

<b>Title</b>	The Nineteenth-Century New England Religious Thinkers' Reactions to Friedrich D. E. Schleiermacher
<b>Author(s)</b>	森田, 美千代
<b>Citation</b>	聖学院大学総合研究所, No.30, 2004.9 : 31-50
<b>URL</b>	<a href="http://serve.seigakuin-univ.ac.jp/reps/modules/xoonips/detail.php?item_id=4306">http://serve.seigakuin-univ.ac.jp/reps/modules/xoonips/detail.php?item_id=4306</a>
<b>Rights</b>	



聖学院学術情報発信システム : SERVE

SEigakuin Repository and academic archiVE

# **The Nineteenth- Century New England Religious Thinkers' Reactions to Friedrich D. E. Schleiermacher**

**Michiyo Morita**

## **I. Introduction**

Friedrich D. E. Schleiermacher (1768-1834), a German theologian and philosopher of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, began to appear on the American religious scene mainly as a review reader during the 1820s and 1830s.<sup>(1)</sup> Despite the strong opposition to his theology in America, his thoughts were often published in the United States by *The Christian Examiner*, a Unitarian magazine. The fact that *The Christian Examiner* published five articles (totaling 117 pages) about Schleiermacher is a clear indication that he is an important figure of study regarding the origins and influences of American theology.<sup>(2)</sup>

With this in mind, a series of questions can be raised. What were Schleiermacher's religious characteristics? What was the religious milieu on the American scene, and in particular, on the New England scene, when the Schleiermacher's religion was introduced into America? Did the specific situation of New England religion during the 1820s and 1830s affect the acceptance of Schleiermacher's religion? If so, then what were the issues related to New England religion in that era? To what aspects and how did the New England religious thinkers react to Schleiermacher's thought? Did they respond to him positively, or, negatively? These are the tasks which I would like to investigate in this study.

## **II. The Background of Friedrich D. E. Schleiermacher**

Friedrich D. E. Schleiermacher was born in Breslau, the capital of

Silesia, in Prussia, on November 21, 1768. From his birth, he was influenced by two religious traditions: the Reformed tradition and the Moravian tradition. However, it is clear that the Moravian tradition had a much stronger impact on his spirituality.

Schleiermacher inherited the Reformed tradition from both sides of his family.<sup>(3)</sup> B. A. Gerrish states that Schleiermacher's maternal grandfather and great-grandfather served as court chaplains in Berlin at the Reformed "cathedral." His father and paternal grandfather were Reformed pastors, too. However, both were also influenced by the Moravian tradition. Schleiermacher's father, Gottlieb, became acquainted with the Moravians of Gandefrei and experienced a spiritual awakening at the age of fifty.<sup>(4)</sup> Gottlieb's deep sympathy with the Moravian tradition greatly influenced his son's religious education. When Schleiermacher was fourteen years old, he was sent to school in the Moravian community at Niesky in 1783. It was during this time that he experienced a conversion. Because of his talents, he was quickly promoted to the Moravian seminary at Barby in 1785; but while at the seminary, he felt the limitations of Moravianism. In a letter to his father, Schleiermacher decisively expressed his opinion:

I cannot believe that he who only called himself the Son of man was the ever-true God; I can not believe that his death was an intercessory atonement; because he nowhere expresses it so, and because I cannot believe it was necessary. For God, since he has not created men for perfection, but only to strive for it, could not possibly punish them because they are not perfect.<sup>(5)</sup>

Interestingly enough, however, Moravianism, especially Moravian pietism remained firmly as Schleiermacher's religious foundation throughout his life, as will be explained later in this study.

In 1787, Schleiermacher decided to leave the Moravian seminary in order to study at the University of Halle. While there, he became a member of the Reformed Church in Germany.<sup>(6)</sup> Under the auspices of such professors as Wolf, Eberhard, Knapp, and Nosselt, he laid the base for his theology and philosophy.<sup>(7)</sup>

From 1790 to 1793, Schleiermacher worked as a house tutor for the

aristocratic Dohna family. In 1794, he was ordained as a Reformed minister. After teaching at the school for orphans in Berlin and preaching at Landesberg, he received an appointment as the Reformed chaplain to the Hospital of Charity in Berlin. He served there from 1796 until 1802. It is during this period that he wrote two of his main works: *On Religion* (1799) and *Soliloquies* (1800). From 1802 to 1804, Schleiermacher moved from Berlin to take a Reformed pastorate in the Pomeranian city of Stolp.<sup>(8)</sup>

In 1804, Schleiermacher accepted a professorship and chaplaincy at the University of Halle, his Alma Mater. However, two years later, the university was closed because of the French invasion, and he returned to Berlin. He became a Reformed minister at the Trinity Church in 1808.<sup>(9)</sup> That same year, he married his friend's widow, Henriette von Willich. He was twenty years older than Henriette, a twenty-year-old widow with two children.<sup>(10)</sup>

In 1810, Schleiermacher was invited to a chair at the theological faculty at the new University at Berlin.<sup>(11)</sup> *Christian Faith*, his final and major work, was written in 1821.

Schleiermacher died in 1834. Gotfried C. F. Lucke, Professor of Theology, gave an account of Schleiermacher's death, writing:

He [Schleiermacher] went on: "Let us receive the supper of the Lord. . . ." He administered the bread and the wine, first to his family and then to himself, with the remark: "I abide by the words of Scripture; they are the foundation of my faith." After he had pronounced the blessing, his eye turned once more with an expression of perfect love, first to his wife, and then to every individual present, and, in those deep and earnest tones which penetrate the heart, he continued: "In this fellowship and faith we are then one, and will remain so." . . . In a few minutes he said: "I can remain here no longer." . . . His eye gradually closed.<sup>(12)</sup>

### **III. The Religious Milieu on the Early Nineteenth-Century New England Scene**

In late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century America, especially in

New England, many Congregationalist ministers had ceased to regard the doctrines of Calvinism as essential Christian beliefs. (Dogmatically speaking, Calvinism is generally summarized as total depravity, unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace, and perseverance.<sup>(13)</sup>) Among the Congregationalists, ministers such as William Ellery Channing and Andrews Norton led a revolt against Calvinism. Thus, Unitarianism (liberal Calvinism) was born from Calvinism (orthodox Calvinism). However, until 1805, ministers whose beliefs fell between orthodox Calvinism and liberal Calvinism exchanged pulpits with one another, and participated together in ordinations and installations.<sup>(14)</sup>

Transcendentalism emerged from Unitarianism in 1830s New England. Ironically, Norton, a Unitarian who had played a leading part in the revolt against Calvinism and was a defender of the belief in miracles,<sup>(15)</sup> was now attacked by Transcendentalists who stressed direct revelation by intuition alone. However, it is interesting to note that most Transcendentalists were Unitarian ministers, who opted to retain their denominational affiliation.<sup>(16)</sup>

Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882) was one of the key persons in the above-described religious milieu of early nineteenth-century New England. He was born in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1803. In 1817, he enrolled at Harvard College, from which he graduated in 1821. He entered the Divinity School at Harvard in 1825, was licensed to preach as a Unitarian in 1826, and delivered his first sermon in that same year. Three years later, he was ordained as a Unitarian minister and invited to the Second Church (Boston) as a junior pastor.

In 1832, just after Emerson delivered the sermon, "The Lord's Supper," he resigned his pastorate.<sup>(17)</sup> *Nature*, one of his main works was published in 1836. The same year occasioned the first meeting of the Transcendental Club, of which Emerson was one of the founding and key persons. At the Harvard Divinity School in 1838, he delivered a controversial address on miracles which was misunderstood by his listeners. As a result, he was not invited back to the school for about thirty years. He died at Concord, Massachusetts in 1882.<sup>(18)</sup>

Whether or not Emerson knew Schleiermacher is an attractive question. Additionally, when and how Emerson became acquainted with Schleiermacher's thinking is of interest. Emerson's *Journals* and *Letters*

indicate that his first reference to Schleiermacher is found in the *Journals* and dated the 14th of December, 1834.<sup>(19)</sup> The entry reads, “Hedge read me good things out of Schleiermacher concerning the twofold division of <the> study, 1. Physics, or that which is; 2. Ethics, or that which should be.”<sup>(20)</sup> Based on the quote, it seems clear that Emerson began to “know” Schleiermacher indirectly just after Schleiermacher’s death.

It was in 1838 that Emerson delivered an infamous address at Harvard Divinity School. One of the controversial issues in the early nineteenth-century religious milieu of New England, or, more specifically, in the Unitarian and Trancendentalist camps, was that of miracles. In Emerson’s address, he made note of the following:

He [Jesus Christ] spoke of miracles; for he felt that man’s life was a miracle, and all that man doth, and he knew that this daily miracle shines, as the character ascends. But the word Miracle, as pronounced by Christian churches, gives a false impression; it is a Monster. It is not one with the blowing clover and the falling rain.<sup>(21)</sup>

Although, as Conrad Wright notes, “the special problem of miracles was really incidental to the main purpose of the discourse”<sup>(22)</sup> delivered by Emerson, it is important to remember that a specific religious condition of early nineteenth-century New England (what to think about miracles) caused an over-sensitive reaction to the miracle issue found within the address.

#### **IV. The Norton-Ripley Controversy<sup>(23)</sup>**

New England religious thinkers reacted differently to Schleiermacher’s viewpoint. Andrews Norton (1786-1853) and George Ripley (1802-1880) can be understood as representative of those who reacted in distinct ways.

Andrews Norton was born on the 31st of December, 1786, in Hingham, Massachusetts.<sup>(24)</sup> He graduated from Harvard College in 1804 with a Bachelor of Arts degree, and with a Master of Arts degree in 1809. From 1819 until his retirement in 1830, he served as professor of Sacred Literature

at Harvard College. He is said to be the “pope of Unitarianism.”

Norton had felt a need to refute Emerson’s 1838 address at the Harvard Divinity School. A good opportunity came to Norton when the alumni association of the Cambridge Theological School invited him to deliver an address. In response to that request, he presented “A Discourse on the Latest Form of Infidelity” on July 19, 1839. For Norton, a counterattack on Emerson was, in reality, a counterargument with Schleiermacher.

Norton stated five points regarding Schleiermacher in the discourse. First, he understood Schleiermacher’s work, *On Religion* to be “a system of pantheism.”<sup>(25)</sup> Second, Norton offered up the following description of Schleiermacher’s definition of religion:

Religion is the sense of the union of the individual with the universe, with Nature, or, with the One and All. It is a feeling; it has nothing to do with belief or action; it is unconnected with morality; it is independent of the idea of a personal God.<sup>(26)</sup>

Turning to Schleiermacher, we find that he defines religion as follows: “Religion’s essence is neither thinking nor acting, but intuition. . . . Religion is sensibility and taste for the infinite.”<sup>(27)</sup> Thus, Norton’s comprehension of Schleiermacher’s definition is correct in a broad sense, even though Norton disagreed with Schleiermacher’s definition.

Third, Norton thought that, according to Schleiermacher, “the belief and desire of personal immortality are ‘wholly irreligious.’”<sup>(28)</sup> However, Schleiermacher did not actually hold that view. He said, “To be one with the infinite in the midst of the finite and to be eternal in moment, that is the immortality of religion.”<sup>(29)</sup> In his fourth point, Norton noted that Schleiermacher paid tribute to Spinoza, because Spinoza was full of religion and of a holy spirit.<sup>(30)</sup> Finally, Norton stated the fact that Schleiermacher administered the Lord’s Supper on his deathbed.<sup>(31)</sup>

George Ripley, who argued against Norton, was born on the 3rd of October, 1802, in Greenfield, Massachusetts.<sup>(32)</sup> In 1823, he graduated from Harvard College as the class valedictorian. As soon as he left Harvard Divinity School in 1826, he immediately became the ordained pastor of a Unitarian society. From that time until his resignation, he served at the

meetinghouse located at Purchase and Pearl streets in Boston. In 1836, the Transcendental Club held its first meeting at his home. In March, 1841, he resigned his pastorate at the Unitarian church and left the ministry permanently. He began a new experiment focusing on agriculture and education at the new community of Brook Farm, in November, 1841. He died on the 4th of July, 1880, in New York, New York.

George Ripley rebutted Norton's pamphlet, *A Discourse on the Latest Form of Infidelity* in 1839 with his work, "*The Latest Form of Infidelity*" *Examined*. He claimed that Schleiermacher's work, *On Religion* was written when hostility to religion was increasing and was never intended to present a system of theology.<sup>(33)</sup> The aim of *On Religion* was to show that "the essence of religion is independent of speculation; that the heart is its seat, not the head."<sup>(34)</sup> Ripley therefore attempted to call Norton's attention to the context in which the book was written.

Ripley also noted that Norton charged Schleiermacher with denying "the doctrine both of a personal God and of personal immortality."<sup>(35)</sup> Ripley thought that Schleiermacher believed in a personal God and personal immortality. Further, Norton classified Schleiermacher as a Rationalist, or a Naturalist, but Ripley regarded Schleiermacher as a Supernaturalist. Ripley offered up the following explanation of Schleiermacher as a Supernaturalist:

You [Norton] class Schleiermacher with the modern German school, whose disciples are called Rationalists or Naturalists. Although Schleiermacher attempted to modify the old Lutheran theology, on several important points, he was a strenuous advocate of the supernatural origin of Christianity; his whole life was a controversy against the rationalist school; and his works are supposed to have contributed more than any thing else to its decline.<sup>(36)</sup>

Ripley went on to argue that Schleiermacher understood "the revelation of God in nature, and in the human soul" as "only a preparation for a perfect revelation through Christ."<sup>(37)</sup> He said Schleiermacher claimed that Jesus Christ was appointed by God to be the Redeemer of the world. Therefore, Jesus Christ did not need redemption for himself.<sup>(38)</sup> Finally, although Ripley regarded Schleiermacher as a supernaturalist as noted above, he also wrote:



A sound theology, according to Schleiermacher, must combine all that is valuable in both systems [the systems of Supernaturalism and Rationalism], reject their exclusive and extravagant tendencies of each, and thus obtain a higher view of divine truth, than was presented by either doctrine in itself.<sup>(39)</sup>

Thus, it seems that Ripley confused Schleiermacher's supernaturalism with naturalism (rationalism).

Norton counterattacked Ripley in *Remarks on a Pamphlet Entitled "The Latest of Infidelity Examined,"* in 1839. Norton took issue with Ripley's statement that "Norton is in error in charging Schleiermacher with denying the doctrines of a personal God, and personal immortality."<sup>(40)</sup> Norton replied that he had never said such a thing about Schleiermacher.<sup>(41)</sup> However, my understanding of the issue is that Ripley was right, because Norton had stated that Schleiermacher regarded the belief and desire of personal immortality as wholly irreligious in *A Discourse on the Latest Form of Infidelity*.

In addition, Norton classified Schleiermacher as an unbeliever in Christianity as miraculous revelation.<sup>(42)</sup> Along similar lines, Norton quoted Schleiermacher's understanding of miracles (as found in *On Religion*):

"What is a miracle?" "A miracle is but the religious name for an event. Every one, the most natural and the most common, if it be of such a character, that it may be prevailingly viewed under a religious aspect, is a miracle. To me, all is miracle; and in your sense, as meaning something inexplicable and strange, only that is a miracle which is none in mine."<sup>(43)</sup>

Based on the above, Norton sought to describe Schleiermacher's view of miracles:

The explanation of Schleiermacher is, that the distinction between the events which we call, and those which we do not call, miracles, is founded, not on any intrinsic difference, but solely on the manner in

which they are regarded by the human mind; that, if we regard an event in immediate relation to the power of God, by which it is produced, that event is to us a miracle; that, if we regard it as occurring in the ordinary course of nature, it is not a miracle.<sup>(44)</sup>

Therefore, although Norton personally did not agree with Schleiermacher's idea of miracles, one can say that Norton did understand Schleiermacher's view of miracles clearly.

Lastly, Norton made note Schleiermacher's affirmation that "the religious man needs no instructor, no external assurance of truth, because he sees miracles for himself, has his own revelation, and his own inspiration."<sup>(45)</sup> In other words, Norton was pointing out that Schleiermacher believed religion could not be taught.<sup>(46)</sup>

*The Princeton Review* took up the Norton-Ripley controversy in January, 1840.<sup>(47)</sup> It noted that the issue was related to two doctrines: the doctrine that miracles are the only satisfactory evidence of a divine revelation, and the doctrine that the denial of the miracles of Christianity is a denial of Christianity itself.<sup>(48)</sup> In addition, *The Princeton Review* wanted to make it clear that although it dissented from Norton as to the first doctrine, it fully agreed with Norton as to the second doctrine.<sup>(49)</sup> In other words, *The Princeton Review* believed that miracles were "essential to Christianity," but did not believe that they were "the only sufficient proof of its divine origin."<sup>(50)</sup> The journal, however, also disagreed with Ripley, stating that it did not agree that Christianity was "addressed to the intuitive perceptions of the common mind" or that it was "embraced because of the accordance of its spirit with the higher nature of man."<sup>(51)</sup> *The Princeton Review's* opinion on the matter is clearly laid out in the following fragment:

We believe the external evidence of the Bible to be perfectly conclusive; we believe its internal evidence, (that is, its majesty, its purity, its consistency, its manifold perfections,) to be no less satisfactory; but we believe also, that the ultimate foundation of the Christian's faith, is the testimony of the Holy Spirit, by and with the truth in our hearts.<sup>(52)</sup>

Thus, it appears that *The Princeton Review* was able to clarify the central issue of the Norton-Ripley controversy by focusing on the problem of miracles. In fact, the question of miracles was one of the critical issues in the religious milieu of early nineteenth-century New England.

Ripley's counterargument to Norton appeared in *Defence of "The Latest Form of Infidelity" Examined*, in February, 1840. Once again, Ripley called attention to the intention and aim of Schleiermacher's *On Religion*. "The work of Schleiermacher," he wrote, "is a bold and impassioned attack on the religious degradation of the age, by the educated men."<sup>(53)</sup> Ripley explained that to accomplish his purpose, Schleiermacher did not attempt to present a system of speculative dogmas.<sup>(54)</sup> Ripley noted that according to Schleiermacher, the essence of religion did not consist of speculative theories or of outward morality, but of feeling in human nature.<sup>(55)</sup> Ripley also comprehended that Schleiermacher believed in the doctrine of immortality.<sup>(56)</sup> Furthermore, he argued, Schleiermacher held that Christianity was super-natural in origin, that Christ did miraculous works through the power of God, and that the divinity of Jesus was visible in his word and life.<sup>(57)</sup> Schleiermacher's take on revelation, Ripley wrote, was that revelation possessed a "rational and natural element."<sup>(58)</sup> As for the miracles of Jesus, Ripley offered the following summation of Schleiermacher's viewpoint:

He embraced the historical truth of the miracles of Jesus, as recorded in the New Testament. He considered them to be peculiar manifestations of divine power, above the ordinary course of nature. To a certain degree, in his opinion, they are proofs of the divine mission of the Redeemer. But, so far from being the *only* proofs, they are not the primary, nor the principal proofs. The faith of the Christian in the Divinity of Jesus rests on a far deeper and more permanent support.<sup>(59)</sup>

Thus, Ripley understood that Schleiermacher did not necessarily regard the miracles of Jesus as the only proof of divine power. This was also one of the most critical points of Norton's attack on Schleiermacher.

## V. The Schleiermacher Centennial in America

Given the above controversy, it is interesting that the Schleiermacher centennial was observed in America. *The Christian Examiner* not only publicized a centennial event held in New York City, but also printed the text of the keynote speaker's oration:

The discourse for the Schleiermacher centennial was given by Dr. Osgood, before the united congregations of Unitarians, on Sunday evening, Nov. 22, 1868, in the Church of the Messiah, New York. Dr. Bellows assisted in the service, which was attended by a large assembly, among whom were many noted scholars and lovers of German thought and heart. Our United-States Minister at Berlin, among others, joined in the request for the commemoration. The commemoration was fully noticed in the German press here and in Europe.<sup>(60)</sup>

In the Schleiermacher centennial discourse, Samuel Osgood (1812-1888)<sup>(61)</sup> made eight points. Although one cannot say that Osgood understood Schleiermacher's religion systematically and deeply, one can see that he did relate to various aspects of Schleiermacher's religion. First, Osgood observed that Schleiermacher was less Christian, but more Theist, if not a Pantheist, and that Schleiermacher "did his providential work by advancing from Theism to positive Christianity."<sup>(62)</sup> Osgood also understood Schleiermacher as a Patriot, because he had experienced the French invasion. Osgood noted that Schleiermacher, in a letter to his friend, stated that he wanted "a free state, its own nationality" without foreign oppression.<sup>(63)</sup>

Osgood found Schleiermacher to be "the Broad Churchman of his country and age" because he had a strong desire to unite all Christians "who had the Christian conscience in its faith in Christ and fellowship of brotherhood."<sup>(64)</sup> Osgood defended this particular thesis four ways. He noted that in 1817, the third centennial of the Reformation, Schleiermacher led the movement to unite the Reformed and the Lutheran churches.<sup>(65)</sup> To illustrate his point, he related that Schleiermacher had led the reunion movement in the Berlin Synod and had written "the call to the whole Prussian Church to

unite in one common union at the jubilee of Oct. 31, 1817.”<sup>(66)</sup> Osgood explained that Schleiermacher contended against the court when it attempted to force a state religion upon the churches.<sup>(67)</sup> He also argued that Schleiermacher was against the bigots who insisted upon the letter of the old creeds and the minutiae of the old or new ritual.<sup>(68)</sup> Lastly, he pointed out that Schleiermacher never attacked Catholicism, in spite of the fact that he was a Protestant. As a result, the Roman Catholic clergy of Berlin were found among the attendees at Schleiermacher’s funeral.<sup>(69)</sup>

Osgood’s address described Schleiermacher as a person who did not use creeds, dogma, scripture, or the office of the clergy to construct his religion and theology, but depended upon “the witness of God, through Christ, in the human soul.”<sup>(70)</sup> Additionally, Osgood told his listeners that Schleiermacher depicted the soul as longing for a relationship with the Almighty:

The soul has a certain sense of dependence that yearns for God. . . . This sense of dependence is known as an instinctive feeling; and, like the craving for food, it can taste the flavor of the bread of life before it can analyze its elements. This feeling does not exclude thought, but demands it. . . . The soul’s sense of dependence must have an object, which is God.<sup>(71)</sup>

With regard to Jesus Christ, Osgood said that Schleiermacher regarded Him as “the manifestation of God to man, not as a teacher and example merely, but as the living and lasting fountain of life and salvation.”<sup>(72)</sup> Concerning sin, Osgood noted that Schleiermacher perceived it as “more an habitual imperfection of mankind . . . than an utterly depraved and willful rebellion against God.”<sup>(73)</sup> Thus, according to Osgood, Schleiermacher believed that salvation was to be found in “the loving grace” of Christ, rather than in a bloody sacrifice designed to appease “the wrath of an angry king.”<sup>(74)</sup>

Schleiermacher’s sermons, Osgood explained, were full of the divine Christ, as well as the human Jesus. He further observed that Schleiermacher began and ended sermons with the grace of Jesus Christ.<sup>(75)</sup>

Lastly, Osgood made note of Schleiermacher’s relationships with John

Wesley, a representative of the Methodists; Jonathan Edwards, a representative of the Reformed or Calvinists; and William Ellery Channing, a representative of the Unitarians. Osgood determined that the religious background of both Wesley and Schleiermacher was Moravian pietism. Both also had discovered a religion of the heart and had worked to “build the Church upon the religious experience or Christian consciousness.”<sup>(76)</sup> However, the two men differed in their religious thinking: Wesley’s thinking was “Hebrew English,” while Schleiermacher’s was “Greek German.”<sup>(77)</sup>

Osgood saw that the connection between Schleiermacher and Jonathan Edwards was Calvinism. He commented that the two men were “severe reasoners,” but “not without gentle emotion and beautiful taste.”<sup>(78)</sup> However, they differed in that Edwards reasoned on the Hebrew base of the literal Scriptures, while Schleiermacher too little appreciated the Hebrew Scriptures.<sup>(79)</sup>

A passion for liberty, love of large culture, impatience with formalism and priestcraft, and large catholicity were what Osgood found as connections between Schleiermacher and William Ellery Channing.<sup>(80)</sup> Yet, while both believed in the Christ of God, Channing thought that Christ exemplified “man rising into communion with God,” while Schleiermacher understood Christ as “God descending into union with men.”<sup>(81)</sup> Thus, their approaches to Christ seemed to come from different directions.

## VI. Conclusion

When investigating how the early nineteenth-century New England religious thinkers reacted to Friedrich Schleiermacher, consideration must be given to how each thinker stood on the issue of miracles. In addition, an individual’s position regarding the issue of immortality influenced how a person responded to Schleiermacher. Emerson, Norton, Ripley, and Osgood each illustrate how these considerations colored their perception of Schleiermacher.

Ralph Waldo Emerson became acquainted with Schleiermacher just after his death. Thus, Emerson only “knew” Schleiermacher indirectly. However, both persons were creative masters of theology and philosophy.

Both also shared similar views on basic points of religion, such as the definition of religion and the issue of miracles.

Andrews Norton, as a conservative Unitarian, or, a liberal Calvinist, took the negative position on Schleiermacher. In addition, Norton reacted in an overly sensitive manner to whether Schleiermacher believed in a personal God, the immortality of man, and miracles. The reason behind such sensitive reactions lies in the specific milieu of the early nineteenth-century New England religions, as already explained in section III.

On the other hand, George Ripley, as a liberal Unitarian, or a Transcendentalist, was extremely sympathetic to Schleiermacher. He supported Schleiermacher, stating that *On Religion* was written when hostility to religion was swelling. He saw Schleiermacher as a supernaturalist, and also regarded the man to be one who believed in a personal God, the immortality of humankind, and miracles. Furthermore, Ripley found that Schleiermacher considered the essence of religion to be a feeling in human nature.

Samuel Osgood responded to Schleiermacher broadly, although he lacked depth of understanding with regard to Schleiermacher's religion. In addition to the issues discussed by Norton and Ripley, Osgood covered three more points. First, he grasped Schleiermacher's patriotism. Second, he saw Schleiermacher as a broad churchman who (1) desired to unite the Reformed and Lutheran churches; (2) contended against both a state religion and conservative creedists or ritualists; and (3) never attacked Catholicism. Lastly, Osgood indicated that Schleiermacher had Methodist (Moravian Pietistic), Calvinist (Reformed), and Unitarian aspects. Broadly speaking, Osgood's comprehension was adequate; however, strictly speaking, it would be more accurate to say that Schleiermacher actually had Pietistic, Reformed, and Transcendental aspects.

## Notes

- (1) Henry A. Pochmann, *German Culture in America: 1600-1900* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1957), 110.
- (2) *Ibid.*, 560. The five articles in *The Christian Examiner* are as follows: "Schleiermacher as a Theologian" by George Ripley in 1836, "Modern Ecclesiastical History" by Samuel Osgood in 1850, "Schleiermacher" by Hasbrouck Davis in 1852, "Passages from the Life of Schleiermacher" by L. P. Hale in 1862, and "The Schleiermacher Centennial and its Lesson" by Samuel Osgood in 1869.
- (3) B. A. Gerrish, *Tradition and the Modern World: Reformed Theology in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978), 16.
- (4) *Ibid.*, 16.
- (5) L. P. Hale, "Passages from the Life of Schleiermacher," *The Christian Examiner* 86 (1862): 111.
- (6) George Ripley, "Schleiermacher as a Theologian," *The Christian Examiner* 20 (1836): 6.
- (7) *Ibid.*, 6.
- (8) Gerrish, 19.
- (9) B. A. Gerrish regards the year as 1809. Gerrish, 20.
- (10) Halle, 116.
- (11) Hasbrouck Davis points out that the plan of this university was drafted by Fichte. Hasbrouck Davis, "Schleiermacher," *The Christian Examiner* 53 (1852): 72.
- (12) Ripley, "Schleiermacher as a Theologian," 46. Ripley describes Lucke in the following way: "Lucke was connected with Schleiermacher in the relations of an intimate friendship, sympathy of opinion, and similarity of pursuits." Ripley, "Schleiermacher as a Theologian," 6.
- (13) Sinclair B. Ferguson and David F. Wright, eds., *New Dictionary of Theology* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1973), 570.
- (14) Conrad Wright, *Three Prophets of Religious Liberalism: Channing-Emerson-Parker* (Boston: Unitarian Universalist Association, 1986), 8.
- (15) Conrad Wright points out the following: "In time, the Unitarians abandoned the traditional theory of miracles, as well as much of the theological structure built upon it." Wright, *Three Prophets of Religious Liberalism: Channing-Emerson-Parker*, 33.
- (16) Conrad Wright, "Unitarianism and Transcendentalism," ed. Joel Myerson, *The Transcendentalists: A Review of Research and Criticism* (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1984), 48-49.
- (17) The contrast between Schleiermacher and Emerson with regard to the Lord's



Supper is interesting. On the one hand, Schleiermacher administered the Lord's Supper on his deathbed. On the other hand, Emerson resigned his pastorate because of a disagreement with the administration of the sacrament. In his farewell sermon in 1832, Emerson wrote, "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace and joy in the holy ghost. Jesus did not intend to establish an institution for perpetual observance when he ate the passover with his disciples; and further to the opinion that it is not expedient to celebrate it as we do. . . . Jesus did not celebrate the passover and afterwards the supper, but the supper was the passover. He did with his disciples exactly what every master of a family in Jerusalem was doing at the same hour with his household. . . . The original Lord's Supper was never intended by Jesus to be the foundation of a perpetual institution. . . . For my part I see nothing wonder at in its [Lord's Supper's] originating there; all that is surprising is that it should exist among us." Ralph Waldo Emerson, "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace and joy in the holy ghost," *The Complete Sermons of Ralph Waldo Emerson* vol.4 ed. Wesley T. Mott (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1992), 186, 187-89.

- (18) Harold Bloom and Paul Kane, eds., "Chronology," *Ralph Waldo Emerson: Collected Poems and Translations* (New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1994), 553-69.
- (19) Pochmann, 171. Pochmann also points out that Emerson refers to Schleiermacher in 1838, in 1841, in 1845, in 1846, in 1848, in 1872, and in 1875, in addition to 1834. Pochmann, 598.
- (20) Ralph Waldo Emerson, *The Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson* ed. Alfred R. Ferguson (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964), 360.
- (21) Ralph Waldo Emerson, *The Collected Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson* volume I (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971), 81.
- (22) Wright, *Three Prophets of Religious Liberalism: Channing-Emerson-Parker*, 45.
- (23) In the Norton-Ripley controversy, the text which they mostly used was *On Religion*. Norton used the fourth edition (1831) of *On Religion*. Norton, *Remarks on a Pamphlet Entitled "The Latest Form of Infidelity Examined"* (Cambridge: John Owen, 1839), 32.
- (24) Henry Warner Bowden, *Dictionary of American Religious Biography* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1993), 397.
- (25) Andrews Norton, *A Discourse on the Latest Form of Infidelity* (Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1971), 43.
- (26) *Ibid.*, 44.
- (27) Richard Crouter, trans., *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers*, by Friedrich Schleiermacher (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 102, 103.

- (28) Norton, *A Discourse on the Latest Form of Infidelity*, 44.
- (29) Schleiermacher, 140.
- (30) Norton, *A Discourse on the Latest Form of Infidelity*, 44.
- (31) *Ibid.*, 44.
- (32) Octavius Brooks Frothingham, *George Ripley* (New York: Ams Press, 1970), 1.
- (33) George Ripley, "*The Latest Form of Infidelity*" *Examined* (Boston: James Munroe and Company, 1839), 132.
- (34) *Ibid.*, 136.
- (35) *Ibid.*, 135.
- (36) *Ibid.*, 138-39.
- (37) *Ibid.*, 142.
- (38) *Ibid.*, 142.
- (39) *Ibid.*, 147.
- (40) Norton, *Remarks on a Pamphlet Entitled "The Latest Form of Infidelity' Examined"*, 28-29.
- (41) *Ibid.*, 28-29.
- (42) *Ibid.*, 29, 49.
- (43) *Ibid.*, 44.
- (44) *Ibid.*, 44-45.
- (45) *Ibid.*, 47.
- (46) *Ibid.*, 47.
- (47) William Hutchison describes the relationship between Charles Hodge, a representative of Princetonians, and Andrews Norton during the 1840s: "Hodge's letters to Norton at this time [in 1840] indicate that both men felt their agreements -- their common supernaturalist emphasis, their reliance upon Locke and the Scottish philosophers, and their partial concurrence on the faults of New England Calvinism -- were stronger than their disagreements." William R. Hutchison, *The Transcendentalist Ministers: Church Reform in New England Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), 87.
- (48) "The Latest Form of Infidelity," *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* 12 (1840): 32.
- (49) *Ibid.*, 32.
- (50) *Ibid.*, 41.
- (51) *Ibid.*, 38.
- (52) *Ibid.*, 38-39.
- (53) George Ripley, *Defence of "The Latest Form of Infidelity" Examined* (Boston: James Mnuroe and Company, 1840), 16.
- (54) *Ibid.*, 17.
- (55) *Ibid.*, 23.

- (56) Ibid., 65.
- (57) Ibid., 83.
- (58) Ibid., 83.
- (59) Ibid., 92.
- (60) "The Schleiermacher Centennial and its Lesson," *The Christian Examiner* 86 (1869): 171.
- (61) Interestingly enough, Samuel Osgood became an Episcopal clergyman in 1869, the year in which he gave a discourse for the Schleiermacher centennial. Hutchison, 198. Pochmann also points out the following: "The 'evangelical order of Unitarians,' with whom Osgood identifies himself, no longer stands in any direct relation to German theology, however much he recognizes its importance as a liberalizing agent in the earlier decades of the century." Pochmann, 248.
- (62) Samuel Osgood, "The Schleiermacher Centennial and its Lesson," *The Christian Examiner* 86 (1869): 174.
- (63) Ibid., 177.
- (64) Ibid., 178.
- (65) Ibid., 178.
- (66) Ibid., 178.
- (67) Ibid., 178.
- (68) Ibid., 178.
- (69) Ibid., 180.
- (70) Ibid., 179.
- (71) Ibid., 179.
- (72) Ibid., 179.
- (73) Ibid., 181.
- (74) Ibid., 181.
- (75) Ibid., 181.
- (76) Ibid., 186.
- (77) Ibid., 186.
- (78) Ibid., 187.
- (79) Ibid., 187.
- (80) Ibid., 187.
- (81) Ibid., 188.

## Bibliography

- Bloom, Harold, and Paul Kane, eds. "Chronology." In *Ralph Waldo Emerson: Collected Poems and Translations*. New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1994.
- Bowden, Henry Warner. *Dictionary of American Religious Biography*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1993.
- Davis, Hasbrouck. "Schleiermacher." *The Christian Examiner* 53 (1852): 66-93.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *The Collected Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. volume I. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971.
- . *The Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. Ed. Alfred R. Ferguson. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964.
- . "The Kingdom of God Is Not Meat and Drink; but Righteousness and Peace and Joy in the Holy Ghost." In *The Complete Sermon of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. vol. 4. Ed. Wesley T. Mott. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1992.
- Ferguson, Sinclair B. and David F. Wright, eds. *New Dictionary of Theology*. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1973.
- Frothingham, Octavius Brooks. *George Ripley*. New York: Ams Press, 1970.
- Gerrish, B. A. *Tradition and the Modern World: Reformed Theology in the Nineteenth Century*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Hale, L. P. "Passages from the Life of Schleiermacher." *The Christian Examiner* 72 (1862): 109-23.
- Hutchison, William R. *The Transcendentalist Ministers: Church Reform in the New England Renaissance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.
- Norton, Andrews. *A Discourse on the Latest Form of Infidelity*. Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1971.
- . *Remarks on a Pamphlet Entitled "The Latest Form of Infidelity" Examined.* Cambridge: John Owen, 1839.
- Osgood, Samuel. "The Schleiermacher Centennial and its Lesson." *The Christian Examiner* 86 (1869): 171-91.
- Pochmann, Henry A. *German Culture in America: 1600-1900*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1957.
- Ripley, George. *Defence of "The Latest Form of Infidelity" Examined*. Boston: James Munroe and Company, 1840.
- . "Schleiermacher as a Theologian." *The Christian Examiner* 20 (1836): 1-46.
- . *"The Latest Form of Infidelity" Examined*. Boston: James Munroe and Company, 1839.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers*. Trans. Richard Crouter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

- "The Latest Form of Infidelity." *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* 12 (1840): 31-71.
- "The Schleiermacher Centennial and its Lesson." *The Christian Examiner* 86 (1869): 171.
- Wright, Conrad. *Three Prophets of Religious Liberalism: Channing-Emerson-Parker*. Boston: Unitarian Universalist Association, 1986.
- . "Unitarianism and Transcendentalism." In *The Transcendentalists: A Review of Research and Criticism*. Ed. Joel Myerson. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1984.

(Submitted on April 26, 2004.)