subjects of frequent debate, and no attempt is made to show which is the superior strength. Because of the organic connections in all social life, the conclusion is reached that the spirit of the whole is reflected in the parts and that the attitude of the parts is evident in the life of the whole.

C. FREEDOM AND GOVERNMENT

Every society has some form of government, and each form of government affects the freedom of those under its sway. Even the family has a system of government which rules by binding and losing power (217) over the moral nature of its subjects.

Legislation is the enactment of laws which morally bind the

(216) "The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review," Vol. 19, 1847, p. 502
(217) "Christian Nurture," p. 205

authority of the subjects. (218) The freedom of the minority is curtailed by the vote of the majority. There is no law enacted which does not seem to interfere with some one's sense of liberty. There are those who measure their sense of liberty only in terms of appetite and, others, in terms of lusts. In every state there is a great concilium, or republic of wills, each of which acts for himself but can be trained, governed and so turned about that finally it is (219) "brought into the harmony of the consenting choice and a common love and character. The system will be one that systematizes the caprices and discords of innumerable wills and works results of order through endless complications of disorder; having, in this fact, its real wisdom and magnificence."

The thing that Dr. Bushnell emphasizes, (220) with reference to freedom and government, is the fact that some system of government, some system of law observance, must precede every form of liberty. In an army, the common soldier must heed the command of his captain until he becomes so full of the spirit of his leader that commands become desires and thus liberty. Attendance at school is obedience to law and order until the child learns to love his work at school, and then it becomes liberty. So, we might continue to refer to incidents of law becoming liberty. Government is necessary because wrong is certain (221), and every moral regimen set up in souls (222) "must begin with law, or imposed obligation; no matter whether it be only pronounced in the conscience, or outwardly also in a revelation."

(218) "Nature and Supernatural," p. 12; (219) "Nature and Supernatural," p. 69; (220) "Ibid," p. 87; (221) "Ibid," p. 116; (222) "Ibid," p. 290

In his "Vicarious Sacrifice," the author suggested (223) that holy virtue is made possible by free obedience to law. In other words, law must come before virtue. Drills and observances long enough enforced may produce ideas and inspirations which help the soul to seize in liberty that which it bowed down to in fear. "This holds true of every man, and, in a certain broader sense, historically of a people or a world."

Dr. Bushnell makes conscience the law before government (224) and the throne of government for all, in so much as God has given man a moral nature. Obedience to this law of conscience forms a complete society.

Possible disobedience, (225) and man's imperfections, (226) make God's system of instituted government and man's adherence to law absolutely necessary to help man to perfection and to permit social life. "In moral life," (227) says the author, "there is no government but self-government; no conservation but self-conservation. Things are governed and conserved by their laws; but men, moral agents, are conservable not by moral laws, but only by their own free choice under such laws, in a way of obedience."

Thus it is evident that government or laws in themselves, do not make men perfect. Only as man chooses to obey law will he find perfect liberty. (228) The moral laws mentioned do acknowledge God's power over and in man by making his obedience possible. Obedience to law only is possible as God gives man strength in answer to his asking. The experience of liberty is

(223)"Vicarious Sacrifice,"Vol.1,p.64;(224)"Vicarious Sacrifice," Vol.1,p.238; (225)"Ibid,"p.261; (226)"Ibid,"p.70; (227)Moral Uses of Dark Things,"p.142 (228)"Nature and the Supern'l,"p.290 (225) also: "Nature and the Supernatural,"p.290

obtainable only through obedience of law. This is a theme that the writer emphasizes.

- In other writings, Dr. Bushnell suggests (229) that precision which is only a way of steering the soul precisely and faithfully into God's inspirations is but the necessary condition of liberty. No man ever keeps the way of liberty in a heedless, hap-hazard life. In a sense, law is necessary until perfection is attained.

In a similar way, law and commandment are shown to be the only way to liberty and holy character in his "Forgiveness and Law." (230) The spontaneous homage a child pays to his mother is pure liberty and has no legal element in it save the law which has made him free. The highest state of liberty exists where the law is obeyed by desire, or habit, and not by enforcement. "The grand analogy of letter and spirit, law and liberty, or law and free commandment, runs through all the organic discipline of life and society." (231)

In any phase of life, fixed routine of duties and rules must be heeded to attain, or maintain liberty. Even in the sacred experience of prayer, one must establish routine before he prays in liberty. In successive enduring of hardships, one finds surcease. Practice under force or obligation is a similar pathway to freedom. (232) This pathway may be considered habit-formation, but, nevertheless, is one way to freedom.

In a religious sense, society may be under definite commandments, but is not forced to obey. Although free to obey, or

(229) "Christ and His Salvation," p.150; (230) cf. p.116, 123ff.;
(231) "Forgiveness and Law," p. 129; (232) "Sermons on Living Subjects," p.320

disobey, perfect freedom is the state of natural obedience.

(233) "Liberty is not the being let alone," says Dr. Bushnell, "or allowed to have everything our own way. If it were, the wild beasts would be more advanced in it than all states and peoples. No, there is no proper liberty but under rule and in the sense of rule.---Spiritual liberty is being in such drill under Christ's commandments, that it has no longer any thought of cost or consequences."

What is said of spiritual liberty, can be said of civil, or social, liberty. The closer society is to God the greater will be its freedom. In fact, Dr. Bushnell goes so far as to say, (234) "And as what we do as right is always free, we shall grow more free as the centuries pass 'til perhaps, even government itself may lapse in the freedom of a righteousness consummated in God." "If civil laws are the result of conscience and conscience is the summit of our nature where it touches God" (235), then the author's optimism should become a reality as man progresses toward God. Such a state might be reached if every Christian family were a little church, consecrated to Christ, as Dr. Bushnell suggests, (236) and wholly influenced and governed by His rules.

Thus the conclusion is reached that law, or government, will be necessary until society has reached a state in which serving God is life. True respect for man is based upon pure reverence for God. In other words, the existence of society depends upon its valuation of life, and this is determined in

(233) "Ibid," p. 408, 410; (234) "Pulpit Talent," p. 239 and "Work and Play," p. 129; (235) "Pulpit Talent," p. 211; (236) "Christian Nurture," p. 120

proportion to the recognition society gives to the supreme law - the law of God, the law of love and mutual helpfulness. Only when this law has possession of the hearts and minds of people will there be true freedom.

D. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER FIVE

Society is an organic unity and, as such, life of one generation is dependent upon another. Social nurture has its effects upon the life of individuals. What affects society as a whole influences its parts. The spirit of the home finds expression in the life of the child. Environment is a powerful force in the formation of character. Parents are limited in their actions because of their influence and children are guided in their thinking by others. Law is the one road to liberty and rules are necessary to maintain liberty. Government becomes unnecessary when living in God is realized.

CHAPTER VI

THEORY OF FREEDOM AS RELATED TO NATURE

To those not familiar with the works of Horace Bushnell, this chapter may seem unnecessary, but to those who know the emphasis which he places upon the distinction between the supernatural and the natural, between God and man as powers and the world of nature as things, this chapter is essential.

Nature, as related to the theory of freedom, will be treated as its freedom is affected by higher powers and its own laws, as well as it affects the freedom of the higher powers. Nature and the supernatural work in and upon each other. While nature may be regarded as a system within itself and the supernatural a realm under its own rules, the laws of the one react upon the realities of the other.

A. LAWS IN NATURE

Dr. Bushnell classifies all things in the realm of nature and all powers in the realm of the supernatural. Things are under the laws of cause and effect while powers are self-determining agents. As suggested before, the word, nature, is a future participle and, as such, implies the thought of being or becoming. A part of nature is in the process of becoming. In fact, the whole of things, called nature, has (237) "a definite futurity, a fixed law of coming to pass, such that, given the thing, or whole of things, all the rest will follow

(237) "Nature and the Supernatural," p. 20

by inherent necessity." In other words, the system of nature is a realm of being, or substance, which is obligated by its own laws.

In a sense, the laws of nature may be the will of God inasmuch ~~as~~ God has instituted the laws. (238) God, having motivated the system, and given the first cause, is responsible partially for the acts. As the writer himself states, (239) "If we say, with some, that the laws are but another name for the immediate actuating power of God, still it makes no difference, in any other respect, with our conception of the system. It is yet as if laws, the powers, the actings, were inherent in the substances, and were by them determined. It is still to our scientific, separated from our religious, contemplation, a chain of causes and effects, or a scheme of orderly succession, determined from within the scheme itself."

Thus the realm of nature was made the world of substance under laws of cause and effect. In a sense, that world is determined by what it is. Supernatural powers, however, can act upon nature, although, perhaps, they never suspend the laws of nature. Dr. Bushnell goes so far as to intimate that, while mechanical laws make disorder impossible, "the malign action of powers" may cause disorder. (240) It is not held that sin is able to destroy the laws of nature. These laws remain even in and under sin. Nevertheless, (241) sin can produce a new combination," which is, to the ideally perfect state of nature, what disorder is to order, deformity to beauty, pain to peace." To produce this combination, force is exerted upon the material world and true natural laws. In his "Vicarious Sacrifice," (242) the writer expresses a similar thought in speaking of disease as going with sin. A cut will

(238)"The New Englander, 1854, p. 497; (239)"Nat. and Super." p. 38; (240) "Ibid," p. 59; (241)"Ibid," p. 123; (242) cf., vol. 1, p. 134

cause pain and bloodshed. A body left to itself cannot change these conditions. So-called natural consequences are held to be determinations of God's mind in the same sense that the laws of nature are actions of forces representing His will. (243)

It is not held that Dr. Bushnell's view of the chain of cause and effect is something new. His application of it as applying only to the realm of nature, however, differs from Jonathan Edwards' view. Even the performance of miracles is not a process of suspending law, but rather, acting upon it. (244) The Christian scheme of redemption as a remedy for sin is in itself a miracle. (245) "Wholly compatible with nature; involving no breach of her laws, or disturbance of their systematic action.---Nature is subjected by her laws, both to God's activity and to ours, to be thus acted on and varied in her operation by the new combinations or conjunctions of causes they are able to produce."

Thus the conclusion is reached that nature is bound by her laws. There is no freedom in the world of nature except the freedom in obedience to law. Natural laws are held to be forces representing actions of God's will. This view makes God initially supreme over nature. Powers cannot suspend, or defraud the laws of nature, but they can act upon and through them.

B. INFLUENCES ON NATURE.

That supernatural powers and even sin influence the workings of nature already has been suggested. The purpose of this section, however, is to note more carefully just how these outside powers

(243) "The New Englander," 1854, p.497; (244) "Nature and the Supern'l," p.193; (245) "Ibid," p.192; (246) "Ibid," p. 26ff

act upon nature.

In a very definite sense, man is in nature, is really a part of it (246) and is sovereign only partially over it. As a power, however, he is able to act through and upon nature and thus becomes an influence. The writer refers to the pistol and gunpowder as both belonging to nature, but brought together into a new combination by man so that they are made to do things that they could never do in, or of, themselves. For the gunpowder to explode when put in juxtaposition with fire is natural, but for it to be put next to the combustion that is caused by a pistol, is unnatural. Again, in the building of a ship, or other mechanical device, materials are made to do things that they could not do in their own state of freedom. In the very act of throwing a ball, or stone into the air, the law of gravity is acted upon, but not suspended.

(247) Dr. Bushnell goes farther, saying: (248) "That nature, ~~has~~ as a realm of cause and effect, is made to be acted on from without by us and all moral beings, thus to be the environment of our life, the instrument of our activity, the medium of our right or wrongdoing toward each other, and so the school of our trial."

That God, as the highest of all powers, can act upon nature by force is taken for granted. It is held (249) that science has proven without the shadow of doubt, that fresh creations have been produced upon the successive races of living forms by a power outside of nature and above it, acting upon it. In the process of creation, God acts upon nature and her laws and forces. Creating is not unnatural, but supernatural. It is not merely the bringing together of the things of nature into new combinations,

(246) See Page 85; (248)-----

(247) "Nature and the Supernatural," p. 38; cf. "Ibid," p. 124; (249) "Ibid," p. 56

but the bringing into nature and her processes of new things. This same thing is true of miracles. A power operates upon the chain of cause and effect from without the chain (250). In this view, Dr. Bushnell was ahead of his day. His idea is becoming the modern theory of Christian creative evolution. Nature works in and of itself, but also is operated upon continuously by powers from without.

Returning to the author's definition of sin, it is evident that it concerns man's relationship to his God. Sin is man's unwillingness to obey Him. By nature, things are perfect; man, by willing disobedience, makes them imperfect. He disrupts the course of nature, unsettles the apparent harmony of things and thus brings about an unnatural state. Sin can change the action of natural causes, produce different conjunctions and thus alter results. (251) The laws continue to act as before, but the sin committed changes the combinations subject to their action, and thus the order of their workings. In this way, it is evident that supernatural agents are sovereign, in part, over the actions of nature without removing her laws. Powers enforce submissions and thus produce an unnatural state. "Sin mars the body, the soul, society, the world, all time before and after." (252)

The fact of sin makes necessary a supernatural system of government, in which man is a self-determining agent that can be acted upon by God. The writer says that (253) "It is an economy supernatural, that shall complement the disorder and fall of nature, having power to call back its currents of penal misery, and bring out souls into the established liberty and beauty of holiness."

(250)"Ibid,"p.261; (251)"Nature and the Supernatural,"p123; (252) "Ibid,"p.166; (253) "Ibid,"p. 166

This system is called the system of "grace and mercy." It does not, in any way, revoke the natural law of justice. (254)

Man's will can be responsible for breaking an egg, but it cannot mend it. So, too, man's will is responsible for disobeying God's commandments, but man cannot restore himself to holiness. Man's sinning sets the causes of nature in courses of retributive action, (255) and when God redeems man a force can be seen to have entered into nature from without. The supernatural powers called man, are acted upon by God. The so-called supernatural system acts upon the natural to produce certain effects which will be beneficial to the higher system. To elucidate, the highest supernatural system, as seen in the special puissance of God, in a new creation, or in His system of redemption, do influence the workings of nature. Likewise, the freedom of man's will has its effect upon the natural order. "Nature may be to Him (God) a kind of continuous creation," states the author, (256) "coalescing, as it flows from His will, in a common stream with His supernatural action, and crystallizing with it in the unity of His end."

In a letter, written by Dr. Bushnell to Dr. C. A. Bartol, of Boston, (257) the writer suggests that there is much more of supernaturalism in the governing of the world than orthodoxy has begun to suspect. There is "a systematic, world-ruling, nature-redeeming, supernaturalism; therefore, such as may aspire to separate sins (in pardon) from the damnation of mere nature, and the causative hell that nature contains or addas as a destiny to sin."

Nevertheless, nature is a realm, the system of which becomes

(254) "Vicarious Sacrifice," Vol. 1, p.283; (255) "Nature and the Supernatural," p. 268; (256) "Nature and the Supernatural," p.268; (257) T. T. Munger, "HBushnell, Preacher and Theologian," p.142

a symbol in its development of the regulative mind of God. Where the forces of nature fail, there God enters. Rejecting a moral law, by moral agents, starts a train of natural consequences which institute discipline and retribution. Disease, disorder, pain, compose what is called the "fall of man." (258) "The penal train is a run of justice, and the run is downward even forever; for it is inconceivable that disorder should ever of itself beget order." Likewise, it is inconceivable to think of man who has broken up the orderly state of nature, as able to will it back to perfection. To disturb nature is quite different from restoring it. It is impossible to think of a restored state without the help of a Supreme Being.

Dr. Bushnell continues on the subject by asserting that the spiritual training of free moral agents established the certainty of sin. Thus the supernatural became a necessity in God's scheme of economy to overcome sin. To quote, (259) "This again is the same, it will be seen, as to say that God will institute and actuate two realms of forces, a kingdom of nature and a kingdom of grace; for as we have seen that nature is the presiding will of God, so also must the supernatural be; and then, the perfection, or completeness of God's economy will consist in the orderly comprehension of both, under harmonizing principles of law and reason, which are clear to Him, but only imaginable to us."

So it is shown that God is the supreme influence and mind in nature and the supernatural. Powers can interfere with, disturb and partially control, nature but only God can restore it. In the absolute sense, nature is not a system in and of itself. Powers from the supernatural system act through and upon it. The

(258) "The New Englander," Vol. 12, 1854, p.497; (259) "The New Englander" Vol.12, 1854, p.497

supernatural contains the ends and final causes for which the natural exists and to which it is made subservient. (260)

To summarize, it might be said that God and man are supreme in the government of the universe. Natural consequences are regarded as determinations of the Supreme Mind. Things are brought into new relationships with each other, thus being forced to do that which is unnatural. Only a moral agent can commit sin and sin disturbs the order and harmony of nature. Neither man nor nature can restore itself; therefore, the kingdom of grace and mercy finds a place in God's system of world government.

C. WORKS OF NATURE

There are very few works of nature that are wholly so. All those things which are brought about by the action of supernatural powers upon the processes, or laws, of nature have divergent causes. There are many apparent works of nature which are produced by acts from without, and should be regarded as supernatural (261), rather than as natural. Infact, Dr. Bushnell, having put things in the realm of nature, goes so far as to assert, (262) that things exist and only act in and by the impulsion of the absolute force, or fiat of omnipotence. (263) "If the sun darkens, "he holds," or the earth shudders with Christ in His death, that sympathy of nature is just as appropriate for Him as it is for us, that our skin should blush or our eye distill its tears when our guilt is upon us, or our repentances dissolve us. It is not cause and effect that blushes or that weeps, but it is that cause and effect are touched by sentiments which connect with our (260)"The New Englander," Vol. 17, 1859, p.230; (~~260~~) "Nature and the Supernatural,"p. 254; (261)"Nature and the Supernatural,"p.21; (262) "Ibid," p. 60; (263) "Ibid,"p. 269

freedom. Nature blushes and weeps, because she was originally submitted so far to our freedom, or made to be touched by our actions, but she could not even to eternity raise a blush or a tear of contrition if we did not command her."

The preceding quotation has been given in full because it is held that the view therein expressed, with reference to the reactions of nature at the time of Christ's crucifixion, is new. The suggestion that nature acts in response to man's condition is not recorded in other writings. As a consequence of sin, the retributive causes of nature do produce disease and disorder. (264) This idea is brought out in the Epistle to the Romans, when Saint Paul speaks of the groaning and travailing of nature, because of sin. Dr. Bushnell says (265) "That everything up to the stars, the whole realm of causes, is arranged to be, in some sense, the executive organ of God's moral retributions."

Works of nature thus are regarded as being the result or effect of one cause, namely, sin. References are made, at different times, to works of nature caused by sin. It is not maintained that, if the realm of nature were left to itself, God would not work upon and through it. The theory of creative evolution indicates that He does this very thing. In other words, sin is not the only way by which the works of nature are affected.

A grain of wheat put into the ground and receiving sunlight and water, will produce wheat. The growth may be regarded as the work of nature, but the planting of grain in the work of man and the sending of sunlight and water is the work of God. In this sense, the two systems work together to produce good. Another

(264)"Vicarious Sacrifice,"Vol.1,p.360; (265) "Ibid,"p.385

illustration: Water, left to itself, only will flow down hill. Supernatural powers, however, can force water to go up hill, thus changing the works of nature, not by sin, but for service. Works of nature are limited by the works of God and man.

Turning to another view of the works of nature, it is found that even the supernatural power, called man, is not sovereign. There are times when man's freedom is affected by the works of nature, and when nature seems to have freedom in doing the things she does, the author refers to certain (266) "terrible powers" which work in awful ways about us, at times overtaking and destroying man. In this connection, it is held that this is so because nature must work in obedience to her fixed laws. A river's banks can hold back only a certain amount of water and when they are taxed to retain more, they cannot do so. Floods are the results, and nature is blamed. Certain weather conditions (267) make men do things, that they had not willed to do. Earthquakes, storms and other revolting elements are incorporated in the works of nature and force man to change his plans. Wild animals, birds and insects make man their prey and destroy each other. Again, plagues and pestilences, which may be considered the effects of sin, (268) come upon the free agent, man, against the dictates of his will. Thus, it is evident that the works of nature are limited within themselves and definitely condition the liberty of man.

In speaking of the works of nature as being produced in accord with certain laws, and in response to supernatural powers acting upon these laws, Bushnell recognizes the difficulty of

(266) "Moral Uses of Dark Things," p. 139

(267) "Moral Uses of Dark Things," p. 240; (268) "Ibid," p. 274

making man's will and the sovereignty of God responsible for all the works of nature. These works are both good and bad and a good God cannot produce anything bad. Again it must be remembered that it is the system that makes the bad possible, or permissible, and not God who produces it. "Insects and animals" (269) affirms the writer, "are all the outfit and furniture of a moral system. - They belong to the revelation and fit discipline of evil, being symbols, physical analogies, such as draw their type from man, and not from the beauty and goodness of God.---They have all received their law (in God) and came forth, in their time, to work with Him in the sad but really wild and terribly sublime history of life."

So the conclusion is suggested in the words that the works of nature are used to accomplish God's eternal purpose for the world. They are limited by God, man and their own laws. God works through nature to teach man, and at such times man is not sovereign over nature. Nature definitely makes man do things contrary to his own plans. The will of man may be changed by the works of nature, and his liberty is affected.

D. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER VI

Again it is found that freedom is possible for nature, as for society, man and Christ, only when her freedom is God's favor. God has instituted a set of laws which regulate the systematic actions of nature. These laws are the forces which represent God's will, or the determinations of His mind. God, and even man, however, can disturb the laws, but cannot destroy

(269) "Ibid," p. 344

or suspend them. They may be acted upon in such a way that new combinations are produced and thus effects changed. Sin changes the actions of nature in this way. It makes out of order, disorder; harmony, discord. Disease and pain are the results of sin, or man's power over nature. Man, as a moral agent, can mar nature, but cannot restore it. Neither can nature restore itself. God and His kingdom of grace and mercy are needed to restore nature and establish freedom.

All the works of nature are under the sovereignty of God either by instituted laws, or by forces acting upon them. Man, however, as a moral agent, can vary the works of nature, by making new combinations or by an act of force. The works of nature, on the other hand, can compel man to change his plans. This is seen in revolting elements and animals. Ultimately, however, all the works of nature are used to establish perfect liberty as made possible in God.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

In some ways, this chapter may be considered the most important of the present study. Very few definite comparisons were made, in the body of the thesis, to show wherein Horace Bushnell made contribution to progressive religious thought in America. The main study was primarily intended to show Horace Bushnell's view on freedom. This chapter, however, makes a brief review of the history of thought on the subject in hand, as it had developed in America, prior to the time of Horace Bushnell, and shows wherein he differed. Certain criticisms will be answered and final summaries made.

A. SUGGESTIONS

The first form of theology which appeared in New England was Calvinistic. The absolute sovereignty of God was maintained in theory, defended in practice, and became the foundation for domestic and colonial life. Historians seemed agreed upon the influence of John Calvin upon the life and thought of New England. John Robinson and the Pilgrims came to America to find freedom in worship, but were so Calvinistic that they persecuted those who did not believe as they did. Thus, we have this conflicting view of freedom and the supremacy of God. Pietism and mysticism place the emphasis upon the spirit and heart, and soon human reason became confused with the spirit and developed into rationalism which emphasized the absoluteness of the Scripture. Sects were

the result of the importance placed upon the spirit's testimony in the heart. The center of truth was put into the objective and the pietism of Roger Williams, the mysticism of Mrs. Hutchinson and the Quakerism of George Fox and William Penn, prepared the way for the works of Jonathan Edwards and, indirectly, for Horace Bushnell's views.

The sermons of Hooker, Cotton and Shepherd proclaim the theory of election, of the impotence of man, by nature, in conversion, and of the necessity of full submission to the will of God. William Pynchon perhaps was the first to break with this dominating Anselmic view of the atonement in his book, "Meritorious Price of Our Redemption," 1650. He rejected the idea that Christ was under the wrath of God in suffering the cross and held that He voluntarily offered Himself. (270) In this, he may have been candle-bearer before Bushnell, but he ante-dated his time, for the Massachusetts legislature ordered his book burned. Likewise, we find John Taylor (1694-1761), (cf. his "Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement"), hinting at Bushnell's view of freedom and theory of the Atonement.

Jonathan Edwards' views of the all-embracing sovereignty of God, and practical denial of the freedom of the human will have been given in the body of the present study. His view closely resembles that of Hobbs^e and Collins, and his distinction between moral and natural ability was advanced in less perfect form by the French theologian, Moses Amyraud and the philosopher, Locke. Denying the freedom of the will in its ordinary acceptations, he preached as if the will had the power of choosing between motives

of self or God. The iron chain of necessity controlling human character and conduct, makes every event in nature a human experience decreed by an Infinite Will. In this view, every event must have some external cause, and man is made a part of nature, rather than a personal being. Further, if God is the cause behind the will, why does a good God make man inclined to do evil? In making man identical with sin and yet holding that man has no existence outside of God, Edwards seems inconsistent for God is goodness. Again, in making God free, only in the sense that He has the power to carry out Divine Inclination and save and reject whom He will, Edwards makes sovereignty contradict necessity. (271) The purpose of the present study, however, is not to find fallacies or discrepancies but merely to show need for further study in this field.

Joseph Bellamy (1719-1786) was the first succeeding student. A glance at his work will show that he accepted Edwards' theory of virtue, freedom of the will and original sin, (cf. "True Religion") but differs in his speculations about the method of our connection with Adam. Divine sovereignty, however, is exalted in his theory of election, and he held the Calvinistic theory of total depravity. (272)

Samuel Hopkins (1721-1803) maintained the freedom of the will. There are many passages in which he exalts the agencies of God. While Edwards had held liberty to be in the external ability to perform our volitions, Hopkins places it in the volition itself. (cf. Loc. Cit., pp.83-86) Hopkins insisted that the will could not be compelled to a given choice. He maintained that

(271) "Life and Writings of J. Edwards," A.V.G.Allen, p.296

(272) "A Genetic History of New England Theology," F.H.Foster, p.112

compulsion ruins the freedom of the will. God is the cause of both evil and holiness in man. (cf. Loc. Cit., pp. 139-140) God is regarded by this writer as absolutely independent and almighty, and the creature, as entirely dependent for every thought and volition, having no power and sufficiency that is not derived directly from his Creator. Thus we find Edwards' view of God's sovereignty and man's dependence upheld. Hopkins denied the responsibility for Adam's sin which Edwards had maintained. Yet God has so made man that the present sin is an effect of Adam's sin according to Hopkins. God is the ultimate cause of all acts, good and bad; but, since sin is the act or exercise and not the cause, it belongs to man and not to God. (273)

Jonathan Edwards, the younger, (1744-1801) contributed to the view on atonement but held his father's theory of freedom. The same can be said about James Dana, Stephen West and Samuel West.

Nathaniel Emmons (1745-1840) developed Hopkins' theory that holiness and sin are exercises of the will. In these acts, the will is free to the extent that it acts voluntarily, but the ultimate cause again is God. Emmons differed with Hopkins in representing man as active in regeneration. He likewise is active in sin and derives no guilt from Adam, for moral depravity consists in the voluntary exercise of a moral being. He upheld the theory of election and reprobation. Nevertheless, he maintained that sin is the voluntary transgression of known law. Emmons advanced the Edwardean view of Hopkins to its farthest

reaches. (274)

Timothy Dwight (1752-1817) was more moderate and conciliatory in his view of theology. He opposed the idea on divine efficiency of Emmons and Hopkins as the cause of sinful choices. He denied knowing anything about the metaphysical nature of the causes of moral action. He was certain of its existence and effects. A certain "disposition" is the cause for righteousness and sin, and regeneration consists in (275) "a relish for Spiritual objects, communicated to it by the power of the Holy Spirit." In other words, a turning back to Edwards is seen in Dwight.

At this point, a more decided tendency is seen in New England theology to restore the freedom of the will, which the Edwardean school had tried to destroy. Asa Burton's "Essays on Some of the First Principles of "Metaphysicks, Ethicks and Theology" (1824) agreed with prevailing necessitarianism, yet started theology in the direction toward freedom of the will. According to Burton, (276) "The will is only an executive faculty; its office is to obey the commands of the heart." Taste is the internal cause of all volitions. God has established an infallible connection between this cause and volition. To elucidate, liberty of the will dwells in man's liberty to will according to his pleasure. This connection was regarded as moral necessity and such necessity assures the liberty of the will. Thus, it is seen that, while Burton differed with Hopkins and Emmons and, in a sense, with Edwards, he yet adheres to Edwards' idea of necessity.

Nathaniel W. Taylor, (1786-1858) was Burton's successor

(274) "The American Church History Series," W.Walker, p.301; (275) "Ibid," p.302; (276) "A Genetic History of New England Theology," F. H. Foster, p. 245

and stood for true freedom based upon consciousness. He definitely differed with Edwards in his statement that man's acts were not necessitated in accord with an unconditioned law of cause and effect; (277) yet choices and antecedent conditions are so connected with God's perceptions that the end is assured even though man is able to choose to the contrary. So God's sovereignty and man's dependency remains, but man is not coerced in his actions. Man has the natural ability to choose the right when there is the appeal to that sense. Self-love is the emotion to which the appeal can be made. While man has this natural power, Taylor claims that he is dependent upon the working of the Divine Spirit to persuade his will to action. According to Taylor, sin is in willingly disobeying known law. He denied the idea advanced by Edwards that sin was the required medium of the greatest good and substituted the theory of a system from which God cannot banish sin. In suggesting a system in which God cannot use force to prevent sin, he initiates the idea of freedom enlarged upon by Bushnell.

Thomas C. Upham (1799-1872) assented to Burton's conception of the different faculties of the mind and helped to free New England theology from the reign of Edwards' thoughts. In his "Philosophical and Practical Treatise on the Will," (1834, p.133) he does suggest that the will is under law, but not compulsion.

Charles G. Finney (1792-1875) made Edwards' differentiation between natural and moral ability, one and the same. Holiness was regarded as man's willingness to obey God; and sin is his unwillingness to do so. Man can live in a continuous obedience when aided by the Holy Spirit. This view is almost Arminian, and (277) "The American Church History Series," W. Walker, p. 304

certainly, perfectionism, in theory. He averred that virtue is the choice of the greatest happiness for the whole universe. In fact, he made happiness the ultimate good which gave value to everything. In other words, the principle of love is the only virtue and finds its origin in the will. The Holy Spirit is needed in the work of regeneration to change man's purpose, and man's responsibility is measured by the ability which he can receive through faith.

So the struggle for freedom continued and the way was prepared for the works of Horace Bushnell (1802-1876). In 1847, Horace Bushnell, as stated in the body of this study, refuted Edwards' conception of conversion in his first publication of "Christian Nurture." Instead of agreeing with Edwards that entrance into the kingdom of God depended upon consciously submitting to God, he argues that a child should grow up as a Christian, never knowing himself to be otherwise. Life is to have the freedom of growth. It is not a machine which must be regulated by certain causes and completely submitted to a Supreme Being. Dr. Bushnell admits the sovereignty of God and avers that man is not so free that he can work out his own salvation. In other words, the leaven of the spirit of God in the hearts of men is essential. (278) In his "Nature and the Supernatural," he says, "Do we then affirm the absolute inability of man to do and become what is right before God? That is the Christian doctrine, and there is none that is more obviously true." At a later time, (279) the writer asserts that there is nothing so tragic as a people who try to work out their own salvation by self-culture and self-righteousness.

By freedom of the will, Dr. Bushnell holds that freedom merely is a volitional function. Volitions, in themselves, however, cannot regenerate ^{or} ~~re~~ create a new character. True virtue is not a series of acts in response to volitions, but a new state, or status of right-disposedness, from which new action may come. No mere voluntary act of the will can change the state of disposedness of the soul, without Supreme help and grace. Redemption in man is dependent upon an action from God.

Thus it is evident that Bushnell did drop "motives" affirmed by Edwards to be so important but found freedom in "indisputable report of consciousness." By doing this, he escapes that endless chain of causation which confused former thinkers on this subject.

Dr. Bushnell's separation of things from powers or the natural from the supernatural with the latter as able to dominate the former and use them for their own ends, really is his great contribution in the field of freedom. As Theodore T. Munger suggests (280), Bushnell materially agrees with the later school of New England theology in his idea of freedom of the will as a volitional function; but differs from it, without contradiction, in his view of sin as due to "conditions preventative that are involved as necessary incidents in the begun existence and trial of powers." Placing character in the will was a needed thought. In this way, he relegated sin to the realm of the supernatural and thus made a supernatural Christ necessary for redemption. (281)

Dr. Charles Hodge (282) says that it is a satisfaction to see that Dr. Bushnell repudiates the principles: First, that man

(280) "Horace Bushnell: Preacher and Theologian," p.217; (281) "Nature and the Supernat'l," p.143; (282) "The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review," Vol.38, 1866

is not asked to do more than he has full power to perform; secondly, that all sin is comprised in sinning or that more character is based upon voluntary action. The sinner, left to himself, however, cannot repent or restore himself to holiness. Even in his suggestion that a child should never know himself otherwise than as a Christian, Dr. Bushnell recognizes man's dependence upon God's spirit.

In summarizing this section, it should be said that Bushnell freed the theology of his day from its extreme individualism, by suggesting organic unity in his "Christian Nurture," and makes society an organism rather than a machine. Secondly, Dr. Bushnell undermined the rabid rationalism of the then-known theology by replacing it with a theology of experience. Intuition and unity took the place of dogma and system in his view of life. Thirdly, he helped to break down the dividing barrier between nature and the supernatural by making the two parts of the one system of God for governing the universe. Lastly, his greatest contribution to theology is found in his view of Christ as the central power and light of Christianity.

B. CRITICISMS

Many Edwardeans as well as others opposed Dr. Bushnell's idea that the child must grow a Christian as he was born on the ground that it implied that man must become a Christian by education rather than through change of his heart by supreme act of God. In a letter to Dr. Bushnell in 1847, Dr. Tyler argued that a child must become a Christian before he can grow up as one. He

held that Christians are not so by natural descent and that grace is not hereditary. Bushnell, however, does not claim that nature is wholly pure and good and that all that is necessary is the unfolding of itself. In the very book which sought to emphasize Christian nurture because of organic unity, he says, (283) "The mind has ideals revealed within itself that are even Celestial, and it is the strongest of all proofs of its depravity that, when it would struggle up towards its own ideals, it cannot reach them, cannot, apart from God, even lift itself towards them." He continues along this same line by suggesting that evil, having once entered the soul of man, is its master until deliverance received through a redemption which is undertaken by "a power transcending nature."

Likewise, in his article, "The Spiritual Economy of Revivals of Religion," (284) he seems to increase the part played by the Holy Spirit in the work of redemption. In none of his books does he hold that man can work out his own salvation.

In answer to the criticism that he has advanced a theory of naturalism, he speaks thus: (285) "So far from holding the possibility of restoration for men within the terms of mere nature, whether, as regards the individual acting for himself, or the parent acting for his child, the incarnation of the Son of God himself is not, as I believe, more truly supernatural than any agent must be, which regenerates a soul." At another time, he suggests, (p.14) that the Spirit of God is in matter, as well as in man, but there is a supernatural grace which works through

(283) "Christian Nurture," p.26; (284) "The Quarterly Christian Spectator," Vol.10, 1838 and "Vicarious Sacrifice," p.424 and "Pulpit Talent," p.132 and "God in Christ," p.171; (285) "Christian Nurture," p.36

Christ upon man. Surely the view that presents the Spirit of God as being everywhere present and operative in nature and man, is as theistic as any view can be.

In his "Nature and the Supernatural," Dr. Bushnell enlarges upon the theme of naturalism and supernaturalism by definitely making man a part of the supernatural by virtue of his will. In this again, his views of freedom are questioned. Yet, it is admitted that, if freedom is to be made a reality, man must be taken out of the realm of cause and effect. His theory of freedom, in this book, is not complete, but what is said finds its basis in experience.

Some objection has been made to his conception of character as determined or constituted by the actions of the will. He makes these actions to end in the realm of nature but, as brought out in foregoing quotations from his "Christian Nurture," man left unto himself cannot become holy in character. In this book, he says, (286) "Volitions, taken by themselves, involve no capacity to regenerate, or constitute a character." As already suggested, holy virtue is a state obtained through the power of God. From this it is clear that volitions do not make up the whole of character. There is an element in original nature and a Divine Spirit necessary to character. That the will plays an important part in actions of praise and blame is generally admitted.

When Dr. Bushnell puts limitations upon the acts of the will by making them "single, transitive efforts" that go into the supple chain of nature, he seems to forget that there are certain activities which remain as "springs of vital energy" to man himself

and not because of their relationship to nature. There are states and conditions of the will itself, as well as of the intellect, which influence decisions and affect character. This fact is admitted by psychology and experience. In answer to this criticism, it might be said that the will, as a supernatural power, is under the influence of the Divine Spirit and that all things, both in the natural and supernatural, work together to accomplish God's will for the universe. He brings this thought out in his book, "Moral Uses of Dark Things."

In making sin the possible or permissible thing in a system instituted by God, Dr. Bushnell asserts that it is possible that powers may sin and, under certain conditions, will sin. The first assertion allows for man's freedom; the second, puts him under the law of necessity. Nevertheless, man can avoid the condition and thus have the will-power to keep himself from sin. This is the theme of his "Christian Nurture," that temptation to an innocent, untried being is certain, from the fact that he is free.

Considering Dr. Bushnell's argument that law and liberating grace are essential to obtain virtue, it has been claimed that he is inconsistent with his view of man as powers manageable only in a moral way. In refuting, it might be said that moral influences may be used in the realm of law and often are used in liberating grace.

With reference to the criticism of Dr. Bushnell's conception of sin as man enslaving himself to nature, it should be remembered that he makes deliverance possible through man's will and God's grace. This is brought out in the eighth chapter of his "Nature

and the Supernatural," as well as in "Vicarious Sacrifice." It is held by some critics that, in his distinction of the natural as the realm of force and the supernatural as the realm of free will, Dr. Bushnell prepared the way for modern apologetics in which the natural science of evolution and law are being adjusted to the Christian philosophy of personality and freedom.

Much argument has been expressed against Horace Bushnell's view of the atonement set forth in his "God in Christ" and "Vicarious Sacrifice." His stress upon the influence the crucifixion has upon man is condemned by some to this day. Nevertheless, the opinion of reconciling man to God, rather than God to man, reveals a more unselfish God than the belief which holds that the cross was necessary to satisfy an angry Deity.

The suggestion that the denial to God of His authority over man until sin demands His intercession is a refutation of his primary rights as a person is answered in former quotations. It has been stated by Dr. Bushnell in this very section that man is dependent upon God to reach his own ideals.

Professor Noah (287) asserts that Bushnell's conception of the nature of penalty is entirely wrong. Yet, experience verifies that lover endures with the loved. Holiness, in the presence of that which is unholy, is not at home or at ease. Discord, in juxtaposition with harmony, pains the lover of music. So, too, the man who is a Christian suffers in contact with the unchristian. In other words, there is definite punishment for the sinner in either temporal or eternal presence before a righteous

God. This punishment remains until man has been sanctified or made holy, through Divine Spirit.

To the controversy that he confuses justification with sanctification in his subjective doctrine of justification, Dr. Bushnell makes his own reply, when he states that justification is in the consciousness and sanctification is below it. In his own words, (288) "The consciousness of the subject, in justification, is raised in its order, filled with the confidence of right, set free from the bondage of fears and scruples of legality; but there is a vast realm back of consciousness, or below it, which remains to be changed or sanctified, and never will be, except a new habit be generated by time, and a better consciousness descending into the secret roots below, gets a healing into them more and more perfect." If all voluntary exercises are found in consciousness, then it is clear that there is a large realm below consciousness which receives sanctification through a power outside of the will. Christ is a power and not a ground of justification and, as such, (289) has something to do even with justification. In the act of justification, man yields himself to God, and thus permits God to perform the work of sanctification. Surely, there could be no confusion of the two in such a view.

That Bushnell may have received some seed-thoughts for his book, "Nature and the Supernatural," from S. T. Coleridge's "Aids to Reflections," is admitted. Some of Dr. Bushnell's definitions are similar to those of Coleridge. Both make will the supernatural in man and regard man as a responsible agent and not merely a living thing. The supernatural and the spiritual (288) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p.440; (289) "Vicarious Sacrifice," p.423

in man are more or less synonymous. Bushnell, however, greatly enlarged upon the germ-thoughts received from Coleridge and gave much new material in the field of freedom in his other works. To the suggestion that an essay of Schleiermacher, translated by Prof. Stuart, was the nucleus for Bushnell's "God in Christ," it may be said that such source was secondary and that Bushnell had no direct contact with the original writings of Schleiermacher. In speaking of the relationship between Horace Bushnell and Albrecht Ritschl, George B. Stevens, (290) suggests that the two thinkers were not in any way associated. Bushnell was not a student of German theology nor did Ritschl follow American thought. Furthermore, Ritschl's important theological work was not published until the latter part of the nineteenth century. All of Dr. Bushnell's theological books, except his "Forgiveness and Law," preceded Ritschl's treatise on "Justification and Reconciliation." As Mr. Bacon suggests, (291) Horace Bushnell was not inclined to accept the methods and findings of others. He preferred to work out his own thoughts by applying experience. In a letter, Dr. Bushnell himself intimated (292) that he was not a great reader.

In answering some of the adverse criticisms, it is not claimed that all of Dr. Bushnell's views are perfect or that all criticisms can be satisfactorily answered. In putting the will under bondage to sin, he may be taking a stand that is not fundamental. In spite of such possible inconsistencies, he has opened the way toward freedom and introduced modern psychology which places will before motive. In this way, he avoided the limitless chain of causation which surrounded and confused his predecessors in the cause of freedom.

(290)"American Journal of Theology," Vol. 16, 1902; (291)"A History of American Christianity," p. 375; (292) M. B. Cheney's "Life & Letters of Horace Bushnell," p. 295

C. SUMMARIES

Dr. Bushnell, as already suggested, reacted against the externalism of religion. He did not plead for something new, but for that which should be vital and alive. Life and God were his guiding thoughts. Dr. W. Burggraff, (293) avers that Bushnell reacted firstly against the method of New England theology, which Edwards had made speculative and which later became purely "rationalistic-dialectic." Secondly, he rejected the popular conception of nature and the supernatural. This conception did not solve the problem of miracles and did not deal adequately with the progress of natural science. Thirdly, he disapproved of the Edwardean view of conversion. Instead of waiting upon the grace of God to convert a child, Bushnell gave Christian nurture a place in New England theology by holding that organic unity had its office in social life. In the fourth place, he made out of the "tri-theistic" doctrine of the Trinity a reality which could be experienced in human life. He emphasized the unity of the Divine Being rather than the Three Persons. Lastly, the writer rejected the governmental theory of the atonement, advanced by the Edwardeans, as "being unworthy of the suffering of Christ and the character of God."

Dr. J. W. Buckham (294) intimates that the first undertaking of Dr. Bushnell, in the field of theology, was the cutting of the bonds of necessitarianism and rationalism in religious life. This he accomplished in presenting the practical and social view of religious life, in his "Christian Nurture." Secondly, Dr. Buckham affirms that Bushnell reconciled the realm of nature with

(293) "The Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America, p.128

(294) "Progressive Religious Thought in America," p.8ff

the supernatural, by making the two the one system of God for governing the universe. Finally, this critic claims that Bushnell made Christ the foci of Christianity. The Calvinism promulgated by Edwards almost had taken Christ out of Christianity. Dr. A. C. McGiffert asserts that "Bushnell perhaps did more than any other single agency to break down the extreme individualism of the old Puritan theology of America." W. Walker adds, (295) "I venture the prediction that posterity will accord Bushnell no second place among the prophets of the latter days and that the verdict of history will pronounce him one of the greatest religious geniuses which Christianity has hitherto produced."

Returning to Dr. Burggraaf's estimation of Bushnell, the following quotation is given: (296) "It appears to us that the New Theology and that part of modern theology which has not as yet become entirely naturalistic, owes its origin and early strength to Bushnell, since the works of Ritschl were not known extensively in America until the last decade of the nineteenth century." --- "All along the line there was agreement with the fundamental principles of Bushnell."

T. T. Munger (297) speaks of the new theology as giving place to the revelation of God to man in thought and feeling; natural interpretation of Scriptures; unity of the human race; natural and supernatural system of God for governing the universe; unity between God and man; belief in eschatology. All these aspects of new theology find seed-thoughts in the works of Bushnell.

In "The Harvard Theological Review," July, 1918, Dr. J. W. Buckham asserts that Divine immanence; witness of Christian Consciousness and experience; continuous creation; social, as well as

individual salvation; Christ as the center of Christian revelation are essential factors in the new theology; and these factors are given a prominent place in the works of Bushnell.

In conclusion, Prof. Walker of Yale, writes in "The American Journal of Theology," Vol. 10, 1906, "To Horace Bushnell, however, the chief reparation for the more modern development of Congregational hteology is to be ascribed. His own contributions to the discussion of particular doctrines were of no slight importance; but much more far-reaching in its influence was his view of the nature and basis of theology in general."

Dr. Charles R. Brown (298) summarizes this section with the assertion that Horace Bushnell's views on Christian growth; on the natural and supernatural as the system of God to govern the universe; on the rational and moral theory of the atonement and on the unity of the Trinity, have been so woven into modern theological thought, that they have been accepted as basic. In his teachings about nature, Dr. Brown declares that Bushnell was a forerunner of Milliken and Eddington, and it must be remembered that his views in this connection contain the essence of his theory of freedom.

Surely the evaluations made by the preceding leaders in the field justify the proposition of the present study; namely that Horace Bushnell did make a vital contribution to progressive religious thought in New England in his theory of freedom, by taking man out of the realm of nature and making him a supernatural power who can find freedom only in the Divine will.

F I N I S

(298) "Yale Divinity News," March 1930

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. SOURCE MATERIAL

- Bushnell, Horace - "Christian Nurture," written 1847 (revised 1861), published, Alex. Strahan and Co., Edinburgh, Scotland, 1861.
- "God in Christ," 1849, John Chapman, 142 Strand, London, England, 1850.
- "Christ in Theology," 1851, Brown and Parsons, Hartford, Conn., 1851.
- "Sermons for the New Life," 1858, Stranham and Co., 56 Ludgate Hill, London. (no date)
- "Nature and the Supernatural," 1858, A. Strahan and Co., Edinburgh, 1861.
- "Work and Play," 1864, A. Strahan and Co., London, 1864.
- "Christ and His Salvation," 1864, A. Strahan, 148 Strand, London, 1870.
- "The Vicarious Sacrifice," 1866, Alex. Strahan, London, 1866. (also two volumes by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1883.)
- "The Moral Uses of Dark Things," 1868, Strahan and Co., London, 1869.
- "The Reform Against Nature," (on woman's suffrage), 1869, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1870.
- "Sermons on Living Subjects," 1872, Sampson, Low, Marston, Low and Searle, London, 1872.
- "Forgiveness and Law," 1874, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1874.
- "Pulpit Talent," 1881, Richard D. Dickinson, 89 Farringdon St., London, 1882.
- "Spiritual Economy of Revivals of Religion," 1838, The Quarterly Christian Spectator, Vol. 10, Hezekiah Howe, Chapel St., New Haven, Conn.
- "The Kingdom of Heaven as a Grain of Mustard Seed," 1844, The New Englander, Vol. 2, B. L. Hamlen, New Haven, Conn.
- "The Christian Trinity A Practical Truth," 1854, The New Englander, Vol. 12, F.W. Northrop, New Haven, Conn.

B. SECONDARY MATERIAL

- Allen, A. V. G. "Life and Writings of J. Edwards," T. and T. Clark, 38 George St., Edinburgh, 1889.
- Bacon, L. W. "A History of American Christianity," The Christian Literature Co., New York, 1897.
- Baird, R. "Religion in the United States of America," Harper & Brothers, 327 Pearl St., New York, 1856.
- Buckham, J. W. "Progressive Religious Thought in America," Houghton, Mifflin and Co., New York, 1919.
- Burggraff, W. "The Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America," The Board of Publication and Bible School Work of the Reformed Church of America, 25 East 22 St., New York.
- Channing, W. E. The Works of, (Centennial Edition) London, 1880.
- Cheney, M. B. "Life and Letters of Horace Bushnell," Sampson Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington, London, 1880.
- Coe, G. A. "Religion of Immature Minds," Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, 1902.
- Coleridge, S. T. "Aids to Reflections," Vol. 1 and 2, Wm. Pickering, London, 1843.
- Day, J. "An Examination of President Edwards' Inquiry on the Freedom of the Will," Durrie and Peck, New Haven, Conn., 1841.
- Dunning, A. E. "Congregationalism in America," J. A. Hill and Co., 44 East 14 Street, New York, 1894.
- Edwards, J. "The Works of J. Edwards, A.M.," revised and corrected by Edward Hickman, in two volumes, J. R. and C. Childs, Bungay, London, 1834.

- Fisher, G. P. "History of Christian Doctrine," T. and T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh, 1896.
- Fosdick, H. E. "Christianity and Progress," Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, 1922.
- Foster, F. H. "A Genetic History of New England Theology," The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1907.
- Grenstead, L. W. "A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement," Longmans, Green and Co., Manchester, England, 1920.
- Knudson, A. C. "Present Tendencies in Religious Thought," New York, 1924.
- McGiffert, A. C. "The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas," Macmillan Company, New York, 1915.
- Munger, T. T. "Horace Bushnell: Preacher and Theologian," James Clark & Co., 13 Fleet Street, London. (no date)
- Schaff, P. "The Creeds of Christendom," three volumes, New York, 1881.
- Turnbull, R. "Review of Dr. Bushnell's Theories of Incarnation and Atonement," Brackett, Fuller and Co., Hartford, Conn. (no date)
- Walker, W. "A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States," American Church History Series, Vol., 3, The Christian Literature, Co., New York, 1894.

"American Journal of Theology," Vol. 6, 1902.

"Horace Bushnell and Albrecht Ritschl: A Comparison,"
George B. Stevens, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

"Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review," Vol. 19, 1847.

"Bushnell on Christian Nurture,"
H. B. Hope, Educational Rooms, 25 Sanson St., Phila.

"Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review," Vol. 21, 1849.

"Bushnell's Discourses on God and Christ,"
W. H. Mitchell, 265 Chestnut St., Phila.

"Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review," Vol. 30, 1858.

"Review of Horace Bushnell's Sermons on the New Life,"
C. Hodge; P. Walker, 821 Chestnut St., Phila.

- "Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review," Vol. 31, 1859
"Review of Horace Bushnell's Nature and the Supernatural,"
C. Hodge, Peter Walker, 821 Chestnut St., Phila.
- "Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review," Vol. 38, 1866.
"Bushnell on Vicarious Sacrifice,"
C. Hodge, Peter Walker, 821 Chestnut St., Phila.
- "The New Englander," Vol. 6, 1848
"Bushnell on Christian Nurture,"
A. H. Maltby, New Haven, Conn.
- "The New Englander," Vol. 17, 1849," H.
"H. Bushnell's Discourses on Incarnation and Atonement"
J. B. Carrington, New Haven, Conn.
- "The New Englander," Vol. 17, 1859
"Dr. Bushnell's Nature and the Supernatural"
"Dr. Bushnell's Sermons for the New Life,"
New Haven, Conn.
- "The New Englander," Vol. 24, 1865
"Review of Horace Bushnell's Christ and Salvation,"
William L. Kingsley, New Haven, Conn.
- "The New Englander," Vol. 25, 1866
"Review of Dr. Bushnell's Vicarious Sacrifice,"
Noah Porter; Thomas J. Stafford, New Haven, Conn.
- "The New York Evangelist," Vol. 8 (no date)
"What Does Bushnell Mean?"
Case, Tiffany and Co., Hartford, Conn.
- "Yale Divinity News," Vol. 26, No. 3, March, 1930
"Horace Bushnell -- A Great Man,"
C. R. Brown, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

35 P

38, 9-10

66.

only two there 7 freedom is de la...