THE CHALLENGE OF CYRUS AUGUSTUS BARTOL TO THE RELIGOUS THOUGHT OF RALPH WALDO EMERSON

Michiyo Morita

I. Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate how Cyrus Augustus Bartol (1813-1900), a nineteenth-century Transcendentalist, viewed fellow Transcendentalist, Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882).[1] It is sometimes said that Bartol was merely a disciple of Emerson, but that assertion is in question. In this study, I will explore Bartol's religious positions and relate them to those of Emerson, based on Bartol's transformational positions as a Transcendentalist.

In order to accomplish that goal, I would like to define some terms to establish a framework for this study. The first set of definitions comes from sociologist James A. Beckford, who suggests that there are two categories of religious movements.[2] The first includes *new religion, new religious movement,* and *cult* without the framework of existing religious groups or traditions. The second set includes *revival movement, revitalization movement,* and *reform movement* within the form of existent religious groups or traditions. Based on Beckford's categories, Transcendentalism can be regarded as belonging to the latter classification. In other words, nineteenth-century New England Transcendentalism can be considered as a revitalization or reform movement within the framework of nineteenth-century New England Unitarianism.

Another group of terms is provided by sociologist Max Weber, who divided Christian organizations into two categories: the church type and the sect type. Weber explained that the former is an institution which includes both the just and the unjust.[3] The latter is a community of personal believers

of the reborn.[4] Ernst Troeltsch, a colleague of Max Weber, asserted that both the church type and the sect type could be contained within a single institution, albeit in a state of tension.[5] From this tension, a third religious response emerges, which Troeltsch defined as mysticism.[6]

Theologian Richard Niebuhr tried to clarify the transition from a sectarian group to a denomination. Joachim Wach, a sociologist, wrote about two types of religious protest: secession and "protest within." With secession, an independent group is created, while "protest within" enables the development of an "*ecclesiola in ecclesia* [a small group existing within the body of the larger church]."[7] Based on the above, the Transcendentalism of the nineteenth-century New England generally can be understood to be a sect, or a special aspect of nineteenth-century New England Unitarianism. This is because Transcendentalism was a "protest within" (Wach) Unitarianism. It is clear that Transcendentalism did not become a denomination (Niebuhr).[8] Rather, Transcendentalism was the community of personal believers (Weber) with mystical elements (Troeltsch).

This view is supported by Conrad Wright, who notes scholars have pointed out that "the older rationalistic Unitarianism and the new Transcendentalist Unitarianism" basically had "continuities" and were not necessarily "antagonistic" toward each other. Creating a further connection was the fact that the Transcendental Club members for the most part maintained their position as Unitarian clergymen.[9] In addition, Wright explains that it makes sense to understand Transcendentalism "as a phase of a changing and developing Unitarianism" when attempting to determine the relationship between Transcendentalism and Unitarianism.[10]

Another question that may be raised is whether Transcendentalism is a religious movement, a philosophical movement, or a literary movement. Although philosophical and literary aspects are certainly included in Transcendentalism, it is crucial to acknowledge that Transcendentalism is mainly a religious movement. This point is made clear by William R. Hutchison, who observes that seventeen clergymen belonged to the original Transcendental Club. Eleven of these clergymen had lifelong ministerial vocations, and fifteen of them spent ten or more years in the ministry.[11]

On the basis of the larger, general framework outlined above, this study will investigate Bartol's challenge to Emerson's religious thought by

exploring (1) the development of Bartol's thinking through four periods, and (2) the relative influence of Emerson's thinking on Bartol's ideas.

II. Bartol's Challenge to Emerson's Religious Thought

A. Bartol's Background

Cyrus Augustus Bartol[12] was born in Freeport, Maine in 1813. He spent his childhood relating to nature. William G. Heath, Jr. explains that Bartol "looked upon nature as more than an emblem of religious truths. It was a living force, a voice speaking to him of God's majesty and love."[13] In addition, Bartol was raised in a Calvinistic environment, something that he had in common with most Transcendentalists. However, in 1819, he began to withdraw from Calvinism and became acquainted with Unitarian Christianity. In 1828, he enrolled at Bowdoin College. During his college days, he read and was profoundly influenced by Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*.[14] He graduated from Bowdoin in 1832, and enrolled at Harvard Divinity School, where he received a divinity degree in 1835.[15] After serving as an apprentice preacher in Cincinnati, he was invited in 1837 to the West Church of Boston as associate minister. He accepted the call and was ordained in the same year.[16] He remained at the West Church until his retirement in 1889. Six months before his ordination, in October 1836, he began a connection with the "Transcendental Club." From that time on, he met regularly with the Transcendentalists until the Club disbanded in 1850.[17] Heath, Jr. writes that during Bartol's fifty-two years as a clergyman, he "enjoyed a reputation as one of Boston's most popular and entertaining religious personalities."[18] Bartol died in December of 1900. According to Heath, Bartol could in some ways be considered to be "the last of the Transcendentalists."[19] In Bartol's life-time, he wrote ten books, published sixty sermons, and penned numerous articles.[20]

There are a few scholars who argue in favor of Bartol's contributions to Transcendentalism and want him to be recognized. For instance, William G. Heath, Jr. observes that although Bartol had a significant impact on Transcendentalism, he has been "largely overlooked," despite the fact that his contemporaries understood him to be an important contributor to their

movement.[21] Additionally, William R. Hutchison claims that even though Bartol had "apparent failures and inconsistencies," these are the very things that make "him such a thoroughly representative figure in the nineteenth-century Unitarian movement."[22]

B. Emerson's Background

Ralph Waldo Emerson[23] was born in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1803. In 1817, he enrolled at Harvard College, from which he graduated in 1821. From then on, he experienced a difficult period of transition to ministry. In 1825, he entered the Harvard Divinity School; however, his studies were interrupted by eye trouble and rheumatism.[24] Emerson was licensed to preach as a Unitarian in 1826, and delivered his first sermon that same year. In 1828, he was made an honorary member of the Phi Beta Kappa Society.[25] In 1829, he was ordained as a Unitarian minister, and was invited to the Second Church, in Boston, as their junior pastor. In the same year, he married Ellen Tucker, even though they both knew that she was dying of tuberculosis.[26]

During the 1830's, Emerson experienced more significant turmoil. His wife, Ellen died in 1831. In 1832, just after he delivered the sermon "The Lord's Supper," he resigned his pastorate, then sailed for Europe, where he stayed until 1833. In England, Emerson made the acquaintance of, and developed friendships with Coleridge, Wordsworth, and John Stuart Mill. In Scotland, he met Thomas Carlyle, with whom he formed a lifelong friendship.

Emerson married Lidian Jackson in 1835, after his return home. The next year, his book *Nature* was published. In 1836, another significant event occurred: the first meeting of the Transcendental Club. Emerson was one of its founders and key persons. In 1838, he delivered a controversial address at the Harvard Divinity School and, as a result, was not invited back to the institution for about thirty years. Apparently, the religious community of Harvard Divinity School was not ready for the challenges Emerson presented in his address.

Emerson served as the editor of the *Dial* from 1842 to 1844, and published the book, *Poems*, in 1847. From 1847 to 1848, he visited Europe once more. In 1850, his work, *Representative Men*, was published. In 1867, as a sign of reconciliation from the school that had found his speech so

offensive nearly thirty years earlier, Harvard University presented him with an LL.D. degree and named him overseer of Harvard College. But difficulties still plagued Emerson. His house burned in 1872. That same year, his friends sent him on a trip to Europe and Egypt. He returned to the United States in 1873 and remained in America until his death. He died in 1882, at Concord, Massachusetts.

C. Bartol's Relationship with Emerson

Before investigating Bartol's ideas, or the relationship between Bartol and Emerson, it is important to note that Bartol was not merely an eccentric disciple of Emerson,[27] and that Bartol held emerging views that were distinct from Emerson. As Heath, Jr. points out,[28] Bartol's evolution as a Transcendentalist was the complete reverse of Emerson's. In the 1850s, Emerson's interest in Transcendentalism almost ended; but during that year, Bartol began to be a full-fledged Transcendentalist.

It is helpful to divide Bartol's relationship with Emerson into four periods.The first period is from 1836 to 1838; the second, from 1839 to 1853; the third, from 1854 to 1881; and the last, from 1882 to 1900.

The First Period (1836-1838). In 1836, Emerson published his first and very important book, *Nature*. The book's key notion seems to be that nature in its entirety serves as a metaphor for the human mind[29] Jaroslav Pelikan notes that this image could also be reversed, so that the human mind can become a metaphor for Nature. As he points out, Nature is the method through which Emerson approaches both science and human endeavors.[30] However, although it is unquestionable that *Nature* had an influence on Bartol, he did not directly write an article in order to respond to *Nature* at this point.

A few years later, in 1838, Emerson delivered the controversial "Divinity School Address." Conrad Wright claims that "there is a hidden meaning" in the address,[31] which he vividly describes below:

> On the Sundays when Emerson was not preaching at East Lexington, or elsewhere on exchange, he ordinarily attended the church in Concord. There, in the preaching of the Rev. Barzillai Frost, Emerson

> found ample confirmation of what, for his own peace of mind, he had to believe. Frost was a graduate of the Divinity School in Cambridge and a firm believer in the historical argument for Christianity, based on the miracles. He was also a faithful parish minister, regularly discharging his pastoral duties and making the rounds of his three hundred families. But he was a mediocre preacher....He wholly lacked the gift of eloquence, the power to change people's lives in an instant by the spoken word, that Emerson looked for in the true preacher. In short, he was a living example of all that Emerson thought was wrong with the clergy of his day....The address he [Emerson] carried with him to Cambridge seemed to be an objective and impersonal report of the universal decay of faith, and a protest against the triumph of formalism in the pulpit.[32]

In other words, what Emerson really intended to do in "The Divinty School Address" was protest contemporary preaching and propose its reform. He told his listeners:

> The injustice of the vulgar tone of preaching is not less flagrant to Jesus, than to the souls which it profanes. The preachers do not see that they make his gospel not glad, and shear him of the locks of beauty and the attributes of heaven. . . . When I see among my contemporaries, a true orator,.. I see beauty that is to be desired. . . . Now do not degrade the life and dialogues of Christ out of the circle of this charm, by insulation and peculiarity.[33]

However, Emerson explained that he did not believe it was possible to revive preaching through religion rebuilt with new rituals and structures. Instead, he suggested that preachers "let the breath of new life be breathed by you through the forms already existing." He told his colleagues that once they found new life, they would find that the old formats and rituals would "become plastic and new."[34] What is so very interesting here is that Emerson did not suggest reforming the church through new forms, but suggested renewing the church by the forms already in existence (in other words, within the framework of Unitarianism), even though he had

resigned his pastorate at this point. Hutchison emphasizes the same point when he describes Emerson's interest in preaching reform and Emerson's expectation that acceptance of new notions regarding human limitlessness would almost automatically remake church institutions. Therefore, Hutchison concludes, Emerson did not think that it was necessary for religious leaders to take any action, such as starting a new denomination or a new church.[35]

Bartol was among those present at "The Divinity School Address."[36] It is certain that Emerson's controversial address and his book, *Nature*, affected Bartol at his deepest level; however, Bartol did not react squarely and directly to "The Divinity School Address" via a scholarly article. What he did do was comment on the address informally in a letter to his friend, George E. Ellis. "Good will comes of [Emerson's] boldness and strangeness," Bartol noted. "It is well men should be waked up occasionally by a whirlwind that warns them to try the security of their own foundation."[37]

To reiterate, Emerson surely had great influence on Bartol, but during the first period, Bartol did not make a scholarly response to Emerson. In the second period, however, Bartol began to express his position and started to challenge Emerson.

The Second Period (1839-1853). In 1841, Emerson published *Essays: First Series*. In one composition, called "The Over-Soul," Emerson offered his description of God:

> In all conversation between two persons tacit reference is made, as to a third party, to a common nature. That third party or common nature is not social; it is impersonal; is God.[38]

Thus, in Emerson's opinion, God is not a personal being, but an impersonal force that exists in the commonality between two people.

Six years later, in 1847, Emerson published *Poems*, a text containing sixty works of poetry. One of the pieces is titled "Hymn." Although the title would lead one to expect that the poem contains Christian words and content, it has neither Christian vocabulary nor Christian content.[39] Furthermore, when Emerson published *Representative Men* in 1850, he chose Plato (the philosopher); Swedenborg (the mystic); Montaigne (the

skeptic); Shakespeare (the poet); Napoleon (the man of the world); and Goethe (the writer) as representative men. There is no mention at all of a representative religious figure in his work.

It is from this second period on that Bartol began to make clear his position and to criticize Emerson. In 1847, Bartol wrote an article called "Poetry and Imagination" in response to Emerson's *Poems*. In his essay, Bartol was critical of Emerson, noting that he could not find any reference to Christianity in the material. He further complained that Emerson did not seem to prefer Jesus to "any other great and good man." Bartol also observed that Emerson made no distinction between humans and God, nor did he use images depicting personal God. Moreover, Bartol opined that Emerson's work ignored "Bible and ritual."[40] In addition, he was offended by Emerson's attempts to "make all things deity," and argued that by taking such a position, Emerson was debasing God. Furthermore, Bartol complained that if Emerson's way of thinking ever caught on, then the attitude found in his essays would lead people away from, rather than to, God.[41]

In 1850, Bartol wrote "Representative Men," as a reaction to Emerson's *Representative Men*. Among other criticisms, Bartol noted that Emerson's "restless struggle to reach broader classifications and reduce all things to ever lower terms" was destructive to both life and spirit, and illustrative of a defect in Emerson's intellectual process.[42]

In short, it was during the second period that Bartol began to criticize Emerson. One of his primary complaints was that Emerson's God was impersonal. In Bartol's opinion, God was just the opposite. In fact, a personal deity is characteristic of Bartol's notion of God. Other scholars support this contention. For instance, Heath, Jr. notes:

> Bartol finds the greatest expression of his own position in a personal theism, a belief that "God is the ultimate person and, as such, is the ground of all being and the creator of finite persons."[43]

The Third Period (1854-1881). This period ranges from Bartol's visit to Europe until Emerson's death. It is, especially in the early years of this period, the turning point in Bartol's ministerial life.

In 1857, Bartol arrived at the conclusion that the traditional Lord's Supper was hypocritical, and found that he could no longer administer Holy Communion using the conventional rite. He was so adamant about this belief that he decided to consider resigning, should the West Church leadership demand that he continue to observe the traditional Holy Communion service, even though he had served the congregation for twenty years.[44] What Bartol wanted to do was to replace the traditional, discriminatory Holy Communion with an open form of communion, thus allowing people to make the decision to participate based on their own discretion and their own relationship with God.[45]

Several factors served as the catalysts that caused Bartol to teeter on the edge of radical belief. Heath, Jr. points out that the reason for the change was primarily a six-month sojourn through Europe in 1854.[46] However, it seems that Bartol held his position regarding communion as early as 1853, the year that he wrote "Eating the Lord's Supper." In the essay, he notes that "no man, no banded ecclesiastic sway, no sectarian or papal excommunication, can dispossess us of our seat. The absolute Disposer assigns it."[47] In other words, whether or not one participated in the Lord's Supper was determined not by human regulations, but by one's relationship with the deity.

At this point, Bartol went to Emerson for advice. Heath, Jr., says that this action may seem odd, given the fact that Bartol had so vigorously attacked Emerson's impersonal God concept in 1847. However, as Heath, Jr. points out, Bartol also knew that in 1832 Emerson had experienced a similar crisis regarding communion.[48] In short, by 1857, Bartol had reached the same place at which Emerson had arrived twenty-five years earlier. In his book, *Ralph Waldo Emerson: A Discourse in West Church*, Bartol reveals Emerson's response to his request for advice:

> Twenty-five years ago, unable myself longer to administer the rite of communion to a congregation divided by a benediction as a sword, I asked his [Emerson's] counsel, and he advised me. . . not to withdraw from my post. . . . I inquired about his farewell sermon in which he had treated the theme; and he first loaned and then gave it me in his own handwriting, declining to have it returned.[49]

In 1885, Bartol revisited Emerson's generous reply in his essay "Emerson's Religion." He wrote that Emerson urged him not to leave ministry. Instead, he encouraged Bartol to try to effect reforms from within the church. To provide Bartol with yet another reason to remain in the ministry, Emerson explained that his own break with pastoral tie had caused him great emotional pain.[50]

As previously mentioned, Emerson had provided Bartol with his 1832 farewell sermon for the Second Church. The title of this discourse was, "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace and joy in the holy ghost." In it, Emerson concluded that "Jesus did not intend to establish an institution for perpetual observance when he ate the passover with his disciples." Such an understanding, Emerson told his parishioners, had brought him to the conclusion that it was not advisable for the church to continue observing the rite in the traditional manner.[51] Emerson went on to explain that the Lord's Supper was actually the Passover supper, and that Jesus "did with his disciples exactly what every master of a family in Jerusalem was doing at the same hour with his household." Based on this observation, Emerson claimed that Jesus never intended for his last supper with the disciples "to be the foundation of a perpetual institution." What Emerson found surprising, therefore, was not the origin of the Supper, but that the ritual had managed to remain a sacrament in nineteenth-century churches.[52] In his sermon, Emerson was careful to explain that he felt "no hostility" toward the members of the Second Church. However, because the congregation viewed Holy Communion as "an indispensable part of the pastoral office," he realized that he had no choice but to resign his position as their minister.[53]

It is clear that Bartol had reached the same understanding in 1857 that Emerson had reached in 1832. That is, Emerson had become a Transcendentalist by 1832,[54] while Bartol became a full-fledged Transcendentalist in 1857. Even though Emerson left the ministry, both men were eager for church reform. The desire for congregational change was not unusual among Transcendentalists. In fact, as David M. Robinson observes, "the impulse toward church reform was a fundamental energy of Transcendentalism."[55]

Despite their similarities, some of Bartol's opinions did diverge from those of Emerson. For instance, with regard to the Lord's Supper and the concept of God, Bartol and Emerson had different understandings. While Emerson considered administering the Lord's Supper as *non sequitur*, Bartol thought that the rite should not be discriminatory but open to all those who wished to partake in it. After 1857 Bartol scarcely mentioned Emerson in his writings and referred to Emerson's philosophy only covertly, until 1882, the year of Emerson's death.[56]

In short, the third period, especially the early stage of this period was pivotal in Bartol's life as a minister and a religious thinker. In a larger framework, Bartol had arrived at the same position as Emerson about Transcendentalism. However, Bartol was not merely a devotee of Emerson. When it came to other details, especially those regarding the Lord's Supper and the concept of God, Bartol held different positions from Emerson.

The Fourth Period (1882-1900). When Emerson died in 1882, Bartol broke his silence. Between 1882 and 1884, he delivered three discourses in which he examined Emerson from many aspects.[57]

The first discourse, entitled "Ralph Waldo Emerson," was delivered at the West Church in 1882 just after Emerson's death. In the first part of the discourse, Bartol related how his relationship with Emerson had early grown "into love and friendship for this man." He added that Emerson had done Sunday preaching at only one church in the period that covered his resignation to his death. That sole church was Bartol's, and Emerson had addressed the congregation on the subject of immortality.[58]

Interestingly, in this discourse, Bartol looked back on Emerson's "Divinity School Address" of 1838. Bartol's comments would lead one to assume that he was favorably disposed toward "The Address":

> It was my fortune, the year after my ordination, to hear his [Emerson's] far-sounding Divinity School address, with its preface of petition from his lips, without any personal pronoun applied to the Deity, yet a supplication, as I distinctly remember it, in this wise: "We desire of the Infinite Wisdom and Goodness to be led into the Truth. So may it be by our lowliness and seeking! This we ask of the Infinite

> Wisdom and Goodness." . . . I think it was heard on hign, and I know some answer sank into my heart.[59]

Yet, as Heath, Jr. points out, theologically speaking, Bartol considered Emerson's defect to be "his attempt to gloss over the darker side of life."[60] In other word, Bartol was critical about Emerson's reluctance to deal with the subject of Satan.[61]

The second discourse was a lecture delivered at the Concord School of Philosophy as part of Emerson's commemoration in the summer of 1882. The title of Bartol's lecture was "The Nature of Knowledge: Emerson's Way." In it, Bartol observed and supported Emerson's life and ideas during his last years. He stated that Emerson was afraid of "the excesses of radicalism." This fear led Emerson to label some of the more prominent radicals of his day as "frivolous." Furthermore, Bartol praised Emerson's later attendance at Sunday worship services, claiming that he saw the behavior as "a spiritual ascent . . . and not an intellectual decline."[62]

Theologically speaking, Bartol regarded Emerson as one who "did not believe in sacrifice nor sin nor the devil nor in two, but in one as Author or sum of all, in the unit as the largest and only number."[63] It seems clear that Bartol's observation of Emerson agrees with his first discourse in 1882. However, Bartol still disagreed with Emerson's concept of impersonal deity in the second discourse. He described their difference in belief in the following incident:

> At a meeting in my house, he had said, "Shall we not say *It* in speaking of the divinity?" at which position I entered my protest. But a friend and philosopher there disputed my speech, and defended his, which, however, afterward I never heard him repeat. There is peril in the personal pronouns applied to the One whose image man and woman are. But in the neuter are there not risk and inadequacy all the more? *It* we cannot love, serve, commune with, entreat, crave aught from, thank, or, in the phrase of the Westminster catechism, "glorify forever." Trinity of persons is better than Impersonality. But God is in all persons, and all persons are in him. He is Person.[64]

Once again, Bartol repeated his opposition to Emerson in this 1882 lecture. Therefore, one can see that in the second and fourth period, Bartol disagreed with Emerson regarding the concept of an impersonal God. In fact, throughout Bartol's life, he could not, at any cost, accept Emerson's theory about an impersonal God.

The last lecture, on the subject of "The Genius and Character of Emerson," was delivered at the Concord School of Philosophy in the summer of 1884. The title of Bartol's discourse was "Emerson's Religion." In this piece, Bartol especially defended Emerson from those who would give a negative evaluation of Emerson's religious life:

> Doubtless he swung from and then back to Christianity, but never quite away. . . . He broke with the organized religion of the Church, not on a point of faith, but of form. . . . He belongs to no denomination, but to the humanity in all.(65)

Furthermore, Bartol even went so far as to regard Emerson as a pious person. He explained that, during a worship service in Emerson's house, he observed how Emerson's religion was expressed as a high, powerful feeling, and that this feeling could be clearly seen by the rapturous expression on Emerson's face.(66) Although one may feel that it is strange for Bartol to describe Emerson as a pious person, it is, in reality, not such an odd thing. As David M. Robinson explains, Emerson had been nourished by "a dynamic and evolving liberalism," the pietistic strain of which had a strong influence on him. Therefore, Robinson insists that scholars must take into account the strong influence of "the pietism of the early Unitarian movement" on Emerson.(67) When viewed from this perspective, it is clear that the piety of Emerson's youth was connected to his return to a pietistic form of Unitarianism in his later days. As Bartol put it, "Emerson reverts to his ancestry. The old Puritan in him revives."(68) Therefore, one can infer that Emerson's spiritual journey was one of transfer from pietistic Unitarianism to Transcendentalism in the 1830's, but that he reverted from Transcendentalism to pietistic Unitarianism in the 1850's, when Bartol departed from a Unitarian to become a Transcendentalist.

In this lecture, Bartol not only defended Emerson from a negative evalu-

ation of his religion, but also positively gave him a high evaluation:

> Should I be suffered to select the three great characters of American history, I should name Washington, Lincoln, and Emerson. In the religious sphere, Unitarianism has given us Channing; Methodism, Taylor; Quakerism, Whittier; Transcendentalism, Emerson, - - a soul religious because reverent for what deserves to be revered.[69]

However, theologically speaking, Bartol continued to disagree with Emerson on the same two points that he disagreed with in the first and second discourses. One disagreement was that "Emerson was not fond of the night side."[70] In effect, Emerson shied away from the darker aspects of life. The other disagreement continued to be with Emerson's impersonal God concept. Bartol complained that "Emerson can scarcely say Thou to Him of whom he is part." Bartol went on to cite Emerson's impersonal prayer offered before "The Divinity School Address" as an example. He noted that Emerson invoked "Infinite wisdom and Goodness to grant light to our lowliness."[71] Therefore, rather than pray to "Our Father" or another name for the Divine Person, Emerson chose to address instead a force comprised of wisdom and goodness.

To sum up the last period of Bartol's thinking, one can say that he not only defended Emerson but also had a high opinion of Emerson's religious life. Nevertheless, Bartol still did not agree with Emerson's theology, especially with Emerson's disregard of humanity's darker side and with his concept of an impersonal God.

III. Conclusion

I have explored five points in this study. First, according to Beckford's categories, nineteenth-century New England Transcendentalism can be considered to be a reform movement within the framework of Unitarianism in nineteenth-century New England.

Second, Transcendentalism in nineteenth-century New England religion can be understood to be a sect, or a special aspect of Unitarianism,

because (according to Wach's criteria,) Transcendentalism was a form of protest within Unitarianism and because (according to Niebuhr's theory,) Transcendentalism cannot be seen as a denomination, even though (according to Weber,) it had a community of personal believers.

Third, regarding the question about whether Transcendentalism is a religious movement, a philosophical movement, or a literary movement, one can say that Transcendentalism is mainly a religious movement, although it truly contains aspects from the other two categories.

Fourth, the relationships between Bartol and Emerson within the larger frameworks stated above, make it clear that the two men had different access to Transcendentalism. For instance, Emerson transferred from Unitarianism to Transcendentalism in the 1830's, and began to revert from Transcendentalism to Unitarianism in the 1850's. However, in the 1850's, Bartol departed from Unitarianism and became a Transcendentalist. In short, Bartol's evolution as a Transcendentalist was the complete reverse of Emerson's evolution.

Finally, Bartol was not merely a disciple of Emerson. He held a position of his own. However, Bartol's position in relation to Emerson was transformational and developed over four periods. In the first period (1836-1838), Bartol was truly influenced by Emerson, but did not react to Emerson in a scholarly way. In the second period (1839-1853), Bartol began to express his own point of view and started to criticize his friend. Bartol, who held to the concept of a personal deity, found fault with Emerson's impersonal God. Thus, a personal theism is an unchanging characteristic of Bartol's notion of God. During the third period (1854-1881), in a broad context, Bartol reached the same position as Emerson. However, this does not mean that Bartol was merely a disciple of Emerson. In particular, he took a position different than his friend regarding the Lord's Supper and, once again, regarding the notion of God. In the last period (1882-1900), Bartol not only defended Emerson's religious life, but even gave it a high evaluation. Nevertheless, Bartol did not agree with Emerson's disregard of humanity's darker side and continued to oppose Emerson's concept of an impersonal God.

Notes

(1) It was while studying Horace Bushnell that the author of this essay became interested in Cyrus Augustus Bartol. Bushnell and Bartol were good clerical friends.
(2) James A. Beckford, "New Religions: An Overview," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion* vol. 10, 1987.
(3) Michael Hill, "Sect," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion* vol. 13, 1987.
(4) Ibid., 155.
(5) Ibid., 155.
(6) Ibid., 155.
(7) Ibid., 156.
(8) Catherine L. Albanese also states, "Transcendentalists could never make the transition from movement to institution." Catherine L. Albanese, "Transcendentalism," in *Encyclopedia of the American Religious Experience: Studies of Traditions and Movements*, 1988.
(9) Conrad Wright, "Unitarianism and Transcendentalism," in *The Transcendentalists: A Review of Research and Criticism*, 1984.
(10) Ibid., 49.
(11) William R. Hutchison, *The Transcendentalist Ministers: Church Reform in the New England Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), viii.
(12) William G. Heath, Jr., "Introduction," in *On Sprit and Personality* (Minnesota: The John Colet Press, 1977), ix-xliv. See also William G. Heath, Jr., "Cyrus Bartol, Transcendentalist: An Early Critic of Emerson" (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1970), 7-52.
(13) Heath, Jr., "Introduction," xiii.
(14) Ibid., xiii-xiv. Horace Bushnell was also greatly influenced by Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*.
(15) Heath, Jr., "Cyrus Bartol, Transcendentalist," 11.
(16) Ibid., 11.
(17) Heath, Jr., "Introduction," xvii.
(18) Ibid., xvii.
(19) Ibid., xxxiii.
(20) William R. Hutchison, "To Heaven in a Swing: The Transcendentalism of Cyrus Bartol," *The Harvard Theological Review* LVI (1963): 276. Ten books by Bartol are as follows: *Discourses on the Christian Spirit and Boston* in 1850, *Discourses on the Christian Body and Form* in 1853, *Grains of Gold; or, Select Thought on Sacred Themes* in 1854, *Pictures of Europe, Framed in Ideas* in 1855, *The West Church and Its*

Ministers in 1856, *Church and Congregation: A Plea for their Unity* in 1858, *The Word of the Spirit to the Church* in 1859, *Radical Problems* in 1872, *The Rising Faith* in 1874, and *Principles and Portraits* in 1880.

(21) Heath, Jr., "Cyrus Bartol, Transcendentalist," 1, and "Introduction," ix.

(22) Hutchison, "To Heaven in a Swing," 275.

(23) "Chronology," in *Ralph Waldo Emerson: Collected Poems and Translations*, 1994.

(24) Ibid., 555.

(25) Ibid., 556.

(26) Ibid., 556.

(27) Heath, Jr., "Introduction," x.

(28) Heath, Jr., "Cyrus Bartol, Transcendentalist," 2.

(29) Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Complete Works* Vol.I (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1894), 38.

(30) Jaroslav Pelikan, "Nature as Natural History and as Human History: An Introduction to Ralph Waldo Emerson's Nature of 1836," in *Nature* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1985), 36.

(31) Conrad Wright, "Introduction," in *Three Prophets of Religious Liberalism: Channing-Emerson-Parker* (Boston: Unitarian Universalist Association, 1986), 27.

(32) Ibid., 25-27.

(33) Emerson, *Complete Works* Vol.I 132.

(34) Ibid., 147.

(35) Hutchison, The *Transcendental Ministers*, 138.

(36) Wright, "Introduction," 27.

(37) Heath, Jr., "Introduction," xvii.

(38) Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Complete Works* Vol.II (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1894), 260.

(39) Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Ralph Waldo Emerson: Collected Poems and Translations* (New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1994), 125.

(40) Cyrus Bartol, "Poetry and Imagination," *The Christian Examiner* 42 (1847): 257-58.

(41) Ibid., 262.

(42) Cyrus Bartol, "Representative Men," *The Christian Examiner and Religious Miscellany* 48 (1850): 317.

(43) Heath, Jr., "Introduction," ix-x.

(44) Heath, Jr., "Cyrus Bartol, Transcendentalist," 91.

(45) Ibid., 92-93.

(46) Ibid., 52.

(47) Cyrus Bartol, *Discourses on the Christian Body and Form* (Boston: Crosby, Nichols, and Company, 1853), 103.

(48) Heath, Jr., "Cyrus Bartol, Transcendentalist," 91.

(49) Cyrus Bartol, *Ralph Waldo Emerson: A Discourse in West Church* (Boston: A. Williams & Co., 1882), 9.

(50) Cyrus Bartol, "Emerson's Religion," in *The Genius and Character of Emerson: Lectures at the Concord School of Philosophy*, ed. F. B. Sanborn (Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1885), 110.

(51) Ralph Waldo Emerson, "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace and joy in the holy ghost," in *The Complete Sermons of Ralph Waldo Emerson* vol. 4, ed. Wesley T. Mott (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1992), 186.

(52) Ibid., 187-89.

(53) Ibid., 194.

(54) David M. Robinson, "The Sermon of Ralph Waldo Emerson: An Introductory Historical Essay," in *The Complete Sermons of Ralph Waldo Emerson* vol. 1, ed. Albert J. von Frank (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1989), 29.

(55) Robinson, 17.

(56) Heath, Jr., "Cyrus Bartol, Transcendentalist," 171.

(57) Ibid., 172.

(58) Bartol, *Ralph Waldo Emerson: A Discourse in West Church*, 4.

(59) Ibid., 8-9.

(60) Heath, Jr., "Cyrus Bartol, Transcendentalist," 173.

(61) Bartol, *Ralph Waldo Emerson*, 10.

(62) Cyrus Bartol, "The Nature of Knowledge: Emerson's Way," *Unitarian Review and Religious Magazine* vol. 18 (1882): 310.

(63) Ibid., 304.

(64) Ibid., 296.

(65) Bartol, "Emerson's Religion," 110, 111,116.

(66) Ibid., 109.

(67) Robinson, 7-8. In addition, Robinson points out the interesting connection between pietism and Unitarianism: "Emerson prepared for the ministry during the Second Great Awakening (1800-1830).... The Unitarians were more than participants in the Second Great Awakening; they were among its pioneers.... Liberals came to realize that they had to demonstrate the emotional power of their enlightened theology as well and prove that their theological advancement had not come at the cost of the piety of their Puritan ancestors. To evoke emotional fervor while resisting the perceived excesses of revivalism was the task that devolved to the Unitarian ministry when Emerson began to prepare for it." 18.

(68) Bartol, "Emerson's Religion," 115.

(69) Ibid., 133.

(70) Ibid., 118, 120-21.

(71) Ibid., 113.

Bibliography

Albanese, Catherine L. "Transcendentalism." In *Encyclopedia of the American Religious Experience: Studies of Traditions and Movements*. 1988.

Bartol, Cyrus. *Discourse on the Christian Body and Form*. Boston: Nichols, and Company, 1853.

____. "Emerson's Religion." In *The Genius and Character of Emerson: Lectures at the Concord School of Philosophy*, ed. F. B. Sanborn. Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1885.

____. "Poetry and Imagination." *The Christian Examiner* 42. (1847).

____. *Ralph Waldo Emerson: A Discourse in West Church*. Boston: A. Williams & Co., 1882.

____. "Representative Men." *The Christian Examiner and Religious Miscellany* 48 (1850).

____. "The Nature of Knowledge: Emerson's Way." *Unitarian Review and Religious Magazine* 18 (1882).

Beckford, James A. "New Religion: An Overview." In *The Encyclopedia od Religion*. 1987.

"Chronology." In *Ralph Waldo Emerson: Collected Poems and Translations*, eds. Bloom, Harold, and Paul Kane. New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1994.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *Complete Works*. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1894.

____. *Ralph Waldo Emerson: Collected Poems and Translations*. New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1994.

____. "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.

Heath, Jr., William G. "Cyrus Bartol, Transcendentalist: An Early Critic of Emerson." Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1970.

____. "Introduction." In *On Spirit and Personality*. Minnesota: The Colet Press, 1977.

Hill, Michael. "Sect." In *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. 1987.

Hutchison, William R. *The Transcendentalist Ministers: Church Reform in the New England Renaissance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

____. "To Heaven in a Swing: The Transcendentalism of Cyrus Bartol." *The Harvard Theological Review* LVI (1963).

Pelikan, Jaroslav. "Nature as Natural History and as Human History: An Introduction to Ralph waldo Emerson's Nature of 1836." In *Nature*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1985.

Robinson, David M. "The Sermon of Ralph Waldo Emerson: An Introductory Historical

Essay." In *The Complete Sermons of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, vol. 1, ed. Albert J. von Frank. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1989.

Wright, Conrad. "Introduction." In *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*, 1984.

(Submitted on October 25, 2004.)