THE NEW MERCERSBURG REVIEW

Journal of the Mercersburg Society
Number XXXVI Spring 2005

ISSN: 0895-7460

Biannual journal of the
MERCERSBURG SOCIETY

THE NEW MERCERSBURG REVIEW

The Mercersburg Society has been formed to uphold the concept of the Church as the Body of Christ, Evangelical, Reformed, Catholic, Apostolic, organic, developmental and connectional. It affirms the ecumenical Creeds as witnesses to its faith and the Eucharist as the liturgical act from which all other acts of worship and service emanate.

The Society pursues contemporary theology in the Church and the world within the context of Mercersburg Theology. In effecting its purpose the Society provides opportunities for fellowship and study for persons interested in Mercersburg Theology, sponsors an annual convocation, engages in the publication of articles and books, stimulates research and correspondence among scholars on topics of theology, liturgy, the Sacraments and ecumenism.

The ***New Mercersburg Review*** is designed to publish the proceedings of the annual convocation as well as other articles on subjects pertinent to the aims and interests of the Society.

From the Editor

John Payne, a founding member of the society, takes us back to Nevin's earlier years to provide insight into his theological development. Benefiting from some of the previous work done by William DiPuccio (*The Interior Sense of Scripture* and "Nevin's Idealistic Philosophy"), Payne employs considerable original scholarship in revealing essential features of Nevin's development. He is especially helpful in describing Nevin's embrace of idealism, not as the harsh break with his Princetonian past as some have suggested, but as a natural process, fueled by a self-described romantic pre-disposition. The germ of Nevin's departure from Scottish common-sense religion and his adoption of the German mediating philosophy are prefigured in an early passage discussed by Payne where Nevin speaks of the Christian faith as a "life" and uses the organic metaphor "germ" in reference to that life.

Joseph Bassett's contribution is on the lighter side and some of it is admittedly tongue-in-check. He lovingly chides his friend and fellow scholar, Daniel Meeter, in a warning that Bassett discovered midst the less known Reformation debates in Hungry and Transylvania (as well as in other pockets of Reformed fervor). Be patient as Bassett spends considerable time in historical preparation for the lesson, setting the stage for what is to come. Your persistence will be rewarded if only for the drama that unfolds. More than that, as if in Agatha Christie fashion, the mysterious warning meted out to Meeter is revealed.

Basett found an obscure but revealing tension in the choices translators of the Heidelberg Catechism made, one that might alter meanings and convict heretics. How much stress should be placed on theological language uncommon to or excluded from the Bible? Or course, as Bassett points out in his warning to Meeter, to disregard such language would be to plunder the Patristic tradition, the Creeds of Christendom and the vast array of theologies surrounding them. That the "communion of the churches" would be "shattered" as Bassett suggests, is more conjectural.

Still, one must be cautious about Bassett's rebuke and measure it against Meeter's exact words. All seems to turn on the emphasis placed on "extra-biblical language." Meeter never suggested its abandonment, but

questioned the decree of importance or weight given it over against that of biblical language.

Yet Bassett's observation is timely. In an age where most of us are aware of the subjective bias of metaphysical science, it is refreshing to note that more than a few scholars no longer wring their hands at the impenetrable perplexities of Chalcedon. How is it inevitable in Christology that a perceived lean toward Christ's divinity is Eutychian and a lean toward his humanity is Nestorian. In the vernacular, this is an obvious "set-up" if there ever was one! That a writer might believe his or her case is made by branding the adversary with either of these epithets is as absurd as expecting for them the same stake that Cranmer got in 1556. And yet the branding continues.

No, today, a host of significant scholars perceive Aristotle peering over the ages, smirking, and they recognize the straw man in the problem of dualism. Perhaps Professor Meeter might like to comment?

Finally, we welcome a delightful paper by Mercersburg Society friend Sally F. Griffith, whose lecture on Mercersburg Theology and its impact on F&M College will find interested readers here. I, for one, was pleased to read more of Rauch and his legacy. Ms. Griffith demonstrates thorough knowledge of the secondary sources in placing Rauch in the idealist tradition, opposing the common-sense philosophy dominating America. Although it might be stretch to conceive Rauch's organic metaphors as appealing to his "rural audience" (more likely they scratched their heads at Rauch's difficult *Psychology*), still he obviously impressed his board enough to command leadership from the spiritual community.

Ms. Griffith recognizes the romantic streak vibrant in idealism, but caution must be raised against too closely identifying Rauch and Mercersburg with the Romantic Movement (or "neo-humanism"). Nichols did that to his peril (*Romanticism in American Theology*) and even to the end of his life, complained of being misunderstood on that score, insisting that his use of "romantic" be taken in the broadest possible sense. Better to locate Rauch along with Nevin and Schaff in their age, at the cutting edge of cultural advances with their contemporaries in the German mediating school of theology. Admittedly here was an approach which gained much from romanticism; from Kant and Fichte, as well as Schleiermacher and Hegel, but brought with it a

deliberate and well articulated "corrective" to the rationalism and liberalism latent in the aforementioned. Add to that lessons learned today from Dr. Payne, and realize the enormous early sway English speaking pietists had on Nevin (pietism also carrying great weight with Schaff, although from the German speaking school). Likewise, Rauch's thoroughgoing churchmanship should assuage any suspicions of latitudinarianism on his part. The warmth and tenderness expressed in Rauch's comments to an anxious father, generously served up by Griffith, also attest to what some might believe to be a natural pastoral disposition in Rauch.

Griffith's observation of a shared suspicion of the impact of revivals is helpful, as well. Most of us know of Schaff and especially Nevin's disapproval of "anxious bench" tactics, but less has been written about Rauch's disdain for what in Europe was broadly known as enthusiastic religion, where the emotions trumped reasoned thought. It might be interesting to test the way in which romanticism might encourage or even define enthusiasm in religion, in so far as romanticism and idealism, as Griffith so aptly points out, allow the fullest expression of human experience to inhabit the sphere of religion.

But what she fairly wants from her research is to appreciate the "holistic" (to some extent Socratic) character of Rauch's curriculum at the college. He really changed education at F&M, as education was changing because of growing European influence. In this respect, Rauch was a forerunner in America.

JOHN WILLIAMSON NEVIN: THE EARLY YEARS

John B. Payne

John Williamson Nevin, who became a professor and minister in the German Reformed Church and the chief architect of the so-called Mercersburg Theology, spent the first thirty-seven years of his life as a Presbyterian. Born February 20, 1803, the son of John Nevin and Martha McCracken, Nevin grew up the oldest of ten children on his father's farm in Franklin County, Pennsylvania, near Shippensburg. His father, John Nevin, belonged to the third generation of his Scotch-Irish family in this country. John Nevin the elder, though a farmer, underwent a classical education at Dickinson College and instilled a knowledge of Latin and Greek in his son, John Williamson, even before he went to college. He likewise impressed Williamson, as Nevin was always called in his younger days, with the importance of avoiding tobacco and hard liquor and with his antislavery views Nevin's father clearly had a major impact upon him. He was a man of industry, integrity, learning and piety, and a strong churchman.[2]

On his father's mother's side Nevin was well connected. She was Margaret Williamson, the sister of Hugh Williamson, a distinguished physician and lawyer, and framer of the U. S. Constitution and author of *History of North Carolina* among other works. Another brother, John Williamson, after whom Nevin was named, was a wealthy bachelor merchant in Charleston, South Carolina. The uncle maintained a close relationship with his namesake and designated him the executor of his estate. When Nevin's father died in 1829, it fell to him as the oldest son, but also by his father's dying wish, to be the guardian of his estate and of the family. As he reports in his autobiography, he became therefore "a man of business as well as a man of letters and books."[3]

Given his Scotch-Irish background, it is not surprising that Nevin was brought up a Presbyterian, baptized and catechized in the church at Middle Spring where both his parents and grandparents are buried. He points out in his autobiography that the old Scottish church customs were still very much in evidence as he was growing up—not only preaching

and the singing of Rouse's Psalms but catechism, pastoral visitation and the use of the sacraments. He mentions the four-day communion season, which consisted of successive days of preaching in the open field and fasting accompanied by humiliation and penance, and which culminated in the celebration of the Lord's Supper on Sunday gathered around long tables. This was the widespread practice in Scotland and in America until it passed out of favor during the course of the second quarter of the nineteenth century.[4]

With the financial support of his Charleston great-uncle and on the advice of his famous New York great-uncle, Nevin was sent at the tender age of 14 to Union College in Schenectady, New York. Union was regarded as one of the three or four best colleges in the country at the time under its Presbyterian president, Eliphalet Nott. Nevin's studies obviously went well, for he graduated with honors, but his health suffered from "dyspepsia," a gastrointestinal disorder which caused him much discomfort. He looked back on it "as a sort of horrible nightmare which covered with gloom the best season of my youth."[5] In addition, his inner being underwent a religious shock. He bumped up against revivalistic religion for the first time in the form practiced by Asahel Nettleton, a more moderate sort than that later promoted by Charles Finney. There Nevin came under the influence of students who had experienced the "new birth." He began to question his own religious state and at their hands underwent a conversion. From the vantage point of his more churchly, creedal and sacramental Mercersburg faith, he was critical in his autobiography of such subjective, unchurchly religion, and yet he did not deny the power of that new experience, that he said was "a true awakening . . . which went beyond all I had known before."[6] But it also led him into introspection and criticism of his previous religious life.

After college there was a three-year hiatus in Nevin's studies as he battled his dyspeptic illness. He recognized that his physical suffering was closely related to the state of his religious life, which consisted of a morbid preoccupation with his inner self and a constant measuring of his spiritual pulse. His religion resembled that of the old Puritans, who according to Perry Miller subjected their piety to "meticulous and unceasing self-examination."[7] I suspect that Nevin's later stress on the objectivities of Christian existence—Christ's incarnation, church, sacraments and liturgy, was in large measure a response to his troubled wrestling with this subjective Puritanical religion with which he first

became acquainted in college, but which was reinforced by what was taking place in his own home territory. The old catechetical system in which he was reared was breaking down, and the new revival system was gradually being introduced into the Presbytery of Carlisle under the influence of the noted preacher George Duffield, a native Lancaster Countian who served in Carlisle from 1816 to 1835.[8] Nevin struggled not only with the question of his religious state but also with the issue of his vocation, both of which were closely related. Even though he took it for granted that he was intended for the profession of ministry, he hesitated, primarily because he was not sure of the quality of his religion and therefore whether he was really fit for ministry. He felt the pressure to proceed in that direction, however, and so he determined with some "fear and trembling" to enter Princeton Seminary in the fall of 1823 to study theology.

The period of study at Princeton was another agreeable moratorium in which he could delay the inevitable decision concerning his vocation. In fact, he referred in his autobiography to his Princeton years as "in some respects the most pleasant part of my life." He came to think of Princeton as his "second home," a place of scholarly leisure, friendship and peace.[9] He apparently entered the seminary determined to be a diligent scholar, for he had informed a friend that he desired there "to study much, write much, and think much."[10] He was, however, not so busy at his desk that he was a recluse, for letters written to him from former colleagues indicate that he made many friends who challenged, supported and encouraged him.[11]

Nevin greatly admired his professors, Archibald Alexander, Samuel Miller and Charles Hodge, who would become the most noted Presbyterian theologian in the nineteenth century. He gained from them a strong appreciation for the Reformed, especially the English and Scottish Presbyterian, tradition. Hodge expressed the loyalty of the Princeton professors to the Reformed heritage by stating with some exaggeration that at Princeton "a new idea never originated."[12] Just as Hodge stressed Princeton's continuity with the preceding Reformed tradition, so he tended to think that that tradition itself exhibited little variation but was all of one piece. Nevin later came to disagree with his professor on this matter, for at Mercersburg, influenced by German historiography, he recognized development in the Reformed tradition—

for example, concerning the view of the Eucharist from Zwingli to Calvin and the Heidelberg Catechism.[13]

Nevin also derived from Princeton a high view of Scripture and its authority as the inspired Word of God. He devoted himself especially to studies in the department of Oriental and Biblical Literature under Hodge. He took up the pursuit of Hebrew, but at first found the language so formidable that he almost gave it up. Persuaded by a friend to persevere, he went on to master it so well that he was asked to teach the subject in Hodge's place while the professor was on sabbatical study in Europe for two years.

Nevin's first major publication, already before he left Princeton, emerged out of his enthusiasm for the biblical field. At the request of the American Sunday School Union, he wrote *A Summary of Biblical Antiquities for the Use of Sunday-School Teachers and for the Benefit of Families* Not claiming originality, the book rested on several recently published studies. In two letters at the time of writing, Nevin complained about the heavy labor of this undertaking and expressed some anxiety about the quality of the work, but it showed itself to be so popular that it went through many more editions, and was still in print at the time of his death in 1886.[14] In Part I the book described the geography, natural history, social customs and political institutions of biblicaltimes. Part II characterized the religious beliefs and institutions of the Bible. His portrayal is not limited, however, to mere description but contains moral and theological judgment. After commenting on the various social customs in the Bible, he states ". . . we should not judge that which prevails among other people to be vastly more unreasonable than our own; it accomplishes the same end, and may be, after all, substantially as good and proper." On the other hand, he was sharply critical of some customs such as polygamy, which, he said, "is the cause of unnumbered evils." He anticipated what he would affirm in an early sermon in Pittsburgh, "The Scourge of God," that disease is not simply the result of the working of the laws of nature but also, as represented in Scripture, is the expression of the divine will since "these laws have no necessity except by His appointment . . . " He gave considerable attention to the origin and history of the church, which he described as having two characters—one *visible*, embracing "all who, in any age, profess to be his people," and the other *invisible*, "as it appears to the eye of God" comprehending "only those who are really and truly the people of

Christ . . ."[15] Later, at Mercersburg, Nevin became critical of this Reformation distinction between a visible and invisible church and put in its place the contrast between the actual and the ideal church.

Nevin's Princeton professors also impressed him with Scottish common-Sense philosophy. This point of view, derived from the popularization of "Baconianism" –after Francis Bacon (1561-1626)—by the Scottish philosophers, Thomas Reid (1710-1796) and Dugald Stewart (1753-1828), virtually ruled the philosophical and theological scene in nineteenth-century America until after the Civil War. It rejected metaphysical speculation and affirmed a strong confidence in an empirical, inductive method of learning modeled on the sciences. This method was applied to theological reasoning in general and to the study of Scripture in particular. [16]

For all of their stress on a logical, propositional theology based on Scripture, the Reformed tradition and common-sense philosophy, the Princeton theologians did not neglect religious experience or piety. Each carried on an active prayer life and encouraged the same among his students. As a young man, Alexander was deeply touched by reading Soame Jenyns', *Internal Evidences of the Christian Religion*, while he was staying in the home of General John Posey in 1788, and in the next year he was strongly affected by the Lexington revival. He was so moved by reading aloud to the Posey family a sermon of the seventeenth-century English Puritan, John Flavel (1630-1691), that he thought he had experienced the new birth. Nevin reports that Flavel was one of the Puritan writers in that period who shaped his piety.[17]

Charles Hodge was less affected by revivalism than was Alexander. There were no dramatic fits and starts in his devotional life but rather a steady growth ever since he imbibed it at his mother's knee. As Alexander was impressed by Jenyns' emphasis on the "Internal Evidences of the Christian Religion," so Hodge, although he insisted that there was also external evidence, argued that it is only by internal evidence that the truth of Scripture reaches the heart of the believer. Christian experience, he thought, testifies to the truth of Scripture. In spite of strong intellectualistic aspects of Hodge's view of faith, he included in it also the element of feeling.[18]

On the matter of his own spiritual life, however, Nevin still had fears and doubts, and his call to ministry remained uncertain. His quandaries were

no doubt exacerbated by Dr. Alexander's searching questions in the regular Sunday afternoon conferences with the students.[19] On the other hand, he reported that Alexander recommended "the older divinity and piety" of the seventeenth century—that of Richard Baxter (1615-1691), John Owen (1616-1683), and John Howe (1630-1705)[20]–which battled in his mind with the newer revivalistic system which he had first encountered at Union, but which he discovered was also alive among many of his fellow students at Princeton. Eventually, his reading of the older Divines would bear fruit. But in the meantime his religious life was sorely afflicted. He wrote to his friends about his spiritual darkness and his vocational doubts. One friend wrote at the end of 1825 trying to console him, "Let faith be matured by habitual exercises—not yield to ceaseless fluctuations of feelings, but anchored immovably in the 'rock of ages.' "[21] The issue of his vocation remained a sticky one even as late as his last year in seminary, for he made it clear in a letter to a friend who was asking him where he might wish to serve that that issue was "of slight importance" since he had not yet decided on the main matter of whether he had indeed been called to ministry.[22]

More important than letters of counsel from friends, however, were those from his father on the subject of his suitability for ministry. Nevin had apparently compared himself unfavorably with the stalwarts of faith in the past such as Jonathan Edwards and Phillip Doddridge. His father told him that one must take into account that in the memoirs of the dead there is a tendency to exaggerate their saintliness and ignore their faults. He pointed out the demeanor of the Apostles Peter and Paul, who did not hide their defects, and yet were not disqualified by the Lord as unfit for the sacred office.[14]

His uncertainty about the ministry led Nevin to consider teaching, at least as a temporary calling. He had corresponded with Dr. DeWitt about teaching Latin and Greek in an academy in Harrisburg, a notion which his father heartily opposed.[24] "You have been too long immured in schools and seminaries for the good of your bodily health," he wrote and also argued that the health of his son's mind would be improved by his removal from the classroom. As it turned out, the father lost the battle, for his son decided to stay on at Princeton after graduation to teach in place of Charles Hodge while Hodge was in Europe on sabbatical for two years and then to accept the chair of Biblical Literature at Western Theological Seminary beginning in 1830. Thus he set out on an

academic theological career which would be life-long even though there were some interruptions. He also desired to preach and for that purpose he came under the care of the Carlisle Presbytery. After examination on October 2, 1828, he was licensed to preach.[25]

Since he was not expected to take up his new duties in Pittsburgh until January 1830, Nevin spent fourteen months at home. His primary activity was not study but preaching the Gospel in churches and schools without a manuscript in so popular a style that his sermons were well received.[26] He took up the cause of temperance, which was in its beginning stage at that time. He published an address in 1829[27] and preached several "spirited" sermons which attacked the distilling and the selling of liquor as a "heinous sin." The cure for the disease, he thought, was the destruction of liquor altogether except as an apothecary drug. Nevin adopted what became a characteristic either/or style of argumentation. On this issue he insisted there was no neutral ground. He stood in the vanguard of Presbyterians, who by the 1830s were demanding not just the temperate use of alcohol but total abstinence.[28] It was more characteristic of New School than Old School Presbyterians to be devoted to total abstinence. Nevin's attitude was therefore more the exception than the rule among Old School Presbyterians.

In the summer of 1829 Nevin became the Stated Supply Pastor at the Presbyterian church in Big Spring not far from his home. He reported in his autobiography that the retired pastor, Dr. Joshua Williams, as well as his "many friends there," were eager for him to become the permanent pastor. He did not relate that there was a division in the congregation between those supporting Nevin and those favoring a Rev. John Kennedy, which was finally resolved by the choice of neither but rather of the Rev. Robert McCachran.[29] Because of his commitment to serving as a professor at the Western Theological Seminary in Pittsburgh, it is doubtful that he would have accepted an appointment at Big Spring even if it had been offered.

In 1830 Nevin took up his duties as professor of Biblical Literature in that seminary, the second and much less well-supported theological institution of the Presbyterian Church. He said it was his fortune in life "to labor . . . in situations attended with more than ordinary difficulty and work."[10] The seminary at Pittsburgh had no buildings and no endowment and only one faculty member, Rev. Luther Halsey, when Nevin became the second professor. He lived at first with Dr. Francis

Herron, the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh, who was known to the Nevin family as the former pastor of the Rocky Spring Presbyterian Church near their home. Herron had played an important role in its founding and in obtaining Halsey and Nevin for the new seminary.

As the professor of Biblical Literature, Nevin presented a lecture at the opening of the winter session in November, 1831, "The Claims of the Bible Urged upon the Attention of Students of Theology." After first arguing for the diligent study of the Bible on account of its literary character, which included for him its aesthetic form but more importantly its thought, he urged upon his students the study of the Bible "as the great textbook of all true theology." His reasoning here for the pursuit of this study owed something to his training in common-sense philosophy when he affirmed that just as in the philosophy of nature one must devote oneself to the study of nature, not only the individual facts but their relation to one another, so one cannot be a theologian without devoting oneself fully to the study of the Bible. The study of the Bible is important for the formation of Christian character and for a successful ministry, and here he stressed its value as an agent of sanctification, making ministers "spiritual guides of others." For this activity, in addition to a theoretical knowledge, a practical appropriation of "the living spirit of the bible itself" is required. And here he referred to some of his favorite seventeenth-century Divines as examples of such a spirituality—Baxter, Owen, Howe, Leighton and Flavel. He then proceeded to attack the feigned imitative "experimental piety" promoted by spiritual quacks "to anxious persons" in anxious revival meetings. Here already twelve years before his tract, "The Anxious Bench," he castigated the abuses of such a practice.

Furthermore, he argued that since "the Spirit of God . . . accommodated himself to the particular style of thought, as well as to the particular speech, of the people to whom his revelations were at first addressed," the interpreter must "to some considerable extent" put on "the mind of the Jew" and learn his language, history and culture. He stressed especially the value of the learning of the Hebrew language which reveals not just the speech but the thought of this ancient people. He did not intend to downplay the importance of Greek, but he especially stressed Hebrew because of its neglect.

While learning is necessary for the understanding of Scripture, just as in the knowledge of nature, it is even more important to possess "a frame of mind, in some good degree correspondent with its own spirit." Since the writers of the Bible were spiritual persons who "contemplated divine truth through the medium of divine affections," it is necessary for the interpreter to clothe himself "with the same spirituality of heaven-born affections."[31] Themes in this lecture were repeated and expanded upon in essays on the interpretation of the Bible published soon afterward in *The Friend.*

In addition to teaching, Nevin preached virtually every Sunday in mostly country congregations far and wide, to which he rode on horseback. Soon he became a fully ordained minister under the auspices of the Presbytery of Ohio.[32] One of the more important sermons Nevin preached in his early years at Pittsburgh concerned the approach of the Asiatic cholera into North America in the summer of 1832. The occasion was a city fast, and the place was the First Presbyterian Church. Its title indicated the theme, "The Scourge of God." Nevin showed himself to be a good Calvinist in seeing the cholera as an illustration of the providence of God. "If there be a God at all who upholds and governs the universe," he argued, "his providence must reach to all interests and events alike." In a manner similar to his teachers at Union College, such as Eliphalet Nott and at Princeton Seminary, such as Samuel Miller and Archibald Alexander, Nevin sought to join a Calvinistic with a post-Enlightenment, Scottish common-sense view of providence. On the one hand, "blessings and afflictions" take place under God's "immediate direction." On the other hand, providence is "governed by general and fixed principles." Such oscillation between particular providence, administered directly by God, and general providence, exercised indirectly through natural law, was typical of Reformed and Presbyterian preaching in the early years of the Republic. It was also characteristic of such sermons to link retribution with such national sins as pride, infidelity and intemperance as Nevin does in this sermon.[33]

Nevin preached also on other weighty theological themes in his early days in Pittsburgh. In the fall of 1832 his topic was "The Trinitarian and Unitarian Doctrines Concerning Jesus Christ." The text was Romans 9:5, "Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen." He contended that this text clearly sets forth the orthodox belief in the doctrine of Christ as both human and divine

and as divine, the second person of the Trinity. He argued that the doctrine poses no contradiction as properly understood. It does not go against reason even if it does rise above reason as an incomprehensible divine mystery. It is a fundamental doctrine that sets true believers off from those who cannot be embraced as members of "the Christian family." Furthermore, in contrast to what Unitarians think, it is not "a speculative dogma" for the intellect alone, but rather a practical teaching which is apprehended "by the heart, more than by the understanding—a thing of feeling, far more than of pure intellection." Since the doctrine is only truly apprehended "when it begins to live in the soul," a mind that is docile, reverential and prayerful is essential for such an august inquiry. He made use again of common-sense reasoning, however, to argue that "the science of Christianity . . . lies in the bible" and "in the regenerated heart . . . just as the science of physiology lies in the human body, or the science of natural philosophy lies in the world of material nature . . ."

Toward the end of his sermon he launched into a sharp critique of Unitarians as failing to supply the spiritual wants of human beings and as not productive of deep devotion or righteousness such as has been exhibted by some of the greats of the Christian tradition, Augustine, Luther, Calvin and his seventeenth-century English Puritan favorites, Baxter, Howe and Leighton, along with the German pietists, Spener and Francke and the Methodist Anglican, Wesley.[34]

In July 1833, Nevin preached at First Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh on the troubling problem of election and its relation to human freedom. Basing his sermon on John 6:37-40, he argued that the texts affirm both divine election and human freedom, and that other biblicalverses do as well. The blessings of the Gospel are offered to all on the condition of their being willing to receive them. But the texts here also teach that it is only by divine intervention, that human beings are brought to salvation. "No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him." He argued that the difficulty here of a seeming opposition between the divine determination and human freedom is not limited to the matter of salvation but rather extends to the providence of God in ordinary human life. On the one hand, human beings sense that the course of their life has been shaped by the circumstances of their birth or education; their fortune, good or bad. On the other hand, human beings feel that they are morally free, able to embrace or refuse what is put before them in ordinary life as well as in religion. From a practical

standpoint, there is no reason why a person should allow himself to be disturbed by this issue, for all assume that both doctrines cohere even if they seem to be in conflict. Furthermore, strong adherence to the doctrine of the absolute divine sovereignty has not undermined human responsibility or the cultivation of good works. Surprisingly, he refers here to the Catholic Jansenists when one might have expected him to point to the Calvinists. Finally, Nevin insists that the two doctrines are consistent not only in practice but also in theory. He contends that the only consequence of the doctrine of the divine decrees is the fact that human actions are certain. He holds further that human acts may be certain and yet be also perfectly free. The will is only free when it acts "according to its own constitutional laws," and when it does so its actions are certain. The sovereignty of God is "the ultimate groundwork of that particular constitution of life out of which the actions of men proceed." Nevin confesses at the end that many will find this theoretical argument, which I have greatly compressed, "metaphysical and abstract," but he insists that that could not be helped.[35]

In April 1833, besides teaching and preaching, Nevin began to edit and write for the journal named *The Friend,* founded by him and the Young Men's Society of Pittsburgh. Editing and writing, in addition to teaching, preaching and administrative duties, characterized his career.

From the beginning, Nevin conceived of himself as a theologian whose aim it was to contribute written reflections for the good of the American church and society. He was what Richard Wentz aptly calls a "public theologian."[36] It is most probable that the title and in part also the purpose of his journal were influenced by the journal of the same title published by Samuel Taylor Coleridge. The first American edition of Coleridge's collected essays from this journal appeared in 1831, only two years before the publication of Nevin's *The Friend.* The language is similar to that of Coleridge when Nevin restated the purpose of his journal at the beginning of his second volume: "to call attention off from what is merely physical and worldly in life, to what is moral and spiritual, and in this way to establish the authority of principles, in opposition to all the changing and fleeting forms of opinion that are found so often usurping their place."[37] Like Coleridge, Nevin expressed in Platonic terms his intent to address chiefly the moral and religious questions of the day which are of more permanent value.[38] He aimed for his journal to promote the view that "there are things of a more excellent nature than

those with which life is ordinarily engrossed, that the perfection of men's state in this world is not to be reached by that sort of industry and enterprise that lead to what is commonly called wealth, but to what is more beautiful than all treasures of silver and gold." He attacked two aspects of American culture which were at war with the "right condition of moral being" or "the true freedom and happiness of our own nature," namely, "the prevailing spirit of business" and "the spirit of political strife" or "party politics." He maintained that his journal would stay clear of this "arena of wrangling."[39]

His intention to avoid political controversy did not mean, however, the exclusion of moral questions which were also political and disputed, such as temperance and slavery, two issues which received abundant treatment in *The Friend.* His arguments on temperance scarcely advanced beyond those already presented in the 1829 declamation, but he addressed slavery for the first time in a public forum in his journal.

While Nevin repeatedly excoriated slavery as a great sin, he adopted for the most part a neutral stance between the two proposed solutions for the evil, colonization and emancipation. He was evenhanded in the publication of pieces which were pro-colonization and those which were anti-colonization and pro-abolition. He argued that the views of both sides should be heard out and discussed without rancor. He cautioned upholders of the abolitionist cause about the use of "rough, reviling" language against Colonization Society adherents. On the other hand, in an article on the Anti-Slavery Society at Lane Seminary, even as he acknowledged that abolitionism had exhibited some extravagance, he reprimanded critics of the abolitionists for regarding them as fanatics and not recognizing "the great and powerful principles which have all along been laboring underneath its action . . ." He urged a common ground between colonizationists and abolitionists concerning "the great evil of slavery."[40]

On December 25, 1834, he delivered his most severe indictment yet on the iniquity in connection with a piece on "Slavery in the District of Columbia" taken from *The Vermont Chronicle.* He stated that every human being, every church, every community in the United States was implicated in this sin, including the citizens and the churches of Pittsburgh.[41] It is no wonder that such remarks raised a storm, that one "prominent physician" called Nevin "the most dangerous man in Pittsburgh,"[42] and that he was forced to give up his position as editor of

The Friend. He resigned, however, by delivering a parting shot, now declaring himself as proudly an abolitionist who was willing to endure reproach for this stance and as no longer of the view that colonization was an appropriate remedy for this evil.[43] In taking such a strong stand branding slavery as an evil in itself and favoring abolition, Nevin was very much in the minority among Old School Presbyterian theologians and indeed the Old School Presbyterian Church as a whole in the early 1830's as he himself implies in his autobiography. Most Northern Old School Presbyterians, such as the influential Charles Hodge, Nevin's former professor, favored at most colonization as a remedy.[44]

In addition to the issues of temperance and slavery, Nevin addressed as a zealous Calvinist moralist such matters as Sabbath observance, theaters and ladies' fairs. Like other Presbyterian clergy, he favored a strict observance of the Sabbath—no work, no play, no travel. In April1836, as chairman of a committee established by the Presbytery of Ohio, he set forth his position on "the Claims of the Christian Sabbath." The specific issue concerned the propriety of church members traveling on the Sabbath or taking part in a business whose vehicles travel on the Sabbath. His comments, however, ranged over a much wider territory than the specific issue at hand. He argued that the institution, grounded in God's creation before the fall and in the fourth commandment, was of vital importance not only for Christianity but for American society. "The prosperity of the land," he contended, "is dependent on religion and religion is closely connected with Sabbath observance." He understood the chief significance of the institution to be located in its spiritual foundation and this he described in Platonic terms. Its "very design" is "to break the strong and steady flow of this world's life, and to give room for 'the things which are not seen and eternal.'"[45] Like other Presbyterians, both Old and New School, Nevin charged that the government was making war on the S abbath by the transportation of mail on Sundays, a practice dating back to a law passed by Congress in 1810 and reaffirmed by the Senate postal committee in 1829.[46] The spirit of the Sabbath, he argued, collided with the feverish spirit of the age, which was occupied with wealth and enterprise carried on by stages and steamboats and with foreign emigration bringing in popery and infidelity.

Nevin's anti-Catholic sentiment here contrasts sharply with his empathetic understanding of Catholicism in his Mercersburg years. In order to press for Sabbath observance, Nevin insisted on the prerogative

of church discipline and authority, which also ran counter to the times. He blamed the connection with the spirit of Congregationalism as making the Presbyterians "skeptical . . . of church power."[47] Like other Old School Presbyterians in the 1830s, Nevin was critical of the Plan of Union with Congregationalism, because it weakened Westminster standards concerning doctrine, discipline and polity.[48]

He also opposed theaters and theater stock investment, for its lack of refinement of taste and moral purpose. Even fairs organized by pious ladies to raise money for charitable causes came under his fire as "purely worldly exhibitions," "completely remote from everything which is truly spiritual." They are, he thought, "a specious form of charitable activity" and are detrimental to the industrious poor who have greater difficulty selling their goods because of competition from fairs.[49] It did not please him that, while he was absent from the city to get married, the ladies chose to hold a fair, but with tongue in cheek he admitted: "We are not in a humor just now to scold very hard . . . It is a hard case that a man cannot steal away a few days from this place, even to get married, without finding this sort of mischief done when he comes back. Such, however, it appears, is the lot of us miserable editors."[50]

The marriage was to Miss Martha Jenkins, the daughter of Robert and Catherine Jenkins. Mr. Jenkins was the ironmaster of Windsor Forge, Churchtown, Lancaster County. The couple was married on January 1, 1835, in Pequea, Lancaster County, by the Presbyterian minister, Rev. John Wallace. Nevin's censoriousness alienated not only the ladies but many of their defenders as well as the theater-goers and managers. He admitted in his autobiography that his "reformatory zeal was on the whole too self-conscious and ambitious" and that "it was not exercised in the wisest and best way."[51]

His writings in *The Friend*, however, considered not only practical moral issues but also theological themes. Most especially, he wrote on the interpretation of Scripture, in which he had a strong personal and professional interest. Three principal perspectives governed his biblical interpretation: 1) the grammatical, historical sense; 2) Scottish common-sense philosophy; 3) Christian Platonic spiritualism or mysticism. Nevin argued that "the grand object of interpretation is to reach and bring into view the very thoughts which were meant to be expressed by the writer." In order to uncover these thoughts, the interpreter must in the first place be of a pious mind. Nevin contended that "only the holy can grasp the

holy." This piety is to be cultivated by centering oneself on the "believing contemplation of the great objects of faith."[52] But piety is insufficient for bringing about a correct interpretation of the Bible. One must make use of grammatical principles, since the Scriptures "are exhibited to us in the drapery of a language that is purely human."[53] Knowledge of the original languages, Hebrew and Greek, is thus essential. In addition, the exegete must have an understanding of the milieu of the Bible—the historical, sociological and geographical context.[54] In other words, he must have mastered the grammatical-historical, critical method in order properly to interpret Scripture. This method Nevin had learned from reading some of the eighteenth-century German biblicalscholars such as J. A. Ernesti and W. M.L. DeWette, but most especially from Andover Seminary's outstanding biblical scholar, Moses Stuart, who introduced German biblical scholarship to America.

Already while at Princeton, Nevin expressed an interest in Stuart's scholarship, his theology and his teaching method to two of his friends studying there. One of them reported that Stuart's exegesis was as inconstant as his theology, "half German, half orthodox," and that "he learns the students to think and investigate for themselves."[55] These comments were not at all wide of the mark, for, although Stuart had appropriated the grammatical-historical method of Ernesti and insisted with the German critics that the Bible be read like all other books, he also subscribed to a high doctrine of biblical authority, which held to the plenary but not the verbal inspiration of Scripture.[56]

Nevin's reading of the German scholars was at first primarily in English, but early in his Pittsburgh period he sought to learn German himself, and before long he had gained enough command of it to translate, for *The Friend*, DeWette's introduction to his *Commentary on the Psalms*. He considered DeWette a rationalist who had little appreciation for the Bible as the Word of God, and yet he praised him as "among the first scholars of the age" and regarded his views on the history, style and language of the Bible as "worthy of great respect."[57]

More important, however, for Nevin's future theological development than his study of the work of DeWette, was his growing mastery of the German language. Soon he became widely acquainted not only with German biblical scholarship but also with German historical studies, theology and philosophy. This knowledge would eventually shape his

own theology and make him a prime candidate for the position of professor of theology at the German Reformed seminary at Mercersburg.

Flushed with enthusiasm for the new objective, critical approach to Scripture, Nevin warned against the pre-understandings of parties or sects to which one may belong. One must approach "the bible in its own light, instead of gazing upon it continually . . . through the medium of a party creed." He pitted exegesis against eisegesis, the interpretation of the text with preconceived notions. Theories of philosophy hinder the right interpretation, but he did not wish to throw out all predispositions, for he recognized that the minds of human beings, especially when they are young, are necessarily influenced by father, teachers, church creeds, various systems of divinity or philosophies.[58] Nevin must have felt here the impulse to acknowledge the forces shaping his own outlook as well as others, but he warned against them as impeding an accurate interpretation of Scripture. Of course, consciously or unconsciously, Nevin was deeply informed by certain philosophical and religious perspectives which shaped his biblical hermeneutic.

Besides grammatical-historical criticism, Nevin made use of Scottish common-sense philosophy for his interpretation of Scripture. In one essay he referred to theology as a science in the same breath with astronomy and anatomy. In language which closely approximated that of his former professor at Princeton, Charles Hodge, Nevin affirmed: "What the material world is in respect to the natural philosopher [that is, the scientist] the Bible is to the theologian . . . As in anatomy, so in theology, the observation of the facts as they are in themselves, and taken in their proper evidence, must always precede, in order to the erection of a scientific scheme . . . The interpretation of the Bible is...to the student of divinity precisely what the interpretation of nature is to the student of natural philosophy."[59] Like Hodge, Nevin applied the empirical, inductive scientific method derived from Francis Bacon to the study of Scripture. As science rests on empirical and inductive reasoning, so does the interpretation of Scripture.

Nevin eventually repudiated this common-sense method for Scripture and theology. Already in *The Friend* he set forth here and there a more intuitive, Platonic, mystical approach to Scripture which stood in sharp contrast to that of common-sense philosophy. After putting forward various literary arguments for the importance of the Bible, he contended that the Bible makes higher claims on human attention than simply those

regarding its literary value. These pertain to its disclosing "the realities of the spiritual and invisible world," in addition to its setting forth the true condition of the human race.[60] Platonism is also clearly evident in his first essay on the topic, "Is the Bible of God?," when he states that "the objects and pursuits of time" pale in comparison with the presentation in the Bible of "things that are not seen and eternal."[61] Sin, which more prevents the understanding of Scripture than the mind's finitude, is also described in Platonic terms. It is "the error of the soul that is fallen away from its proper fellowship with the spiritual world, and subjected to the slavery of matter." And yet Nevin referred here also to the Bible as a system of facts presenting many difficulties to the human mind which can only be overcome "by long and diligent study." That, he thinks, is also the case with the natural sciences.[62] Thus, common sense continues to compete with Platonism as the philosophy by which to interpret Scripture.

Another important illustration of the tension in Nevin's mind between an intuitive, Platonic reading and a common-sense reading is found in the previously cited essay, "Is the Bible of God?" On the one hand, he contended that for the Bible to be believed at all, it "must be believed on the evidence of its own immediate and direct light." On the other hand, even though he acknowledged that this argument is not convincing to unbelievers, he thought that there were external proofs which abundantly demonstrate to human reason the claims of revelation. But here, with Alexander, he stressed more the internal evidences which impress themselves upon the mind of the believer. And he closed with a quotation from the *Imitation of Christ* by Thomas À Kempis, a work which he mentioned in his autobiography as having deeply affected him: "Blessed is the man whom eternal truth teacheth, not by obscure figures and transient sounds, but by a direct and full communication . . . "[63]

The *Imitation of Christ* was also greatly admired by Archbishop Robert Leighton (1611-1684) of Glasgow, who, as already mentioned, was one of several seventeenth-century spiritualizing Divines who made a favorable impact on Nevin.[64] Others whom he recalled as having influenced him were John Howe (1630-1705), Henry Scougal (1650-1678) and Samuel Shaw (1635-1696). "The deep Platonizing thoughts" of Howe he remembered as having made a forceful effect upon his mind.[65] Scougal's popular devotional classic, *The Life of God in the Soul of Man*, was another work which much attracted him, expressing in its

very title what he came increasingly to perceive as the essence of the Christian life. The same notion was affirmed in Shaw's *Immanuel; or True Religion, a Living Principle in the Minds of Men*. This mystical theme matched his own, basic mystical bent. The spirituality of these seventeenth-century Divines appealed to him also in another respect. It was Platonic, in contrast with the nineteenth-century revivalistic piety which he first experienced at Union College. It took more account of the "objective powers" or "ideas" of Christianity. It had to do with "the believing apprehension" of a "real grace meeting the soul" and not with mere subjective feelings of the soul itself.[66] Thus, this seventeenth-century Platonizing spirituality offered to Nevin not only a perspective on the interpretation of Scripture, which competed with a rational-critical approach, but also a corrective to the evangelical subjectivism he had met at Union and continued to encounter on the American scene. In addition, Nevin's Platonic idealism prepared him to be receptive to the Hegelian idealism[67] which he encountered forcefully for the first time in the thinking of Friedrich Rauch, whose colleague Nevin became when he was appointed as a professor at Mercersburg in the spring of 1840.

Nevin became also increasingly disenchanted with the grammatical, historical approach to Scripture and adopted a more romantic, poetic perspective, which, however, had much in common with his previous mystical, intuitive understanding. He became impressed with the need to penetrate through the letter of Scripture to its spirit. As with poetry, so with Scripture, he thought, "no philological or historical learning can reveal" the meaning of the text. Just as there must be on the part of the interpreter of poetry a sense of the spirit of poetry or the same mind as the poet himself, so the biblical interpreter must take into account that with Scripture one is dealing not just with human words but with human words that have "the mind of the Divine Spirit" in them. Such a literature cannot be penetrated by the mere natural understanding, but only by an organ capable of apprehending the supernatural and that organ is faith.[68]

As Nevin indicated in his autobiography, he was assisted here by the *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews* of Robert Lowth (1719-1787) and especially by *The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, written by the pre-Romantic, Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803). Lowth's lifting up of the unique sublimity and figurative quality of Hebrew poetry which arouses the feelings and which requires on the part of the reader a

sympathetic approach[69] probably stirred Nevin just as he must have been impressed by Herder's insistence that the Bible is to be interpreted not just critically, but also with feeling by entering into its poetic spirit. Herder did not reject grammatical, historical criticism, but he did not think that through that method alone one can come to a proper understanding of the biblical text. One must approach it with sensitivity or empathy; that is, seek to enter into the same mind as that of the author and to understand it as revelatory of both the human and the divine Spirit, a notion which clearly appealed to Nevin.[70]

Closely associated with the mystical motif of the life of God in the soul of man and the romantic stress on feeling is, for Nevin, the idea of religion as a life. He wrote several articles on the subject toward the end of his tenure as editor of *The Friend*. Religion, he argued, is "the true and proper life of the soul, "a state . . . of sympathy and fellowship with Him who is the original Fountain of life." He made use here, for the first time, as far as I can determine, of an organic metaphor like those which were common to his writing in the Mercersburg period. Such metaphors were prominent in the Romantic Movement. Religion as the life of the soul "carries within itself the germ of its own perfect state from the beginning and grows by unfolding itself from within . . . "[71]

Nevin stressed that this state is not to be apprehended by speculation but by the interior sense of the soul. Like the German theologian, Friedrich Schleiermacher, he argued that it is more a matter of sentiment than of thought. Christianity held on to its identity from one age to the next because it seized the minds of its adherents as a "system of facts" and not as a "system of notions" for speculation.[72] However, while it might appear that he has been swayed by a romantic understanding which stressed feeling, Nevin showed that he was still under the spell of common-sense reasoning when he insisted, that just as a false theory of physics is refuted by "a collision with the actual course of nature as discerned by the experiences of the senses," so Christian theology is tested by experience.[73]

Like Coleridge, Nevin maintained that Christianity revealed itself from the beginning as an internal life, not as a science—that is, not as a theological system.[74] But again under the influence of common-sense philosophy he compared the life of religion with the life of nature and affirmed that just as with the latter, so with the former, "experiment, observation, analysis and comparison were needed to draw forth its

hidden relations into the light of day, and adjust the whole into the proportions of a regular system of divinity."[75]

Like Schleiermacher, and in contrast to his later views, he stressed that creeds and confessions were secondary, not primary in the history of Christianity.[76] They developed out of Christian experience rather than being the ground for it. It was not because of creeds that the church triumphed over paganism in its first centuries, but rather because it had "Life in itself." He revealed again here, however, the continuing hold of Baconianism upon his mind when he argued that the view he had just propounded concerning the priority of religious experience over creeds, stood in harmony "with reason and common sense." Just as with science where the living facts of nature precede the construction of a theory concerning those facts, so with Christianity, the living experience precedes its theoretical formulation in articles of faith.[77]

Again, like Schleiermacher and his school, Nevin argued in a late essay in The Friend that religion is " a certain state and habit of the mind" which is not to be identified with morality nor with the forms of worship nor with doctrine nor even with the outward expression of religious sentiment.[78] It is a "grand heresy," in his view, to trust simply in the forms of morality or of doctrines or of religious worship instead of understanding that religion is "a life" even though he does not intend to disparage morality, doctrine or forms of worship.[79] Nevertheless, his view here contrasts sharply with the importance he gave to creeds and liturgy in the Mercersburg period.

The theme of the "life of God in the soul" was also prominent in a lecture of 1837 and a sermon of 1838. In the lecture, addressed to Western Theological Seminary students at the beginning of the summer term, Nevin maintained that the sense of "the power of a divine life" in one's own inner being is necessary for the proper pursuit of theological studies. The objects of theological knowledge, since they have to do with "the realities of the spiritual world," can only be apprehended by "a spiritual mind." Likewise, the conduct of ministry can only be fruitful when the "the life of God" is "kept up actively in the soul." Thus the cultivation of piety through prayer and meditation on the divine life of Jesus is necessary for both theological study and the practice of ministry.[80] And Nevin practiced what he preached. His cousin, the Reverend Alfred Nevin, who lived with the John Williamson Nevin family while he was a student at the seminary in Pittsburgh, reported that

Nevin regularly locked the door of his study after breakfast and family worship, "to spend an hour in communion with God" before taking on the day's tasks.[81]

The sermon, "The Seal of the Spirit," based on Ephesians 1:13, was permeated by the same theme. He claimed that a supernatural change is brought about by the seal of the spirit which issues in the most intimate and strong bond of union with "the invisible spiritual world in which God dwells." He dared to affirm that through the seal of the Spirit believers are made "partakers of the divine nature." He showed here and elsewhere that the reading of the seventeenth-century Puritan Platonizing mystics had left an indelible impact upon him, and yet there lingered in his mind also a rational approach to God. No special illumination, he thought, was needed to posit the idea of God, for the human understanding can be persuaded by the "logical fitness" of this truth. The logical forms of religious truths may be understood by human reason, but they are not grasped in their own nature except by an immediate and direct communication with them by faith.[82] Nevin is still fusing the logical-empirical with the intuitive-mystical—common sense philosophy with Platonism—but the stress is clearly on the latter, and before long the common-sense approach will drop out altogether.

This theme of participation in the divine nature through faith made him, in my view, receptive later to the views of the Church Fathers, along the same lines. The thought of the Fathers, previously so strange to his Presbyterian eyes, was opened up to him for the first time in this Pittsburgh period by the work of the Berlin church historian, August Neander,[83] but his knowledge and appreciation of the Fathers was greatly deepened during his time at Mercersburg. Nevin also gained from Neander, for the first time, the idea of development in church history, which, as reinforced by his colleague at Mercersburg, Philip Schaff, played a major role in his later thinking on the church.

Nevin's mystical spirituality remained with him throughout his life, but at Mercersburg it became more Christocentric, communal, sacramental, and liturgical than previously. Although his theology had already moved in a more decidedly Christocentric direction before his arrival at Mercersburg, this tendency, he reported in his autobiography, would come to prevail only in this latter period.[84] The creed, that is, especially the Apostles Creed with its central affirmations concerning the incarnate Christ and the church, played here a major role. In his autobiography he

reported that he had made little of the creed while he was at Pittsburgh. He also related that he did not yet have a proper grasp of the churchly and sacramental side of Christianity. He stated that his "first glimpse . . . of what the church spirit" really meant came to him when he happened to read one of the Oxford Tracts;[85] that is, one of the writings of the Anglo Catholic theologians such as Edward Pusey, John Keble and John Henry Newman. It is my judgment that, although his reading of the Oxford Divines may have sparked the prominence of the church in his piety and theology, his later views on the subject were more shaped by his reading in the Fathers and portions of the New Testament, especially Ephesians, and by his reflections on the subject in the light of the widespread sectarianism of American society. The high-church views of the Confessional Lutherans in Germany may also have had some bearing on his growing churchliness, but not nearly as much, I think, as some scholars hold.[86] Belief in "one holy catholic Church" was central to Nevin's Mercersburg theology. He understood this article as setting forth an historic, objective unity and universality of the church over against the rampant sectarianism of American society.

At Mercersburg, Nevin experienced also a sacramental awakening which was, however, in part prepared for by the communion seasons in which he had participated as a young Scotch-Irish Presbyterian. He came more and more to understand the sacraments as having an objective force in a more Catholic sense as causing and containing grace. The theme of "the life of God in the life of the soul" remained prominent in his religious self-consciousness, but he now stressed that the mystical union with God takes place only through union with Christ, the God-man, and it is especially in the Eucharist that such an intimate union is realized. With this view, he fell in line not only with the Eucharistic thought of John Calvin, but also with the mystical sacramental theology of the Church Fathers, especially those in the Eastern Church.

The logical consequence of this Eucharistic spirituality and theology was attention to the liturgy. According to Nevin, the liturgy was to be eucharistically, not homiletically, focused. Thus the altar rather than the pulpit was to be the visual center of worship. Worship was to be communal, not individualistic, involving not just the pastor in preaching and praying, but both the pastor and the people, with many responses by the congregation. The liturgy was to be historical, drawing on Scripture

as well as the best of the ancient and Reformation liturgies, and yet the language was to be contemporary.

In all of this Christocentric, churchly, sacramental and liturgical piety and reflection, Nevin found the answer not only to his own earlier anxious introspective wrestlings, but also to the troubling individualism and sectarianism of American Protestantism in the mid-nineteenth century. True spirituality, he had come to understand, does not wallow in its own subjectivity but requires objective, historical forms—creed, sacrament and liturgy. And this conviction was and is a hallmark of the Mercersburg Theology, one which is still relevant to an American Protestantism still rampantly individualistic and subjectivistic.

---

1. This essay was presented in a briefer form at the Annual Meeting of the Evangelical and Reformed Historical Society on October 11, 2003, at Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of Nevin's birth and the 150th anniversary of the founding of the college.

2. John W. Nevin, *My Own Life: The Earlier Years. Papers of the Eastern Chapter the Historical Society of the Reformed Church*, No. 1 (Lancaster, Pa., 1964), 5-6. Originally published in the *Reformed Church Messenger*, 1870.

3. *My Own Life*, 36.

4. On Scottish communions see Leigh Schmidt, *Holy Fairs: Scotland and the Making of American Revivalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).

5. *My Own Life*, 7-8.

6. *My Own Life*, 10.

7. Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1954), 55.

8. On Duffield see, *American National Biography*, vol. 7 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 20-21.

9. *My Own Life*, 20-21.

10. Letter from Lewis D. Howell, 11/26/1825, Evangelical and Reformed Historical Society Archives.

11. Letters from J. A. Stowe, 12/27/1825; Lewis D. Howell, 2/17/1826; ERHS Archives.

12. "Proceedings Connected with the Semi-Centennial Commemoration of the Professorship of Charles Hodge, D. D., LL.D. in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., April 24, 1872" (New York: D. F. Randolph & Co., n. d.), 52, cited and quoted in Randall Palmer and John R. Fitzmeier, *The Presbyterians* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1993), 52, 59, n. 15.

13. John W. Nevin, *The Mystical Presence: A Vindication of the Reformed or Calvinistic Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1846), 63-94; "Doctrine of the Reformed Church on the Lord's Supper," *Mercersburg Review*, vol. 2 (1850), 454-548.

14. Letters from John G. Maclay (Nov. 27, 1827) and A. Logan (Feb. 18, 1828); ERHS Archives.

15. *A Summary of Biblical Antiquities Compiled for the Use of Sunday School Teachers, and for the Benefit of Families*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union, 1829), 117, 131, 139, 235-38.

16. On Scottish Common Sense Philosophy see Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), and Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *Protestants in an Age of Science: The Baconian Ideal and Antebellum American Religious Thought* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1977), 3-31. For its influence on Old School Presbyterianism and Princeton College and Seminary, see Bozeman, 32-43 *et passim*, and Lefferts A. Loetscher, *Facing the Enlightenment and Pietism: Archibald Alexander and the Founding of Princeton Theological Seminary* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1983), 29, 57, 94-95, 184. For a recent excellent discussion of Baconianism under the category of "Evidential Christianity," see E. Brooks Holifield, *Theology in America: Christian Thought from the Age of the Puritans to the Civil War* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), 173-196, and for its impact on the Princeton theologians in particular, see ibid., 379- 381.

17. Loetscher, 21-22 and see W. Andrew Hoffecker, *Piety and the Princeton Theologians, Archibald Alexander, Charles Hodge, Benjamin Warfield* (Grand Rapids: Baker House, 1981), 1 -43. Nevin, *My Own Life*, 122.

18. Hoffecker, 79-81.

19. *My Own Life*, 21. On Alexander's Sunday Conferences, see Hoffecker, 31-32.

20. *Ibid.*, 22.

21. Letter from J. A. Stowe, 12/27/1825, ERHS Archives.

22. Letter from Lewis D. Howell, 2/17/1826, ERHS Archives.

23. *My Own Life*p. 26.

24. Letter from R. Dewitt, 8/26/1826, ERHS Archives, and *My Own Life*, 28.

25. *Ibid.*, 27-28.

26. *Ibid.*, 31-32.

27. John W. Nevin, *An Address in behalf of the Temperance Cause in Big Spring Church, Newville, Pa., August 8, 1829 on Occasion of the Newville Temperance Society* (Carlisle, Pa., 1829).

28. "An Address in behalf of Temperance," pp. 7-10, 21, 23, 34. Cf. Fred J. Hood, *Reformed America: The Middle and Southern States 1783-1837* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1980), 154; Leo P. Hirrel, *Children of Wrath: New School Calvinism and Antebellum Reform* (Lexington, Ky.: The University of Kentucky Press, 1998), 120-21.

29. *My Own Life*, 35; Gilbert W. Swope, *History of Big Spring Presbyterian Church, Newville, Pa. (1737-1898)* (Newville, Pa., 1898), 98.

30. *My Own Life*, 76.

31. *The Claims of the Bible Urged upon the Attention of Students of Theology. Lecture Delivered on November 8, 1831 at the Opening of the Winter Session of Western Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church* (Pittsburgh: D. & M. Maclean, 1831), 3-7, 9-12, 14- 16, 22-23.

32. *My Own Life*, 78-79.

33. John W. Nevin, *The Scourge of God: A Sermon in the First Presbyterian Church, July 6,1832, on the Occasion of a City Fast in Reference to the Approach of the Asiatic Cholera.* Pittsburgh: Johnston and Stockton, 1832. Cf. Hood, 27-47.

34 "The Trinitarian and Unitarian Doctrines Concerning Jesus Christ," *The Presbyterian Preacher*, Vol. I, No. 5 (October 1832), 69-70, 72-73, 78.

35. "Election not Contrary to a Free Gospel," *The Presbyterian Preacher*, Vol. II, No. 2 (July 1833), 209-24.

36. Richard Wentz, *John W. Nevin: American Theologian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 49-65.

37. *The Friend* (Edited by J. W. Nevin, for the Young Men's Society of Pittsburgh and Vicinity) , Vol. II, No. 1 (July 3, 1834), 4. Cf. Coleridge, *The Friend, The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge,* IV. pt. 2, ed. Barbara E. Rooke (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), Appendix A, 18: "The object of *The Friend* . . . is to uphold those Truths and those Merits, which are founded in the nobler and permanent Parts of our Nature, against the Caprices of Fashion and such Pleasures as either depend on transitory and accidental Causes, or are pursued from less worthy Impulses."

38. Cf. the words of Coleridge in the preceding note. The extent of Coleridge's influence upon Nevin is not altogether clear. See the discussions of David Layman and William DiPuccio in *The New Mercersburg Review* , Nr. 17 (Spring, 1995), 54-63. Layman denies any significant influence whereas DiPuccio, while rejecting a major influence, does think that Nevin was impressed by Coleridge's epistemology and his understanding of faith. My own view is closer to DiPuccio than to Layman even if I concur with Layman's critique of James Hasting Nichols' too facile acceptance of Coleridge's impact on Nevin which has been too readily adopted by succeeding scholars. His journal is no doubt, in part at least, modeled on that of Coleridge. He had in common with Coleridge a strong admiration for the Christian Platonism of Archbishop Leighton and probably had read the Aids to Reflection which consists of Coleridge's commentary on aphorisms of Leighton. See below n. 71. In addition, he may have been further bolstered in his Christian Platonism and in a kinship with Coleridge by the comments of F. A. G. Tholuck which Nevin published from The Boston Recorder in *The Friend* [Vol. II, Nr. 10 (Sept. 11, 1834), 740] under the title, "German Philosophy in America." Tholuck argued that for German

philosophic thought to make any headway in England and America the mode of thinking in those countries must rise above John Locke and the Common-Sense Philosophy into Christian Platonism. He referred to Coleridge as having been a mediator of German thinking to the Anglo-Saxon world. How much of an impression Tholuck made upon Nevin at this point in his career one can't be sure, but he does refer in his autobiography to his acquaintance with Tholuck and Olshausen as having been "salutary and fruitful to him in no common degree" (*My Own Life*, 138). It would be some time after the appearance of this piece by Tholuck, however, before Nevin himself would put Common-Sense Realism behind him .

39. *The Friend*, Vol. II, Nr. 1 (July 3, 1834), 4.

40. *The Friend*, Vol. I, Nr. 44 (April 17, 1834), 174.

41. *The Friend*, Vol. II, Nr. 25 (Dec. 25, 1834), 197.

42. *My Own Life*, 90.

43. *The Friend*, Vol. II, Nr. 36 (March 12, 1835), 287; *My Own Life*, 93.

44. Leo P. Hirrel, *Children of Wrath: New School and Antebellum Reform*, 135-37; John R. Bodo, *The Protestant Clergy and Public Issues (1812-1848)* (Princeton, N. J., 1954); reprint (Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1980), 123-127. On Old School Presbyterian opposition to abolitionism see John R. McKivigan, *The War against Proslavery Religion: Abolitionism and the Northern Churches, 1830-1865* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1984), 165-167. In *My Own Life*, (94) Nevin stated that "the Presbyterian Church as a whole . . . was fully committed to the Southern view of slavery, and considered it a religious as well as a political wrong to allow in any way its free ventilation." He reported that the New York "Observer" and the Philadelphia "Presbyterian" were "hostile in full to the anti-slavery movement in every form." Cf. McKivigan (167) who points out that even some prominent New School Presbyterians opposed abolition, including Sidney E. Morse, editor of the *New York Observer* and Amasa Converse, editor of the Philadelphia *Christian Observer*.

45. *The Presbytery of Ohio on the Claims of the Christian Sabbath: A Report Read and Adopted*, April 21, 1836 at a Meeting of the Presbytery held at Raccoon Church (Pittsburgh: William Allinder, 1836), 4.

46. Bodo, 39; Hood, 137-39

47. *The Presbytery of Ohio . . .*, 4-5.

48. Balmer and Fitzmeier, *The Presbyterians*, 66.

49. "Fairs," *The Friend*, vol. I, No. 6 (June 6, 1833), 22; No. 37 (Feb. 27, 1834), 147.

50. The Friend, Vol. II, No. 27 (Jan. 8, 1835), 222.

51. *My Own Life*, 84.

52. "Essays on the Interpretation of the Bible," No. VII, *The Friend*, Vol. I, No. 11 (July 11, 1833), 42 .

53. "Essays on the Interpretation of the Bible," No. VII, *The Friend*, Vol. I, No. 12 (July 18, 1833), 45.

54. "Essays on the Interpretation of the Bible," No. X, *The Friend*, Vol. I, No. 14 (August 1, 1833), 53; "Essays on the Interpretation of the Bible," No. XI, *The Friend*, Vol. I (August 22, 1833), 66.

55. From Thomas A. Ogden, March 2, 1827, ERHS Archives.

56. William Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, vol.2 (Minneapolis : Fortress Press, 2003), 21-25; John H. Giltner, *Moses Stuart: The Father of Biblical Science in America* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988). On Ernesti and DeWette, see Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, vol. I (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 108-14, 221-29.

57. *The Friend*, Vol. II, No. 8 (August 28, 1834), 62. The first evidence of Nevin's use of German appears in translations of "Christian Emblems" from Neander's *Denkwürdigkeiten* (*The Friend* , Vol. I, No. 5 (May 30, 1833), 17), and of a piece by the editor of *Der Pittsburger Beobachter* (*The Friend*), Vol. I, No. 37 (Feb. 27, 1834), 146). *In My Own Life* (140) Nevin reported that he first learned German to read Neander in the original and that Neander's *Geist des Tertullianus* was "the first German book of any account" which he read. But there is no mention of this in *The Friend* nor of any other writing of Neander apart from the *Denkwürdigkeiten* which is itself not reported in *My Own Life*. From *The Friend* one would have the impression that he learned German primarily to read the German Biblical critics. In an article, "French and German," he favored German rather than French as giving expression "not infrequently" to "the very charm of mysticism itself." But he

thought that "the language as spoken in this country, is barbarous in every respect." *The Friend*, Vol. II, No. 16 (Oct. 23, 1834), 122.

58. "Essays on the Interpretation of the Bible, No VI," *The Friend*, Vol. I, No. 7 (June 6, 1833), 26.

59. "Essays on the Interpretation of the Bible," No. II, Vol. I, No. 2 (May 9, 1833), 5. Cf. Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. I (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1946), 10.

60. "Essays on the Interpretation of the Bible," No. I, *The Friend*, Vol. I, No. 1 (April 10, 1833), 2. On Nevin's interior, spiritual, Platonic interpretation of Scripture, see William DiPuccio, *The Interior Sense of Scripture: The Sacred Hermeneutics of John W. Nevin* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1998), esp. 79-114. DiPuccio's discussion draws not so much, however, on Nevin's early writings as on essays written toward the end of his life.

61. "Is the Bible of God?" *The Friend*, Vol. 1, Nr. 32 (Jan. 23, 1834), 126. Cf., also, "Is the Bible of God?" No. 3, *The Friend*, Vol. I, No. 34 (Feb. 6, 1834), 134.

62. "Essays on the Interpretation of the Bible," No. V. *The Friend*, vol. I, No. 6 (June 6, 1833), 21.

63. "Is the Bible of God?" No. 5, *The Friend*, Vol. I, Nr. 39 (March 13, 1834), 154; *My Own Life*, p. 127

64. "Valedictory Oration," in *The Select Works of Archbishop Leighton* (Boston: Pierce and Parker, 1832), 556; *My Own Life*, 122.

65. According to Edmund Calamy, the author of "The Life of Mr. John Howe," Howe, when he attended Christ College, Cambridge, came under the influence of the Cambridge Platonists, Dr. Henry More and Dr. Cudworth, from whom "he received that Platonic tincture, which so remarkably runs through the writings which he drew up and published in his advanced years." *The Works of John Howe* (New York: John P. Haven, 1888), iii.

66. *My Own Life*, 122-123.

67. On Nevin's idealism and its relation to his Platonic spirituality, see William DiPuccio, "Nevin's Idealistic Philosophy," in *Reformed Confessionism in Nineteenth Century America: Essays on the Thought of John Williamson Nevin*, edited by Sam Hamstra, Jr. and Arie J. Griffioen

(Lanham, Md., 1995), 43-67 and Linden DeBie, "German Idealism in Protestant Orthodoxy: The Mercersburg Movement, 1840-1860," Ph.D. dissertation (McGill University, 1987).

68. *My Own Life*, 133-36.

69. *My Own Life*, 137. Robert Lowth, *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews (1787)* (Hildesheim: George Olms, 1969), I, 103-119; Vincent Freimarck, Introduction, in *ibid.*, XXVIII.

70. J. Herder, *The Spirit of Hebrew of Poetry, translated by James Marsh*, 2 vols. (Burlington, Vermont, 1833). On Herder's Biblical hermeneutics see Hans W. Frei, *The Eclipse of the Biblical Narrative* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1974), 183-201. In *The Claims of the Bible*, there is a passing reference to Lowth and Herder as discerning with their skill in the habits of oriental thought "the taste and literary refinement" of sacred Scripture, 4.

71. "Religion a Life," *The Friend*, Vol. II, No. 25 (Dec. 25, 1834), 198.

72. "Religion a Life," *ibid.*; and " Religion a Life," *The Friend*, Vol. II, No. 29 (Jan. 22, 1835), 230.

73. *The Friend*, Vol. II, No. 30 (Jan. 29, 1835), 238.

74. "Religion a Life," *The Friend*, Vol. II, No. 30 (Jan. 29, 1835), 238. Cf. Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection, The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, vol. 9, ed. John Beer (Princeton University Press, 1993), 202: "Christianity is not a Theory, or a Speculation; but a Life. Not a Philosophy of Life, but a Life and a living Process."

75. "Religion a Life," *The Friend*, Vol. II, No. 30 (Jan. 29, 1835), 239.

76. See below n. 78.

77. "Religion a Life," *The Friend*, Vol. II, No. 30 (Jan. 29, 1835), 239.

78. Cf. Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, ed. H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark), 5-12, where Schleiermacher locates the essence of religion in the feeling of absolute dependence rather than knowledge (doctrine) or doing (morality) which are secondary to religious feeling.

79. "The Grand Heresy," *The Friend*, No. 31 (Feb. 5, 1835), 246.

80. *Personal Holiness*, "A Lecture Delivered, June, 1837 at the Opening of the Summer Term in the Western Theological Seminary By John W. Nevin" (Pittsburgh: William Allinder, 1837), 3, 6-7, 10.

81. "Letter to Theodore Appel," in Theodore Appel, *Life and Work of John Williamson Nevin* (Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publication House, 1889), 90.

82. *The Seal of the Spirit* (Pittsburgh: William Allinder,1838), 6.

83. *My Own Life*, 139-144.

84. *Ibid*., 145.

85. *Ibid*, 149.

86. James Hastings Nichols, *The Mercersburg Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), 11, 14, 16; Walter H. Conser Jr., *Church and Confession: Conservative Theologians in Germany, England, and America, 1815-1866* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1984), 283-297. See John B. Payne, "Schaff and Nevin, Colleagues at Mercersburg: The Church Question," *Church History* 61 (June 1992), 175-76.

THE PUPPETS FROM TRANSYLVANIA WARN DANIEL MEETER

Joseph Bassett

The Rev. Dr. Daniel Meeter delivered an outstanding lecture for the 2003 Convocation of the Mercersburg Society. His topic was the Heidelberg and Westminster Catechisms with special attention to worship. This was the 440th anniversary of the Heidelberg Catechism. Since Lancaster had hosted a major event on the 400th anniversary of the catechism with translations and commentaries being published in 1963 it was fitting that we meet at Lancaster Seminary to hear this particular lecture.

That Dr. Meeter's lecture was informative as well as erudite and witty did not surprise me. In 1985 he had come up to East Milton to address the Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers regarding the Belhar Declaration. Two years prior to that, he and I encountered a venerable Presbyterian minister from Canada. We were all at a meeting of the Consultation on Common Texts in Chicago. After the initial session we retired for conversation and refreshment. Meeter and I promptly delivered our subjective critiques of Karl Barth. With a measure of patience and grace, the Reverend Dr. William Klempa, who had studied Calvin with Barth in Basel, replied in a generously authoritative tone, "Well, that's not quite true." Then he would quote volume chapter and paragraph pointing out the error of our un-researched opinions. Dan and I quickly realized what was happening and verbally retreated. It was a lesson in measuring one's cursory opinions with those of thoroughgoing scholarship. When it came to the subject of Heidelberg, however, it was good to see Meeter in his element!

In his sketch of the catechism as a genre, Domine Meeter[1] noted that Caspar Olevianus, in the city and Zacharius Ursinus, at the University wrote the Heidelberg Catechism not only for children but for "Pastor Franz" and "Pastor Hans" out in the country as well. Proof of his point came when Joan Hunt, The Director of Religious Education at my own

[1] A venerated title in the Dutch Reformed tradition.

First Church latched onto the published text of Meeter's lecture.[2] Here at First Church we do a puppet show at the family, "Early Church" to pass on church history. Following a visit from the Unitarian Bishop from Transylvania (yes, there is one)—the previous February, we had decided to do puppet plays about Transylvania on the border of contemporary Hungary and Romania, that is, "The Land Beyond the Forest." The "Unitarians" in that region emerged from the Reformed Church in Hungary and Poland. George Hunston Williams' *History of the Radical Reformation* (1st and 3rd editions) was to be our primary text.[3] Director Hunt complimented the Williams history with material from the lecture by Dr. Meeter. In the course of producing the plays we discovered a version of the Heidelberg Catechism that raised a warning to the paper by Dr. Meeter.

Our plays took place in sixteenth century when Transylvania was between the Holy Roman and the Ottoman Empire. Viewed from Europe, Transylvania was "The Land Beyond the Forest." Viewed from Istanbul, Transylvania was northwest of Bucharest on the road to Vienna. Within Transylvania there were the Seven Cities, the walled municipalities of Saxon merchants. From 1520 on these burghers brought Lutheran books from the Leipzig Book Fair into the region.[4] The King of Hungary, Louis II, was killed in the 1526 the Battle of Mohacs against the Sultan Suleiman I, The Magnificent. The victorious Sultan, who ruled from 1520 to 1566, controlled most of Hungary except for a remnant in the Northwest that Ferdinand maintained in the name of the Holy Roman Empire.

The Transylvanian nobility found themselves between a rock and a hard place. On the one hand, there was Suleiman I. On the other hand, there was Ferdinand of the Holy Roman Empire. The Transylvanians refused to submit to Ferdinand, considering him a foreigner. After defeating Ferdinand in 1529, the victorious Transylvanians turned to the east and surrendered their crown to the Sultan. Suleiman the Magnificent in turn conferred the crown on one of their own, John Zopolya, voivode of

[2] Daniel Meeter, "Heidelberg and Westminster: Especially on Worship," *The New Mercersburg Review*, Number XXXIII, (Autumn 2003), pp 2-17.
[3] George Hunston Williams, "The Radical Reformation," third edition Volume XV, *Sixteenth Century Essays and* Studies (3rd edition; Kirksville Missouri: Sixteenth Century Journal Publisher, 1992).
[4] Williams, 1103.

Transylvania. Zopolya became known as King John I and married to Queen Isabelle, sister of the King Sigismund I of Poland.[5] In the last year of his life, 1540, King John I and his wife Queen Isabelle had a son.

When King John I died in 1540, the Sultan, marched into Transylvania ostensibly to protect the royal claim of infant King John II, Sigismund Zapolya, against the invading Ferdinand. Transylvania became an Ottoman Suzerainty ruled by Queen Isabelle and little John II, grandson of the Polish King. The Queen died in 1559 making her son John II King of Transylvania at the age of nineteen. He reigned for twelve years before he died in 1571 of injuries sustained in a fall from his horse.

> The Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth from whence Isabelle came was noteworthy for its religious toleration. But when religious strife threatened the realm of Transylvania, Queen Isabelle issued on Pentecost in 1557 an edict of toleration that went beyond the practice in Poland and Lithuania.[6] Her son King John Sigismund II increased the extent of her Edict of Torda's toleration six years later and then again in 1568.[7]

Transylvania was no stranger to Reformation controversy. Suleiman the Magnificent allowed a number of Christian communions to worship, teach and make their witness. The debates of the Reformation rang out in Transylvania as various protagonists came through to make their points. By 1544 German communities in both Transylvania and Hapsburg Hungary had adopted the Augsburg Confession. Hungarian speaking Lutherans soon did likewise. Those later known as *Unitarii* in 1585 emerged under the leadership of Francis David and George Biandrata.[8] David and Biandrata both participated in the controversies with one Francis Stancaro behind whom lurked Andreas Osiander. Peter Melius, defender of Calvin, was David and Biandrata's influential ally in that confrontation. Then in the closing years of King John II's reign, David and the Reformed parted company. At that point the Heidelberg Catechism in one form or another was invoked as an authority.

Francis David was born in Kolozsvar to a Saxon father and Hungarian mother. The fact that he grew up in a bilingual household had vocational

[5] Williams, 1100.
[6] Williams, 1104.
[7] Williams, 1109, 1113.
[8] Williams, 1114.

implications. David was educated at the Franciscan School in Kolozsvar and then at the Cathedral School in the region's capital, Alba Iulia. In 1545 David traveled to study at the University of Wittenberg. He left in 1948, two years before Zacharius Ursinus arrived. Returning to Transylvania, David was made the rector of a school and a pastor. Eventually he became Rector of the Lutheran School in Kolozsvar and in 1556 the Pastor of the Lutheran Church in that same city. The Lutheran Church was composed of two synods; one segment like David's mother spoke Hungarian, the Saxon synod like his father spoke German. David was the superintendent of both Lutheran synods in Transylvania until 1559, when he was expelled from the Saxon Synod as the result of his controversy with Francis Stancaro. David managed to maintain his standing with the Hungarian synod as well as his pastorate in Kolozsvar, despite his Reformed theology.[9]

Francis Stancaro was born in Mantua and had fled the Inquisition in 1542. He had been Professor of Hebrew at the University of Vienna 1544-46. In 1547 he went to Basel to study theology. After receiving his degree he taught languages in the Augsberg town academy. The year 1548 found him in Zurich with Bullinger. Having given offence there, Strancaro went to Poland, where he helped organize the Reformed Church in Poland. He was banished from Poland by royal decree and went to Konigsberg to be Professor of Hebrew.[10]

While in Konigsberg, Stancaro debated the Lutheran, Andreas Osiander, objecting to Osiander's understanding of Christ's mediation in the doctrine of justification. Stancaro insisted that redemption involved only Christ's human nature, not his divine nature. In the final edition of *The Institutes* [1-15-3] Calvin tartly maintained that Osiander's understanding of the image of God in humanity not only mixed heaven and earth, it led to a confusion of the Trinitarian persons. Both Calvin and Stancaro's protest touched on a Chalcedonian issue that Reformed and Lutheran communions debated: the dynamics of the hypostatic union.

After Stancaro lost the debate with Osiander in Konigsberg, he moved to Transylvania. There both the Saxon and Hungarian sections of the Lutheran Synod on 1556 condemned him at the synod of Ovar.[11] They

[9] Williams, 1108.
[10] Williams, 999.
[11] Williams, 1107

allowed him to take up residence in one of the Seven Cities in the south, Hermanstadt, provided Stancaro refrained from further controversy. Being "a bellicose Anselmian,"[12] this Stancaro could not do. He was expelled from Hermannstadt and sent to the northern city of Bistritz. On the way Stancaro stopped at yet another of the Seven Cities—Kolozsvar. There at the end of 1557 he was challenged to a debate by the local clergy, among them Francis David. The debate carried over into a pamphlet war the following year.[13]

Opposing Stancaro, David, the Lutheran superintendent worked with Reformed pastor theologian Peter Melius. Melius had been raised in Horhi and educated at a Calvinist school at Tolna. In 1556 he briefly studied in Wittenberg, and then he became Pastor of the Reformed Church at Debrechen. Located in Hapsburg, Hungary, Debrechen was considered by some to be "The Calvinist Vatican." Melius later published a hymnal and translated Calvin's Genevan Catechism into Hungarian.[14]

In the course of arguing with Francis Stancaro, Melius persuaded David of the Reformed understanding of the Lord's Supper. Together in 1559 they wrote a treatise on the Reformed understanding of the Lord's Supper. At that point the Saxon section of the Hungarian-Saxon Lutheran Synod expelled Francis David for being a "Sacramentarian" in 1562. The term "sacramentarian" primarily designated "an opponent of the objective presence of the eucharistic Christ." Strictly speaking, "sacramentarian" meant those who held that:

> *any* of the sacraments was merely a sign involving no alteration either in the sacramental *res* . . . or in the recipient . . .[15]

Rather than split the Lutheran synod, in 1563 King John II extended Queen Isabelle's edict of toleration to include both Lutheran and Reformed Churches. This included Francis David and his current eucharistic doctrine.[16]

[12] Williams, 1106.
[13] Williams, 1107.
[14] Williams, 1108.
[15] Williams, 95-96
[16] Williams, 1109.

In the summer of that same year, 1559, Dr. George Biandrata arrived to attend to the ailing Queen. Dr. George Biandrata was a gynecologist who attended Transylvanian royalty. He had attended the widow of King John Zapola. Like the physician, John Crato, who sponsored Ursinus, Biandrata was a court physician with a marked interest in theology.[17] He was born in Piedmont Italy c. 1515 and escaped the Italian Inquisition in 1556 by going to Geneva. He so irked Calvin with his persistent theological questions, many on the doctrine of the Trinity, that he moved to Poland in 1558. He became involved with John Laski and the first Reformed Synod in Poland, until the Polish King sent him to Transylvania to attend his ailing sister in the summer of 1559. He was dispatched by the King of Poland to attend his sister, Queen Isabelle of Transylvania. He arrived in the summer of 1559.

Stancaro had appealed to Queen Isabelle protesting his treatment at the hands of the Koloszvar ministers. Realizing that the Queen was not well, he returned to Poland in May, and immediately became embroiled in controversy with Laski and the synod of the Polish Reformed Church. When Biandrata returned to Poland in September after the Queen's death, he promptly joined the fray.[18]

Dr. Biandrata went back to Transylvania in 1563 as the personal physician and counselor to the twenty-three year old King. In that capacity he recommended Francis David as Court Preacher at Alba Iulia. The King accepted his advice. Somewhere in this period, no one seems exactly sure when, Biandrata and David began to question the Trinity. Dr. Biandrata was discrete in his speculations and opinions. Pastor David was not. By 1563 he was preaching against the doctrine. This came to the attention of the rector of the Reformed school in Koloszvar, Peter Karoli. Karoli notified Meliuus in Debrechen. Together the Peters, Karoli and Melius, brought David's opinions on the Trinity to the attention of the King along with critical letters they had solicited from Calvin and Beza.

In 1566 David and Biandrata's opinions on the Trinity came before two Reformed synods. David himself had called for a Reformed Synod at Alba Iulia to debate the matter. That synod took place in February. Then, in April, Melius requested a synod of both the Turkish Hungarian and the

[17] Deborah Rahn Clemens, "Foundations of German Reformed Worship in The Sixteenth Century Palatinate" (Diss. Drew University, 1995), p. 118.
[18] Williams, 1025.

Transylvanian Reformed churches to take up David and Biandrata's understanding of the Trinity. At this point Biandrata made the same proposal he had made in Poland some years earlier, namely that the terms of the debate be limited to biblical and apostolic terms. This excluded "philosophical" terms. Melius "unaccountably agreed" to this condition according to Prof. Williams.[19]

On May 19 a consensus document from this synod was published. In it the terms *essentia, substantia, and personae* were suppressed. The equality of the three persons is stated in Article II, and the terms *essence* and *personae* are vehemently repudiated in Article III. The Apostles' Creed is affirmed in Article VII.[20] Williams notes that at this juncture the authority for the Transylvanian Reformed congregations had shifted from Beza's Switzerland to Ursinus' Heidelberg.[21] As a result, after the synods of 1566 Biandrata and David published their own version of the Heidelberg Catechism. No copy of this text is known to be extant in this country. The Andover Harvard Library is trying to acquire a copy from Hungary.

But one wonders if David and Biandrata cast Heidelberg's Question 25 as it is translated in a current Christian Reformed Church translation?[22]

> Since there is but one God, why do you speak of three: Father, Son and Holy Spirit?

The United Church of Christ 400th anniversary edition of the Catechism has a more accurate translation of this question.[23] It reads:

> Since there is only one Divine Being, why do you speak of three, Father, Son and the Holy Spirit?

The phrase "Divine Being" is a translation of *essential divina* in the original. The Latin and German texts read:

> *Cum una sit tantum essentia divina . . .*

[19] Williams, 1111.
[20] Frederic A. Lampe, *Historia Ecclesiae in Hungaria etr Tranyslvania* (Utrecht: 1728), pp.159-163.
[21] Williams, 1111.
[22] The Heidelberg Catechism (Grand Rapids: Board of Publications of the Christian Reformed Church, 1975), page 9.
[23] The Heidelberg Catechism (Cleveland: Untied Church Press, 1962), page 30.

The CRC translation "one God" is a substitute for "divine essence". To which I think Biandrata and David would say "Amen."

Now to the question at hand: In his lecture before the Mercersburg Society at Lancaster, did Dr. Meeter take a step in the direction of Biandrata and David? When speaking of the Westminster's Decrees and Effectual Calling he said,

> The formal problem is that Westminster, in a shorter catechism, raises to first importance a pair of theological terms that are derivative and extra-Biblical.[24]

Meeter was referring to the Westminster Short's "Decrees and Effectual Calling" even though Karl Barth in II/2 noted ". . . it is not necessary, nor would it be wise, to erase or abandon altogether the concept *decretum*."[25] Biandrata would say that "essence" in Heidelberg's Question 25 is also a "derivative and extra-Biblical word?"

If so, how does a church decide what extra-Biblical derivative terms can be dropped? One answer is to consult a confessional statement. To check David and Biandrata's, thrust Peter Melius pressed the 1567 Reformed synod at Debrechen to adopt the Second Helvetic Confession for Reformed Churches in Hapsburg, Hungary and Transylvania.[26] In that Confession, Article III ("Of God His Unity and Trinity") uses the extra-Biblical word "essence" in the first sentence.

Our puppet shows warn Dr. Meeter that dismissing derivative and extra-biblical words in theological debate and catechisms long or short produces at least three kinds of trouble. First, the communion of churches is shattered. Consider what happened to the players we presented from Transylvania? Francis David perished in a prison where he had been banished for his increasingly heretical opinions of God and the sacraments. Dr. Biandratra played a part in David's incarceration. After the preacher's death he became increasingly alienated from the Reformed Churches in both Transylvania and Poland.[27] Toward the end of his life it is said that the doctor consorted with the Jesuits at court.

[24] Meeter, 9.
[25] Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, II/2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark,1957), p. 182
[26] Williams, 1113
[27] Williams, 1156.

Francis Stancaro died at the home of his noble patron in Poland after reconciling with the *Major* Reformed Church in that realm, a reconciliation Professor Williams characterized as "without much grace on either side."[28] We are left to assume that Osiander and Melius died in the comfort of their respective justifications and sanctification.

Second, Joan Hunt maintains that abandoning key traditional terms leads to chaos in religious education. First, the terms are dropped as too philosophical leaving no basis to discuss the basic elements of Christian tradition. As a result pastors and children don't know their faith. They are left with terms of a common theism. "Jesus' ministry and passion sensitizes us to man's inhumanity to man." "Every religion has its version of the Golden Rule." Illustrations are taken from modern ideology. "Who is our neighbor? The homeless, battered women and victims of war." The teaching situation is as Marilynne Robinson observed. When our children ask for it, we fail to feed them bread.[29]

Finally, crucial questions arise in our worship. We need the words of theology to articulate just what it is we are doing, when we pray and sing. At a Sunday afternoon service in a hospital chapel after reading prayers written by parents, patients and staff, we respond, "Lord, in your mercy, hear our prayer." Who is this Lord? Is this ultimately the same Lord to whom Moslems pray facing Mecca behind the last pew? When we sing, "Lord of all being" or "Lord of all hopefulness" or "Lord dismiss us with thy blessing" who is this Lord? Answers to these liturgical questions require the words of tradition as well as scripture, extra-Biblical and derivative though they may be.

[28] Williams,1115
[29] Marilynne Robinson, *Hesselink and Robinson: An Exchange of Letters*, Perspectives Vol. 16 Number 3 (March, 2001), p.7.

MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY AND THE LIBERAL ARTS AT FRANKLIN & MARSHALL COLLEGE

Sally F. Griffith

Mercersburg Theology played a significant role in the educational thought of the leaders of Franklin and Marshall College, in particular shaping a philosophy of liberal arts education that distinguished the College through much of the nineteenth century.

American colleges in the colonial and early national period followed a surprisingly standard curriculum. Observing practices inherited from Greece and Rome and passed on by way of medieval scholasticism and Renaissance humanism, studies were organized into two branches: the trivium, ("three roads") trained verbal skills through the disciplines of Latin and Greek language, logic and rhetoric; the quadrivium dealt with mathematical skills through arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music. After mastering these subjects advanced students tookup philosophy and theology. By these means, youths were to be transformed into gentlemen, introduced to a "natural aristocracy" of learning and prepared to lead their communities. The curriculum was therefore considered most appropriate for sons of aristocracy and wealth, but it also occasionally provided a means of social advancement for talented boys from the laboring classes. It was referred to as the "liberal arts," from the Latin *liberalis* that referred to a citizen who possessed both political freedom and sufficient wealth to afford leisure for study and political participation. The term carried connotations of both elitism and tolerance, for by the eighteenth century the adjective "liberal" also indicated a certain openness of mind and generosity with one's material possessions.[1]

There had been changes in the American college curriculum by the early nineteenth century, although Greek and Latin remained at the core. Insights and practices of the Scientific Revolution had been brought into the curriculum in the form of "natural philosophy," for the Protestant clergy who headed nearly all of the colleges were confident that increased knowledge about the workings of the external world served to demonstrate the wonderful hand of God in its creation. Scottish scholars

who taught in many American colleges introduced new aesthetic study of literature and a new approach to "moral philosophy" that expanded its treatment of religion and ethics to include concern with economic and political life. Moral philosophy thus served as the starting point for investigations that more than a century later would spin off into the new "social" sciences of psychology, sociology, political science and economics. At the end of the eighteenth century and beginning of the nineteenth, however, instruction in moral philosophy were intended to instill proper Christian ethics.[2]

Franklin College, founded in 1787, was the first institution of higher education designed particularly for the region's large German-American population, and Marshall College, in 1836, was founded to offer studies that would prepare students for the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church. The inclusion of German language and literature was an unusual feature of Marshall's curriculum, in keeping with its role of preparing ministers to preach in High German.[3] Nonetheless, instruction in the college was in English and like Franklin College it attracted a more diverse student population, both ethnically and in terms of prospective vocation. Both schools offered a standard liberal arts curriculum, designed not simply to prepare young men for the ministry but to ready all students for the responsibilities of citizens and leaders in a democratic society.

Differences of opinion seem always to have existed over how much emphasis should be placed in undergraduate education on preparing for particular occupations as opposed to general personal development. Many Americans complained that the traditional classical curriculum wasted too much time in the study of "dead languages" and argued that more attention should instead be paid to new advances in science and technology and forms of "useful knowledge" like English grammar, history and geography, arithmetic and book-keeping.[4]

Smarting under criticism of its classical curriculum and methods in the 1820s, Yale College's leaders had formed a committee to consider change. Its 1828 report reaffirming the importance of the traditional curriculum was the most widely read antebellum statement of the educational purpose of the classical curriculum. "The two great points to be gained in intellectual culture," it began, "are the *discipline* and the *furniture* of the mind; expanding its powers, and storing it with knowledge." Its metaphors were static and architectural, envisioning

"laying the foundation of a thorough education," one that "must be broad, and deep, and solid." This was accomplished by strict rules to restrain youthful impulses and "unceasing and strenuous exercise of the intellectual powers." The Yale Report argued that a liberal arts education focused on the classics was best suited "both to strengthen and enlarge the faculties of the mind, and to familiarize it with the leading principles of the great objects of human investigation and knowledge." Although it referred in passing to the importance of character, it focused exclusively on cognitive functions and paid no attention to the emotions.[5]

The Report's arguments rested upon "faculty psychology," the widely-held view of the mind as a collection of separate faculties. This was in turn based on Common-Sense Philosophy, which presented the world and truth as unchanging realities created by God and revealed both in Scripture and in the immutable laws of nature. Human beings were made up of a number of distinct and often competing powers, or "faculties" ranging from the purely "animal" and instinctive, to the emotional, rational and moral. The goal of education was to strengthen the higher faculties and instill discipline, enabling one to achieve balance with the more powerful lower faculties. This approach envisioned the human mind as a passive reflection of external reality. Through the faculty of common sense, each individual was capable of discerning truth directly. The educational process sought to discipline young minds and furnish them with accepted truths by requiring them to memorize the contents of approved textbooks.[6]

Under the leadership of German-born Frederick Rauch, Marshall College's approach to education became quite unlike anything else in America. His practices reflected the milieu in which he himself had been educated, Germany of the 1810s and 20s. It has been customary to trace the birth of the modern research university to 1810, when Wilhelm von Humboldt founded the University of Berlin. Envisioning the university as a "learned republic," he promised to make faculty appointments and promotion on evidences of intellectual inquiry rather than doctrinal purity, family ties or loyalty to the state. Historians have typically viewed his innovations as the beginning point for the idea of universities as places for research within a framework of specialized disciplines, but it is important to realize that this kind of institution did not emerge fully in German areas until well after the middle of the nineteenth century.[7]

The early part of the century was a time of transition, in which students and faculty alike were invigorated by the idea of the university as a place of inquiry, where knowledge was not static but constantly in a state of discovery. "Knowledge must be considered as something not yet wholly discovered and never entirely discoverable," Humboldt explained, and "must incessantly be sought as such." Consequently, professors were expected to engage in the process of inquiry. But natural and moral philosophy had not yet been carved up into distinct academic disciplines, and the ideal was, as one historian puts it, "the active pursuit of *integrated*, *meaningful*, and *pure* knowledge." This pursuit was commonly described as *Wissenschaft,* connoting a dedicated search not merely for knowledge, but for self-fulfillment through pursuit of ultimate meanings. (The common translation of this term into English as "science" has obscured its idealist origins.) The teacher's role in inspiring curiosity, passing on habits and tools of thought, and providing a "living example of a *wissenschaftlich* approach to life," was seen as "at least as important as the discoveries of his own personal research or the content of his lectures."[8]

This emphasis upon inquiry as a *process* was consistent with the ethos of German romanticism, reflected in an ideal of cultivation (*Bildung* in German) in which education was seen as fostering an organic unfolding of the human personality to its full potential. Humboldt himself envisioned his reformed university as promoting "the highest and most harmonious development of [man's] physical and mental faculties." In this view, cultivation was an end in itself, not a pragmatic means to a career, and *Wissenschaft* was considered the best method of achieving it.[9]

At Marshall College, Rauch infused this constellation of ideas into the traditional structure and curriculum of the American college. Not surprisingly, Rauch emphasized the mind's active construction of meaning. At a time when most classroom instruction required students to answer questions about or recite information memorized from textbooks, Rauch preferred the German practice of lectures and open discussion, and from the beginning emphasized "exercis[ing] the understanding rather than the memory" of his students.[10]

Rauch's educational methods were further shaped by his immersion in German philosophy, particularly that of G. W. F. Hegel. When Rauch immigrated to America, he learned that Hegel's ideas were virtually unknown there. As historian, Bruce Kuklick has noted that the New

England theologians who dominated American philosophy had become isolated from intellectual trends in Europe. Ironically, Rauch's appointment at Marshall College, located geographically and socially far outside the mainstream of American educational institutions, placed the small school at the cutting edge of philosophy in America.[11]

On top of his heavy teaching and administrative responsibilities, Rauch resolved to introduce to an American audience the recent advances in German philosophy "in all that relates to the phenomenology of the soul." He planned a trilogy of works dealing in turn with psychology, aesthetics and ethics. The first volume, *Psychology, or a View of the Human Soul*, appeared in 1840. It was the first book with the term psychology in its title to be published in the United States. Following closely the ideas and structure of Hegel's *Philosophy of Mind*, Rauch first composed the book as lectures to his junior class at Marshall College. In the preface he explained that his goal was to "render this noble and delightful science accessible to all classes of readers" by using ordinary language and "taking all his illustrations from nature." He seems to have succeeded in finding an audience, for the first edition sold out in a matter of weeks and was used in a number of colleges.[12]

In *Psychology*, Rauch challenged the passive view of the mind presented in Common-Sense Philosophy, emphasizing that consciousness played an active role in structuring experience. Mind was comprised of different aspects, but they were organically linked through a dialectical process of development. Rauch envisioned each higher stage of thought as rising out of and encompassing previous ones, including the most primitive physical level, thus rejecting a Cartesian dualism between mind and body, subjectivity and objectivity. The goal of this process of development was the achievement of human personality, a concept that for Rauch moved toward self-consciousness and awareness of God. His organic vision influenced Horace Bushnell's understanding of human development, expressed in his *Christian Nurture* (1847). *Psychology* also introduced the Romantic historicist concept that human cultures themselves were organic entities that developed over time. Change did not abandon the past but included it in more complex forms. "History includes the past by making us *conscious* of what it was," he argued. This historicism proved to be a fertile seed from which the Mercersburg Theology grew.[13]

Rauch had already outlined the educational implications of his philosophy in 1837 in his address upon his inauguration as President of

Marshall College. Speaking to a combined college and community audience, he avoided the complex philosophical structure of *Psychology*, drawing upon themes and images common in German Romanticism. His frequent use of organic metaphors was not only consistent with his philosophy but well suited to his rural audience. He began with the premise that the development of human consciousness requires interpersonal contact. "Fire only can kindle fire; mind only can awaken mind. We must be among men to become men; we must be acted upon . . . This mutual influence of men exerted on each other is what we call education in its widest sense." Dismissing the idea of the mind as passive recipient of outside stimulus, he argued that learning depended upon the child's own activity. "The mind does not receive impressions like wax," he cautioned. "In receiving it is active; and unless what is committed to memory, is understood, nothing is learned." Although education could not *cause* development, it provided the environment essential for the growth of children's "latent" potential. "Their manifold and various talents, all the faculties of their minds, are the slumbering seed which the hand of the Lord has scattered, that it may awake, and grow, and ripen, and become beneficial to our race" through education.[14]

True to his neo-humanistic background, Rauch insisted that education's primary purpose was "the harmonious cultivation of the latent faculties of the mind."

> Only when the reason is fully developed and not merely a few of its parts, only when we are conscious of every power and energy in us, are we entirely *men*; whilst without this full development, we are like plants trimmed down to dwarfs by the knife of the gardener.

If in the interest of practicality, he warned, "the mind is cultivated in one direction more than in another, the memory more than judgment, prudence more than feeling, cool speculation more than imagination—an unhealthy state of the mind is produced, which must result more or less to our own disadvantage and to that of our fellow-men." Hence, the College must seek to develop more than its students' intellects. "The fortune of our lives and our government depends not exclusively on useful knowledge but on our character as citizens, and to form this character by cultivating the whole man is the aim of education in the proper sense."[15]

For Rauch, this "symmetrical cultivation of the whole inner man" required more than exposure to a wide range of subjects. It involved the students' very motivation for learning. He warned that attempts to use fear of punishment or even ambition to spur student activity only stimulated selfishness. Rather, love was the ideal motivation: "that which subdues the will and the understanding at once—which induces us to desire a thing as soon as we know of it, and which consequently unites knowledge and action." An emotion, "love to the subjects taught, must therefore be the great motive to learn, love to knowledge, to truth, to goodness, independently of any selfish calculation as to the use and advantage we may derive from them." Again, students could not be forced to experience this emotion, but they learned it only through interaction with the teacher in all that he did: "Let the teacher live with all his heart in his occupation; let him be inspired with love to truth and holiness; let his instructions be delivered in a free, lively and distinct manner; let him understand how to appeal now to the judgment, now to the feelings of his pupils; and especially let him be aware, that his instruction ought only to guide and aid the learner in reproducing all knowledge *by his own efforts*."[16]

Ultimately, Rauch believed that education should lead students to the search for knowledge of the Absolute. Each particular science had its own methods of teaching, but, Rauch concluded, "That method will be infinitely best, which in all the sciences recognizes a reflection of the eternal Truth; which knows how to lead the fountain of life and of wisdom by many streams into every art, and into every science—how to connect every science with the Head of all knowledge." That knowledge for Rauch was essentially religious: "The laws of reason and nature are the expressions of the same divine will."[17]

Later in the nineteenth century, this idea of education as cultivation of the whole man would become the basis of the defense of classical liberal arts education, not only at Marshall or Franklin and Marshall College, but throughout the country. But as expressed by Rauch in 1837, it was a new way of talking about education in the United States. Moreover, he seems to have practiced what he preached. Although he could be a demanding colleague, he was an energetic and enthusiastic teacher. "There was in his nature a joyous element which endeared him to his students," reported Joseph Dubbs. "The business of teaching with him, was any thing but mechanical or formal," recalled his colleague John

Williamson Nevin. "His nature was ardent, generous, enthusiastic; and towards the young especially, standing to him in the relation of pupils, it uttered itself with the most affectionate earnestness and vivacity. His whole intercourse with his students besides, was adapted to win their confidence and engage their love."[18]

Unlike other colleges of the day, under Rauch's leadership the faculty's disciplinary policies also relied upon personal relationships with students. His view of developmental psychology seems to have inspired an unusually flexible approach when it came to enforcing the strict formal regulations with a degree of tolerance for young men's need to define themselves in opposition to others, including authorities. Despite one student's "wild" behavior, Rauch reassured his father that he was in no danger of moral "ruin." "I have watched him closely," Rauch reported, and he was "perfectly convinced" that his recent misbehavior was a reaction to the unwanted attempts of some other students, less intelligent than he, "to *bring about a revival*" in him.

> Your son is in that age, in which he begins to claim all the deference due to a young gentleman; he is *smart* & interesting to all his fellow students, he is of a lively disposition and much inclined—like every youth of his stamp would be—to ascertain every where his rights; this is a feeling, to be honored & though it is to be guarded too, this must be done in a gentle manner. I can understand the feelings & views of your son entirely; the more he perceived some of the students ready to act as his moral or intellectual guardian, the more he felt inclined, to assume airs, which they would not like or do things before them, which they would not approve & all this only to show them his entire indifference to their judgement . . . Your son is in my opinion an orderly, morally good & highly promising young Gentleman, in whom I feel much interested & whose conduct is far from producing unpleasant apprehensions in me.[19]

This lack of sympathy with efforts to stimulate conversion is significant, for revivalism was a significant feature of the religious scene at this time and the errant student's father, Bernard C. Wolff, was a prominent Reformed clergyman, and as you probably know, had become a major issue within the Church.[20]

Rauch's distaste for the new revivalistic measures was shared by John Nevin, who became his colleague a year after he wrote this letter, and who fast became a close friend and intellectual comrade. After Rauch's

untimely death in 1841, and the arrival Phillip Schaff, the stage was set for the emergence of what soon became widely known as the Mercersburg Theology.

This theology permeated the particular understanding of liberal arts education at Marshall and then Franklin and Marshall College through the rest of the nineteenth century. Some of its most prominent and compelling aspects had direct curricular and pedagogical applications at the College.

First, not surprisingly, was its attitude toward religious education. Although most nineteenth-century American colleges had denominational affiliations and were led by minister-presidents, most subjects were taught without reference each other or to a religious context. The task of tying everything together was left to the President, when he taught moral philosophy as a kind of capstone in the senior year. On the other hand, instilling religious emotions was left to the recurrent revivals that were a common feature in American colleges. At Marshall College and later Franklin & Marshall, leaders did not encourage revivals, and seem to have actually discouraged student participation when revivals were conducted locally. This did mean that religion was ignored, but rather that it provided a constant underpinning for the life of the college community. In *The Anxious Bench*, Nevin argued that true religion, "the life of God in the soul," must be continually and organically "cultivated in order that it may grow." In his college this cultivation was pursued through regular shared corporate worship, periodically for the sacraments as well as through daily chapel. Moreover, the Mercersburg sensibility was infused throughout the curriculum. This did not entail teaching Christian doctrine, for the college was proud of its non-sectarian character and considered such questions to be more appropriate for the seminary. Rather, it was reflected in an emphasis on idealistic philosophy that embraced ethics, aesthetics, and natural science. Common-Sense Philosophy was rejected because it focused too exclusively on "the world of mere matter and sense."[21]

Nevin always emphasized the college's "peculiar *genius*" as an "Anglo-German institution." This included not only study of the German language in the lower classes, but delivery of lectures in some of the higher classes in German, as well as in chapel on alternate Sundays, "the language, under its finest form, serving its proper purpose as a vehicle of

rich instruction for the soul." . He considered knowledge of German to be essential to obtain "a solid culture in art, science or religion," but also believed the German language possessed "unusual *depth* and *force*" that was felt "as a living element in the midst of living relations."[22] In keeping with Nevin and Schaff's overriding interest in history, the teaching of history in the college expanded through the decade, until the subject was covered in all four years, well in advance of most American colleges.[23]

The fusion of philosophy and history reached its high point when Nevin came to teach at Franklin & Marshall in 1861. In subsequent years, he developed a series of lectures on the "Philosophy of History" that came to be taught in the sophomore year. Rather than waiting until the senior year to demonstrate the connections between all the forms of knowledge covered in the college curriculum, Nevin's course presented an overarching philosophical framework to integrate all the instruction to come.[24]

In the process of showing how history was the "*Progression or Onward Movement of Human Life*," Nevin's lectures encapsulated his Christian philosophy of "the universal relation of the system of nature to the system of living mind in the economy of the world." Moreover, they underlined the close connection between his philosophy and his intense commitment to liberal education. In short, the latter was the means of forming a mind, or whole personality, capable of perceiving this true "economy of the world." He insisted that history could not be understood as a mere "accumulation of facts." Using science in its older meaning of a system of knowledge, he pointed out, "The main thing always is the life which is thus breathed into the facts, from what we must call the ideal side of their science." This ideal side came only from the mind "by which they are apprehended and converted into knowledge." To practice historical science as he envisioned it, a person must be liberally educated, possessing fully developed learning, faith and imagination.[25]

Conversely, Nevin believed that the study of history was the most important subject for "the liberalization of mind." The connection between liberal culture and historical science was expressed most explicitly in the concluding lecture of the course. "The grand utility of history is the science itself introduced into the mind," he confirmed. Its result was the "historical spirit," which he defined as "a sympathy with the organic movement of human life, in which the old and new are

continually joined as one and the same existence." Upon the expansion of this spirit rested the hope of the future: it "will constitute the main power of modern culture and the main hope of the world, in that conflict of vast powers in which it is coming to be more and more involved, as between mechanical tradition on the one hand, and blind or reckless radicalism on the other."[26]

As the linchpin of the college's philosophical curriculum, the course continued to be taught even after Nevin's retirement in 1876; in fact, Henry Harbaugh Apple taught the course in the early 1920's using notes his father Thomas G. Apple had taken in the 1870's and 80's. In an overview of the curriculum, Thomas Apple explained that the emphasis on philosophy throughout F&M's history functioned not "merely to discipline the minds of its students in the study of Metaphysics, as a sort of mental exercise," but to unify the curriculum and "give it direction, by the principles of a sound Christian philosophy." The sophomore lectures on the philosophy of history served as a beginning exercise in thinking philosophically and historically. Afterward, students studied anthropology and psychology, and lectures on aesthetics, the fine arts and comparative philosophical systems followed in the junior and senior years, concluding with an entire year's study of ethics. Apple considered philosophy to be "the crown of a liberal education." Its dominance of the final years, "when the students' minds have reached their best discipline," cast "its rays of light back upon the studies they have passed through, and enables them to better estimate their design and end."[27]

Moreover, the spirit of the college's philosophical tradition produced an "organic relation" among all the other departments that had created "a sort of general atmosphere in which all the students live." Because many in the faculty had "grown up under its influence," they had "a proper sense of the relation of the parts to the whole in a liberal education," whatever their loyalties might be to a particular subject matter. He considered this "common intellectual life" crucial because of the close relationship between teacher and student. "The mind of the professor moulds the minds of his students quite as much through an indefinable influence as through textbooks."[28]

The Mercersburg Theology's concern with general cultivation fed into a concern with the student's life outside the classroom. From the earliest days at Marshall College, the faculty had supported the development of students' independent intellectual life focused around the literary

societies. Like the adult debate and discussion societies that were ubiquitous in antebellum America, the Goethean and the Diagnothian societies were officially dedicated to "the mutual improvement of its members in the exercises of Debating and Composition, in the graces of Oratory, the encouragement of Friendship, and the cultivation of Morality." Hence, like the formal curriculum, they sought to develop more than the isolated intellect. It was widely believed that the experience gained by participating in literary societies was an essential complement to the formal curriculum in preparing young men to take their place in public life. Nevin recognized that the societies played a significant role in the students' personal development and described them as "a department of education, to say the least, fully as important as any other belonging to the system."[29]

In his first address to students as President of Franklin and Marshall, Nevin emphasized the importance of cultivating students' independent action and thought. He defined education, in terms nearly identical to those introduced by Rauch three decades before, as the result of the contact of minds. "It must be mind working upon mind; intelligence meeting intelligence; will infusing itself into will," Nevin emphasized. Hence education could never be imposed from above, without the student's active participation. "Indeed, their training is a failure," he warned, "if it do not bring them continually more and more to be a law to themselves, to do their own thinking, and to will their own working."

Nevin clearly hoped that the address would not only introduce students to his philosophical perspective, but inspire them to become more fully committed to the school's mission. Undoubtedly also hoping to reduce the frequency of the rowdier outbursts, he concluded by emphasizing that "self-government" was far more desirable than "hard-fisted discipline, laid on heavily from without . . . We wish to have as little as possible to do with the espionage, the surveillance, the inquisitorial trials, or the penal visitations of a college system of police. Spare us, we beseech you, the misery and pain of all this."[30]

Through the century, college leaders came under mounting pressure to add more practical, vocationally relevant courses to the curriculum. Around the middle of the century, many formerly classical colleges experimented with a number of innovations that included preparatory programs; electives; non-classical degree courses, such as the Bachelor of Science, literature or philosophy; partial courses, in which students

studied only one or two subjects; coeducation; and vocational programs in education, engineering and agriculture.[31] Franklin & Marshall's strong ties to the Mercersburg Theology enabled its leaders to staunchly refuse to follow the trend. Soon after the merger, the board rejected a local request to add instruction in "the theory & practice of teaching," upon which local leaders founded the Lancaster County Normal School, the fore-bearer of the present Millersville University.[32] When the Board conducted a reorganization in 1866 that brought Nevin to the presidency, it called for adding studies in political and constitutional theory, and introduction "at an early day" of a three-year "scientific course of instruction, similar to that provided in other Colleges" leading to a Bachelor of Philosophy degree.[33]

Nonetheless, Nevin refused to carry out the Board's mandate. Pragmatically, he argued that this was not the time for adding new professorships, when it could not pay adequate salaries to the teachers it now had.[34] More importantly, in his public addresses he emphasized that it was essential that undergraduate education *not* be practical. Nevin took the occasion of the first commencement of his presidency to drive home his determination that there would be no educational experimentation. Nevin acknowledged, in fact celebrated, that the recent war had ushered in a new era in world history. But he saw this as reason to reaffirm rather than alter the college's mission. He regretted that the recent increase in support for education focused only on the utilitarian, material ends of education. F&M had a special role to play in preserving the time-honored role of liberal education.[35]

He disclaimed any attempt to prescribe for other institutions. "It is no business of ours, to denounce or oppose the changes by which other colleges are seeking to adapt themselves to the educational demands of this spirit." But he was certain that "our vocation" was "altogether different."

> If we are to be of any account in the cause of learning and education, it must be by our holding on steadfastly to what has been the reigning purpose and character of this institution from the beginning; and instead of finding in the present bearing of things a reason for changing our course, we should see in it rather only new reason for our continuing unswervingly true to it to the last. For if the general bearing of the age be, in the way we have seen, more and more toward merely material interests and outward ends, it is but all the more necessary that our testimony, if it have been worth anything heretofore, in favor of education for its own sake and for purely spiritual or inward ends, should not now be relaxed, but be made, if possible, more firm than ever.[36]

In a statement that was reprinted in the college catalog for many years and frequently quoted elsewhere, Nevin laid out his fundamental rationale for liberal education:

> Let it be our ambition, then, and our care, to maintain in vigorous force here, an institution that shall be devoted supremely to liberal education, in the old and proper sense of the term; *liberal*, as being free from all bondage to merely outside references and ends, and as having to do, first of all, with the enlargement of the mind in its own sphere. This, after all, must remain the true conception of education forever.[37]

He was convinced that no purely "utilitarian, practical, and professional" education could ever be sufficient "to complete the organization of a true human culture." To stand, such a "practical superstructure" must have "at least a basis of solid spiritual thought." If everyone else focused on "the outward," it was "all the more necessary" that some few "make all in all of the inward."

Never was there a time, when there was more room or more need for education, regarded simply as a discipline of the soul for its own sake. Agriculture, mining, and civil engineering, are of vast account; but not of so much account, by any means, as the development of a strong and free spirit in men themselves.[38]

Nevin elaborated his defense of liberal education in a series of articles written for local newspapers in 1869. He explained that a college education must be independent of and precede professional training in order to provide "a common liberal culture" upon which all professions depended for "their full dignity and strength." The subjects studied were best suited to cultivating a mind capable of taking the broadest possible view of knowledge, of transcending narrow and selfish interests, of "*estimating aright the comparative values of the different kinds of truth.*" He feared that institutions that sought to combine liberal and vocational

programs would inevitably see the latter, like "a Johan's whale," swallow up the liberal.[39]

His successor Thomas G. Apple was also called upon to defend F&M's curriculum with increased frequency, as the post-war founders of the new universities justified their departure from the prescribed classical curriculum by attacking the ideas of mental discipline and faculty psychology traditionally used as its theoretical underpinning. They also rejected the ideals of fostering persons of wide cultivation and of a shared civic culture. University promoters did not immediately abandon the ideal of fostering moral development, but they argued that training in scientific method would do this more effectively than the "narrow" religious indoctrination provided in "sectarian" denominational colleges.[40]

Apple too resisted change, and his arguments remained rooted in the College's philosophical traditions. He insisted that the study of languages was central to cultivation because it put one in touch with the very "outward form of thought."[41] He also presented liberal education as a counterweight to the excessive materialism of Gilded-Age America. "To value education for its own sake," he told the organizers of the College Association of Pennsylvania in 1887, "is to set an ideal before the individual and the nation which is in itself elevating, and which must act as a breakwater against the greatest danger that threatens this nation."

Apple also based his defense of liberal education upon his sense of the college's mission to form the whole Christian personality. He even used the occasion of a memorial service for a student to drive home the point that the ultimate goal of a liberal education was to prepare not for an occupation but for eternity. Was his young man's education "a failure," Apple asked, because he had died before he had the chance to use it? The "proper end" of liberal education was "a life in the spiritual world" as much as on earth, he concluded. "For what is the true aim of a liberal education except to elevate and ennoble true manhood, and thus to become an organ for the glory of God."[42]

In the last decade of the century, John Summers Stahr was able to find a way of allowing Mercersburg Theology to serve as a bridge to an expanded understanding of liberal education that would allow the college to move into the twentieth century. His successor on the science faculty characterized Stahr as "pre-eminently philosopher, the last and the most

widely informed exponent of the Mercersburg Philosophy." His understanding of science departed from his predecessors in that he translated idealistic concepts of evolution into terms consistent with new findings of "exact science."[43]

As the professor of natural sciences, Stahr presented a report to the Board in 1886 that offered a sophisticated argument for scientific education that subtly recast the very rationale for liberal education.[44] A college course "is for culture and discipline rather than for specifically practical ends," and was valuable not for imparting "useful or practical information" but for its power "to discipline the mind and help to form character." Nonetheless, he redefined this process by elaborating the set of intellectual skills that a cultivated mind should possess: "A college course ought to include, the writer holds, all those elements, which, harmoniously working together, train the student to observe accurately, reason correctly, express himself clearly and act rightly." The natural sciences, he argued, were ideally suited to developing these abilities. Later, he expanded upon this argument by pointing out, in keeping with the college's philosophical traditions, that true science was not the mere accumulation of facts, but the ability to theorize upon them, reflecting a "broad, comprehensive grasp of things." This emphasis on scientific method as a "marriage of hypothesis and experiment" flowed naturally from the Mercersburg tradition but was only in the 1880s being adopted by university advocates of science.[45]

Like Rauch, Stahr emphasized the crucial importance of "a competent teacher whose enthusiasm kindles that of the student." But ensuring such competence and enthusiasm on the instructor's part required facilities for original research. "A botanist without a herbarium, a biologist or chemist without a laboratory, a minerologist or geologist without a cabinet of specimens or a museum, is no more likely to thrive than an astronomer without an observatory, or a fish without water." Faculty should be encouraged to do research, not as an end in itself, but because they would thereby be made more effective teachers.[46]

Under Stahr, Franklin & Marshall College would begin a gradual process of adaptation to new educational demands, particularly for laboratory education in the sciences, without abandoning its commitment to a philosophically-based liberal arts core. Because of his understanding of change rooted in the Mercersburg Theology's historicism, he was able to help the college change without leaving its traditions behind. Franklin &

Marshall was one of the last colleges to give up its prescribed classical curriculum, moving gradually in the early twentieth century into a system with a disciplinary concentration and distribution in the natural and social sciences, humanities, and languages, without an intervening stage taken by most schools in which all requirements were dropped. The acceptance of the concept of evolutionary change made for greater openness to the scientific currents of the later nineteenth century, and laid the groundwork for the excellence in the sciences that would become one of the college's hallmarks in the twentieth century. One thing that has remained consistent throughout, however, is the college's commitment to fostering a learning dynamic relationship between teacher and student, based on mutual love for knowledge.

---

[1] Gilman M. Ostrander, *Republic of Letters: The American Intellectual Community, 1776-1865* (Madison, WI: Madison House Publishers, 1999), 13; Bruce A. Kimball, *The "True Professional Ideal" in America: A History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 1992), 102; Douglas Sloan, *The Scottish Enlightenment and the American College Ideal* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1971).

[2] Sloan, *Scottish Enlightenment and the American College Ideal*; Ostrander, *Republic of Letters*, 22-28; David W. Robson, *Educating Republicans: The College in the Era of the American Revolution, 1750-1800* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1985), 64-66; Daniel Walker Howe, *Making the American Self: Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997), 50-57; Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York: Oxford University Press), 32-34

[3] Beginning in the mid-1820s, a few of the more prominent colleges such as Harvard, Columbia and Princeton had begun to offer instruction in German. At Middlebury College, German was briefly offered in the early 1820, but did not become a regular offering until 1847. (Richard Spuler, "American *Germanistic* and German Classicism: A Nineteenth-Century Exchange," in *Germans in America: Aspects of German-American Relations in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. By E. Allen McCormick (New York: Social Science Monographs, 1983), 60; David M. Stameshkin, *The Town's College: Middlebury College, 1800-1915* (Middlebury: Middlebury College Press, 1985), 78.)

[4] Herbst, *From Crisis to Crisis*, 88-91; Ostrander, *Republic of Letters*, 14.

[5] *Reports on the Course of Instruction in Yale College* (New Haven: Yale College, 1828), 6-7, 11, 30; Louise L. Stevenson, *Scholarly Means to Evangelical Ends: The New Haven Scholars and the Transformation of Higher Learning in America, 1830-1890* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 15. On ideas of mental discipline in this period at Middlebury College, see Stameshkin, *Middlebury College*, 73-75.

---

[6] May, *The Enlightenment in America*, 341-350; Howe, *Making the American Self*, 5-8, 128-130 and Howe, *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970); Stevenson, *Scholarly Means to Evangelical Ends*, 16-17; George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).

[7] Rüdiger vom Bruch, "A Slow Farewell to Humboldt? Stages in the History of German Universities, 1810-1945," in Mitchell G. Ash, ed., *German Universities Past and Future* (Providence, R.I.: Berghahn Books, 1997), 3-27.

[8] vom Bruch, "Slow Farewell to Humboldt?" p. 10; R. Steven Turner, "University Reformers and Professorial Scholarship in Germany 1760-1806," in Lawrence Stone, ed., *The University in Society* 2 vols., (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), 2: 495-531; Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 24; McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany*, 110-150, 171-181 (quotation on p. 122).

[9] Konrad H. Jarausch, *Students, Society, and Politics in Imperial Germany: The Rise of Academic Illiberalism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 8-9; McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany*, 118, 172-173; Michael J. Hofstetter, *The Romantic Idea of a University: England and Germany, 1770-1850* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2001). The use of the masculine pronoun is intentional, for ideas about education were closely wound up with masculine gender norms, and hence excluded women.

[10] "Classical School of the German Reformed Church, York, Pa., Report of the progress of the Classes during the last session…" F&M Archives; Joseph Henry Dubbs, *History of Franklin and Marshall College* (Lancaster: Franklin and Marshall College Alumni Association, 1903), 169.

[11] Stevenson, *Scholarly Means to Evangelical Ends*, 31-37, 176; Bruce Kuklick, *Churchmen and Philosophers: From Jonathan Edwards to John Dewey* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 118; Howard J. B. Ziegler, *Frederick Augustus Rauch, American Hegelian* (Lancaster: Franklin and Marshall College, 1953), 3-17; Jurgen Herbst, *The German Historical School in American Scholarship: A Study in the Transfer of Culture* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1965), 65. Kuklick recognizes Rauch as one of the first American academic writers to challenge the prevailing Common Sense school of philosophy.

[12] Nevin, *Rauch*, 19; Ziegler, *Frederick Augustus Rauch*, 48-51; James A. Good, "Introduction," in reprint edition of *Psychology* (2002); Richard C. Schiedt, "A Tribute to Dr. Frederick Augustus Rauch, First President of Marshall College, Eminent Educator and Philosopher in Commemoration of the 125th Anniversary of his Birth 1806-1931," Reprinted from *The Reformed Church Messenger* (n.d. [ca. 1931]), 12-13; Frederick A. Rauch, *Psychology, or a View of the Human*

Soul (New York: M. W. Dodd, 1840); Anonymous review, *New Englander* 1 (April 1843), 297-98; Robert Clemmer, "Historical Transcendentalism in Pennsylvania" *Journal of the History of Ideas* 3 (Oct.-Dec. 1967), 579-592; Lewis Perry, *Intellectual Life in America*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 212-213, 249, 252; "The Promotion of Scientific Learning Through 150 Years," *Franklin and Marshall Papers* No. 9 (July 1937), n.p.

[13] James T. Kloppenberg, *Uncertain Victory: social Democracy and Progressivism in European and American thought, 1870-1920* Oxford University Press, 1986), 16, 18; Merle Curti, "The American Exploration of Dreams and Dreamers," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 27 (1966), 401; Rauch, *Psychology*, 47-48, 63, 175-179, 180-181, 183-184. On Rauch's influence on Bushnell, see Sidney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 620.

[14] Frederick A. Rauch, "Rauch on Education," *Mercersburg Review* 10 (July, 1858), 443-545 (quotations pp. 444, 446.

[15] Rauch "Rauch on Education," 450-451

[16] Rauch, "Rauch on Education,"453-454.

[17] Rauch, *Psychology*, 270-271, 282; Rauch, "Rauch on Education," 454; Ziegler, *Rauch*, 93.

[18] Dubbs, *History*, 175; Nevin, *Life and Character of Frederick Augustus Rauch*, 23.

[19] Marshall College Faculty Minutes, Jan. 31, Feb. 1, March 13, and Aug. 31, F&M Archives; Rauch to B. C. Wolf[f], [March, 1839?], Rauch Papers, F&M Archives.

[20] John B. Frantz, "The Return to Tradition: An Analysis of the New Measure Movement in the German Reformed Church," *Pennsylvania History* 31 (July 1964): 314-319. On the Second Great Awakening in general, see William G. McLoughlin, *Revivals, Awakenings, and Reform* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1978), Chap. 4.

[21] John W. Nevin, *The Anxious Bench, A Tract for the Times*, (Chambersburg: Publication Office of the German Reformed church, 1843, Second Edition,1844), 14, 49, 52, 53, 64, 119, 125, 129; *Catalogue ... 1846-47*, 21-22

[22] *Catalogue ... 1844-45*, 21; Nevin, *The German Language, an Address, delivered before the Goethean Literary Society of Marshall College, at its anniversary, August 29, 1842* (Chambersburg: Goethean Literary Society, 1842), 15.

[23] Catalogs 1841-42 through 1848-49, F&M Archives; Stevenson, *Scholarly Means to Evangelical Ends*, 87. In 1869, Harvard had only one "dear old gentleman" who taught history, and as late as 1881, there were only eleven full-time professors of history in American colleges and universities. (Gilbert Allardyce, "The Rise and Fall of the Western Civilization Course," *American Historical Review* 87 (June 1982): 699; Joseph F. Kett, *The Pursuit of*

Knowledge Under Difficulties: From Self-Improvement to Adult Education in America, 1750-1990 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 165.)

[24] *Catalogues* of 1867, 1868-69, and 1871, Archives.

[25] "Philosophy of History," Lecture 1, *College Days*, January, 1873, 2; and April 1874, 2

[26] *College Days*, November 1874, 3.

[27] Apple, "The Philosophic Course in Franklin and Marshall College," mss., n.d.; and "The True Idea of Liberal Education," mss. n.d. [1880s] both in Apple Papers, Archives.

[28] Apple, "The Philosophic Course in Franklin and Marshall College," mss., n.d., in Apple Papers, Archives.

[29] Dubbs, *History* 213 -217; Catalogue ... 1846-47, 21. On college literary societies see Louise L. Stevenson, "Preparing for Public Life: The Collegiate Students at New York University 1832-1881," in *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the Present,* ed. by Thomas Bender (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 150-177; and Leon Jackson, "The Rights of Man and the Rites of Youth: Fraternity and Riot at Eighteenth-century Harvard," in Geiger, ed., *American College in the Nineteenth Century*, 46-79. On general societies see Joseph F. Kett, *The Pursuit of Knowledge Under Difficulties: From Self-Improvement to Adult Education in America, 1750-1990* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994).

[30] Nevin "Master and Disciple, an address at the opening of fall term of Franklin and Marshall, Sept. 12, 1866" *German Reformed Messenger*, (n.d., clipping in Nevin Papers, Archives.)

[31] Roger L. Geiger, "The Rise and Fall of Useful Knowledge," in Geiger, ed., *The American College in the Nineteenth Century* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2000), 153-168; and Geiger,"The Era of Multipurpose Colleges in American Higher Education, 1850-1890" in *College in the Nineteenth Century*, 127-152 (quotation on128).

[32] F&M Trustees Minutes, March 1, 2, and 3, and April 19, 1853, F&M Archives; Dubbs, *History*, 284-287; "History," http://muweb.millersville.edu/~ucatalog/History.htm. Princeton required faculty to be Presbyterians until 1876; see P. C. Kemeny, *Princeton in the Nation's Service: Religious Ideals and Educational Practice, 1868-1928* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 61-62.

[33] Trustees Minutes, Jan. 24, May 24 and 25, Archives.

[34] Nevin to Board, July 23, 1867, Trustees Minutes, Archives.

[35] J. W. Nevin, *Address to the Graduating class of 1867, and the Alumni of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., July 25th, 1867* (Philadelphia: S. R. Fisher & Co., 1867).

[36] Ibid., 23-24.

[37] Ibid., 24.

[38] Ibid., 24.
[39] Trustees Minutes, June 30, 1869, Archives; "Franklin and Marshall," newspaper clippings (n.d. [1869], n.p.), Nevin Papers, Archives.
[40] The most influential treatment of this period of change, which relies heavily on the rhetoric of promoters themselves, is Laurence Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965). Much recent work has served to qualify the dichotomous views of colleges and university, for example, J. Bruce Leslie, *Gentlemen and Community: The College in the "Age of the University," 1865-1917* (State College, Pa., Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992); Louise Stevenson, *Scholarly Means to Evangelical Ends: The New Haven Scholars and the Transformation of Higher Learning in America, 1830-1890* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986); Julie A. Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).
[41] Apple, "The Argument Against the Ancient Classics," mss. n.d., Apple Papers, Archives; Noah Porter, *The American Colleges and the American Public* (1870; reprint by Arno Press, 1969), 40.
[42] Apple, "The Idea of a Liberal Education," *Proceedings of the College Association of Pennsylvania*, 1887-88; Apple, "In Memoriam," (Lancaster: F&M College, 1885); Peter Dobkin Hall, "Noah Porter Writ Large? Reflections on the Modernization of American Education and Its Critics, 1866-1916" in Geiger, *American College in the Nineteenth Century*, 196-220; Stevenson, *Scholarly Means to Evangelical Ends*, 49-51.
[43] Herman, "Dr. Stahr and the Reformed Church Review," *In Memoriam*, 137; Schiedt, "Reminiscences," 7. On the mediating role of New Haven scholarship, see Stevenson, *Scholarly Means to Evangelical Ends*, 84.
[44] Faculty Minutes, Jan. 6, 1876, Archives; Trustees Minutes, June 18, 1884, June 16, 1885, Archives; F&M Weekly, Oct. 21, 1896.
[45] *College Student*, May 1886; Stahr, "Scope of Science"; Trustees Minutes, June 15, 1886, Archives. On the shift from Baconianism to "progressivist" definitions of science, see Reuben, *Making of the Modern University*, Chapter 2.
[46] *College Student*, May 1886.

An invitation to join the Mercersburg Society and attend the annual convocation!

- Membership in the Society is sustained by $35.00 per annum for general membership and $20.00 per annum for students, payable to the Treasurer.

- Membership includes receiving *The New Mercersburg Review*.

- Manuscripts submitted for publication and books for review should be sent to:

Linden DeBie, Editor
The New Mercersburg Review
2700 Mayan Drive
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316
E-mail: ldebie@fdn.com

- Manuscripts must be submitted by disk or by e-mail attachment. Please include the appropriate biographical information.

THE NEW
MERCERSBURG REVIEW