



THE NEW MERCERSBURG REVIEW

Journal of the Mercersburg Society
Number XLVIII **Spring 2013**

**URSINUS THEOLOGY VS.
MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY**

Matthew Stillman

**T. S. ELIOT'S EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY
AS EVINCED IN *FOUR QUARTETS***

John Tamilio, III

BOOK REVIEW

The Eucharist's Biographer

Philip Schaff

By Albert J. D. Walsh

Reviewed by Deborah Rahn Clemons

MAY 28 2013

Library

ISSN: 0895-7460

**Semiannual Journal of the
MERCERSBURG SOCIETY**

The New Mercersburg Review 48

Contributing editors

F. Christopher Anderson, UCC (editor)
Kenneth Aldrich, TEC
Norman Kansfield, RCA
John Miller, UCC
Linden DeBie, RCA
Deborah Rahn Clemons, UCC
Gabriel Fackre, UCC
John B. Payne, UCC
Joseph Bassett, UUA
Charles Yrigoyen, Jr., UMC
Harry Royer, UCC
Theodore Trost UCC
Anne Thayer, UCC
Lee Barrett, III, UCC

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 and 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 the subjects pertinent to the aims and interests of the Society.

From the Editor

F. Christopher Anderson
Pentecost 2013

Those with an aversion to theology should not read this issue of the NMR. Matthew Stillman's article gives us a clear picture of the differences in theology between the Ursinus Movement and the Mercersburg Movement. John Tamilio, III uncovers the theology of Holy Communion of the great poet, T.S. Eliot. Deborah Rahn-Clemens takes a look at the theology of Holy Communion in her book review.

The Ursinus Movement never produced a systematic theology. Instead James I. Good produced volumes of Church History. Matthew Stillman has used his D.Min. Studies at Lancaster Theological Seminary to make up for this oversight. He has given us part of Chapter Four of his recent thesis. The resulting article uses the primary and secondary sources to provide a look at seven *loci* of theology from both the Ursinus perspective and the Mercersburg perspective. This makes the article a keeper. There is no other place that does this so thoroughly, nor in such an accessible manner. This article assumes that the reader has a basic understanding of the historic controversy between the two movements. We assume that most of our readers have this pre-understanding.

We are fortunate to have John Tamilio, III's essay on T. S. Eliot's theology of Holy Communion. I was particularly happy to get the article since I did independent study on Eliot way back in my undergraduate days. Dr. Tamilio, III is the newly called pastor of the United Church of Christ in Canton, MA as well as a visiting Assistant Professor in the English Department at Salem State University. We previously published his article, *Called by Grace: Elucidating and Appropriating the Doctrine of Vocation in Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics*, in NMR issue # 34, Spring 2004.

The President of the Mercersburg Society, Deborah Rahn Clemons, has given us a review of Albert J. D. Walsh's book, *The Eucharist's Biographer*.

We look forward to The Fall 2013 issue of the NMR. First, it should actually come out in the Fall! Second, it should include the two presentations by Teresa Berger that will be given at the 2013 Annual Convocation at Princeton, June 4th through June 6th. We will return to Lancaster Theological Seminary for the 2014 Annual Convocation.

Ursinus Theology vs. Mercersburg Theology (A Section from Chapter 4 of a D.Min. Thesis)

Matthew Stillman, Pastor of Wolf's ECC, York, PA

Because the Ursinus writers usually reacted to the initiatives of their Mercersburg adversaries, the Mercersburg theology must be considered first. Of course, Nevin and Schaff did not write compendia of systematic theology, but produced more topical and *ad hoc* works and historical accounts. Therefore, in order to elaborate the Mercersburg theology, I will consult William Erb's *Dr. Nevin's Theology* which is a distillation of some classroom notes from Nevin's lectures on theology. Erb's book is a compilation of three sets of class notes taken by the Revs. D. F. Brendle, W. M. Deatrick and F. K. Levan from Nevin's lectures in 1851. remarks that "the notes of the three copies compared were strikingly similar (iii) . . . What Dr. Nevin calmly and deliberately evolved and taught in his class room, totally free from the polemic spirit, comes nearer his beliefs than any of his published writings . . ." (vi). I will also use Emanuel Vogel Gerhart's two volume *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Gerhart was a student of Nevin and Schaff, and became the second-generation systematician of the movement.

The Ursinus movement is even trickier to articulate in any depth since it produced historians rather than systematic theologians. I will try to piece together the Ursinus theology by using critical theological observations made by James I. Good in his *The Reformed Reformation and History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century*. Additionally I will consult an early polemical work by an Ursinus movement sympathizer, Benjamin S. Schneck's *Mercersburg Theology: Inconsistent with Protestant and Reformed Doctrine*. By noting what they like about the theology of the reformers I will try to reconstruct their theological position *contra* the theology of Mercersburg. First I will sketch the Mercersburg position concerning the key doctrines identified by Bomberger and Good, and then I will describe the response by Schneck and Good, with references to the charts of Bomberger and Good.

I. DOCTRINE OF THEOLOGICAL AUTHORITY

First the respective views of the Mercersburg and Ursinus movements on the nature of the authorities that govern and provide the basis of the Christian faith must be explored. Bomberger and Good clearly believed that a shift in the understanding of the source and norm for Christian theology was responsible for all the aberrations of the Mercersburg

theology. These differences in the ways that the two parties justified their convictions would inform all their other disagreements.

Mercersburg:

According to the notes that students took from his lectures in Erb's, *Dr. Nevin's Theology*, Nevin taught his pupils that there were two primary sources for theology. The first is reason. He asserted, "By reason is meant the moral and the intellectual nature of man exercised without any supernatural assistance" (12). The second, he claimed, is divine revelation. "There are different kinds of revelations. First nature" (12). However, since our reason has been ruined by the Fall, we need more than nature to reveal divine truths. Nevin asserted that "a historical revelation becomes necessary" (12) in order to clarify the truths that our reason can no longer clearly discern and to add the saving truths pertaining to salvation, which are beyond the power of reason to discover. Nevin added that, "Judaism looked forward to that higher form, which is the Gospel" (13).

According to Nevin, reason and revelation worked together, not at cross-purposes, and ultimately they lead to faith. Reason, in spite of the fall, remains the indispensable lens through which an historical and special revelation must be interpreted and grasped. He explains, "Revelation is the truth in an objective form, and requires reason that it may enter into a man in a subjective way. He must embrace it in a rational way. . ." (13). He concludes, "Reason, then, in connection with Revelation, is the only legitimate source of religious knowledge. The Bible is not the principle ground of theology, but God and human reason . . ." (18).

Nevin while articulating two hallmarks of Mercersburg theology, its organic nature and the principle of historical development, explains further the place of the Bible as a "rule of faith." Nevin says, The Protestant doctrine, that the Bible is the only rule of faith, is correct, if we understand by it that the Bible is not the principle of faith, but the measure of it, and that normally rather than extreme; i.e., that all the developments of truth for the Church are not in the Bible, but they must be normally contained in it. So in the oak growing from the acorn, we can distinguish between the norm or type and principle. The latter is the life of the tree; the form is the rule or form that life must take in its development. So it is with the life of the Church. The Church is continually unfolding itself, and this is not only in an internal, but also in an external manner. In this view we are required to take hold and make use of tradition, not as an outward mechanical power, but as an inward power, a development of the Church. In the nature of the case there must be more reverence for the more general way of thinking around us. We must think in this way, and

this must not be considered a calamity. This tradition should be the embodiment of the life of the Church in her process of development (55). Nevin again explains the place of the Bible. It is not the ultimate authority on its own, apart from the life of the church. He says, The conception that the Bible was to be a rule by which all things were to be measured is false. The apostles had no such design when they wrote their epistles. We have no reason to assert that Paul had in view, in his epistles, to anticipate and to provide for all possible occasions. It is only when we admit the living character of Christianity that we have a proper sense of Christ's prophetic office, an office that reveals itself in the bible as interpreted by the Church. It is rationalistic to measure everything with the Bible. To pronounce every doctrine mere human tradition which has been introduced by the Church, but which cannot be substantiated by the Bible, as for instance infant baptism and the celebration of the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath, is absurd. These are to be regarded as in full conformity with the Bible. The Church has objective power and authority by which the individual judgment is controlled. Those who deny this, deny the prophetic office of Christ. This office is not confined to the text of the Bible (252).

So to sum up, Nevin believed that the sources of theology are reason and revelation as taught in Scripture but not slavishly dependent upon Scripture. The Bible is the rule of faith in that any doctrine should be congruent with a trajectory contained in the Bible, unfolding the meaning of a theme as a plant unfolds the potentialities of a seed, but biblical passages should not function as a source of the literal articulation of all doctrinal propositions. The Bible, he insists, must be interpreted by reason and tradition.

Tradition obviously plays a significant role for Nevin. Erb records, "The Church is more important than the written Word. The Church in her life has even greater authority than the Bible." (107). Doctrine is always developing and unfolding. Nevin uses the example of the Trinity to illustrate this conviction:

Now the Church has become conscious of the divinity of Christ, and hence was led to the doctrine of the Trinity. The Church had not such clear views of the Trinity in the first century as she had in the fourth. The doctrine had to be developed objectively. It existed fully in the life of the Church, but was not fully understood. Athanasius in exposing the sophistry of the Arian theory served to bring out clearly into the consciousness of the Church the doctrine of the Trinity (107).

Nevin's disciple, Emanuel Vogel Gerhart, set out to write something which Nevin never did: a systematic theology. Gerhart picks up where Nevin left off, stressing the fact that doctrine develops organically

because of the living presence of Christ in the church. According to Gerhart, the ultimate source of authority in the Church is Jesus Christ himself. He writes, "There is only one objective source of theological knowledge, not two or more sources; and that one source is the central and all-embracing fact or principle of Christianity, Jesus the Christ of God, glorified in heaven, who is related to personal faith, to reason and theological science . . ." (46).

He then explains what he means beginning in Volume I of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Gerhart says that "the source of this branch of theological science (Biblical theology) are to be found exclusively in the sacred scriptures" (4). Then he avers that "the source of knowledge is the same for the progressive science of Christian dogmatics as for biblical theology" (6) with one exception; that this revelation has been augmented with "the agency of the Holy Spirit" (5). He also notes that there is a development of doctrine over time, or, in other words, asserts that revelation is progressive. He says, ". . . progress in the spiritual life and apprehension of every age becomes to subsequent ages the condition of still further progress of life and knowledge" (p. 6). This is true for dogmatics but not for biblical theology whose sources "are in themselves always the same" (6). He sums this up nicely by saying that the Reformation, "affirms two sources of theological knowledge, namely: the written word of God and the illumination of the Church by the Holy Ghost" (12). In the language of the Reformation, "They may be expressed by the brief formula: Scripture alone and faith alone" (14).

According to Gerhart this understanding of authority changed from the 15th and 16th centuries to be replaced in the 17th and 18th centuries by reason and revelation (18). "By the term *reason* was understood man's intuitive and discursive powers," including the assumption that there are certain religious truths which can be apprehended by reason alone such as the existence of God and his various attributes (p. 20). Revelation on the other hand was necessary for certain other religious truths such as redemption and the Second Coming (20). According to Gerhart, this scholastic view failed to realize that the ultimate source of authority in the Church is Jesus Christ himself. Gerhart writes: "Jesus, the Christ of God, is Himself the source of the true and final knowledge of God" (33).

According to Gerhart, Christ is mediated to the church by "the gift and constant presence of the Holy Ghost of Christ glorified" (34). This witness is superior to and above Scripture. He says, "The books of the New Testament are nevertheless only the written *medium* through which the original heavenly light shines. Strictly speaking, the written word is not the fountain of light" (36). He says that "the Bible stands in a subordinate relation to Him who by His indwelling Spirit is ever present

and active in the communion of His church" (41-42). Both Nevin and Gerhart stressed the role of the traditions of the church as the lens through which the Bible must be interpreted and its implicit themes elaborated and developed.

Ursinus:

As noted above, the Ursinus movement produced historians and not theologians. The most prolific of these was James I. Good. Good outlined his own view of theological authority as he narrated the history of the Reformed tradition. Significantly, in the *Reformed Reformation* he sets out to demonstrate that the Reformed Reformation was earlier to and superior to the Lutheran Reformation. He asks the question, "Who were the earliest Reformers?" He answers, "And of these on the Reformed side two stand out prominently, Prof. James Lefèvre, of France, and Prof. Thomas Wyttenbach, of Basel" (1).

For Good, Thomas Wyttenbach was important because of his early conversion to the Evangelical (Reformed) movement and his role as Zwingli's teacher. Good claims:

But though humble, he was Evangelical even before Lefèvre, who as we have seen was Evangelical before either Luther or Zwingli. As early as 1506, twelve years before Lefèvre, he taught at Basel the two fundamental doctrines of Protestantism, namely, (1) the supreme authority of Scripture and (2) salvation by Christ and not through Mary. And eleven years before either Luther or Zwingli denounced the evils of indulgences; he denounced them as a fraud and cheat (37).

For Good, James Lefèvre was important because of what he taught about authority in the Reformation. Good elaborates:

But more important and significant for Protestantism was his declaration for the authority of the Bible; and this supremacy of the Bible would logically interfere with the supremacy of the Church's authority. He boldly says: 'It is there (in the Bible) where the doctrine of Christ is found. And those who will study it, will draw water with joy from the Savior's spring.' 'Let us exalt Christ our king by studying him in the holy oracles. Let us not follow the precepts and dogmas of men, which have no foundation in the light that has shone from on high' (10).

On matters of authority he explains that Zwingli, the "founder" of the Reformed Reformation (and ostensibly the founder of the German Reformed Church), understood authority as being the Bible itself. Zwingli picked this up from Thomas Wyttenbach at the University in Basel. Good writes, "Luther became a Reformer by emphasizing the doctrine of justification by faith, but Zwingli approached the Reformation from a somewhat different viewpoint . . . The supreme authority of Scripture—

the Bible was to be the guide rather than the Church, as the Catholics held" (4).

Wyttenbach was Zwingli's teacher. He helped Zwingli reconcile his theology and the authority of the Bible with his humanism, which was an hermeneutic approach that insisted upon a return to the original textual sources. Good says:

Wyttenbach came into his mind with great power, by showing to him that there was a harmony, instead of a contradiction, between theology and humanism, that by making the Bible the sole authority, they were harmonized. Wyttenbach showed to him on the one hand, the usefulness of humanism for theology, in that it led to a scholarly examination of the original sources; and on the other hand, the usefulness of theology to humanism, to prevent it from becoming a useless and merely secular science. True theology was the application of humanism to the Bible. Wyttenbach communicated to Zwingli the impulse which led him to search the Bible in the original. This is shown by his later study of the Greek and later still of the Hebrew (41).

Good continues with Zwingli's story by noting the place and authority of Scripture not just for theology but also in the life of the church:

Zwingli was doing what Luther had not yet thought of doing, namely, making changes in the cultus or worship of the Church. Zwingli did not go any farther at first than simply to lay aside the pericopes and preach on whole books of the Bible at a time. But even that was a great step, for it broke the unchangeable order of the Catholic Church service. For no man had a right to do this without express permission from the bishop. By this step he uprooted the Catholic custom of centuries. Had he done as he had been doing before at Einsiedeln, preach upon the pericope of the Sabbath, it would not have been so revolutionary. But no, he was now so strongly imbued with the authority of Scripture, that parts of the Bible as in the pericopes, did not satisfy him, he must give the whole Bible to his people. And so he preached on the Gospel of Matthew, verse by verse. His preaching began to produce results ... (70).

In his discussion of John Calvin, Good again emphasizes the authority of Scripture in matters of theology. In his polemical fashion he says:

This is a large subject, of which only the briefest outline can be given here. He held to *1. The Supremacy of Scripture*. The Bible was the infallible and sufficient rule of faith and duty. Where does Scripture get its authority? The Romanists said, "From the Church." "No," said Calvin, from "the testimony of the Holy Spirit." This was the self-evidencing power of the Bible to us—the appeal that its truths made to us, for we feel the Holy Spirit speaking to us through it as through no other book. This, however, differs from the modern view which makes the authority of

Scripture depend on our religious experience of it (a critique of his contemporary Gerhart?). Calvin made its authority depend on the Bible itself as objective to us, but proving itself by its own appeal to us. Not our answer to Scripture (as according to the modern view), but Scripture's appeal to us gives it its authority (78).

Good demonstrates his commitment to the Reformation principle of *sola Scriptura* in his critique of Erasmus' more irenic humanism and more ecclesial understanding of authority. Once again in high dudgeon he writes:

Erasmus had been willing to rouse the world by his criticisms of the Church, indeed he was willing to critically revise the text of Scripture; but he never came out boldly saying that the Bible was the rule of faith. He emphasized Scripture over against a religion of outward rites, but he did not emphasize the Scripture over against the Church as an authority. He was too much of a time-server for that. He could say severe things against the Church, but he was careful never to attack her constitution or her authority (50-51).

In another work, *History of the Reformed Church in the U.S.*, Good summarizes the basis of authority in "Mercersburg Theology" (adapted from 587—594): It departs from this Reformed principle of *sola Scriptura*, as it operated on the philosophical principles of Hegel and Schelling. The idea of "historical progress" according to a philosophical theory rather than a straightforward exposition of Scripture became the basic premise. Consequently, *church tradition* was elevated over the authority of the Bible.

Another writer in the Ursinus tradition was Benjamin Schneck. He was as polemical in nature as was Good. In his book, *Mercersburg Theology: Inconsistent with Protestant and Reformed Doctrine*, Schneck, in an appendix, approvingly quotes Prof. J. A. Dorner about the problems of Roman Catholic theology and by extension what Schneck sees as also being problematic in Mercersburg theology. Of Dorner's work, Schneck says that it is "the ablest paper we have ever perused on that subject" (166). On the subject of authority Dorner writes, in an appendix included in Schneck about the Roman Catholic System:

Lest they should open the door to disorganizing arbitrariness, they imprison Christianity itself; lest they should give room to subjectivism, they lead the way to an objectivism which is human bondage. Church authority is made the basis of faith; the symbols of the Church, and their formula, are placed above the Bible; Church tradition is most scrupulously guarded, not because it is the truth, but because it is tradition, and thus there is a zeal for evangelical doctrines which are based merely on tradition. Many, who are especially anxious for the credit of orthodoxy,

subordinate the study of the Scriptures to the symbolical books and the ancient dogmatical writers. They are annoyed when the believer in the study of the Scripture shows the necessity of harmonizing more completely Church doctrine with the Bible (170).

Schneck and Good both criticized the Mercersburg theologians' tendency to see the Bible's message as being in need of being clarified and further developed by church tradition and philosophical concepts. For them, the Bible contains all the data that theology merely organizes and expounds. A ferocious commitment to the doctrine of *sola Scriptura*, taken to mean that the Bible in itself is the only source and norm of theology, became a hallmark of the Ursinus tradition.

II. DOCTRINE OF GOD

Mercersburg:

The best way to articulate the nature of God as understood by the Mercersburg theologians is to describe God as a personal being who exists in a trinity and that "God is love." God has created us in order to love us and for us to love God in return.

In his classroom lectures (according to Erb) Nevin affirms a personal, Trinitarian God who has elected to be in relationship with humanity. He does not typically use the term "love," but rather speaks of union (actually "mystical union"), connection, and relation.

Nevin is recorded as saying, "We must conceive of God as a Personal Being. . ." (73). The emphasis of God's personal nature leads Nevin to adopt the language of a "social" model of the Trinity. "The doctrine of the Trinity teaches that ...there are three distinct persons in the Godhead. Not mere modes of existence but persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost" (103). According to Nevin, the persons of the Trinity are defined by their reciprocal love for one another. This mutuality of the persons of the Trinity is God's most definitive characteristic and is the essence of God's "life."

From the beginning of creation God had a plan for humanity. Nevin writes, "The decrees of God are admitted on the ground that God as an intelligent Being could not act without plan in the execution of His work. Thus the creation of the world evidently rests upon some previous determination. God's providence designs plainly to bring the whole created existence to some glorious end" (140). That plan is for humanity to live in relationship with God as God lives in relationship with Himself. Nevin says, "The Church is the body of Christ, and the members are the participants of His life" (280). How does God accomplish this plan? Nevin points not to the cross but to the Incarnation. He explains, "The

Incarnation is the medium through which this higher life is brought into the world; and we are brought into it only by union with Christ" (285). According to Nevin, "The object of Christianity is the salvation of the individual, and this can be accomplished only by union with Christ" (293). He calls this union which God had eternally intended for humanity the "mystical union." He explains how the power of the Incarnation is extended to humanity:

The mystical union is accomplished by the Holy Spirit on the one side and by faith on the other . . . Both the activity of the Spirit and the exercise of faith are necessary for the mystical union . . . The Spirit brings the whole person of Christ into union with man, but through the medium of His humanity. . . His humanity becomes the door through which our humanity passes into union with his divinity (291-292). The goal of God's soteriological scheme as described by Nevin is that we are brought into the right relationship with God that God had wanted. God adopts us as children of God's own family. He writes, Christians are said to be adopted into the family of God, which implies that they are not originally of that family. This relation is not external and legal only, but it expresses a real, filial sonship and state which belongs to Christians by virtue of their union with Christ. . . In this case the sonship is a real, living relation to God, which holds by means of their connection with Christ (313).

Similarly, in his introduction to volume 1 of Gerhart's *Christian Institutes*, Philip Schaff says,

... the God whom Christ has revealed to the world is a God of saving love. . . There is no greater word in the whole Bible than the sentence: 'God is love,' and the other which is like unto it: 'God so loved the world (that is, all mankind,) that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life' (xiv).

Schaff clearly shared Nevin's conviction that the purpose of creation was the adoption of humanity as God's beloved children.

Gerhart learned his theology from his professors at Mercersburg and followed the same path but in a more sustained and systematic fashion. Gerhart says, "In His incarnate Son the Father loves us; we in turn are constrained to love the Father in the Son" (51). Gerhart explains the Incarnation by saying, "The Christ-idea affirms the ideal relationship between God and man under its twofold aspect, God's relation to man and man's relation to God. . . As related to God man is His child and companion . . . man is formed for obedience and for the fellowship of love with God" (116-117). As I mentioned, it was a central tenet of the Mercersburg theologians that God has created us to love us and for us to love God in return. Gerhart emphasizes this theme by saying, "Each exists

for the other. God formed man to the end that God might fill man's nature with divine fullness. Zwingli says, '*Deus gaudet possideri*'" (157). Like Nevin and Schaff, Gerhart grounded God's love for humanity in the "personal" nature of God and in the mutual love the persons of the Trinity for one another. Regarding the personal nature of God, Gerhart continues, "God is personal and the personal Creator" (208). For Gerhart, this personal nature of God is a function of God's life as a Trinity: "the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost is God" (216). While a Trinity, God is also only one. "The difference between Hebrew monotheism and the Christian God-idea comes to view in a new manifestation of *divine unity* ... God is One in Three" (294-295). A little later Gerhart says, "...the Christian God-idea theology must therefore affirm triunity, or oneness in threefoldness, and threefoldness in oneness" (339). This triune God is a God of love, love within the Trinity and love for the creation. Regarding the former Gerhart says, "The one holy God is the God of absolute *love*" (293). Gerhart affirms, "Love, predicated of divine nature as self-related, denotes the self-communication and self-communication of God. God is eternally the only satisfying object of His life. He embraces Himself with an unchangeable self-conscious volition. God loves God" (445). Regarding the second – that God loves his creation, Gerhart says, "The law of love in the communion of God with Himself rules in the communion of God with the world. In the domain of creation God loves the objects that are capable of reciprocating His love" (448).

Ursinus:

I submit that the doctrine of God was not an explicit point of contention between the Mercersburg and Ursinus parties, although their differing emphases in the understanding of the Trinity did lead to substantial disagreements on other doctrinal topics. Both groups held to the orthodox Christian understanding that God is a personal being who exists in a trinity. However, the Ursinus party tended to emphasize the oneness of the transcendent God, and associated that oneness with God's holiness, righteousness, power, and judgment.

The Ursinus party's understanding of God becomes evident in their response to questions raised about the orthodoxy of Lewis Mayer, the first professor of theology at the German Reformed Seminary. Good in his, *History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century*, grieves the attacks on Lewis Mayer's orthodoxy by those sympathetic to Mercersburg theology. Good laments:

This whole subject is a difficult one, especially because some who charged him with heresy were later biased in their opposition to him by their Mercersburg theology, whose beginnings Mayer opposed. Prof. T.

G. Apple charges Mayer with having varied from the accepted orthodoxy of the Church on the trinity, person of Christ, atonement and original sin. Prof. Theodore Appel says he diverged on the trinity and person of Christ. Dubbs says he had peculiar views on the trinity and eschatology. Prof. E. V. Gerhart adds that he lowered the supernatural in the miracles. Schaff says Mayer had been under DeWette's semi-rationalistic influence and adds he had no churchly sense—his liturgy shows this as it is only a gathering of theological and sensible reflections. In this latter clause Schaff reveals the animus of a good deal of criticism against Mayer, namely, the bitter animosity of the Mercersburg men against him (84-85). This is significant because the charges of heresy against Mayer related to his view of God, Christ and the trinity. In 1839 the East Pennsylvania Classis passed a series of resolutions on the matter. They say in part: It also declared that according to the (Heidelberg) Catechism (answers 15, 33 and 35), Jesus is the eternal Son of God and it opposed the view that he had his origin in his human nature and was only clothed with divine attributes. It held that God exists as the trinity and declares that the view that God is only unity in any sense is Unitarianism and a calumny on our doctrine (85).

While Good is sympathetic to Mayer he supports the correctives contained in the resolutions. Of Mayer's questionable orthodoxy Good notes:

In one of his theological articles in the "Biblical Repository," 1840, on "The Sonship of Christ," he emphasizes the inferiority of the Son to the Father and claims that the phrase "Son of God" does not prove Christ's divinity. "The Son of God is not properly a designation of the God-man but of the man Christ Jesus." This would seem to bear out the statement made by one of his students that "he uniformly spoke of the man Christ Jesus. He affirmed his divinity, but by it meant that God had endowed Jesus with divine authority, divine knowledge and divine powers, above Moses, above all the prophets, above all other men. Jesus was called the "Son of God" because he was the most beloved of the Father and was commissioned to perform the great work of redemption." (In a word, he built Christ's divinity on his manhood and not on his essential divinity.—JIG) "On the Godhead he taught the threefold manifestation, but denied personal distinctions in God's being." This would prove a charge made in the *Messenger* that he taught Sabellianism—"that there was only one person in the Godhead and that the Son and Spirit are only different powers, operations and offices of the one God the Father." Farther than this we can not get the facts. But this charge is a serious one, for the doctrines of the trinity and the divinity of Christ are fundamental and logically lead to serious departures on other correlated doctrines (86-87).

From these comments we can deduce that Good understood the issues at stake and that he, like Mercersburg, affirmed that God exists in a trinity and that Jesus Christ is the fully divine second person of the Trinity. However unlike Mercersburg, Good does not add that the doctrine of the Trinity is crucial for Christianity because it identifies God as being intrinsically a life of interpersonal mutuality. Rather, Good speaks of the persons of the Trinity in an "economic" fashion, as being the sources of God's activities of creating, redeeming, and sanctifying. Of course, Good is careful to avoid the modalism that may have been espoused by Mayer, and insists that these activities are rooted in the three-fold nature of God. Nevertheless, Good keeps the focus on the three-fold glorious activities of the righteous, just, and holy God working out our salvation in unity of purpose.

Of course, the differences between the Mercersburg and Ursinus traditions on the Trinity must not be exaggerated. As Good transitions from Mayer to Rauch and what the two men taught and the controversy about Mayer's orthodoxy in 1839, Good, in a note, quotes appreciatively the reminiscences of one of Rauch's students (Kieffer) who said: They would talk about the objective and the subjective, the abstract and the concrete, the general and the particular, the absolute being and the relative being and the relations of these different things. One student would ask another, "Where is the absolute ground of all relations?" He replied, "in personality." "In God," was asked, "or the personal creature." The reply was "ultimately in God the Absolute. God is a personal being." "Yea, tri-personal," was the response. (89). As Good quotes this favorably I believe that we can add that for Good God is a personal being who exists in a trinity. However, Good again does not therefore develop a social understanding of the Trinity; this despite that the fact that Rauch's reported remark invited such a conclusion. The language of God's loving relationship with humanity being the purpose of creation, and the affirmation that this goal being an expression of God's inner relational life, is altogether missing.

III. DOCTRINE OF HUMAN NATURE

Mercersburg:

There is no overt, self-conscious quarrel between the Mercersburg and Ursinus movements about the doctrine of human nature. They both believe that humanity is created in the image of God and has fallen from this place through sin and that sin has twisted humanity and needs to be "fixed." Where there is disagreement is in their depiction of the pre-fall nature of humanity. The Mercersburg movement says that Adam was

created only potentially "holy" and that he would have to grow into it. The Ursinus folk would dispute this. This difference in views comes from Mercersburg's emphasis on organic growth or development. In *History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century*, Good defines Nevin's organic view thusly: "The organic means that it lives and grows by its own forces according to the laws of its own being." (315). It was this theme that human nature needed to develop according to inherent, law-like principles that the Ursinus adherents found to be so objectionable.

Even if Good did not quite grasp the nuances of the Mercersburg position, he was detecting a real difference. According to Erb, Nevin believed that humanity is the intended apex of creation, and not just an accidental product of natural forces. Nevin taught, "We must not regard his creation as a mere evolution. Man forms the climax of the world; yet there is introduced through him a higher principle, a new creation, which completes the process" (167-168). Nevin asserts, "He (man) was created in the image of God" (176). For Nevin, this "*imago dei*" was the capacity to receive the power to relate in love to the infinitely loving God. This receptive potential was intrinsic to human nature, but it was only a potentiality. According to Nevin, the action of God's grace was necessary to activate it and give it the gift of a supernaturally loving life, and nurture that life to fruition. In the Garden of Eden Adam and Eve were like children who had not yet grown into the final maturation of this spiritual potential.

While humanity is created in God's image we have fallen into sin. We were able to fall because we were not created "holy" with our capacity to love God in full bloom. This idea follows from Nevin's idea of organic growth. Nevin says, "Man was not created perfectly holy, or else he could not have fallen. He had perfect holiness potentially; and if the fall had not taken place, his holiness and integrity would have developed themselves until fully confirmed by the partaking of the tree of life" (179). Nevin continues in this line of thought: "Man fell soon after his creation. We cannot tell how soon; but it could not have been long, or else he would have been established in holiness" (196). In other words his "organic" development would have rendered him holy and inured to temptation and sin.

Here is where Good and the Ursinus folk depart from Nevin and the Mercersburg position. Good charges that this idea of "organic" development leads to pantheism. In *History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century* he says:

"Dr. Nevin was a supernaturalist himself in belief, but his methods were an inheritance from pantheistic rationalism. Organism was the word by

which he conjured. Everything, every doctrine must be organic. But this making everything to be organic was rationalism in the last issue, for it put everything under law. Organic means that it lives and grows by its own forces according to the laws of its own being. But putting everything, even God, thus under law, was ultimately pantheistic. It allowed no room for God working as he wills in the laws of nature. The supernatural was reduced to the natural" (315-316).

Of course, Nevin did not propose that that this potential would develop through its own power or intrinsic momentum. Rather, its blossoming would require the on-going activity and grace of God.

Nevin, like all Reformed theologians, describes the consequences of the fall in very dire terms: "The immediate consequence of their transgression was that their eyes were opened, and they saw that they were naked, i.e., they had a consciousness of their fallen state. . . The penalty was death, but this was not experienced at once; it is a process" (201-202).

Ultimately, as a good Reformed theologian, Nevin expresses the doctrine of a pervasive human depravity infecting every aspect of human nature. He says of Adam (and humanity in general): "His faculties are disordered, his understanding darkened and his will powerless and bound to evil" (210). He concludes, "A general disablement of human nature has been the result of Adam's fall" (210). The twist that Nevin gives to this doctrine of depravity is that he identifies sin with not just a broken relationship with God but also with a resistance to the life of relationality with God.

A generation later Gerhart echoed many of Nevin's sentiments and even amplified them. Where Nevin says that humanity "forms the climax of the world" (Erb, 167) Gerhart in a paroxysm of ecstasy says, "man is the final outcome and crown of the cosmos" (I, 584). Of humanity's bearing the *imago dei*, Gerhart says, "... the record assigns him (Adam) as the being made in God's image (*tselem*) . . . it is said of him that he is created in the image of God. Not good, but god-like" (II, 47). Where Nevin speaks of the organic development of humanity over time Gerhart says, Divine imageship is commensurate with the divine idea. It is the idea as partially realized by the primeval man that is god-like. As he is an organic unity, so is also the divine image. . . divine imageship comprehends every constituent and every capacity of man's being, his corporeal no less than his spiritual endowments, each in a form answerable to its place and function" (II, 65-66).

Like Nevin, Gerhart associates this image as the human capacity to mirror God's life of mutual fellowship one with the other.

Gerhart also insists that while created in God's image humanity has fallen from grace. Gerhart says, "The fall is an ethical process of decadence. . ."

(II, 81). He affirms original sin, asserting that "Original sin, as used by Augustine . . . refers to the willful deed of Adam and Eve, the first act of disobedience. The first sin conditions all subsequent sinning." (II, 113). This disobedience is the rejection of the *telos* that God had established for humanity. The result of this process of defection from our intended path of spiritual development is human depravity in all its forms. Gerhart elaborates, "Transgression incurred the loss of those noble gifts with which Adam was in fact endowed." (II, 87). Further he says, "Depravity fixes attention chiefly on the perverseness of human nature. The term expresses the abnormal character of the 'natural man' . . . affirming the fact of a radical predisposition to turn from the highest Good toward all forms of moral evil" (II, 114). Specifically, the "highest good" from which we turn is the goal of loving union with God or that "*telos* that God had established for humanity."

To summarize, the Mercersburg party's doctrine of human nature was that human beings were created in God's image and have fallen into sin and depravity. Here there is substantial formal agreement with the Ursinus party. However, Nevin's idea of "organic" development necessitates that the *imago dei* was something potential to be "grown into" rather than an inherent attribute of pre-fall humanity. Furthermore, the Mercersburg theologians tended to describe the *imago dei* in terms of the potential capacity to become united to God in a loving relationship and sin in terms of the resistance to that ultimate goal.

Ursinus:

For Good there is no doubt that human nature as described in scripture is normative, and that the description of Adam and Eve before the Fall is a picture of ideal human nature as God intended it to be. Man (humanity) was created in the image of God, enjoyed a holy life, and then fell into sin. The effects of the fall are catastrophic and humanity must be "saved" from its fallen condition.

There is no dispute that humanity is created in the image of God for Good, and that this image was an actuality rather than a potentiality. In his *History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century*, he says, "The Old Reformed theology held that man was created in the image of God" (606). This image was knowledge of God's law, the ability to obey it, and the enjoyment of God's presence. Eden was not a state of mere spiritual potency, but a state of actualized righteousness. The only problem was the defectability of the will of Adam and Eve. The metaphors used to describe the relationship with God in Eden suggest that the proper way to image God is through obedience and adoration. The language of loving union with God, so prominent in the Mercersburg

writings, is missing. For Ursinus the *telos* or goal of humanity was a return to the righteousness enjoyed in the garden. Good also teaches that the "Old Reformed" believed fully in the fall of humanity and original sin. In *History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century* he says, "Our forefathers ... thoroughly believed in original sin" (156). In *The Reformed Reformation*, in discussing Beza's conversion experience, Good sheds light on his understanding of humanity's sin problem and its remedy. Good writes, "Then God's providence came in to help (Beza). His older brother died and that sobered him. Then came a serious illness, so severe that his life was for a time despaired of, and so long that it gave him time for deep thought. As he remembered his worldliness and sinful condition, he came to deep conviction of sin, and out of that he came to forgiveness (88). Beza, in his contrition, identified sin with willful disobedience of God's righteous law.

In criticizing Nevin's understanding of salvation as being organic Good further elaborates his understanding of original sin. He says in, *History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century*, "This cornerstone of generic humanity in Nevin's system is false and with it the whole structure falls to the ground. Salvation is not, as Nevin holds, exactly like original sin in its methods. We inherited sin but no man inherits salvation, for salvation is accepted only by a free act on our part. Salvation is a "gift," and not "wages" as in the case of sin. "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life." The connection between salvation and us is not natural as between sin and us, but it is supernatural. (317).

According to Good in this passage, death is not a natural outgrowth of sin, but is a punishment attached to it by a legal decree. In general, the advocates of the Ursinus movement used legal metaphors to describe sin, while the Mercersburg theologians gravitated toward relational ones.

IV. DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON & WORK OF JESUS CHRIST (CHRISTOLOGY)

The questions asked of Christology are 1) who is Jesus Christ? and 2) what has he done for humanity?

Mercersburg:

In the lectures recorded for us by William Erb, Nevin begins his discussion of the person of Christ by noting first that he was Israel's expected Messiah. However, Nevin elaborates that as the Messiah, Christ was not just the deliverer of a nation, for Christ's real messianic

significance was his possession of two natures. Nevin emphasizes the fact that "His person is the union of the human and the divine natures" (239). Nevin affirms, "Christ is God and man in one person" (242). Jesus as the human/divine Messiah was the mediator between God and humanity and the introducer of a new life into humanity. Nevin explains, "There was a general expectation of deliverance through humanity, but this also comprehended the idea of a life transcending the common range of humanity, viz., a divine life" (239).

Here is where I believe that Nevin and the Mercersburg movement and Good and the Ursinus movement most dramatically part company. Nevin says, "The effects of this union are, first, it qualified Him for accomplishing the redemption. This lies in His person and not in His works" (242). In other words, our redemption is accomplished through the Incarnation rather than through the medium of the cross only. According to Nevin,

The mediation of Christ lies primarily and mainly in the constitution of His person by itself considered. . . He is the actual living union of both parties in a central life, and does not merely pass to and fro from one to the other. He does not merely stand between both parties, but He is the union of them, not in an abstract way, but organically (243). The goal in all of this is to unite humanity to God. Nevin says, "... each individual should stand related to an organic common centre capable of sustaining the whole, it must be united to divinity" (243). This union accomplished in the person of Christ changes human nature. Nevin says, "On the ground of Christ's life a foundation is laid for the development of a new order of existence, in which humanity itself becomes complete. This new order of existence is not bound solely to Christ, but passes over continually to others" (244).

This union of God in humanity through Christ creates a new humanity along the lines of divinization or *theosis*. Nevin says, "By the union of the two natures the divine and human properties have become subject to one person. The properties of one nature are predicated to the other . . . they are predicated of each other in their organic union in the person of Christ" (245). This doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* was crucial for Nevin, for it highlighted the communication of God's supernatural life to human nature.

Of course, Nevin does not deny the efficacy of the cross in salvation. His alleged innovation in soteriology is just a matter of emphasis. In the same way Good does not deny the necessity of the Incarnation in salvation but rather emphasizes the cross. Nevin says, "The propitiatory character of Christ's death is admitted by all who acknowledge Christianity in its true form" (258). He continues by saying that the cross is "a universal sacrifice

not in appearance only, but in reality" (259). The real issue between them was that for Nevin the Incarnation was far more than a necessary foundation for the remediation of human sinfulness, while for Good the Incarnation was only necessary because of humanity's fall and was a means for getting Jesus to the cross. For Nevin God would have become incarnate even if humanity had not fallen in order to inject the divine life into human nature; the need to rectify humanity's sinfulness simply added another complicating dimension to the purpose of the Incarnation. Good, however, was not interested in humanity's participation in God's interior relational life.

How did the next generation of Mercersburg theologians deal with the questions 1) who is Jesus Christ? and 2) what has he done for humanity? Gerhart follows Nevin's lead but changes the language somewhat, emphasizing love as the essence of the divine/human life even more explicitly. He too believes that Christ is the human/divine mediator and came to bring God and humanity together. In volume I of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, he writes:

Christianity is the communion of love in Jesus Christ between God and man. Communion is reciprocal. In Christ God is active toward man in goodness and grace. In Christ man is active toward God by faith and the obedience of love. Two elements accordingly enter into the nature and history of religion, the divine and human, or the life of God and the life of man. Each is an essential factor (97).

In volume II of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Gerhart again comments on the organic union of God and humanity in Christ. He says, The original humanity of Adam is by a creative act, by the transition of 'living soul' into 'life giving spirit' advanced organically to the ideal status of union with God, and thus of that objective perfection which in principle actualizes the divine purpose ... 'the first man' is fulfilled, inasmuch as humanity in the act of assumption into God is born again (215).

Once again for Gerhart, as for Nevin, the emphasis is on the Incarnation. He writes, "The birth of Jesus is the new birth of the race in Him. He becomes the principle of regeneration for all the members of fallen mankind. That new life of which He is the principle is the 'eternal life'" (215-216). This "theanthropic" life of radical inter-relationality is both the fulfillment of created human nature, and the introduction of a new potency that takes it beyond its original natural capabilities. Human nature was designed to be transcended through the sharing in the life of God.

Ursinus:

As we have already seen in Good's chart he answers the questions 1) "Who is Jesus Christ?" and 2) "What has he done for humanity?" in a way that differs significantly from Nevin and Gerhart. Good answers the question concerning the identity of Jesus by pointing to the Incarnation and acknowledging that this is a sticking point between the Mercersburg and Ursinus theologies. According to Good, Jesus "is the union of the Son of God with humanity" (588). Furthermore, this union of God with humanity

is not organic, for organic puts all under law. But Christ is not under law. The Incarnation is not according to law. The Incarnation was a unique thing—the great exception to law. It was not according to the natural, but according to the supernatural. It is not a natural process but a gift of God to reveal his mercy (588).

According to Good, as for Nevin and Gerhart, Christ is both God and man. However, Good emphasizes the fact that "Christ's two natures are distinct in one person" (588). The distinction of the persons allows Good to suggest that the attributes of the divine life are not communicated to Jesus' human nature and therefore not to human nature in general. Good rejects the language of "organic union" and regards the human nature of Jesus as an instrument used by God to reveal supernatural truths and make possible the atonement.

According to the Ursinus movement and Good the reason Christ came was to save humanity from sin. Good's last remark about the reason for the Incarnation is: "The Incarnation took place because of sin and because of the need of redemption for sin. The Bible gives no other reason for it" (589). In elaborating the nature of this redemption, Good employs the vocabulary of substitutionary atonement, particularly penal substitution. Jesus primarily satisfies the demands of the law and retributive justice. Again the thrust of the Ursinus position is forensic. Even when it is confessed that the grace of Jesus Christ makes sanctification possible, this is presented as the guidance and stabilization of the will. Redemption is not the introduction of a new supernatural life into human nature.

V. DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION & SANCTIFICATION (SOTERIOLOGY)

Soteriology is the doctrine of salvation. Again, Good points out that this was a point of difference between the Mercersburg and Ursinus movements. Good wants to distinguish justification as imputed righteousness and keep it strictly separated from sanctification. Nevin, however, says that they are two sides of the same coin. For Good and the Ursinus movement faith is the key and salvation is a subjective

experience, but for Nevin our justification is objective and is apprehended through faith in the promises attached to the Church and the sacraments. Highlighting this difference, through Erb, Nevin says, "...salvation is to be regarded as coming to its completion by the Incarnation... There is no particular merit in faith toward Christ, except that He is the end of all promises" (303). As we shall see, the difference between seeing faith as primarily being a personal act that effects salvation, and seeing faith as trust in a salvation already accomplished, would have enormous consequences for the Christian life.

Mercersburg:

In William Erb's, *Dr. Nevin's Theology*, Nevin says: The Bible does not make a technical distinction between justification and sanctification; yet a distinction is correct, although they are only different sides of the same fact. In theology it becomes necessary to distinguish them ... the two must go together with subjective sanctification; with objective imputation of justification implies the subjective receptivity, and this again implies sanctification. Justification is the ground of the sinner's sanctification (295).

For Nevin, conversion, including the reception of justification, is not a point of time in the life of a believer but a process. He says, "It seems necessary to admit the idea of justification that is not limited to a single point in the history of the subject, but may include a considerable portion of time before it is complete; though it is nevertheless a single act" (299). Justification is the process of progressively sharing in the righteousness of Christ through the union of the believer with Christ. For Nevin the process begins at baptism. He says,

Baptism is justification in its incipient character ... when the idea of justification is entirely sundered from baptism and made to be a divine act, which is conditioned and suspended on a particular exercise of the subject, there is danger of losing sight of its objective side entirely, making it a subjective movement in the subjects themselves (300).

For Nevin the sacraments are the means of this justifying grace and there is no salvation apart from the Church, for the Church makes this grace available and awakens the faith that appropriates it. This faith is elicited by the objective proximity of God's grace He says:

Justification does not become complete until it is actually met by a corresponding activity on the part of the subject. Then it is the germ of sanctification. The grace of justification becomes of full effect by faith on the part of man, but this grace is not created in that way. The objective reality is brought near to man independently of his faith. For this reason it is important to see the connection in which it stands to the Church as the

bearer and medium through which it is thus exhibited... There is danger, however, of making justification the product of faith... in which they trust, and glory virtually in their own works. They have little or no apprehension of the objective ground of our righteousness (300-301). In volume II of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Gerhart follows Nevin to his logical conclusion. He writes, "Baptism is the objective translation of the subject from the old race in Adam to the kingdom of the new race in Christ... Baptism anticipates justification by faith; and through the exercise of faith in Christ by the subject its spiritual virtue becomes actual." (731).

For the Mercersburg theologians salvation is a "mystical union" with Christ. It begins at baptism and grows organically as a process. Gerhart says, "The new race (new humanity in the new Adam) is the race of salvation. By virtue of vital connection with the Mediator it is now in principle the saved race, and its history is the process of achievement of complete victory over sin and death" (646). In speaking of the union of Christ and the Christian Gerhart says, "...one distinguishing characteristic is, that it effects and maintains a union of the object with the subject. The union is internal, being a moral force in the personal life of the subject" (665).

There is a place for personal faith but this faith is a response to the promises of Christ made available through his Church. Gerhart writes: "But what Christ designs to be and to do in the history of the Christian Church and in its individual members, He becomes and He effects through their faith, which conditions the development and ripe fruit of the mystical union of Christ with His members. Engrafted into Him by the Holy Spirit, the blessing of this engrafting is experienced by those only who by their own act make this blessing their personal possession" (653). Because of theme of union with Christ, the Mercersburg theologians could regard both justification and sanctification as different aspects of the believer's participation in the life of Christ. Christ's righteousness becomes the believer's, making the believer holy (justified) and also enabling the believer to live out this new righteousness (sanctified). Gerhart explicitly links faith in Christ and sanctification. He writes, "Faith is an active faculty, not passive submission... Faith is the principle of good works, and grows with the growth of the Christian life" (671). Later he says, "Sanctification is a gradual transformation into the likeness of the ideal Man, and a gradual purification from the pollution of sin" (763).

Ursinus:

According to Good, "Redemption is . . . — a free act of grace or unmerited favor of God to us, unworthy sinners" (589). However, Good

devotes most of his attention to the way that this unmerited grace must be accepted by sinners in order for salvation to be effected. He continues, "Redemption does not come to us exactly as sin came to us, for sin is inherited, whereas salvation must be chosen by a free, conscious act of the will" (589). Good believes that persons must be "converted" or must make a decision for Christ.

As we have seen, for Good and the Ursinus movement, redemption from sin was the whole point of the Incarnation. God sent His Son in order to provide atonement for sin. He writes, "The atonement is the central Christian doctrine. It is 'Incarnation in order to atonement.' Christ made it central. He left no sacrament of the Incarnation as he did of his death" (589). Salvation according to the Ursinus movement is first and foremost the change in the sinner's legal status with God brought about through the acceptance of Christ's atoning work.

Good sought to keep this change in legal status (justification) distinct from any change in the believer's way of life (sanctification). In explaining the justification of sinners Good says, "Justification is a forensic act of God charging over to our account the merits of Christ, (Heidelberg Catechism, Ans. 60). Salvation is therefore a gift (Romans 6:23). Justification must not be confused with sanctification, but it leads to sanctification and is therefore not merely calling a sinner righteous but making him so. Justification is external to the Christian, at the cross of Christ" (590).

The *ordo salutis* is the Latin phrase for "the order of salvation" which deals with the steps or stages in the salvation of a believer. Concerning the *ordo salutis* Good recounts an exchange between Nevin and Joseph Berg on justification and sanctification and writes approvingly of Berg's response to Nevin: "Justification must be sundered from sanctification. It is a forensic act. But every justified person must be regenerated, although regeneration is not the ground of the justification" (252). In traditional Reformed theology justification precedes sanctification. This is the point that Berg is making. Nevin, according to Good, is conflating justification and sanctification in his question to Berg, when he asks "In justification, is the sinner viewed by God in justifying him as in Christ or out of Christ? Can the objective side be sundered from the subjective?" (252). Nevin, of course, believed that the believer is justified by being "in Christ" and sharing in Christ's righteousness, while Berg insisted that Christ's righteousness remains external to the believer, and is only imputed to him by faith or conversion.

According to Good in the *Reformed Reformation* Prof. James Lefèvre of France was the first Reformed Reformer, and Good cited Lefèvre's work

as authoritative. In explaining Lefèvre's teaching about the relationship between justification and sanctification, Good writes:

... (Lefèvre's) clear enunciation of the doctrine of justification by faith. He held that salvation was not of works, but was by grace—the free gift of God. He says:

"It is almost blasphemous to talk of the merit of works especially before God. For a merit does not seem to ask for grace, but to exact what is due: to attribute merit to works is to have the opinion of those who think that we can be justified by works, an error for which the Jews were particularly condemned. Therefore let us not speak of the merit of our works, which is very small, indeed, rather worthless. And let us exalt the grace of God which is everything. One can attribute real merit to no one but Christ, who has deserved everything for us: But as for ourselves, let us acknowledge that we have no merit before God and hope in his grace."

"But you say, has any one ever been justified without the works of the law, either written or natural?" Yes, there have been such and without number. Who knows not that the penitent thief was justified by faith alone." "By works without faith it is impossible to be justified; by faith without works, it is possible." "It is God alone who by His grace justifies unto everlasting life. There is a righteousness of works, there is a righteousness of grace: the one is earthly and passeth away, the other is heavenly and eternal: one is the shadow and the sign, the other, the light and the truth: one makes sin known to us that we may escape death, the other reveals grace that we may obtain life." When asked by his hearers in his lectures, "If we are not justified by works what is the use of performing them?" His answer was: "Certainly, they are not in vain. If I hold a mirror to the sun, its image is reflected; the more I polish and clear it, the brighter is its reflection. But if I allow it to become tarnished, the splendor of the sun is dimmed. It is the same with justification (he really means sanctification) in those who lead an impure life." His objectors answered, "Then St. James did not agree with St. Paul?" Lefèvre's reply was: "St. James says, in the first chapter, that every good and perfect gift cometh down from above. Can you deny that salvation is a good and perfect gift? It is true, works are a necessary sign of faith, just as breathing is a necessary sign of life. But a man breathes because he is alive. If he did not breathe, you would know that he is dead. A man is justified by faith, and works then follow as a necessity" (10-11).

Good here regarded the good works performed by believers as the fruits of sanctification, and wanted to make sure that they were not regarded as anything that might justify the individual. Lefèvre was praised for clearly separating sanctified works from justification, and regarding them as nothing more than signs of a living faith.

Following conversion and faith in God's justifying act, Good believes that sanctification is a different act of grace accomplished by the Holy Spirit. In *The Reformed Reformation*, Good writes:

"With the Reformed the mystical was the secret work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification and its influence in every relation of life. Perhaps the best illustration of pietism in the Reformed Church is found in the Heidelberg Catechism, its first answer, 'What is thy only comfort in life and death? That I with body and soul am not my own but belong to my faithful Savior Jesus Christ.' Its emphasis on personal experience is the finest flower in the garden of religious instruction in the Church. Therefore the richness of personal experience, which is so prominent a feature of Protestantism over against the mechanical and ceremonial of the Catholic Church, is due mainly to the Reformed" (139).

Good certainly did not deny the inner transformation of the believer's heart and the outward reformation of the believer's life and behavior. This, however, should not be regarded as being organically related to justification. It was most definitely not to be seen as the infusion of the divine life into human nature. Sanctification was not the outworking of Christ's life in the believer due to an organic union with Christ, but was the activity of the Holy Spirit, the gift given by Christ, strengthening the individual's will and awakening a love for God's righteousness. In this sense, Good affirmed "personal experience" and the heritage of Pietism in the Reformed church.

VI. DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH (ECCLESIOLOGY)

Ecclesiology is the doctrine of the Church. Once again, Good points out that this was a point of difference between Mercersburg and Ursinus. The Ursinus movement understood the church as a collection of individuals, whereas the Mercersburg theologians placed the emphasis on the institution of the visible church as the medium through which people come to and grow in faith. The Church is not optional for the Mercersburg theologians, but is a means of grace.

Mercersburg:

The visible Church is where the action is for Nevin and his Mercersburg colleagues. We return to William Erb's, *Dr. Nevin's Theology*, in which Nevin asserts that like any other doctrine the Church is an essential article of faith. Nevin taught, "The doctrine of the Church is made an object of

faith in the Creed, 'I believe in the Holy Catholic Church.' The Church does not claim our regard as a theory or an existing organization in the world, but as an article of faith" (424).

The Church is crucial for Nevin because the Church is where faith is reproduced through the Church's mediation of the life of Christ to individuals. Nevin says, "The sacraments are part of the institution of the Church, and they imply that there is an objective power in the Church flowing over from the person of Christ" (422). Christianity and the Christian faith are not merely an assent to theological propositions for Nevin. He proposes, "Christianity is not a system of doctrines merely, but it is life and develops itself as such" (423). Neither is Christianity a private relationship consisting of "me and my buddy Jesus." Nevin proclaimed, "The Church exists in the world not merely to receive Christians, who have been such without her, into her bosom, but she is an organization whose object is to make Christians." (432). Even more strongly, "There is no room to talk of a man belonging to the Church or not. The Church being universal, is at the same time necessary, not optional" (433).

This is the heart of the difference between the Mercersburg and Ursinus movements. For Mercersburg the Church is God's means of reproducing the faith through the generations and is necessary for salvation. Nevin says, "It is a false conception of the Church when the process of Christian salvation is supposed to lie beyond the Church" (432). He continues, "The Church is the form of the new creation in the world and it follows that the Church must have an objective power and sacramental grace. In the former view man is thrown on the abstract grace of God; in the latter, man is made to lean on a power really at hand" (432). Nevin does not pull any punches here, claiming that "A man, to be a man in the full sense, i.e., to be a Christian, must be in the Church" (433). He follows Cyprian, Augustine, and Calvin in affirming the theme that "No one can have God for his Father, who does not have the Church for his mother."

In volume II of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Gerhart once again follows Nevin. He writes, "The work of the Holy Spirit implies the existence of an objective economy, a new order of spiritual life on earth, which by His advent (the Incarnation) He has created and in which He perpetually lives. This new economy is the Christian Church" (454). Just as for Nevin, so also for Gerhart the Church is the means of salvation. Echoing Nevin, he wrote:

For as Jesus called men and women from among the Jews to Himself, and by the heavenly virtue of His word united them in a community different from that of the Scribes and Pharisees, different from the Sadducees and Herodians, so the Church by the word of the Gospel approaches the world

and effectually calls men to turn from sin and enter into her holy fellowship (459-460).

The Church is not a collection of isolated individual Christians gathering together for "fellowship" after they have had private conversion experiences. Gerhart warned, "But the secret, the strength and blessing of her fellowship do not lie in the association of believers with one another" (460). The blessing lies in being united to Christ and participation in the "mystical union." Gerhart writes, "The blessing lies in the vital connection of believers with Christ glorified, who is the archetype and source of a new spiritual life" (460).

The Mercersburg movement understands that saving faith and Christian growth are parts of the same whole and that in God's economy and by God's plan it is a communally mediated process. Gerhart writes: The growth of the mustard seed, the vine and its branches, and the human body suggest the best figures of speech by which the teaching of the New Testament concerning the Church may most fitly be represented in ecclesiology. If thought governed by this imagery, we discover the Church to be, not an aggregation of individuals, not an organization devised by human genius, but a spiritual organism, all of whose parts, like the mustard tree developed from the mustard seed, grow forth from the mystery and personality of Christ glorified (461).

Gerhart's phraseology reveals that in the pages of the Mercersburg theologians the organic metaphors that informed their views of human nature and the union with Christ reappear in the doctrine of the Church. The members of the church are animated by a common root in the life of Christ, and that theanthropic life is communicated to them through their mutual interaction in the church's liturgical practices as the 'means of grace.'

Ursinus:

Good says in *History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century*, one could be "saved" apart from the visible church but this was not possible in Mercersburg theology. Good writes critically, "Nevin ... held that Christ's generic humanity comes down to us in the Church and sacraments and unites us to him in a mystical union" (213). For the Ursinus advocates, the opposite view from Nevin's was the case. The Ursinus movement understood the church as a collection of individuals; whereas the Mercersburg theologians placed the emphasis on the institution of the visible church. According to Good, "The Church is made up of all in all ages gathered, defended and preserved by Christ through his Spirit out of the whole human race (Ans. 54) and who agree in essentials of the true faith" (590). One way to express this might be to

assert that the church is "the mystical body of all faithful believers." According to Good, the Ursinus orientation "views the Church rather from the individual standpoint ("made up of all") though it does not ignore the importance of the visible Church." (590).

Good sees the difference between the visible and the invisible church in terms of the church as either a divine (Mercersburg) or voluntary (Ursinus) institution (268, n.170). Good's criticism of Nevin was based on Nevin's understanding of the visible church as the organic means of transmitting salvation. Good writes:

The new position of Nevin here is his emphasis on the organic in dealing with the Church and Church unity. "The whole humanity of Christ, soul and body, is carried by the process of the Christian salvation into the person of the believer. His resurrection is only his regeneration fully revealed at last—complete. Union with Christ is organic, is not a mere aggregation or abstraction, not an all but a whole. Individual Christianity is not older than generic Christianity, but the general in this case goes before the particular" (211).

For Good, the individual members of the Church exist prior to and apart from the Church as a corporate entity. The individual becomes a Christian through personal faith, therefore already enjoys salvation, and then voluntarily joins the Church.

Another of Good's criticisms of Nevin was based on Nevin's emphasis on the objective side of the faith. Good writes:

Rauch taught the distinction between the subjective and objective, which was then much emphasized by German philosophy; but he emphasized the subjective. Nevin followed him on making the same distinction, but he, on the other hand, unduly emphasized the objective. In his later doctrine of the Church and the sacraments he minimizes, if not ignores, the subjective and experimental ... (211).

Against this "objective" orientation, the Ursinus movement believed that one became a Christian by an act of faith – which act is "subjective and experimental" in nature. The Mercersburg theologians, as we have seen, believed in a more organic development of faith as a person grows into faith as an oak grows from the acorn through participation in the "objective" practices of the Church, primarily its sacramental practices, but also its preaching and catechesis. For the Ursinus movement the church is the aggregate of those who have made a personal decision for salvation and have experienced an inner transformation. Contrary to this view the Mercersburg authors see the institution of the church (and the sacraments) as objectively effective – almost *ex opera operato*, although they admit that the individual must be open to their transforming power

and allow personal faith to be elicited. In comparing Rauch and Nevin on the Church Good says,

An organ may be the avenue or *channel* through which the life comes. Or the organ may be more than a channel; it may be the *force* of that life itself. Both Nevin and Rauch emphasized the organic process but they differed in their emphasis. Rauch emphasized the organ as a channel or avenue, while Nevin gives it intrinsic, objective power in itself. Rauch called attention to the organic connection, Nevin to the organic force. Thus Nevin begins to place intrinsic power in the sacrament and Church (212-213).

Of course, the comparison of Rauch and Nevin is made to Nevin's detriment. Whether Good's attempt to differentiate Rauch's view from Nevin's is plausible or not, it is significant that Good wanted to emphasize the fact that the sacraments and the Church do not possess the intrinsic power of Christ's life, but are only a channel through which that life, which can be distinguished from the Church, is usually presented to the believer.

Finally, Good takes on Philip Schaff's view of the Church suggested by Schaff's inaugural address *The Principle of Protestantism*. To Good's way of thinking the Mercersburg theology had a "Romanizing tendency" in regard to the Church. The Ursinus movement and Good would subscribe to the first of the positions listed below. Good explains the "Romanizing tendency" by commenting on Schaff's address: "... it is to be remembered that there have been several ways of vindicating Protestantism against Catholicism. There were in the main two Protestant theories:

1. The common Protestant view that Protestantism was a return to the primitive Church of the New Testament. After the first century the Church became more and more corrupt until the Reformation of the sixteenth century revived apostolic times. This view looked on the Catholic Church, especially of the Middle Ages, as evil and corrupt. Nevin later calls this the Puritanic theory.
2. The Anglican or Episcopalian view. This held that Protestantism was a return not to the first century but to the early Church of the first four or five centuries. This view allowed room for the development of Church government by bishops and also of some rites not Biblical but ecclesiastically sanctioned, which were rejected by the other view. This view, like the first, looked upon the Catholic Church as a corrupt Church but not as Antichrist, for it had preserved in the midst of it a remnant of truth.
3. The third view which Schaff proposed, was that neither were right, that there was still another view, namely, historical development. The

Protestant Church was not a return to either the first century or to the first five centuries, but it was different from both, yet connected with them by historical development. Church history is organic. It was not a collection of facts promiscuously thrown together but an organism unfolding its powers. The Church is an ever-living organism, "with a continuous flow of life in which every succeeding age is a true development of its own organic will from the life preceding." This was contrary to the first view for it denied that the Catholic Church was only evil and corrupt. It held, on the contrary, that the Protestant Church was a development right out of the good forces within the Catholic Church before the Reformation. Prof. Schaff however added, "This development would continue—the Protestant Church would not stop with the Church of the Reformation, but would continue developing until Protestantism and Catholicism would approach and finally unite. His Principle of Protestantism was "Historical Development" (214-215).

Good's criticism of Schaff's "Romanizing tendency" view appears in his analysis of Schaff's understanding of the Church: Tradition (according to Schaff) should not be separated from Scripture as Protestants hold. It was the contents of the Bible as settled by the Church against heresies. In stating tradition he fails to guard himself sufficiently against the Catholic view. Another sign of Romanizing charged against him was his commendation of Puseyism, its moral earnestness, reverent solemnity, holding fast to the sacraments "that hang not on the precarious side of the subjective but include the actual presence of Christ as really as when he stood before his disciples." But although he makes such statements he is not satisfied with the position of the Romish Church because its formulas are fixed and allow no room for the historical development which is the corner-stone of his system. For the same reason he criticizes Puritanism. He errs in not guarding himself against Romanism. While he is so easy with Rome, he is very severe on Protestantism for its disease of sects and its Puritanism (217-218). For Good, Schaff erred in stressing the authoritative nature of the historical development of the Church through the ages. The Church, he feared, had been identified by Schaff as the unfolding of the life of Christ, who was alleged to be objectively still present on earth through the Church. This view failed to appreciate Christ's transcendence of the Church and the reality that Christ's Incarnation on earth was followed by Christ's ascension. Against the Mercersburg position, the Ursinus movement stressed the individual's access to the Risen Lord through faith. It also emphasized the sufficiency of the Biblical witness to that Risen Lord, without the supplementation of the ecclesial traditions.

VII. DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS **(SACRAMENTOLOGY)**

We finish our survey of the foundational Christian doctrines with sacramentology, which is the study of the sacraments. According to Good this too was a matter of disagreement between the Mercersburg theologians and the adherents of the Ursinus movement.

Mercersburg:

So what do Nevin and Gerhart make of the sacraments? Once again we begin with Erb's, *Dr. Nevin's Theology*, in which Nevin says, "A sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace" (359). In Reformed theology generally the sacraments are considered to be the "means of grace." Nevin says, "The means of grace belong to the application of redemption. This is accomplished by the power of the Holy Ghost on the one side, and by faith on the other, which, however, is always through external media" (352). So far Nevin has proposed nothing controversial from a general Reformed perspective.

However, Nevin does not stop there but he adds a novel emphasis. For Nevin the sacraments have an objective force in their administration. He says, "The solemnity of the rite does not consist alone in the subject's profession (faith), but also in the act of the Church receiving the subject into her bosom, giving him a right and title to all of her privileges. It is also a divine act of the Church in favor of those who are the subjects of it" (365). Again Nevin emphasizes the objective force of the sacraments found in the Church alone. He writes, "But let it once be felt that God has a Church in this world and that this Church has supernatural power lodged in her and that of this power the sacraments are seals . . . it must have an objective authority to be of any value" (387). Although Nevin continues to use the traditional Reformed language of the sacraments as "seals" of faith, it seems that the sacraments not only "seal" an already existing faith but convey an objective power to stimulate faith and the other Christian virtues.

For Nevin there is a kind of "trickle down" effect at work in the sacraments. They are effective because they are objective acts attached to the promises of God. He uses infant baptism as an example of how this works: "How is it with infants who cannot exercise faith? They are united to their parents. However, the value or objective force of baptism does not depend on the faith of the parents or even of the officiating minister. It is the act of Christ and has its own force in His fidelity" (390). Because Christ has promised to be available to the Christian through baptism,

baptism has an objective power to communicate the life of Christ quite apart from the faith of the child's parents or the minister.

The goal of the sacrament is to unite the person to Christ. We are united to Christ in a "mystical union" through the use of the sacraments. Jonathan Bono explains this rather well in relationship to Nevin's doctrine of the Eucharist. He writes:

Nevin claims that the foundation of the historic Reformed doctrine (of the Eucharist) is the "idea of an inward living union of believers with Jesus Christ." By virtue of this union believers are 'mystically inserted more and more into the person of Christ.' It is above all this process of ongoing mystical union with Christ that had always been thought by the Reformed churches to be most fully realized and confirmed to believers in the Supper. The union to which Nevin refers here is not merely moral or forensic, but "organic" and "mystical" (23).

The Christian's union with Christ is more than the power of the believer's lively meditation upon Christ's sacrificial death, vivid inner sense of Christ's love, or inspiring thoughts about Christ. The union with Christ is objective and cannot be reduced to a quality of the believer's subjectivity. In volume II of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Gerhart, like Nevin, understands the sacraments to be objective conveyors of God's grace. In reference to baptism he writes: "Baptism signifies the admission of the subject into the kingdom of God, whereby he becomes an heir to its blessings; and the transaction seals what it signifies. It makes him a member of the Christian community. But the blessing of Baptism is objective only" (558). This sounds much like Augustine's claim that "A sacrament is an outward and visible sign of an inward and invisible grace, effecting what it signifies," and is efficacious *ex opera operato*. Gerhart continues: "Baptism consists of two things: the one outward, the other inward; the one natural, the other supernatural; the washing with water, and the gracious work of the triune God" (558). The inner operation of the supernatural grace is due to the objective activity of God, not to the potency of the individual's faith. The promises of God tie this objective activity of God to the performance of the sacramental rituals.

Like Nevin, Gerhart affirms that the object of the sacrament is a "mystical union" with Christ. Gerhart writes, "Only of the mystical union of the earthly and the heavenly by the Spirit does the New Testament predicate spiritual significance" (559). It is the mystical union with Christ, nurtured by the sacramental life of the Church, that transforms the experience and behavior of the individual. This union with Christ must be seen as logically preceding the transformation of the individual's inner life, for the mystical union is the basis for the communication of the supernatural power to become a new creature in Christ.

Ursinus:

So what does Good and the Ursinus movement think about the sacraments? In his *History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century*, Good says, "The sacraments are signs and seals of redemption to the believer. They are not in themselves redemptive, but they bring to us the benefits of redemption. Christ was the redemption and they are the channel confirmatory of it (Ans. 65). They are not saving ordinances but sealing ordinances. The sacraments and the Word go together, alike in their effects" (591). The sacraments serve mostly as a testimony to the redemptive power of Christ's life, death, and resurrection. They "confirm" Christ's redemptive power, but do not in themselves communicate that saving power which otherwise requires personal faith to activate.

The Ursinus advocates emphasize the necessity of faith on the part of those who receive the sacraments. Good says, "The subjective is emphasized — faith is always necessary in order that the grace in the sacrament may be effective. Without faith there is no benefit" (591). He identifies Zwingli as the "father" of the Reformed (or German Reformed) Church. In his, *The Reformed Reformation*, Good says, Zwingli then explains to his former teacher, the symbolical view of the Lord's Supper over against transubstantiation, which he attacks as he does baptismal regeneration. He held that in both sacraments, faith is necessary in order to bring blessing. He emphasized the subjective side of the Lord's Supper over against the objective aspect of the Catholics (41).

It is actually the personal faith inspired by the sacraments that possesses the transformative power, and not the rituals themselves. The rituals are intended to stimulate the all-important inner experience confirming the presence of saving faith.

Good in his own commentary on the sacramental differences between the Reformed and Catholic writes:

At the other extreme is the subjective view of sacramental efficacy. This has been the Reformed view. The sacraments have no efficacy unless faith is present. It is this subjective side that comes out in the early Zwinglian and the Calvinistic views. Zwingli's at first made it a memorial—we were to remember Christ's death—a subjective process. Calvin said that at the Supper we are to lift up our minds away from the elements up to heaven where Christ is and thus commune with him; also an intellectual and subjective process. "The Reformed thus emphasized the subjective element. (116-117).

Again, in his *The Reformed Reformation*, Good speaking about Luther and Lutheranism compares Luther negatively to his own "evangelical" (Protestant) understanding of the sacraments. Good writes:

Luther was then like the great Church Father whom his Order revered, Augustine. Augustine held to the two opposing theories of Evangelicalism and Sacramentarianism. According to the former he held that men were saved by grace—that is, by the election of God—God's act; according to the latter he held to regeneration by baptism—that is, men were saved by man's act—the act of the priest. Like him, Luther seems here to have held to salvation by faith and also by works (14-15).

For Good, the sacramentology of the Mercersburg movement, with its "objective" orientation, made the celebration of the sacraments a good work performed by the Church. But this was a form of ecclesial Pelagianism. Against this, the Ursinus movement stressed the necessity of responding to Christ's gracious action with sincere personal faith.

CONCLUDING REMARKS ABOUT THEOLOGY

Having made a systematic comparison of Mercersburg and Ursinus theologies on the topics of: authority, God, human nature, Christology (person and work of Jesus), soteriology (justification and sanctification), ecclesiology (the doctrine of the church) and the sacraments, a consistent difference of orientation becomes evident. As Good indicated in his chart the differences between the Ursinus movement and Mercersburg theology are profound when it comes to certain doctrinal matters. Of course, the divergences were not absolute. Both schools find themselves firmly within the larger Reformed tradition. Both schools laid claim to their historical referents. The Ursinus movement advocates emphasized that salvation is the result of Christ's atoning work at Calvary but did not deny the doctrine of the Incarnation. The Mercersburg theologians emphasized the Incarnation in God's work of salvation and mediating union with Christ but did not deny the importance of Calvary. The Ursinus protagonists claimed that Mercersburg theologians placed too much emphasis on tradition in the formulation of doctrine yet they also claimed that they are the faithful heirs of the "Old Reformed doctrines and worship." The proponents of the Mercersburg movement, while frank about the significant role of tradition as an expression of organic development or progress, did not deny the significance of Scripture in the development of doctrine and worship.

Nevertheless, the divergence in theological orientation between the two parties runs deep. It is sometimes difficult to grasp the exact nature of the difference, for they often employ different vocabularies. Sometimes they

employ the same terminology but seem to mean very different things by it. This project has been an account of their conflict, and the differences in their sensibilities and ways of thinking about the Christian faith have come to the fore. Part of the obscurity surrounding their disagreements is the fact that they tended to produce different genres of literature. As I noted at the beginning of this study the Ursinus movement produced historians rather than systematic theologians. Thus like brothers in a dysfunctional family they frequently talked past each other. All too often there was lots of heat and smoke but very little light.

There is a fine metaphor in *The Economist*, in an article entitled, "The Science of Climate Change: The Clouds of Unknowing," that is useful for understanding these differences. It is noted how climate realists and skeptics talk past each other. It goes like this: If you view climate science as a jigsaw puzzle, the full picture becomes clear once you've got most pieces in place. A loose piece here and there does not obscure the whole picture. If it is a kitten in a laundry basket that you are looking at, you can be sure it is a kitten in a laundry basket with only 90 percent of the pieces in place. On the other hand, if you view climate science as a house of cards, with each piece dependent on another piece, one loose card can topple the whole apparatus. (The chain is only as strong as its weakest link, to add yet another metaphor.) The two ways of thinking are simply different paradigms, and conversation between them is extraordinarily difficult.

One such paradigm, the Mercersburg theology, took was love as understood as mutuality and interpersonal communion which was the basic lens through which Christianity should be viewed. The theme of love as "union" informed their views of the relations of the persons of the Trinity, the ultimate goal of human existence, the nature and purpose of the life of Christ, and the role of the church and the sacraments in the Christian life. For them the theme of unity-in-difference, including the unity-in-difference of the finite and the infinite, became the key to understanding everything. Because of this paradigm, the concepts of "organism," "reconciliation," and "mystical union" were central to their theology. Because this desire for unity is a progressive overcoming of differentiation and alienation, the theme of "development" also became central to their vision of Christianity. The other paradigm, the Ursinus view, made the adoration of and obedience to a transcendent divine Other the lens through which everything in the Christian faith should be regarded. The infinite and the finite are not to be united and cannot be united. The proper relationship of humanity to God is not union in love, but fidelity to God's will and trust in God's sustaining power. Forensic

language should be used to describe the God/human relationship, not organic language.

As a result, the Ursinus movement emphasized the Bible as the revelation of God's will and saving truths, God as sovereign and transcendent of everything finite, sin as the transgression of divine ordinances, Christ as the substitutionary atonement for sin, justification as the imputation of Christ's righteousness to unworthy sinners, sanctification as Spirit-enabled growth in obedience, and the Church as the institution that witnesses to Christ's saving work and which the faithful should join in order to be further inspired. I believe that one of the reasons that the German Reformed Church was able to come back together with the advent of Peace Commission in 1878 was that at long last they began to see each other as brothers again and that they had finally resolved the seemingly insurmountable differences and agreed these differences should not be bars to Christian fellowship. In *History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century*, Good concludes with these words: "Thus was closed officially the controversy with Mercersburg theology. On doctrine and liturgy freedom was allowed to either party . . . by way of a compromise." (586). In effect, each party continued to cherish different paradigms of the Christian life and employed different root metaphors and they agreed to disagree more agreeably.

Works Cited

- Berg, Joseph F. *Lectures on Romanism*. Philadelphia: D. Weidner, 1840. Print.
- Bomberger, John H. A. *Five Years at the Old Race Street Church*. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston, 1860. Print.
- . *Funeral Discourse on the Occasion of the Death of Rev. Samuel Helfenstein, D.D.* Philadelphia: Jas. B. Rodgers, 1866. Print.
- . *Infant Salvation: In Its Relation to Infant Depravity, Infant Regeneration, and Infant Baptism*. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston, 1858. Print.
- . *Reformed, Not Ritualistic, Apostolic, Not Patristic*. Philadelphia: Jas. B. Rodgers, 1867. Print.
- . *The Revised Liturgy: A History and Criticism of the Ritualistic Movement in the German Reformed Church*. Philadelphia: Jas. B. Rodgers, 1867. Print.
- . *Spiritual Libertinism: An Address Delivered before the Alumni Association of Marshall College, September 8th, 1846*. Chambersburg: Publishing House of the German Reformed Church, 1846. Print.
- Bonomo, Jonathan G. *Incarnation and Sacrament: The Eucharistic Controversy between Charles Hodge and John Williamson Nevin*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2010. Print.
- Erb, William H. *Dr. Nevin's Theology*. Reading: I. M. Beaver Publisher, 1913. Print.
- Frisk, C. Donald. *Covenant Affirmations: This We Believe*. Chicago: Covenant Press, 1981. Print.
- Gerhart, Emanuel Vogel. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Vol 1. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1891. Print.
- . *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Vol 2. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1894. Print.
- Good, James I. *History of the Reformed Church in the United States 1725-1792*. Reading, PA: Daniel Miller, 1899. Print.
- . *History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: The Board of Publication of the Reformed Church in America, 1911. Print.

---. *History of the Reformed Church of Germany 1620-1890*. Reading: Daniel Miller, 1894. Print.

---. *The Reformed Reformation*. Philadelphia: Heidelberg Press, 1916. Print.

Good, Jeremiah Haak. "Are Ministers of the Gospel Priests and Kings?" *Reformed Church Monthly* 1.3 (1868): 48-55. Print.

Harrity, Grant E. "The Events Leading to the Founding of Ursinus College." Diss. Lancaster Theological Seminary, 1949. Print.

Hinke, William J. *Ministers of the German Reformed Congregations in Pennsylvania and other Colonies in the Eighteenth Century*. Ed. George W. Richards. Lancaster, PA: Rudisill and Company, Inc., 1951. Hinkle, Gerald Hahn. "The Theology of the Ursinus Movement: Its Origins and Influence in the German Reformed Church." Diss. Yale University, 1964. Print.

Horton, Scott. "Harpers Magazine." *Harpers Magazine*. Harpers Magazine, 27 Dec. 2008. Web. 27 Apr. 2013.

Kieckhefer, Richard. *Theology in Stone: Church Architecture from Byzantium to Berkeley*. New York, NY [u.a.]: Oxford Univ., 2004. Print.

Kilde, Jeanne Halgren. *When Church Became Theatre: The Transformation of Evangelical Architecture and Worship in Nineteenth-century America*. New York: Oxford UP, 2002. 170-97. Print.

Klein, Harry M. J. *A Century of Education at Mercersburg, 1836-1936*. Lancaster: Lancaster Press, 1936. Print.

Mercersburg Review 1-4 (1849-1853): n. pag. Print.

Nevin, John Williamson. *Catholic and Reformed: Selected Writing of John Williamson Nevin*. Ed. George H. Bricker and Charles Yrigoyen, Jr. Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1978. Print.

---. *My Own Life: The Earlier Years. Issue 1 of Papers of the Eastern Chapter*. Lancaster: Historical Society of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, 1964. Print.

Nichols, James Hastings. *The Mercersburg Theology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966. Print.

Nichols, James Hastings. *Romanticism in American Religion: Nevin and Schaff at Mercersburg*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Omwake, George L., ed. *John H. A. Bomberger: Centenary Volume*. Philadelphia: Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church in the United States, 1917. Print.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. Interviewed. *U S News and World Report* 26 July 1989: 25. Print. In Horton, Scott. "Harpers Magazine." *Harpers Magazine*. Harpers Magazine, 27 Dec. 2008. Web. 27 Apr. 2013.

Penzel, Klaus. "Philip Schaff." *Makers of Christian Theology in America*. Ed. James O. Duke and Mark G. Toulouse. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997. 236-41. Print.

Proceedings of the Convention of the Ministers and Laymen Belonging to the German Reformed Church Held at Myerstown, Pennsylvania, Sept. 24-25, 1867. Lancaster: Pearsol & Geist, Daily Express Office, 1867. Print.

Reformed Church Monthly. v.1 (1868)—v. 9 (1876).

Reformed Church Messenger v.1 no.1 (1867) - v. 41, no. 52 (1875).

"Report of the Minority of the Committee." *Acts and Proceedings of the General Synod of the German Reformed Church in the U.S.A.* N.p.: n.p., 1866. 71-73. Print.

Richards, George Warren. *History of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States (1825-1934) and the Evangelical and Reformed Church (1934-1952)*. Lancaster: Rudisill and Company, 1952. Print.

Schaff, Philip. *The Principle of Protestantism*. Ed. George Bricker and Bard Thompson. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2004. Print.

Schlicher, Donald W. *Wolf's 200th Anniversary*. N.p.: n.p., 1963. Print.

Schneck, Benjamin S. *Mercersburg Theology: Inconsistent with Protestant and Reformed Doctrine*. N.p.: Lippincott, 1874. Print.

"The Science of Climate Change: The Clouds of Unknowing." *The Economist (US)*. 20 March 2010: n. pag. *The Economist*. The Economist Newspaper Limited, 20 March 2010. Web. 11 May 2011.

Shetler, John C. "The Ursinus School." *Hidden Histories in the United Church of Christ*. Ed. Barbara Brown Zikmund. Vol. 1. New York: United Church Press, 1984. 37-49. Print.

Thompson, Albert R. "Lectures of Dr. John H.A. Bomberger." 1878-1879. Lecture.

Tickle, Phyllis. *The Great Emergence: How Christianity is Changing and Why*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2008. Print.

VanderMolen, Ronald J. "Spener, Philipp Jakob." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984. 1039. Print.

Webber, Robert E., ed. *The Complete Library of Christian Worship*. Vol. 6. Nashville: StarSong Group, 1994. Print.

Williard, George W. "The Children of Believers Prior to Baptism." *Reformed Church Monthly* 1.2 (1868): 41-47. Print.

Worrall, B. G. *The Making of the Modern Church: Christianity in England since 1800*. 3rd ed. London: SPCK, 2004. Print.

Zikmund, Barbara Brown, Ed. *Hidden Histories of the United Church of Christ*. Vol. 1. New York: United Church Press, 1984. Print.

Ursinus Movement Bibliography Compiled by Rev. Richard R. Berg, Archivist, Evangelical and Reformed Historical Society 1/14/2010

Berg, Joseph F. *Lectures on Romanism*. Philadelphia: Weidmer, 1840.

Bomberger, John H. A. *Five Years at the Old Race Street Church*. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston, 1860.

---. *Infant Salvation and Its Relation to Infant Depravity, Infant Regeneration, and Infant Baptism*. 1858.

---. *Funeral Discourse on the Occasion of the Death of Rev. Samuel Helfenstein, D.D.* Philadelphia: Jas. B. Rogers, 1866.

---. "Lectures of Dr. John H. A. Bomberger." Class notes taken by Albert R. Thompson, 1878-1879.

---. *Reformed, Not Ritualistic: Apostolic, Not Patristic*. 1867.

---. *The Revised Liturgy: A History and Criticism of the Ritualistic Movement in the German Reformed Church*. 1867.

---. *Spiritual Libertinism*. Chambersburg, PA: Publishing House of the German Reformed Church. 1846.

---. See also his articles in *Mercersburg Review*, *Messsenger*, and *Reformed Church Monthly*.

Good, James I. *History of the Reformed Church in the United States*. Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publication Board, 1911.

Good, Jeremiah Haak. "Are Ministers of the Gospel Priests and Kings?" *Reformed Church Monthly* 1.3 (1868): 48-55.

Harrity, Grant E. "The Events Leading to the Founding of Ursinus College." Diss. (B. D.), Lancaster Theological Seminary, 1949.

Hinkle, Gerald Hahn. "The Theology of the Ursinus Movement: Its Origins and Influence in the German Reformed Church." Diss. (Ph.D.), Yale, 1964. *John H. A. Bomberger: Centenary Volume*. Ed. George L. Omwake. Philadelphia: Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church in the United States, 1917.

Proceedings of the Convention of the Ministers and Laymen Belonging to the German Reformed Church Held at Myerstown, Pennsylvania, Sept. 24-25, 1867. Lancaster, PA: Pearsol & Geist, Daily Express Office, 1867.

Reformed Church Monthly. v.1 (1868)—v. 9 (1876).

"Report of the Minority of the Committee." *Acts and Proceedings of the General Synod of the German Reformed Church in the U.S.A.* 28 Nov.-7 Dec. 1866. 71-73.

Shetler, John C. "The Ursinus School." *Hidden Histories in the United Church of Christ*. Ed. Barbara Brown Zikmund. Vol. 1. New York: United Church Press, 1984. 37-49.

Williard, George W. "The Children of Believers Prior to Baptism." *Reformed Church Monthly* 1.2 (1868): 41-47.

**T.S. Eliot's Eucharistic Theology
as Evincd in *Four Quartets*
By John Tamilio III, Ph.D.**

*Presented at the Annual Meeting of the T.S. Eliot Society,
at Washington University in St. Louis, September 28-30, 2012*

I

It is well-known by his biographers and critics that T.S. Eliot endured an interminable struggle with his faith, which, in part, was a quest to delineate Christian orthodoxy. Although he studied a myriad of belief systems and philosophies for intellectual edification as well as spiritual devotion (of particular note is his work in Buddhism, Hinduism, Confucianism, Zen, Yoga, Christian mysticism, and even the teachings of occultists), Eliot's maturation as a writer and a Christian found him not only emigrating to England and eventually becoming a British citizen, but also shedding the Unitarianism of his paternal ancestry in favor of Anglicanism. Lyndall Gordon notes that "The turning-point in Eliot's life came not at the time of his baptism in 1927, but in 1914 when he was circling, in moments of agitation, on the edge of conversion."¹ Gordon's claim is predicated on "a group of intense religious poems" that Eliot penned while at Harvard, but did not publish in his lifetime.² Gordon, however, also chronicles the poet's above mentioned baptism — how on "29 June 1927 the doors of Finstock Church were firmly locked against idle spectators, and [William Force] Stead poured the waters of regeneration over Eliot's head."³ This, I believe, launched Eliot on a more pronounced spiritual quest that found its fullest expression in the poet's later verse. Peter Ackroyd claims that the doors of the church were locked and "a verger was posted on guard at the vestry" because Stead thought "the sight of an adult at the font" would be embarrassing.⁴ Ackroyd, however, also acknowledges that Eliot's baptism, as with "so many of the major events of his life, [was] performed in great secrecy."⁵ This is the same Eliot who did not want a biography written about him. He was a private person who gave the world insight into the more personal aspects of his life, including his theology, in his poetry.

¹ Lyndall Gordon, *Eliot's Early Years* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 58.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., 130-131.

⁴ Peter Ackroyd, *T.S. Eliot: A Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984), 162.

⁵ Ibid.

In this article, I will examine T.S. Eliot's theology of the Eucharist (or Holy Communion) as evincd in *Four Quartets*, especially "East Coker." The text of the poem will be interpreted after surveying the major understandings of the Eucharist in post-Reformation Protestant theology and in traditional and contemporary Catholic thought. Finally, I will highlight areas of the *Quartets*, wherein Eliot addresses other tenets of the Christian faith, for further research.

II

Before we delve into the poem proper, we need to establish our liturgical context. Being a practicing Christian within a mainline Protestant denomination, and an heir of the liturgical arguments that ensued since the Reformation, Eliot would have been informed — consciously or not — of the predominant understandings of the sacrament of Holy Communion. As a reaction against perceived abuses within the Roman Catholic Church involving (but not limited to) the Mass, three influential views on the meaning of the Lord's Supper emerged in the writings of Martin Luther, John Calvin, and Huldrych Zwingli.

The traditional Roman understanding of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist is called transubstantiation. This paper does not afford me the space to do justice in explicating the history and complexity of this doctrine. In sum, though, transubstantiationists maintain that through the act of consecration, the bread and wine actually become the body and blood of Christ.⁶ The sacrifice of the Mass is performed on an altar. The salvific work of the crucified Christ recurs each time the priest, who represents Jesus, breaks the body of Christ and pours his blood while quoting the earliest record of the events in the Upper Room: For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, "This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me." In the same way he took the cup also, after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me." For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes.⁷

⁶ In the Western Church this is achieved through the Words of Institution (see the next footnote). In the Eastern Church this is accomplished through the *epiclesis*: a prayer in which the celebrant asks the Holy Spirit to bless the bread and wine, and, in some rites, those gathered to receive the meal. (Editor's note: It should be noted that Mercersburg Theology stresses the importance of the *epiclesis*.)

⁷ 1 Corinthians 11:23-26 (NRSV).

Trying to reconcile eucharistic theology with Aristotelian metaphysics and Plato's theory of forms, the Reformers of the sixteenth century offered distinct explanations as to how Christ is present in the elements. Martin Luther, who is often credited with inaugurating the Reformation when he composed his Ninety-Five Theses on the Power and Efficacy of Indulgences (1517), did not believe that the elements underwent any substantive change when blessed. Instead, he held that the spirit of Christ pervades the bread and wine, existing "in, with, and under" them. Often referred to as consubstantiation (a term Luther did not employ himself), many theologians refer to the ubiquitous presence of Christ when parsing Luther's eucharistic thought. The latter highlights the permeative character of Christ's presence in the elements and the gathered community over the former.

John Calvin, whose theology had a profound influence on Puritanism — an austere dogmatics with which the young Eliot was certainly conversant and, as many critics contend, influenced — broke from Catholic and Lutheran eucharistic theology by focusing less on how Christ is physically present in the bread and wine and more on sacramental efficacy. Calvin's eucharistic theology is sometimes called virtualism, which comes from the Latin word *virtus*, meaning power. (It has nothing to do with the similar English word *virtual*, which means close to reality.) Albert Curry Winn, in interpreting Calvin, explains that "the Holy Spirit 'unites things that are separated in space,' not by bringing the body of Christ down to earth as in the mass, but by raising the congregation up to the heavenly places."⁸ Through this meal, the gathered church experiences the fullness of the Risen One by ascending, via the Holy Spirit, to his ethereal table. James F. White uses a modern analogy to try to explicate this: "the Holy Spirit operates like an escalator to raise us up to heaven where we truly feed on Christ."⁹ Calvin himself said that this is a mystery that cannot be explained rationally. He wrote, "I shall not be ashamed to confess that it is a secret too lofty for either my mind to comprehend or my words to declare. And, to speak more plainly, I rather experience than understand it."¹⁰

⁸ Albert Curry Winn, "The Role of the Holy Spirit in Communion," in *Reformed Liturgy & Music* 29:4 (1995): 230-231.

⁹ James F. White, *The Sacraments in Protestant Faith and Practice* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), 79.

¹⁰ John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, Library of Christian Classics 20-21 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 1403.

In the Swiss corner of the Reformation, Huldrych Zwingli proffered a theory of the Lord's Supper that is still the predominate view in several mainline and progressive Protestant churches. Zwingli believed that the Eucharist helped bolster the faith of communicants; it is a memorial of Christ's life and deeds, particularly the events surrounding Holy Week. He also believed that Christ was present in the community itself, but the bread and wine were spiritual apparati to aid individual reflection and development. Christ is not present in the elements, though.

Lastly, it is pertinent to note that during and immediately following Vatican II, supplements to the traditional understanding of transubstantiation were developed. The most notable came from the Dominican theologian Edward Schillebeeckx. In 1966, Schillebeeckx, who came to prominence due to his work at the Second Vatican Council, published a piece in the journal *Worship* in which he augmented Catholic eucharistic thought. Schillebeeckx argued that two terms need to supplement the doctrine of transubstantiation: namely, transignification and transfinalization. Although neither has been recognized as official doctrine by the Catholic Church, both reflect contemporary understandings among adherents inside (and outside) Roman circles. As their names suggest, the meaning of the meal (transignification) and its purpose (transfinalization) change when the elements are consecrated. Although the accidents (the physical and chemical composition of the bread and wine) may remain unchanged, they are no longer simply bread and wine. They have a meaning and purpose beyond mere pabulum.

This synopsis is not exhaustive. It is simply a survey of the predominate understandings of the Eucharist that — other than Schillebeeckx — existed from the time of the Reformation and the Council of Trent to the mid-1930s and early-1940s when Eliot composed *Four Quartets*.

III

Part IV of "East Coker" (1940) is the principal section wherein Eliot illumines his doctrine of the Eucharist. Steven Ellis argues that this section "is the first sustained reference to Christian doctrine" in the *Quartets*.¹¹ Helen Gardner reminds us that Eliot himself saw part four as "the heart of the matter."¹² A hasty eye will be drawn to the end of the section. It is here that the poet writes:

¹¹ Steve Ellis, *T.S. Eliot: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London/New York: Continuum, 2009), 112.

¹² Helen Gardner, *The Composition of "Four Quartets"* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 109.

The dripping blood our only drink,
 The bloody flesh our only food:
 In spite of which we like to think
 That we are sound, substantial flesh and blood —
 Again, in spite of that, we call this Friday good.

Here, we have the obvious reference to the body and blood of the sacred meal. It is also set in the context of Christ's passion, commemorated throughout the Church Universal on Good Friday. However, to bracket these five lines in isolation from the rest of EC IV would be an error, for the entire movement is laden with Christological imagery — specifically around the doctrine of the atonement.

United Church of Christ theologian Gabriel Fackre dissects this term syllabically to accentuate its theological import: at-one-ment. Through the soteriological work of Christ, humankind, which "cannot bear very much reality," is reconciled (or made "one") with God. Liberal and conservative churches often quarrel as to how this is achieved. The former typically focuses on the life (the parabolic teachings and miraculous healings) and resurrection of Christ; the latter on the cross. It is no surprise that Eliot, in his quest for orthodoxy, subscribes to the more traditional view. His Christ is the crucified savior. The St. Sebastian of his early poems, the Prufrock who is "pinned and wriggling on the wall," and the Pietà of Michelangelo, often associated with Eliot's conversion, finds a more mature expression in EC IV.¹³

Humankind's Fall is due to "Adam's curse." Here, he is depicted as the "ruined millionaire" who squandered the gift of Eden and, as a result, "endowed" the human race with "this hospice/hospital called Earth, where all are born only to die."¹⁴ Christ is the "wounded surgeon" who heals us with "bleeding hands." EC IV opens with the crucified Christ and ends with the image of the one whose suffering was foreshadowed the night before Golgotha when he instituted the Supper of "dripping blood" and "bloody flesh." It is pertinent to accentuate that Eliot is not just referring to bread and wine here, but "bloody flesh" and "dripping blood." As mentioned above, the atoning work of Christ, in Eliot, is achieved through the cross. Consequently, the meal associated with this event is likewise painted in sacrificial hues.

¹³ See Lyndall Gordon, *T.S. Eliot: An Imperfect Life* (New York/London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1998), 192.

¹⁴ Russell Elliott Murphy, *Critical Companion to T.S. Eliot: A Literary Reference to His Life and Work* (New York: Facts on File, Inc./Infobase Publishing, 2007), 208.

But other eucharistic themes surface in this section of the poem. Humanity is not only born to die, as Russell Elliott Murphy suggests. According to T.S. Eliot in EC IV, we like to think of ourselves as "sound, substantial flesh and blood." The term the body of Christ has two meanings in the Christian lexicon: the bread of the Eucharist and the Church. It is no accident that both signifieds, which hail from the writings of the Apostle Paul, are treated in consecutive chapters: 1 Corinthians 11 (the body or bread of the Lord's Supper) and 1 Corinthians 12 (the body as a metaphor for the Church). In EC IV, though, the Church is "the dying nurse," which is a far cry from being sound or substantial. This commentary on the Church is also set in the same context in which the holy meal is referenced: Good Friday. What is Eliot suggesting here? Is the reference to a sound, substantial humanity "in spite of" Good Friday a sarcastic polemic? If read from the perspective of his Choruses from "The Rock," which he penned only six years beforehand, that would seem to be the case. In that piece, the poet laments that "Men do not need the Church...the Church does not seem to be wanted / In country or in suburb; and in the town / Only for important weddings."¹⁵ Is the Church the dying nurse, because humanity no longer needs her? Or might it be that humankind — even those within the ecclesia — sees itself as self-sufficient or, better yet, self-sound and self-substantial in spite of the gift of Good Friday?

Methodist theologian Laurence Hull Stookey argues that this day on the Christian calendar "is good precisely because God was in control at Calvary. The crucifixion of Jesus was not some bad deal that God had to try to make the best of; it was a working out of the divine intention with a view to salvation of an otherwise doomed creation."¹⁶ Even though we are part of a broken creation — a creation that erroneously thinks of itself as sound and substantial — God, through the crucified One, still reaches out to humanity. Such striving (on God's part) is costly and is wrought through sacrifice and self-surrender. It is not cheap grace, nor is it offered with pristine hands. Through Christ, God suffers the most for creation. In so doing, the Church is bequeathed with a constant reminder and symbol of that costly love: the Eucharist. We may think we are sound and substantial, but it is only through coming to the Lord's table repeatedly that we will not only be reminded of "our, and Adam's curse," but will also find the only antidote for our fallen condition — one we receive from the perfect, wounded surgeon working through the imperfect, dying nurse.

¹⁵ T.S. Eliot, *Collected Poems: 1909-1962* (Orlando: Harcourt, Inc., 1963, renewed 1991), 147, 148.

¹⁶ Laurence Hull Stookey, *Calendar: Christ's Time for the Church* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996), 96.

Harkening back to the previous section of this paper, it is crucial to note that Zwingli's memorialism is not a cerebral activity as when one or more persons cognitively recalls a past event. Zwingli's memorialism comes from the biblical term anamnesis. The Greek etymology of this word is communal and it signifies eradicating the line between a historic event and the contemporary reenactment of that event. W. Jardine Grisbrooke maintains "that the person or deed commemorated is past and absent, whereas anamnesis signifies exactly the opposite: it is an objective act, in and by which the person or event commemorated is actually made present, is brought into the realm of the here and now."¹⁷ In terms of the Eucharist, this means that Christ's actions at the Last Supper and on the cross are experienced anew by those who partake of the bread and wine and the benefits of the ancient meal are actualized in the present. In a similar vein, Eliot would say that "all time is eternally present" ("Burnt Norton" I). The anamnesis of Christ's work in history, along with his proleptic eschatological return, are experienced by the Church in the present at the Lord's table. Eliot scholar Kenneth Paul Kramer concurs: Like the poet's remembrance of timeless moments of vital reciprocity, Eucharist is a ritual act of remembrance (anamnesis), remembering the person of Christ in a way that makes Christ effectively present again. The "real presence" of Christ, therefore, does not rely upon the belief of individual participants but upon the redemptive power of mutual dependence between a believer's affirming faith and God's liberating presence.¹⁸

T.S. Eliot's theology of the Eucharist does not fit firmly into any of the categories outlined in part two of this paper. In some respect, it embodies a combination of them in a novel amalgam. Eliot suggests that Christ is present in the meal in a very real, physical way. The elements of the meal are described sanguinely: dripping blood and bloody flesh. But Eliot's eucharistic understanding involves more than transubstantiation.

It may be that Eliot is leaning more toward Calvinism, not so much in adopting the Reformer's virtualism as much as his stress on the experience of the meal being the crux in dispensing the Supper's meaning. It may be that Eliot is offering a complementary view in which he seeks to disturb. Is he not drawing his reader's attention to the gore that the elements personify? He wants us to see the bread and wine for what they

¹⁷ W. Jardine Grisbrooke, "Anaphora," in *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, ed. J. G. Davies (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986), 18.

¹⁸ Kenneth Paul Kramer, *Redeeming Time: T.S. Eliot's "Four Quartets"* (Lanham: Cowley Publications, 2007), 93.

are: a crucified body and blood wrought by torture. The early Church was often accused of cannibalism for obvious reasons. In the Vaudevillian exchange between Sweeney and Doris in "Sweeney Agonistes: Fragment of an Agon" Eliot touches upon this theme, but here he illumines the horror of the Eucharist in bold relief. He is forcing his readers to contemplate the costly carnage of the passion to delineate the seriousness and severity of the Christian faith.

On the other hand, it may be that the poet is saying that the body of Christ (the Church) more fully becomes the body of Christ (the living manifestation of Christ on earth) by receiving the body of Christ (the Eucharist) continually. Christ is truly present at the meal, but for Eliot the pertinence of this presence is restorative, not an exercise in which he struggles to reconcile his faith with sixteenth century metaphysics. Eliot employs medical metaphors purposely: "The whole earth is our hospital"; we are healed by Christ, "The wounded surgeon"; the church is "the dying nurse." We are neither sound nor substantial, but by the grace received at the table we find that we are accepted and made whole in spite of ourselves. Calvin's virtualism is of note here. We are united with Christ at the meal (though not necessarily ethereally) and, in ways that transcend language, we are regenerated. For Eliot, what occurs in the spiritual lives of communicants is as important — if not more so — than how Jesus is located in the physical elements. Eliot also subscribes to Zwinglian anamnesis, if we employ that term with all its historical import. What was achieved on Good Friday — the restoration of humanity with God through Christ — is not simply remembered; it is enacted again and again. It is because of (not in spite of) this that this Friday is good.

IV

This is only the beginning — a critical analysis of one doctrine (among many) that Eliot treats in his opus. There are others tenets of the Christian faith on which Eliot expounds in the Quartets, enough to construct a systematics (albeit in verse), which earns him, among his myriad of offices, the distinction of theologian. My objective is to write a more extensive piece to advance this assertion. Such a study could be achieved by examining the poet-playwright-critic's oeuvre. For now, though, I wish to highlight just a couple of the other tenets raised in Four Quartets for further study.

In grappling with the paradoxical quandary of time at the outset of "Burnt Norton," the poet illumines the concept of redemption: a theme that runs throughout all of Four Quartets. A reference to creation appears here as well. In BN I, we are beckoned by "the bird" (one of the five biblical manifestations of the Holy Spirit) "Into our first world," a phrase

repeated for emphasis (appearing in lines 21 and 22). Part two of the same poem treats not only Eliot's belief in heaven and hell, but here the writer excogitates the medieval Catholic and Dantean understanding of purgatory: "Cleansing affection to purify the soul." The fifth part of the poem is the weightiest theologically. Here, Eliot speaks of "the Word," as he had earlier in "Gerontion," "Ash Wednesday," and his Choruses from "The Rock." But in BN, the logos is more ostensible as the "The Word in the desert...attacked by voices of temptation." The temptation of Christ here is linked with the road to Golgotha: "Shrieking voices / Scolding, mocking, or merely chattering, / Always assail them."

In "The Dry Salvages," Eliot delves into Mariology. The most overt reference is the allusion to the "Ave Maria" and Dante's *Paradiso* that begins part IV. But before the prayer to the "Queen of Heaven," Eliot muses at length on the annunciation. It is the prayer that ends three stanzas in DS II. Of interest, though, are the negative adjectives he associates with Mary's call. It is "calamitous." The bell that signals it is clamorous. Being unwed and pregnant in first century Israel would not only have been scandalous; it would have been an affront to Jewish law as well. Is the poet calling upon Mary here because she could identify with the pain of humanity, which he also depicts in this section? The poet sketches "withering autumn flowers," "a drifting boat with a slow leakage," and "The bone's prayer to Death its God." Though named after the poet's boyhood summer coast of Cape Ann, the vacuous, sterile state of humanity that Eliot portrays here is not much different from the state of the post-World War I England of *The Waste Land*. As a testament of faith, a prayer of intercession may be the only recourse after such knowledge.

The bird returns in "Little Gidding," but this time it is the baptismal dove. The Spirit of God descended upon Christ in the form of a dove when Jesus emerged from the baptismal waters of the Jordan River. Accompanying this was the voice of God declaring Christ as the beloved Son — "the one discharge from sin and error." This began Jesus' public ministry. Interestingly enough, Eliot connects this inaugural moment to another in Christian history: the birth of the Church at Pentecost. "Little Gidding" may be the most theologically rich of all the Quartets. In it the poet deals with the nativity and the visit of the Magi (I), the eschaton (II), Golgotha (III), and a cyclical return to Eden joined to the apocalypse (V).

Though not a comprehensive Church Dogmatics à la Karl Barth, *Four Quartets* is certainly the crown of Eliot's lifelong quest to articulate the Christ that Andrew Eliott brought to New England from East Coker at the end of the seventeenth century, and the poet brought back to England 250 years later.

BOOK REVIEW

THE EUCHARIST'S BIOGRAPHER: THE LITURGICAL FORMATION OF CHRISTIAN IDENTITY

Albert J. D. Walsh, Pickwick Publications. Eugene Oregon, 2012

Albert Walsh turns the Eucharistic debate from a discussion of the material, spiritual, mystical, and symbolic transformation of the elements of bread and wine in the Christian Sacrament to a focus on the transformation of the believer. This, he is convinced, is the question which should absorb our thought and lead to stronger ecumenical unity. Rather than nuancing what is on the plate or in the cup, Walsh challenges us to explore the effect the sacred meal has on those who come to the Table. He has elected to use the phrase *eucharist-evangel* in order to emphasize that it is in the liturgical partnering of both Word and Sacrament that Christians are transformed. This, he believes deflects one from reducing the Sacrament to magic or mystery apart from the Biblical story. It also prevents those who have tended to neglect the Instituted act in favor of the rationalism of the service of the Word.

Walsh expounds the resurrection appearances in Luke 24 in order to demonstrate the Biblical precedent for his theses. This he does quite convincingly. He highlights the Anamnesis in the Eucharistic prayer to make a similar argument liturgically: That it is in the Word, (the story), the remembrance of God's salvific acts along with the practice of breaking the bread and pouring out the wine that we become who we are destined from our baptism to be: The True Body of Christ both individually and corporately.

Walsh writes: "*This exposition of the Lucan narrative incites the affirmation that it is this unity of Word and Sacrament which forms the central, critical, and crucial influence on the transformation and maintenance of a distinctive Christian identity, as well as a distinct form of both liturgy and mission.* (43)

The anamnesis of the eucharistic-evangel, is therefore a communion in Christ as well as with Christ; as an event in Christ

it is to remember one's personal and temporal identity and united to/with that of Christ (crucified, risen, reigning and returning) as the true presence disclosed in the liturgy of Word and Sacrament; as the communion with Christ it is to remember his true identity as the one who fulfills the Scriptures, an identity that is Alpha and Omega." (63)

The essay is heavily documented with historic and contemporary sources. Indeed the footnotes are almost equal to the content. In some places Walsh's argument is so weighed on the theoretical that the practical (a self-professed goal) is lacking. I would have liked to see him explain in more detail how the transformation of the recipient may look. I also would question why so slight attention is given to the Epiclesis in his argument since it is surely by the Power of the Holy Spirit that the presence is known and our spirits unite.

There are times that Walsh assumes the reader's familiarity with obscure authors. Perhaps the weakest section of this treatise is the ending. He resorts to a schema for transformation based on a process outlined by James Loder of Princeton in 1979 and then concludes. "Thus the goal of transformation calls for an integrated relationship between the educational, liturgical, ministerial, and missional life of the Christian community. (This in my estimation confuses the solid premise on which he begins.) With this proviso, I am most grateful to Rev. Walsh for his devoted offering to the ecumenical mission of the church.

Rev. Dr. Deborah Rahn Clemens

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

F. Christopher Anderson, editor
THE NEW MERCERSBURG REVIEW
38 South Newberry St., York, PA 017401
E-mail: fcba@comcast.net

(Manuscripts must be submitted as an attachment.
Please include biographical information.)

President: Rev. Dr. Deborah Rahn Clemens,
1070 Church Rd, East Greenville PA 18041
clemens@newgoshucc.org

Vice President: Rev. W. Scott Axford,
155 Power St., Providence, RI 02906-2024

Secretary: Cheri Roth cheri@spiritualentry.com

Treasurer: Rev. Dr. Thomas Lush, 304 West Ave,
Myerstown, PA 17067 tomlush@verizon.net

Administrative Vice President: Rev. John Miller, 115
North Maple St., Ephrata PA 17522 jcmocc@ptd.net

Membership Secretary: Rev. Judith Meier,
revgreywolf@hotmail.com