

ARTICLE XI.

CRITICAL NOTES.

THE ANDOVER QUESTION.

At the semi-centennial anniversary of Andover Theological Seminary, held in the Old South Church of Andover on the morning of August 4, 1858, the commemorative address on the occasion was delivered by the Rev. Leonard Bacon, D. D., then pastor of the Center Congregational Church of New Haven, Conn. After reviewing ably the causes which led to the establishment of the Seminary, describing the splendid work which it had done, and defining its theological position, the writer closed his address with this inspiring sentence: "Under what brightening auspices of hope for the kingdom of Christ does our Seminary enter to-day upon the second half of its first century of life. This memorable year of the outpouring of God's grace, this year of religious awakening spread almost simultaneously from Plymouth Rock to the Golden Gate, is the promise to us of what God will have wrought in¹ his providence and by his Spirit, when in the eighth year of the twentieth century, the children of some of us and the remoter descendants of others, shall be assembled from the East and the West, from the North and the South, to celebrate with prayer and praise, and with exultant commemoration the second jubilee at Andover." The eighth year of the twentieth century is rapidly approaching, and the preparation for the coming anniversary, in case it is held, must be soon made. We fear the children of some of us and the remoter descendants of others will not be assembled from the East, West, North, or South, neither will many come from Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Isles to celebrate with exultant commemoration the second jubilee of Andover. It is quite

¹ Reference is here made to the remarkable revival movements of 1858.

possible that, in lieu of those who come from the ends of the earth, a few discouraged Alumni who live in and around Boston may assemble in a moderate sized room and hold a dismal debate over the question whether or not Andover Seminary shall continue to exist at all. What is the reason for the decline of the institution, after the brilliant prospect open before it fifty years ago?

There may be some complex elements in the answer, but in our opinion, the main reason has been a lack of integrity in carrying out the original intention of the men who founded the institution.

If there is one fact which stands completely proven in the history of the church in America, it is the fact that Andover Seminary was established in a great measure to oppose the power of Unitarianism which was then centering in Harvard College. Other motives entered into the calculation of our fathers, but they were of a minor character. The old method of preparing for the ministry by which the candidate studied under the personal superintendence of some eminent pastor was gradually falling into disuse. Doctors Bellamy and Smalley of Connecticut, Dr. West of Stockbridge, Mass., and Dr. Emmons at Franklin in the same State, may be said to have had small theological seminaries in their families. The young graduate from Yale, Harvard, or Williams boarded in the older minister's house and probably took care of his teacher's horse and tilled his garden, while in the working hours of the day he read the theological treatises prescribed by his instructor, was examined from time to time with reference to his forming theological opinions, and in due season preached his first sermons from the pulpit of his teacher. The method had some advantages, as the pupil received a training which was more personal and better adapted to his individual needs than is the public education given him in a modern institution. But it began to be realized that the number of pastors who were capable of instructing pupils in such a manner was diminishing, nor was the next generation likely to replace them. There became evident, moreover, an increas-

ing dissatisfaction with the system itself. Seldom, if ever, was there a minister who was sufficiently accomplished to train his pupil in Hebrew, Greek, theology, homiletics, and rhetoric; he could not usually instruct well in more than one of these five departments. The education given lacked balance. The sense of proportion between the different studies was lost. The method at best was irresponsible; it was fatal to any sort of denominational standard; the young minister was inclined to give his people the views of the one who had taught himself. One young pastor was equipped with a good knowledge of Hebrew and knew little else, another stated and restated the positions of Edwards on Original Sin, another one repeated the opinions of Emmons on Election and Reprobation, while his neighbor gave to his people endless dissertations on Hopkins' "Love to Being in General," and still another found the pasture ground for his religious thoughts in Bellamy's "True Religion Delineated." The more sagacious divines of the period saw coming danger in this fragmentary and discordant theology and desired that their successors in the pastoral office should receive a special training and conform to an authorized standard. These vague, half-defined desires for centralization were brought to a practical result by the rapidly increasing power of the Unitarian body, growing out of the Arminianism of a previous generation, which on May 14, 1805, established Dr. Henry Ware, a very able and distinguished Unitarian leader, as Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard College.

The election of Dr. Ware to this important position, which was practically the capture of Harvard College by the Unitarians, alarmed our fathers in the church, and made them desire to establish at once a theological school which should be under orthodox control. The idea was not new, it had been distinctly mentioned twenty-seven years before. In a letter dated 1778 from Rev. Jonathan French of Andover to the Hon. N. Niles of Vermont there is found the following significant sentence. After describing with pleasure the formation of Phillips Academy, he goes on to say: "What if

some enterprising genius should rise up and set on foot a subscription for founding a *Theological Academy*? A sufficient sum could be subscribed to raise a building sufficient to contain a number of students about equal to the number who annually study for the ministry. They should tarry three years at the Academy, the best of libraries should be procured, and everything that may assist to qualify young gentlemen for the work of the ministry be taught. Would not such a design be likely to revive and continue the purity of doctrine and furnish the churches in this land with the ablest ministers of Jesus Christ in spite of all opposers?" Ideas like these just quoted existed in the minds of many sagacious men, but after the practical ejection of the orthodox party from the management of Harvard College, the plan suggested by the Andover pastor rapidly took shape in the powerful mind of Eliphalet Pearson, who resigned his professorship at Cambridge and devoted his energies to the establishment of a theological school in Andover. By one of those double movements which often occur in the crises of human history it was found that Dr. Samuel Spring¹ of Newburyport, Mass., a conspicuously able man and strong representative of the Hopkinsian type of theology, and the noted Dr. Jedediah Morse of Charlestown, now principally remembered as the father of the inventor of the telegraph, were planning to establish in West Newbury, Mass., a theological school of their own which should maintain and defend the extreme Hopkinsian view in opposition to the Unitarianism of Harvard. The folly of maintaining an Hopkinsian theological school in Newbury and another school in Andover, only twenty-seven miles distant, for the Moderate Calvinists, was apparent to every man of sense; but in that age it was hard to bring together the best of men if they differed on minor theological points. But the determined energy of Eliphalet Pearson, who made thirty-six journeys in his chaise between Andover and Newburyport in order to effect the union, combined with the skillful manipu-

¹ Dr. Spring had been a chaplain in the revolutionary army and was the father of the noted Dr. Gardiner Spring, pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church of New York City for fifty years.

lation of Dr. Leonard Woods, afterwards the first professor of theology at Andover, finally prevailed. The creed was formed with immense difficulty and effort, after many prayers and innumerable consultations. Whatever modern criticisms can be made upon the document, it formulated admirably the theology of the period. Hopkinsians and Calvinists waived all lesser differences and united in opposition to "Jews, Papists, Mahometans, Arians, Pelagians, Antinomians, Arminians, Socinians, Sabellians, Unitarians, and Universalists, and to all heresies and errors which may be opposed to the Gospel of Christ or hazardous to the souls of men." Having thus blown this blast of defiance to all who opposed orthodoxy, generous endowments were secured from Messrs. Bartlet and Brown of Newburyport, Samuel Abbot of Andover, Mrs. Phebe Phillips and her son John Phillips of Andover, and Mr. and Mrs. John Norris of Salem. The first buildings were erected, Eliphalet Pearson, Leonard Woods, and the brilliant Edward D. Griffin were secured as professors, and the Seminary was open for students on September 28, 1808.

One needs to study the history of the period in order to understand how essentially and rapidly the formation of Andover Seminary changed not merely the theology, but the entire method of religious thought in New England. Responsible and organized instruction was now given by men in whom the religious public could place confidence. In the department of Hebrew, Professor Stuart, who assumed his office in 1810, opened a new world of thought and study; he was the first American scholar who mastered the German Hebraistic literature and gave to his pupils and countrymen foreign ideas and methods of biblical interpretation. In theology Dr. Woods proved himself for a great many years to be a safe and progressive leader. The able and eloquent Dr. Griffin gave a powerful impulse to the rhetorical studies of his pupils until he left his position to become the all-controlling pastor of Park Street Church, Boston. The moral impulse which brought the Seminary into being gave birth to foreign missionary life. Samuel Mills, and other men who had formed

their missionary plans in Williams College, brought their new-born zeal to Andover, met Judson, Nott, and Newell, and caused the organization of the American Board in 1810. The home missionary work also originated in Andover, largely through the influence of the late Dr. Nathaniel Bouton, then a student of the institution, and our National Home Missionary Society was organized several years later. The impulse given to the ministerial profession was so strong that Andover Seminary was unable to meet the wants of the churches, and other seminaries were established at Bangor, New Haven, East Windsor (now Hartford), Oberlin, Chicago, and Berkeley (Cal.). The Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, and Episcopalians established seminaries for their own use mainly on the Andover model, and the Unitarians themselves attached to Harvard College a divinity school modelled largely upon the very institution which our fathers established in opposition to them. It was soon felt that seminaries would be useless unless there were pupils to fill them, and in the year 1816 Eliphalet Pearson founded the American Education Society, which has since aided over nine thousand worthy young men to enter the ministry, besides assisting fifty colleges and many theological seminaries. By establishing this most efficient society, Andover Seminary unconsciously made arrangements to repeat herself. Affliction is often a disguised mercy, and the victory of the Unitarians in capturing Harvard College was really a vast advantage to the orthodox party. The theological seminary system of the entire Protestant Church of America, our home and foreign missionary associations and all their adjunct societies have grown out of it. The loss of this important college was a Bull Run defeat which prepared the way for future victories. At one time it seemed as though the Unitarians would capture all the churches of Massachusetts, but the establishment of Andover Seminary and the great forward movements connected with that event, confined the Unitarian influence to much smaller limits.

With this moral revolution started, although the full results of it were not foreseen at the time, Andover Seminary

went rejoicing on her way. The eloquent Dr. Griffin yielded his place to the devout and scholarly Ebenezer Porter, and the large place of Eliphalet Pearson was more than filled by the learned and enthusiastic Moses Stuart, who published at this time his "Letters to Channing," which with Dr. Channing's "Baltimore Sermon" formed the two great documents called forth by the Unitarian controversy. The classes were large, the professors were generally considered to be final authorities in their respective departments, the graduates of the Seminary were almost universally wanted by the churches, and the home and foreign missionary societies looked to Andover to find the men who stood ready to carry the banner of the cross to the Indians of the far West or the Zulus of Africa. Although by the establishment of other Congregational seminaries Andover lost a sort of monopoly in conducting ministerial education which she had for many years possessed, she held her own well, and remained the first and foremost of all our Congregational seminaries so long as she kept to the doctrine which she was created in order to defend. Other institutions might veer and waver, but Andover held to the faith of the fathers and the churches believed in her. She resembled the giant Antaeus, who derived his strength from the earth, and was invincible when he stood upon the ground, though when he was lifted into the air, he had only the strength of a common man. Her situation was far more rural and remote than it is at present, and during many of her best years she did not have the thirty-eight conveyances a day to Boston which she now enjoys, but was reached only by a daily stage coach. But the student found rapid motion when he did reach the town, and Andover possessed teachers whom it was worth a long journey to reach.

The attacks upon the orthodoxy of Andover were generally repelled to the grief and confusion of the assailant, the outside enemy was usually laid prostrate; but in 1862 the sound, learned and able Dr. W. G. T. Shedd gave up his chair of ecclesiastical history. The period began when Andover was "wounded in the house of its friends," who injured it more

than opponents had ever done. In the course of time vague and whimsical ideas began to take the place of solid instruction. The doctrine of "Probation after Death," perhaps not positively denied in the Scripture, but which an eminent theologian declared has not "a breath of air to stand upon and cannot rest even on a vacuum," was stated more and more distinctly and finally proclaimed as a dogma. In time the doctrine ceased to be taught, and was withdrawn by those who advanced it, but the impression remained that Andover was a place where such crude, unproven theories were welcomed. For a while the public was amused by displays of shallow originality, but realized ultimately that thinking differently from other men is not necessarily thinking better than they do. Free thinking is often very close to freedom from thinking. Such teaching touched at once the nerve of spirituality, and the old religious earnestness, which had been the real life of Andover, passed in a great measure away. The frantic effort to prove that the Andover professors were teaching in harmony with the creed, while a child could see that they were daily departing from it, only increased the general distrust. In various other ways the institution lost. Professors Park and Phelps, who had given their life work to the Seminary, resigned on account of advancing years. A promising scholar was elected Professor of Rhetoric, but died before he had given a single lecture. His successor, an able elocutionist and rhetorician, also died while he was doing noble and successful work. One eminent and learned professor, who was a signally honest man, resigned his position and accepted a place in Harvard Divinity School, because he could not subscribe to the Andover creed.¹ His departure was a great and heavy loss. Soon after-

¹ "If a professor has common honesty, he can never subscribe to the Creed unless he really believes it. . . . If, in the course of his investigations, he becomes satisfied that any of the principles of his Creed are substantially incorrect, then let him openly and honestly abandon a place which he cannot conscientiously hold. If, for the paltry consideration of retaining his salary, he will do violence to his conscience, and conceal his sentiments, there is no human remedy for it; but if he develops them, the Statutes of the founders must be executed. Why

wards several extremely able teachers left the institution, two of them became presidents of important colleges, while a third became a professor in the Harvard Divinity School. In addition to these losses by death and departure, the sound and orthodox BIBLIOTHECA SACRA spread its wings and fled toward Oberlin, and the institution was obliged to struggle on without its steady guidance. The buildings were renovated and every financial inducement was offered to students who would come, but there were few who desired the seminary privileges at any price. The graduates of the institution were not wanted by the churches, and the candidate for the ministry did not prefer a seminary whose diploma was more a hindrance than a help to him. The result was that which might have been foreseen, and which sagacious men did foresee twenty-five years before. Graduating classes were reduced to three, and the bottom of the institution fell out. The trouble was quite generally assigned to the—"location."

It is now proposed that Andover Seminary affiliate with the body whose persecution called her into life. When we remember how the church property of the orthodox was seized in repeated instances by Unitarian cliques in the societies during a former generation,¹ the plan of moving Andover Seminary to Cambridge seems like a possible effort of Jonah to go back into the mouth of the whale because the situation did not suit him in Nineveh. Our fathers in the church were driven out of Cambridge and prospered best while they staid away.

should they not? And what complaint could he have to make if they should be? He accepted the office with a full knowledge of all the circumstances." (From the Sermon of Professor Stuart at the Dedication of the Bartlet Chapel, Sept. 3, 1821.) We understand that, by agreement of the Trustees and Visitors, subscription to this Creed has of late years been dispensed with.

¹ Special reference is made to the "Groton case" in 1826, when the orthodox congregation were locked out of the church and held a service on the steps of the edifice. Rev. John Todd was then the pastor. According to tradition, the Unitarians gave a ball to celebrate their capture of the church. The orthodox members tried to do right and "love their enemies," but felt it their painful duty to excommunicate the nine Unitarians who desired to remain in the church!

We do not doubt but that Harvard Divinity School which "in the past years has averaged less than five in the graduating class," would like to get Andover Seminary with her endowment worth nearly a million dollars. Of all the religious denominations Congregationalism has been the one to give herself away and it might be a good plan for her now to surrender herself to an institution which drove her out of her first home. We will be deceived by no specious arguments to the contrary, Andover Seminary could no more preserve her identity when moved to Cambridge than a bucket of water could preserve its identity after it has been thrown into the sea. All her wealth of sentiment and tradition, and sentiment is the invested capital of an institution, would disappear, and Andover Hall standing among the Harvard buildings would remain as a tombstone inscribed "Ichabod," which signifies "The glory is departed from Israel." She was unfaithful to her trust and was wanted no more.

But why anticipate this insignificant end of a great career? Strength comes from believing, not fearing. Is it necessary to give up ignominiously the result of the prayer, toil, and gifts of our fathers? What Andover needs is not a new location, but a new spirit in the old location. Let her find the change not in her place, but in herself. If she wants to become great, let her return to the principles which made her great once and can do it again. Blood-red religious earnestness once made Andover important in a location which was remote; will it fail to be effective in the same location which steam and electric railways have made central and which the close proximity of Lawrence, Lowell and Haverhill, with their great manufacturing populations, has made strategic? If Andover can not get pupils in her old home when suspected of erroneous teaching, will she secure them by going over to an opponent who denies the main principles which she was established to assert? It is a pitiful bid for popularity, to adopt any principle whatever in order to get out of a present difficulty. The most complex reasons have been assigned for a failure which is mainly due to sheer unfaithfulness to a

solemn agreement. Let Andover carry out the plan of the founders instead of wasting her strength in futile speculations on subjects about which little can be ever known; let her seek the salvation of men and train preachers who can effect the work, addressing herself to the wants of the present age as our fathers of the Seminary met the needs of their own generation. Preachers will be eagerly sought when they can give what churches want. Churches do not want a gospel of doubt and negation, they desire instruction and encouragement for meeting the emergencies of the present life and preparation for the future one. Neither do they desire to see the stupendous being of Jesus Christ brought down to human proportions, or his authoritative claim on the will of man made weaker each successive Sabbath. Men have an instinctive feeling for what is great and do not attend church in order to see the Matterhorn gradually shovelled down to a molehill. If teachers in a seminary will proceed in a manly way to train men for practical work among the masses they will succeed in any location, and if they do not do this they will fail in any location which can be selected on the earth. Supposing Andover affiliates with Harvard Divinity School, the present faculty of that institution may be noble men who will inculcate no essential error, but what guarantee have we that their successors will do the same when we consider that Harvard Divinity School is utterly committed to a different theology? Let Andover Seminary secure a separate board of trustees for her special work, the want of which has made great confusion¹ in the past, and let her recover strength and public confidence by doing her work well, not by uniting with a church which has always opposed her. If after a fair

¹ Reference is here made to the almost inevitable tendency of trustees who are trained for practical affairs and have charge of a theological seminary and a large academy in the same place, to give the more attention to the institution which has by far the larger number of students and the greater momentum. The formation of a separate Board of Trustees for the Seminary would in a great measure relieve this difficulty, which was foreseen at the outset. But the legal situation was such that separate boards of trustees could not then be secured. The division, however, can be made now.

trial under new conditions a new location must be had, the partnership with Boston University is far more consistent for her than the union with the Cambridge Divinity School. But the great question remains not where she is, but what she is. There is common sense in the line which Milton puts into the mouth of even Satan himself:

"What matter where If I be still the same,
And what I should be."

Oberlin, Ohio.

WILLIAM EDWARDS PARK.

A NEGLECTED ANALOGY.

PERUSAL of Dr. Jarrel's able article in defense of verbal inspiration brings clearly to light the fact that many who maintain opposing theories upon the subject differ from each other less than they are wont to suppose. Though defending the theory of *verbal* inspiration, Dr. Jarrel really expounds the theory of *plenary* inspiration, for, it will be noticed, in the closing paragraphs of the article, that he adopts the *dynamical* as opposed to the *mechanical* theory, making due allowance for the use which is made of the natural capacities of each writer. The Spirit first utilizes all the natural forces involved, merely supplanting their deficiencies and directing them to the accomplishment of the desired end, which is the choice of those words, that, on the whole, are best calculated to convey the truth to all coming generations.

Those who are accustomed to regard this theory as impossible of accomplishment, or as so improbable that it can be rejected with little discussion, should be reminded that there is a close analogy between this doctrine of inspiration and the views entertained by modern science concerning the unity of nature. More and more, science is teaching us that the universe, like the human body, is an organism, in which the head cannot say to the feet, "I have no need of you"; for "God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant power to that part which lacked."

It is a serious error to impute to the advocates of plenary inspiration a belief in the equal importance, for all purposes, of every portion of Scripture. The purposes of the several portions of a complete written revelation are as various as are those of the several portions of any organism in nature which is adapted to its environment. No other writer has magnified the importance of small things so much as Darwin has. With him nothing is so small as to be insignificant. One of the most interesting subjects of his investigation is that of the means by which seeds are dispersed over the earth. The down of the thistle or the dandelion seems worthless in itself, but without it the seed would have no adequate means of transportation and would fall directly to the ground, thus rendering the spread of the plant impossible. The husks or the shell which inclose the kernel are by no means useless organs, for they are the protectors of the kernel, and the means of prolonging its life, thus enabling it to accomplish the true ends of its being. It may be true that the revelation of God is given to us in earthen vessels; but, even so, the vessels are the work of the Creator, and as such are not to be despised.

No machine or work of art can be produced as a whole without attention to every particular part. A locomotive with a single defective cog is a useless piece of work. A machine with every part in place can do no effective work if there is a deficiency of oil to lubricate its movements. On the other hand, if a piece of machinery is known to have done effective work for a long time, the presumption is overwhelming that all its parts were adapted to each other by a master mechanic, and that probably nothing about it is superfluous.

Applying these illustrations to the Bible, we perceive at once that we are dealing with a literary collection which has been most wonderful in its influence, and has maintained this influence for a longer period of time and under more diverse conditions than any other literature has ever done.

This very fact creates an overwhelming presumption that all the parts have been fitly joined together, and that it is extremely hazardous for any one to undertake to improve it.

Wisdom dictates that we should approach the Bible, as the church has always done, with great reverence and humility, and that, first of all, we should try to find some significance in all its various parts. It is as unsafe for the hands of unhallowed criticism to tamper with this literature as it is for an ordinary stone-cutter to attempt to improve the products of the classic age of Grecian sculpture, or for a house-painter to retouch the immortal portraits of Raphael.

How often have we been amiss in depreciating the importance of various portions of the Bible! In the piping times of peace we neglect the imprecatory Psalms, and many would cast them permanently into the rubbish-heap, but in those periods of great national convulsions which try men's souls, when the wicked seem likely to triumph and to blot out truth and justice from the world, no other expressions of feeling are so adequate as those outbursts of righteous indignation preserved to us in the imprecatory Psalms.

Nor can we lightly expunge from the Bible the long lists of names of persons and places which fill so many pages of the Old Testament; for, in these later days, they have come to assume an importance little thought of even a few years ago. In Egypt and Syria, and in Babylonia, and even in Persia, the spade is turning up parallel references which shed light upon the mental habits of the Old Testament writers which would have been unattainable, except for the preservation of those dry, and seemingly useless, lists of names. Our interest in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis has been immeasurably increased by the discovery of the laws of Hammurabi, and the various references to him and his associates in the monumental records of the Euphrates Valley.

In a book which was to command attention of children, and of people in the primitive stages of culture, who shall say that it was unworthy of the Divine mind to embody in it all those graphic details of history which made the Bible the most popular story-book of the world; while, on the other hand, in a book which was to meet the wants of the maturest intellects, and of every one when called upon to face the impenetrable

darkness of the future, why should we be deprived of the profound theological discussions of Paul and of the imimitable symbolism of the Apocalypse?

The shafts of criticism fall harmless at the base of this monumental structure of Divine revelation embodied in the Old and New Testaments. The more profound our views of the course of nature, and the greater our familiarity with the workmanship of God as revealed in the heavens and in the earth, the easier it is to believe that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." The task of assigning each part of its appropriate sphere is one of interpretation. But this is by no means so difficult as for the disciples of Darwin to prove their fundamental assumption that every part of every organ which has been preserved in a species has been preserved because it has played a more or less important part in the struggle of the species for its continued existence.