

## ABSTRACT

### Goodwill, Ministers, and Manliness: The Idea of Benevolence in Antebellum American Benevolent Societies and Seminary Education

Jacob E. Hiserman, M.A.

Mentor: Andrea L. Turpin, Ph.D.

This thesis evaluates the idea of benevolence in two antebellum American benevolent societies, the American Education Society (AES) and the American Home Missionary Society (AHMS), and then explores whether or not any notion of benevolence animated three antebellum seminaries. It argues that those two organizations held an idea of benevolence as ministerial manliness—strong and educated male ministers leading and modeling benevolence—as an imagined trait of orthodox Congregational and Presbyterian ministers contrary to historian Ann Douglas’s contention of feminized liberal Congregationalist (Unitarian) ministers. Andover Seminary, the first case study, expounded benevolence as ministerial manliness but Union Seminary and Danville Seminary did not propagate any idea of benevolence, leaving ministerial manliness an imagined concept divorced from real ideas in Presbyterian seminaries. Overall, this work nuances the recent scholarly focus on

antebellum benevolence and benevolent leadership as mainly female by analyzing male gender and male leadership in the AES and AHMS.

Goodwill, Ministers, and Manliness: The Idea of Benevolence in Antebellum American  
Benevolent Societies and Seminary Education

by

Jacob E. Hiserman, B.A.

A Thesis

Approved by the Department of History

---

Barry G. Hankins, Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree  
of  
Master of Arts

Approved by the Thesis Committee

---

Andrea L. Turpin, Ph.D., Chairperson

---

T. Michael Parrish, Ph.D.

---

Perry L. Glanzer, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School

August 2018

---

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2018 by Jacob E. Hiserman

All rights reserved

## CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	viii
Dedication.....	ix
Chapter One The Marketplace of Benevolence.....	1
Antebellum Benevolence.....	2
Many Meanings of Benevolence.....	3
A Note on Etymology and Methodology.....	3
Jonathan Edwards.....	4
Adam Smith.....	8
Samuel Hopkins and the New Divinity.....	14
Philanthropy: An Alternative to Benevolence?.....	19
Historiography/Literature Review.....	22
Chapter Two The AES Idea of Benevolence.....	30
New England, the American Nation, and the AES.....	30
The AES: An Arm of the Benevolent Empire.....	34
Benevolence: An Idea in Print.....	37
The AES and Gender: Ministers, Manliness, and Femininity.....	46
The AES and Race.....	52
Conclusion.....	54
Chapter Three Benevolence and the AHMS.....	55
Early Tensions.....	57

A Christian, Patriotic System.....	59
The Patriotic Piece of the System.....	66
Essentializing the Western Man.....	69
One of Racism’s Compatriots.....	78
Conclusion.....	81
Chapter Four  Ideas of Benevolence in Antebellum Seminaries.....	83
Andover Seminary: The Beating Heart of Benevolence.....	87
Union Seminary: Minor Engagement in Benevolence.....	99
Danville Theological Seminary: No Place for Benevolence.....	108
Conclusion.....	112
Chapter Five  Conclusion: Ministers and American Intellectual Life.....	114
Bibliography.....	121

## ABBREVIATIONS

AES	American Education Society
AHMS	American Home Missionary Society
ACS	American Colonization Society
QR	<i>American Quarterly Register</i>
RHMS	<i>Report of the American Home Missionary Society</i>

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many scholars and colleagues made this thesis possible. Nevertheless, highest thanks goes to Dr. Andrea L. Turpin, my advisor, for reading many drafts and challenging me to think about intellectual history, benevolence, higher education, and nineteenth-century America in new ways. Dr. T. Michael Parrish and Dr. Perry L. Glanzer offered wonderful suggestions during my thesis defense. I also owe much gratitude to Benjamin Leavitt for his insightful comments while workshopping our thesis chapters and other papers during our days in the Baylor M.A. program. Additionally, Dr. Parrish nurtured the Southern history portion of my thesis through his Fall 2016 Religion in the American South course and a few long and happy conversations on Southern history and benevolence. For that I am ever thankful. Drs. Thomas Kidd, Joseph Stubenrauch, Beth Allison Barr, and Barry Hankins all read and gave brilliant feedback on my seminar papers that became parts of this thesis. Many other friends and colleagues listened to me talk of benevolence and helped me refine my ideas on it. My mother and father, Jeff and Helen Hiserman, and future in-laws, Randy and Linda Wimmer provided me with the love and moral, spiritual, and nutritional support necessary to complete this thesis. Lastly, I thank God, *qui salvandos salvas gratis*, for the graces He gave me which made it possible to successfully finish this work for His glory.



*To Stacie, my fiancée, for all of her editing and encouragement of my writing*

“And the king answering, shall say to them: Amen I say to you, as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me.”

—Matthew 25:40, Douay-Rheims 1899 American Edition

## CHAPTER ONE

### The Marketplace of Benevolence

The line between the theological and the social continually fluctuates throughout history. Sometimes historical actors sought a sharp delineation between the two realms, but others mixed them into bright hues. Indeed, the concept of benevolence, goodwill or love towards God and all humans, straddled the realms of the theological and the social—society and the class, racial, and gendered forces which shaped it. Though a creature of both worlds, benevolence has its roots in the theological consciousness of the British Atlantic world. Intellectual historian Gertrude Himmelfarb describes benevolence and its organizational outcroppings as the distinguishing mark of the eighteenth-century British Enlightenment.<sup>1</sup> Other historians trace the American path of benevolence back to the Puritan Calvinist theological giant, Jonathan Edwards, and his treatise, *The Nature of True Virtue* (1765).<sup>2</sup> A disciple of Edwards, theologian Samuel Hopkins, picked up Edwards' strain and developed it in his work, *An Inquiry into the Nature of True Holiness* (1773). Then, the followers of Hopkins—known as the New Divinity or Hopkinsianism

---

<sup>1</sup> Gertrude Himmelfarb, *The Roads to Modernity: The British, French, and American Enlightenments* (New York: Vintage Books, 2005), 131-146. Additionally, Abram C. van Engen places sympathy, a term related to benevolence, as a distinguishing mark of Puritan literature and society that came from England in *Sympathetic Puritans: Calvinist Fellow Feeling in Early New England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

<sup>2</sup> On this, see George M. Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards: A Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003), 464-471. For an opposite view, see William J. Danaher, Jr., "Beauty, Benevolence, and Virtue in Jonathan Edwards's *The Nature of True Virtue*," *Journal of Religion* 87, no. 3 (July 2007): 386-410, accessed April 13, 2018, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=25301849&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.

—consistently and prodigiously applied the theology of benevolence to the burgeoning American public realm for social uplift—raising the economic, personal, and social status of individuals and groups.<sup>3</sup> Both Edwards and Hopkins provided the baseline conception of benevolence for nineteenth-century American Protestants.

### *Antebellum Benevolence*

Benevolent societies took numerous forms in nineteenth-century America such as poor relief, anti-slavery activism, and opposition to alcohol consumption, among others. These endeavors manifested themselves at local and national levels.<sup>4</sup> This thesis centers around national benevolent organizations such as the American Education Society, American Home Missionary Society, American Women's Educational Association, American Missionary Association, American Bible Society, American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, and the American Tract Society, among others. It questions whether different ideological strains of benevolence animated the American Education Society (AES), an interdenominational eleemosynary organization extant from 1815-1921 that raised funds to assist indigent ministerial candidates with their formal liberal arts and seminary higher education, and the American Home Missionary Society (AHMS), an interdenominational society that sent ministers to churches in the Western

---

<sup>3</sup> On the New Divinity debates about social causes, see Kenneth P. Minkema and Harry S. Stout, “The Edwardsean Tradition and the Antislavery Debate, 1740-1865,” *Journal of American History* 92, no. 1 (June 2005), 47-74, accessed April 14, 2018, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=19324139&site=ehost-live&scope=site>. For the New Divinity and racial uplift, see John Saillant, “Lemuel Haynes's Black Republicanism and the American Republican Tradition, 1775-1820,” *Journal of the Early Republic* 14, no. 3 (Autumn 1994), 293-324, accessed February 13, 2017, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3124515>.

<sup>4</sup> For a superb study of local benevolence, see John W. Quist, *Restless Visionaries: The Social Roots of Antebellum Reform in Alabama and Michigan* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1998).

United States from 1826-1893. The driving concern of this thesis is how the AES and AHMS conception of benevolence for ministers opens the way for exploration into how antebellum benevolence was gendered male. I chose the AES and AHMS because they provide a window into the antebellum ideas of religion, ministers, gender, education, and benevolence with their focus on benevolence for male ministers not found in other national benevolent societies. As a starting point, three major interpretations of benevolence in the British Atlantic World, Edwards's, Adam Smith's and Hopkins's, will be evaluated.

### *Many Meanings of Benevolence*

#### *A Note on Etymology and Methodology*

Etymologically, benevolence means “good will.” “*Bene*” is Latin for “good” and “*volo*,” the Latin verb meaning “to will, to want.” Additionally, nineteenth century intellectuals also used the term “eleemosynary” as a synonym for charitable societies. That word has origins in the Latin for “alm,” *eleemosyn*. Finally, clarification on the ways “benevolence” differs from philanthropy (“phil” is a prefix of Greek origin for “love” and *anthropos* is Greek for man [as in human])—so the word literally means “lover of man” also occurs in this introduction. Methodologically, I follow in the footsteps of Quentin Skinner's magisterial 1969 article, “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas” because I recognize the contradictory nature of ideas held by historical actors and the contextual influence of the actor upon his or her ideas(s).<sup>5</sup> Therefore, the proper

---

<sup>5</sup> Quentin Skinner, “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas,” *History and Theory*, 8 no.1 (1969), 30, 38, 47, accessed September 16, 2017, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2504188>.

primary avenue of inquiry remains exposition of the definition of the idea of benevolence to discover whether it was monolithic or polysemous in nineteenth-century America.

### *Jonathan Edwards*

In the American colonies, Puritan theologian Jonathan Edwards formulated an idea of benevolence in his treatise, *The Nature of True Virtue*.<sup>6</sup> His multifarious influences centered on the thought of the moderate Enlightenment and the social stability of New England as a British royal colony.<sup>7</sup> Edwards held that virtue is a type of beauty.<sup>8</sup> This came from the philosophical thought of David Hume, Francis Hutcheson, and Lord Shaftesbury.<sup>9</sup> Adam Smith's famous moral text, the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, did not influence Edwards' *True Virtue* because *Moral Sentiments* was

---

<sup>6</sup> Danaher argued that *True Virtue* is not Edwards's paradigmatic text about benevolence. Instead, a combination of Edwards's works, from sermons such as "The Excellency of Christ" to *Charity and its Fruits* and *Religious Affections* expound the entirety of Edwards's theology of benevolence. Danaher, "Beauty, Benevolence, and Virtue," 388-89, 409-10. *The Nature of True Virtue* will be shortened to *True Virtue* throughout the remainder of the thesis.

<sup>7</sup> Gerald McDermott argues that Edwards's relation to the Enlightenment was "one of critical appropriation" since deism altered his thinking on truth in non-Christian religions in *Jonathan Edwards Confronts the Gods: Christian Theology, Enlightenment Religion, and Non-Christian Faiths* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009). Norman Fiering delineates Edwards' intellectual contact and wrestling with Hume, Malebranche, Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, and the benevolists, and Andrew Ramsay and the Quietists in *Jonathan Edwards' Moral Thought and its British Context* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987). Smith and Edwards were reading Hutcheson and replying to him on benevolence in some way. Leon Chai pinpoints Edwards as the final gasp of the new Enlightenment philosophy, its appeal, and its natural limits in *Jonathan Edwards and the Limits of Enlightenment Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), accessed June 3, 2017, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=23517&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.

<sup>8</sup> Jonathan Edwards, "The Nature of True Virtue" in *Two Dissertations, I. Concerning the End for which GOD Created the World II. The Nature of True Virtue* (Boston: S. Kneeland, 1765), 116, Google Book. Cited hereafter as *True Virtue*. Leslie Ellen Brown, *Artful Virtue: The Interplay of the Beautiful and Good in the Scottish Enlightenment* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2015), 33-34.

<sup>9</sup> Brown, *Artful Virtue*, 33-34 and Fiering, *Jonathan Edwards' Moral Thought*, 111, 327.

published in 1759, a year after Edwards' death, and Hutcheson was Smith's mentor.<sup>10</sup>

The chronological and intellectual gap between the texts of Edwards and Smith provides an opportunity to look at the currency of the separate idea of benevolence in each moral philosopher in the early American intellectual landscape.

In *True Virtue*, Edwards argued for a generalized and philosophical account of virtue as part of the transatlantic development of eighteenth-century moral philosophy.<sup>11</sup> He distinguished between particular and general virtue. Particular beauty remained beautiful due to certain, limited relationships to objects while general beauty is the beauty of the whole in all of its relations.<sup>12</sup> Then, Edwards concluded true virtue is general beauty of the heart of a rational being or "true and general beauty of the heart" or "benevolence to Being in general."<sup>13</sup> Alternatively, George Marsden sums up true virtue, true love, or real benevolence for Edwards as "love that resonates with God's love and is in harmony with it."<sup>14</sup> Therefore, Edwards gave his definition of true virtue and introduces the concept of benevolence.

Benevolence resides in the love of affection mixed with good-will. Edwards defined good-will as "that consent, propensity and union of heart to Being in general."<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Douglas A Sweeney and Allen C. Guelzo, eds., "Introduction" In *The New England Theology: From Jonathan Edwards to Edwards Amasa Park* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006), 15.

<sup>11</sup> Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards*, 464.

<sup>12</sup> Edwards, *True Virtue*, 117.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 117.

<sup>14</sup> Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards*, 467.

<sup>15</sup> Edwards, *True Virtue*, 118.

Besides God, being in general encompasses all beings that have intellect and will.<sup>16</sup> For Edwards, good-will is love, the love of benevolence.<sup>17</sup> This love contrasted to the love of complacency—“delight in beauty, or complacency in the person or Being beloved for his beauty.”<sup>18</sup> Those who are not beautiful must be loved with a benevolent disposition despite their lack of beauty, according to Edwards. He further clarified, saying, “he that has true virtue, consisting in benevolence to Being in general, and in that complacency in virtue, or moral beauty, and benevolence to virtuous Being, must necessarily have a supreme love to God, both of benevolence and complacency.”<sup>19</sup> Real virtue lies in love of God because He is the all-beautiful Creator of humankind and all human beings because they are His creation.<sup>20</sup> Therefore, for Edwards, God remained the source of existence, beauty, and will in humans and benevolence is due to Him on that account.

A distinguishing factor of Edwards' discussion of benevolence remained its cornerstone, God. He decried moral systems, like those of Hutcheson and Adam Smith, that do not have ultimate reference to God.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, Norman Fiering wrote that Edwards refuted the benevolists—those British moral philosophers, such as Hutcheson and Shaftesbury, who claimed a purely natural basis for the intrinsic benevolence of all

---

<sup>16</sup> Fiering says Being-in-general is God and His creation (nature) in *The Moral Thought of Jonathan Edwards*, 326.

<sup>17</sup> Edwards, *True Virtue*, 119

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 120. Fiering further elaborates this concept in *The Moral Thought of Jonathan Edwards*, 127 fn. 50.

<sup>19</sup> Edwards, *True Virtue*, 126.

<sup>20</sup> Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards*, 468.

<sup>21</sup> Daniel Walker Howe posits this antithesis as a major trait of Edwards's intellectual life in *Making the American Self* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 34. Danaher disagrees in “Beauty, Benevolence, and Virtue,” 389.



humans, namely, compassion and pity for the misery and felicity of every human.<sup>22</sup>

Fiering even states Edwards remained “almost alone among the philosophers of his sophistication in the skepticism with which he confronted the benevolist gospel” because Edwards held that natural benevolence only signified “the fragile restraint of God's common grace” upon an innately malevolent human nature.<sup>23</sup> Indeed, Edwards grounded benevolence in love of God. He stated, “If the Deity is to be look'd upon as within that system of Beings which properly terminates our benevolence, or belonging to that whole, certainly he is to be regarded as the *head* of the system, and the chief part of it.”<sup>24</sup>

Furthermore, Edwards concluded, “And therefore certainly, unless we will be atheists, we must allow that true virtue does primarily and most essentially consist in a supream love to God.”<sup>25</sup> Later in the text, he used a pertinent analogy to solidify God as the ground of universal benevolence or general affection for Being over and above private, individual affections. Edwards said, “He that takes a subject, and exalts him above his prince, sets him as supreme instead of the prince, and treats his prince wholly as a subject, therein acts the part of an enemy to his prince.”<sup>26</sup> Here, the philosophical division between private and public, individual and general, comes to the forefront.<sup>27</sup> This strand unites the theocentric and anthropocentric systems of benevolence of Edwards and Hutcheson,

---

<sup>22</sup> Fiering, *The Moral Thought of Jonathan Edwards*, 10, 172, 175, 252. James P. Byrd notes this is Edwards' direct reply to Hutcheson in “We Can If We Will: Regeneration and Benevolence,” in *After Jonathan Edwards: The Courses of the New England Theology* ed., Oliver Crisp and Douglas A. Sweeney (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 67. Moreover, Marsden notes this in *Jonathan Edwards*, 465.

<sup>23</sup> Fiering, *The Moral Thought of Jonathan Edwards*, 252-253.

<sup>24</sup> Edwards, *True Virtue*, 128. Emphasis in the original.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 128.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 131.

<sup>27</sup> Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards*, 468 also notes this.

respectively. Nevertheless, Edwards's explicit dichotomy between atheism and Christianity through the presence or lack of love of God as the ultimate good in a moral system differentiates him from Hutcheson.

### *Adam Smith*

Another key definition of benevolence came from Scottish philosopher Adam Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, an authoritative work of moral philosophy for the young American nation written in the vein of Hutcheson's moral philosophy. Smith—more famous for his 1776 work, *The Wealth of Nations*, than for *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*—held the Chair of Moral Philosophy at the University of Glasgow when he published in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* in 1759.<sup>28</sup> The 1759 edition came from Smith's lectures on moral philosophy.<sup>29</sup> He had a pious Calvinist mother who instilled a creedal Presbyterianism in him, but he later abandoned the “dependency and particularism” of his homegrown Calvinism when socialized in the “independence and universalism” of eighteenth-century Scottish society.<sup>30</sup> Here, sociologist Charles Camic argues for Smith's move (along with that of four other major Scottish intellectuals) from a Calvinist focus on Christ's atonement for the individual sinner and absolute reliance upon God for salvation to the belief in human moral autonomy coterminously participating in a systematic view of nature. Other scholars note Smith's propensity for moral systems.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, ed. D.D. Raphael and A.L. Macfie (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1982), 1.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>30</sup> Charles Camic, *Experience and Enlightenment: Socialization for Cultural Change in Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 46-47, 53, 119.

<sup>31</sup> Iain McLean asserts this in Smith's choice between different systems in *Adam Smith: Radical and Egalitarian: An Interpretation for the 21st Century* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007), 49,

As for popular reception, seven editions of the *Theory* were printed in Edinburgh and London: in 1759, 1761, 1767, 1774, 1781, 1790, and 1792. Moreover, U.S. editions only came at the dawn of the nineteenth century: Boston and Philadelphia in 1817 and New York in 1821-1822.<sup>32</sup> Nevertheless, historian Henry May mentions Smith's prominence among learned Americans as a moral philosopher before the American Revolution and notes American clergymen integrated Smith's moral and economic tenets into textbooks they composed.<sup>33</sup> Such integration into curricular materials without using the full text partially explains the tardiness of U.S. editions.

Yet, Americans engaged Smith's *Theory* before and after the publishing of American editions. Bookstores in New York in 1761 and 1818, Connecticut in 1818, and Boston in 1821 advertised copies of *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*.<sup>34</sup> Also, Smith's account of sympathetic community in *Moral Sentiments* received a revamp in the American novel, *Arthur Mervyn; Or, Memoirs of the Year 1793*, written by Charles

---

accessed June 10, 2017, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1r2464>; T.D. Campbell labels Smith's overarching theory a “limited natural theology” in *Adam Smith's Science of Morals* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1971), 229; and Alexander Broadie calls it a “moral naturalism” in *A History of Scottish Philosophy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 217-218, accessed June 10, 2017, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1r1znr>.

<sup>32</sup> Smith, *Moral Sentiments*, 32. In this part of the introduction, the editors note that the list of editions is incomplete.

<sup>33</sup> Henry May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), 343, 349.

<sup>34</sup> *Albany Gazette*, April 11, 1818, p. 1, April 14, 1818 p.1, April 16, 1818, p. 1; *Boston Daily Advertiser*, Sept. 14, 1821, p. 4; *Connecticut Journal*, June 23, 1818, p. 3; *New York Mercury*, Oct. 11, 1762, p. 4.

Brockden Brown in 1799-1800.<sup>35</sup> An 1833 newspaper review referenced it as a source for abolitionism, saying,

we do most positively reject the system which would make its dogmas (doctrines if you will) the sole rule of human action, to the total exclusion of benevolence, patriotism, philanthropy, and every good feeling of our nature. And here we will take the liberty to refer the disciples of Malthus and Ricardo, to the example of the illustrious founder of the science to which they are so justly proud; and to remind them that if he faithfully and philosophically delineated the selfish part of the constitution of man in the “Wealth of Nations,” he also eloquently vindicated his moral nature in the “Theory of Moral Sentiments.” We do seriously hold and earnestly maintain. . . .that good feeling—a sense of right—may operate on communities as well as individuals; and with the author of the Review before us, we do look with unwavering confidence to the potent operation of such causes in leading to that issue. . . .—the extirpation of slavery.<sup>36</sup>

In this instance, Smith's *Theory* undergirded anti-slavery reform because it moderated the love of gain and capital derived from Thomas Malthus and David Ricardo's interpretation of Smith's *Wealth of the Nations*. Jane Minot Sedgwick, mother of Louisa Sedgwick, a young lady in Massachusetts in 1841, wrote in her diary that Louisa's “taste was decidedly for subjects relating to moral philosophy & poetry—I therefore, at her earnest request permitted her to take up Abercrombie's intellectual philosophy, which was succeeded by Dugald Stewart & Smith's theory of moral sentiments. These two last works she studied with great delight often coming to shew me passages of which she was particularly fond.”<sup>37</sup> Alongside private use, the *Theory of Moral Sentiments* stirred hearts and minds in the public. In 1855, *The Christian Mirror* of Portland, Maine praised

---

<sup>35</sup> On this, see, Sian Silyn Roberts, “Gothic Enlightenment: Contagion and Community in Charles Brockden Brown's *Arthur Mervyn*,” *Early American Literature* 44, no. 2 (2009), accessed July 26, 2017, <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/268150/summary>.

<sup>36</sup> *Richmond Enquirer*, Feb. 26, 1833, p. 2.

<sup>37</sup> Jane Minot Sedgwick I, November 8, 1841. Sedgwick Family Papers Box 30 Folder 26, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Massachusetts. Erin Bertram kindly lent me the quoted passage from her research.

the prose of Smith's *Theory* as “fully as easy and flowing” as the best British prose and doctors used *Theory of Moral Sentiments* to speak of habit's effect on physical beauty.<sup>38</sup> A variety of sources—advertisements for booksellers, a personal diary, a novel, and newspaper commentary—all highlight the use and broad readership of Smith's *Theory* in antebellum America.

First, Smith viewed benevolence as universal. He characterized the universality of benevolence with a comparative, namely, “Though our effectual good offices can very seldom be extended to any wider society than that of our own country; our good-will is circumscribed by no boundary but may embrace the immensity of the universe.”<sup>39</sup> For Smith, morality came in two forms: actions or deeds and the movement of the rational appetite—a practical and speculative division into political *versus* social categories (country *versus* world). Universality transcended political bounds. Moreover, he also delineated the object of universal benevolence: happiness. This happiness stemmed from the deeply-rooted belief “that all the inhabitants of the universe, the meanest as well as the greatest, are under the immediate care and protection of that great, benevolent, and all-wise Being, who directs all the movements of nature; and who is determined, by his own unalterable perfections, to maintain in it, at all times, the greatest possible quantity of happiness.”<sup>40</sup> Here, Smith hit on the heart of universal benevolence: a worldwide imagined moral community under divine care for utilitarian ends—the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Also, universality of benevolence sprang from the relation of

---

<sup>38</sup> *The Christian Mirror*, April 24, 1855, p. 4.

<sup>39</sup> Smith, *Moral Sentiments*, 235.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 235.

private life and politics. Smith stated the virtuous man gives up his private interest to the higher public good interests of his country and “he should, therefore, be equally willing that all those inferior interests should be sacrificed to the greater interest of the universe, to the interest of that great society of all sensible and intelligent beings, of which God himself is the immediate administrator and director.”<sup>41</sup> Again, Smith juxtapositioned benevolence as a transnational characteristic against the claims of the nation-state on man's activity. Benevolence contained the notion of man's submission or “resignation” to God's governance of the happiness of all men in contrast to local and individual actions of care for *familia, amici, et patria*.<sup>42</sup> Besides, His discussion of benevolence characterized God as an “administrator and director” of a moral universe—set apart from it—instead of the object of human love as in Edwards's conception.<sup>43</sup> Thus, the universality of benevolence for Smith grew from God's ordination of human happiness and man's submission to it.

Next, Smith identified benevolence as the core of one of three moral systems: prudential, suitable, or benevolent, and distinguished between benevolence as a moral framework and an individual action.<sup>44</sup> He places the origin of this virtue with the Eclectic philosophers who viewed it as the Deity's “supreme and governing attribute” in which “the whole morality, if I may be allowed such an expression, of the divine operations, was ultimately derived” and sees development through the Cambridge

---

<sup>41</sup> Smith, *Moral Sentiments*, 235.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 236-237.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 235. This language and similar phrases, such as God's primary role in the “administration of the great system of the universe” are found throughout Smith's exposition on benevolence, 235-237.

<sup>44</sup> Smith lists these three in a chapter summary, *Moral Sentiments*, 305.

Platonists and his teacher, Hutcheson.<sup>45</sup> Summarily, he detailed three parts to this benevolent “system”: superior beauty given to the all actions that flow from it, a disinterestedness which increases merit and grounds virtue, and benevolence's perfection in God alongside mankind's halting attempt at imitation of divine benevolence.<sup>46</sup> Smith's own division between benevolence's systematic and individual structure raises fundamental points for future inquiry on benevolence. Either an individual imitated a benevolent Deity through self-sacrifice for the greater good of mankind above his selfish interests or the individual assented to the entire system, *i.e.* disinterested benevolence *is* virtue and the moral standard for all human actions. Notably, Smith only used the term “disinterested” as a modifier for “benevolence” in his discussion of the system. That language highlighted his division between system and individual. For Smith, human action was benevolent in a non-virtuous or virtuous manner. Though Smith drew upon Christian elements for his exposition of benevolence, especially the Christian-infused philosophy of Hutcheson, he ultimately argued for a purely natural morality as did Hutcheson.<sup>47</sup> Benevolence did not equate to a Christian understanding of virtue ethics infused by God's grace as in Edwards's thought. Consequently, Smith treated benevolence as a set of moral norms for human action separate from individual, as one of three moral structures, and as a solely natural phenomenon.

---

<sup>45</sup> Smith, *Moral Sentiments*, 300-301. Footnote 1 tells of confusion among scholars as to who Smith refers to when he mentioned the “Eclectics.” The editors concluded that Smith reads Christian doctrines advocated by later thinkers impacted by Neoplatonism back onto Neoplatonist thought.

<sup>46</sup> Smith, *Moral Sentiments*, 301-305.

<sup>47</sup> Raphael and Macfie, introduction to *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* by Adam Smith (Indianapolis, 1976), 6, 12. Fiering states benevolists such as Hutcheson held a morality based solely upon natural feeling in *The Moral Thought of Jonathan Edwards*, 8.

### *Samuel Hopkins and the New Divinity*

Edwards died in 1758, but some New England theologians after him carried on his intellectual legacy and their body of thought became known to history as the “New Divinity.”<sup>48</sup> One of the most prominent New Divinity theologians who promoted an Edwardsean understanding of benevolence was Samuel Hopkins (1721-1803), a student of Edwards. He was a Congregationalist minister at Second Congregationalist Church in Housatonic, Massachusetts and later First Congregational Church in Newport, Rhode Island.<sup>49</sup> Hopkins, one of the most prolific and prominent New Divinity theologians, wrote a synthesis of New Divinity tenets in his 1793 *System of Doctrines*, one of the most significant pieces of eighteenth-century systematic theology.<sup>50</sup> He published Edwards' *The Nature of True Virtue* in 1765, seven years after Edwards's death.<sup>51</sup> Hopkins also modified Edwards's idea of benevolence in his own theological works. This continuation of the Edwardian legacy stood out in *The Nature of True Holiness*, published in 1773.<sup>52</sup> In that work, Hopkins developed an understanding of benevolence.

More than Edwards, Hopkins stressed the universal nature of benevolence. The term “universal” appeared in *True Holiness*, though it was not present in *True Virtue*. Hopkins states, “This universal benevolence, with all that affection or love which is

---

<sup>48</sup> This term contrasts their thought and that of Edwards with the Old Calvinists, who taught a different imputation of guilt on mankind after the Fall. Other terms for this school of theology are “Edwardseanism,” “Consistent Calvinism,” and “The New England Theology.”

<sup>49</sup> *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. “Hopkins, Samuel (1721—1803),” accessed July 5, 2017, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/68574>.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Sweeney and Guelzo, *The New England Theology*, 91.

<sup>52</sup> Hereinafter referred to as *True Holiness*.



included in it, and inseparable from it, is the holy love which God's law requires, and is the whole of true holiness.”<sup>53</sup> Now, benevolence encompassed not only virtue but holiness. This shifted the idea from the moral realm to the religious or theological realm. Edwards connected a moral concept of benevolence with a Calvinist understanding of God in other works beyond *True Virtue*, but Hopkins linked it with a distinctly religious tenet, actions in the life of grace. Furthermore, Hopkins also clarified the meaning of the beings under the category of benevolence. In dense philosophical language, Edwards mentioned in *True Virtue* that “Being in general” meant “every intelligent Being is some way related to Being in general, and is a part of the universal system of existence” which is the object of true virtue or benevolence.<sup>54</sup> Hopkins simplified that, stating, “Benevolence, or universal goodness, has for its object all beings, which exist, capable of good, or that can be, in any sense and degree, objects of good will.”<sup>55</sup> Hopkins delineated an intelligent being as a being endowed with the moral capacity for good. This definition included all human beings. In this way, Hopkins provided an individual account of a constitutive member of Edwards' general system of existence. Lastly, Hopkins emphasized the totality of benevolence: “In short, there is not any one virtue, or branch of godliness, humanity, or sobriety, not any duty we owe to God, our neighbor, or ourselves, that is not comprehended in universal benevolence, and is not necessarily exercised and practiced so far as this affection takes place in the heart.”<sup>56</sup> Absolutely understood,

---

<sup>53</sup> Samuel Hopkins, *An Inquiry into the Nature of True Holiness*, in Sweeney and Guelzo, *The New England Theology*, 92-93. All further quotes from this text come from this edition.

<sup>54</sup> Edwards, *True Virtue*, 118-119.

<sup>55</sup> Hopkins, *True Holiness*, 93.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 95.

benevolence typified the entire moral and spiritual life of a Christian in the mind of Hopkins. Consequently, Hopkins demonstrated the vast and endless scope of benevolence in its aim and in its place in Christian living.

Hopkins refined Edwards's teaching but also dialogued with Smith's 1759 work on benevolence. Concrete communal value or application remained scarce in *True Virtue* because of its philosophical agenda. Yet, in *True Holiness*, at least three references to practical points about benevolence occurred. Hopkins wrote, "He whose regard to himself and his own interest does not arise from selfishness, but general benevolence, is ready to give up his own personal good for the sake of the whole: he desires no good for himself unless consistent with the common good."<sup>57</sup> A passage in Smith's *Moral Sentiments* read: "The wise and virtuous man is at all times willing that his own private interest should be sacrificed to the public interest of his own particular order or society."<sup>58</sup> For Smith, this disposition flowed from the individual human place in a benevolent system. Hopkins applied Smith's practical tenet to the historical context of the American Revolution as nation-making, unifying force. For Hopkins, universal benevolence concretely played out on a micro-level through willing the common good of the colonies instead of the macro-level of the universe as in Edwards. Therefore, Hopkins echoed Smith's link between benevolence and the common good.

Also, Hopkins elaborated a distinctly Christian understanding of the "common good" or "common interest" of benevolence. "Thus the interest of the benevolent man is the common interest and he has no other. In a word, he subjects and devotes himself and

---

<sup>57</sup> Hopkins, *True Holiness*, 94.

<sup>58</sup> Smith, *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 235.

all things to the glory of God, and the happiness and glory of his church and kingdom—which is the greatest universal good, and includes the highest good of the creature—he having no other interest but this.”<sup>59</sup> Edwards linked God and benevolence and Hopkins melded the aims of Christianity and benevolence. Moreover, Hopkins reiterated the sequence of God's glory, His kingdom, and His church as benevolent aims three more times in the concluding paragraph of *True Holiness*.<sup>60</sup> Such trinitarian writing highlighted the importance of that concept for Hopkins. The New Divinity theology represented by Hopkins grafted one of its central theological tenets, benevolence, onto the public sphere.<sup>61</sup> In Hopkins, the Christian church claimed a spot in the emerging *agora* of ideas in the American colonies. Ultimately, the common good articulated by Smith received Christian baptism for the fledgling American nation in Hopkins.

Benevolence's practical aspect received more treatment in Hopkins's *A Dialogue Concerning the Slavery of the Africans*. Published in 1776, it discussed the morality of slavery, the slave trade, and the “Christianizing” efforts of slaveholders.<sup>62</sup> Hopkins linked a lack of benevolence to slavery and the slave trade. He stated,

When I speak of our being under the divine judgments for this sin of enslaving the Africans, I do not mean to exclude other public crying sins found among us, such as impiety and profaneness, formality and indifference, in the service and cause of Christ and his religion, and the various ways of open opposition to it—intemperance and prodigality, and other instances of unrighteousness, etc., the fruits

---

<sup>59</sup> Hopkins, *True Holiness*, 94.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 96-97.

<sup>61</sup> Minkema and Stout, “The Edwardsean Tradition and the Antislavery Debate,” 51 also commented on Hopkins's work of attaching theology to society and public life.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 50-62 assessed the convoluted and shifting attitudes of New Divinity scholars and ministers toward slavery and the slave trade. Hopkins was part of the Revolutionary New Divinity school that saw the need for immediate abolition because of the dictates of universal and disinterested benevolence and the social upheaval all around him. Other ministers included Jonathan Edwards Jr. (Edwards's son) and Lemuel Haynes.

of a most criminal, contracted selfishness, which is the source of the high-handed oppression we are considering.<sup>63</sup>

Slavery and its attendant evils remained a heinous sin that stemmed from an odious self-love, the “most criminal, contracted selfishness.” Here, the self-love that made slavery and other moral evils sins insinuated benevolence was an important virtue. Hopkins pinned benevolence as a general virtue while slaveholding was a selfish vice because it only sought the individual good of the slaveholder. Additionally, Hopkins characterized slavery's selfishness as the sin most contrary to Congregational Christianity and the professed aims of liberty in the American Revolution.<sup>64</sup> These words confirmed the juxtaposition of slavery and benevolence but also attached a public and political significance to slavery seemingly worse than other sins against benevolence.

Edwards, Hopkins, and Smith provided their contemporaries and historians with cogent definitions of benevolence. Furthermore, Hopkins contextualized benevolence within one of the great debates in early American history, slavery and the slave trade. At the same time, he asserted it was one of the greatest “public crying sins” that benevolent endeavors hoped to remedy. The idea of benevolence in the early American republic, from 1800-1860, descended from that lineage of thinkers. For further clarity, the concept of benevolence remained distinct from the idea of philanthropy in America.

---

<sup>63</sup> Samuel Hopkins, *A Dialogue Concerning the Africans*, in Sweeney and Guelzo, *The New England Theology*, 155.

<sup>64</sup> Samuel Hopkins, *A Dialogue Concerning the Africans*, 155.

### *Philanthropy: An Alternative to Benevolence?*

In my analysis, philanthropy constituted a departure from benevolence in a few ways but had identical roots in common good. The late nineteenth and early twentieth century industrial magnates created a new understanding of philanthropy. Historian Olivier Zunz states,

their innovation was to conceive of philanthropic funding as yet another financial investment and to use the skills they had acquired in business to minimize the risk of their speculations, and to vastly enlarge the scope of their charitable giving. Traditional charitable givers had more modest goals and did not expect much in return for their generosity. What may have been true of the charitable giver, however, was no longer true of the modern philanthropic funder. American philanthropy would be a capitalist venture in social betterment, not an act of kindness as understood in Christianity.<sup>65</sup>

A larger amount of giving and the dominance of the economic instead of Christian foundation for giving defines philanthropy. Another new facet Zunz points out is the philanthropist's vision of a limitless horizon of philanthropic activities in service of social progress.<sup>66</sup> A boundless philanthropy differed from the bounded benevolent organization because limitations on gifts and bequests no longer held from one generation to the next. That freed up large sums for new purposes in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. For example, John D. Rockefeller's philanthropic gift that formed the University of Chicago, a non-sectarian research powerhouse steeped in scientific progress distinguished between sectarian benevolent efforts and progressive philanthropy.<sup>67</sup> A division between sect and science set philanthropy against the older conception of benevolence. Therefore,

---

<sup>65</sup> Olivier Zunz, *Philanthropy in America: A History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 2, 12, accessed July 8, 2017, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://site.ebrary.com/lib/baylor/docDetail.action?docID=10499001>.

<sup>66</sup> Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 3.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 26-30.

an economic attitude, a lack of boundaries, and a scientific focus characterized philanthropy.

Nevertheless, Zunz's analysis overlooked the facet of universality and the common good that united philanthropy and benevolence. Historians maintain philanthropy as a term distinct from benevolence arose in the late nineteenth century though the term was used interchangeably by antebellum social reform.<sup>68</sup> Yet, Zunz remarks that philanthropists consistently defined their efforts as ordered towards mankind in general.<sup>69</sup> He clearly states, "Philanthropy's goals and its rhetoric were universal."<sup>70</sup> Nineteenth-century benevolence shared the same end, especially at the level of *ideology*. "Being in general" remained the goal of benevolent organizations just as mankind-in-general animated philanthropists. Though antebellum benevolent societies existed for poor relief, that motive did not constitute their sole domain, contrary to what Zunz argues.<sup>71</sup> Both benevolent organizations and philanthropists sought the common good, but their definitions differed. Hopkins and the nineteenth-century organizations crafted a religious understanding of the common good while the philanthropists' retained only a

---

<sup>68</sup> This change came about mainly because of legal changes that permitted giving in larger amounts by individual persons instead of benevolent organizations channeling many smaller donations. Other historians differ from Zunz. Robert A. Gross points out charity and philanthropy go hand-in-hand in early America and philanthropy grew up in late seventeenth-century England, in "Giving in America: From Charity to Philanthropy," in *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, eds. Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003). In fact, most essays on antebellum reform movements in that volume conceptualize philanthropy as the motivating factor for such benevolent endeavors.

<sup>69</sup> Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 10, 17.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 43.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 10, 17. He contends charity solely based itself on need and dominated the nineteenth century while philanthropy concerned itself with human progress.

moral understanding.<sup>72</sup> Both conceptions placed value on the common good as a universal human good, but nineteenth-century benevolence included religious ends in the common good. Finally, the question of universality impregnates Zunz's contention that mass philanthropy at the national level is a novel trend in post-Reconstruction America compared to the strident localism of nineteenth-century charity.<sup>73</sup> The existence of comparable national benevolent organizations in the early nineteenth-century United States with a national administration that spread financial assistance for a specific cause throughout the nation problematizes Zunz's discontinuity argument.<sup>74</sup> More continuity existed between antebellum benevolent endeavors and post-Reconstruction philanthropy than he admits because they shared an ideology of universality in their idea of the common good.

Nevertheless, other scholarship about philanthropy argues that charity or benevolence and philanthropy intersected and co-existed in nineteenth-century America. According to historian Robert A. Gross, the individualistic mark of charity and the social focus of philanthropy were two parts of benevolence in the antebellum period.<sup>75</sup> Gross also mentions local charity gave way to the “formalization of benevolence” at the national level, but the two streams were never fully separated in the mid-nineteenth century, especially in the South.<sup>76</sup> Ultimately, philanthropy and benevolence remained

---

<sup>72</sup> Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 8; Hopkins, *True Holiness*, 94.

<sup>73</sup> Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 2.

<sup>74</sup> Gross highlights the charitable roots of such organizations that sprouted into philanthropic bureaucratic endeavors foreshadowing late nineteenth-century philanthropic organizations, in “Giving in America,” 42-43.

<sup>75</sup> Gross, “Giving in America,” 31, 42.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 44-4

endeavors for transforming and perfecting society according to a collective notion of the common good.<sup>77</sup> Zunz's distinction between antebellum and postbellum conceptions of the common good that motivated the shift from benevolence or charity to philanthropy is a matter of implicit versus explicit religiosity. Antebellum reformers forcefully wrote of making the Kingdom of God upon earth in unambiguously millennial tones while postbellum philanthropists did not use such religiously-charged language. Benevolence is the key descriptive term for social reform in my thesis because of its blatant antebellum religious connotation and intellectual lineage in Calvinist theology.

### *Historiography/Literature Review*

The Edwardsean and New Divinity definition of benevolence seems monolithic and purports to encompass all types of benevolence. One example of that remains the continual use of the phrase “Benevolent Empire” to discuss nineteenth-century eleemosynary and benevolent organizations. Such a term presupposes an imperial system—one unified by a single conception of benevolence with a variety of different manifestations—as an empire contains many colonies under one ruler. Additionally, post-millennialism and progressive millennialism, modern ideas that Christianity should prepare the world for Christ’s second coming and the new millennium to follow, animated American culture and the Benevolent Empire in the antebellum era.<sup>78</sup> Much ink

---

<sup>77</sup> G.J. Barker-Benfield, “The Origins of Anglo-American Sensibility,” in *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History* ed. by Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 73 and Wendy Gamber, “Antebellum Reform: Salvation, Self-Control, and Social Transformation,” in *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History* ed. by Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 130.

<sup>78</sup> On this variety of millennialism, see W. Michael Ashcraft, “Progressive Millennialism,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Millennialism Online*, ed. Catherine Wessinger, accessed Jan. 11, 2017, 1, 9-13, <http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195301052.001.0001/oxfordhb->



was spilled about what one historian termed the “Big Five” benevolent societies: the American Tract Society, the American Bible Society, the American Education Society, the American Home Missionary Society, and the American Sunday School Union.<sup>79</sup> Other societies such as the American Colonization Society, the American Women's Educational Association and the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, also deserve a place among national benevolent organizations.<sup>80</sup> Besides national benevolence, some historians highlight the importance of local benevolence.<sup>81</sup> Other historians such as Timothy Lockley place charity work as an integral part of benevolence alongside social reform.<sup>82</sup> All of these categories—local, national, charitable—have been considered part of the “Benevolent Empire” in antebellum America.

---

[9780195301052-e-3](#); and Robert Abzug, *Cosmos Crumbling: American Reform and the Religious Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

<sup>79</sup> For the term, see John W. Kuykendall, *Southern Enterprise: The Work of the National Evangelical Societies in the Antebellum South* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982), 14-15. On the American Bible Society, see John Fea, *The Bible Cause: A History of the American Bible Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016). On the American Education Society, see David F. Allmendinger, “The Strangeness of the American Education Society: Indigent Students and the New Charity, 1815-1840,” *History of Education Quarterly* 11, no. 1 (Spring 1971): 3-22, accessed September 3, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/367057>; Naylor, Natalie A. “‘Hold High the Standard’: The Influence of the American Education Society in Ante-Bellum Education.” *History of Education Quarterly* 24, no. 4 (Winter 1984): 479-497, accessed September 3, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/367732> and “Raising a Learned Ministry: The American Education Society, 1815-1860,” (EdD diss., Columbia University, 1971), accessed September 7, 2016, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/docview/302479893?accountid=7014>.

<sup>80</sup> For the most recent scholarship on the American Colonization Society and the ABCFM, see Allan E. Yarema, *The American Colonization Society: An Avenue to Freedom?* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2006) and Emily Conroy-Krutz, *Christian Imperialism: Converting the World in the Early American Republic* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015), Kindle.

<sup>81</sup> An excellent study of local benevolence is John W. Quist's *Restless Visionaries: The Social Roots of Antebellum Reform in Alabama and Michigan* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1998). Additionally, John G. Deal treats local benevolence in “Middle Class Benevolent Societies in Antebellum Norfolk, Virginia,” in *The Southern Middle Class in the Long Nineteenth Century*, ed. Jonathan Daniel Wells and Jennifer R. Green (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2011).

<sup>82</sup> Timothy Lockley, *Welfare and Charity in the Antebellum South* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2007), 2.

Nevertheless, recent historical scholarship challenged a uniform conception of benevolence among evangelical Protestant social reformers.<sup>83</sup> The seven national benevolent organizations listed above each took on a distinct aura of social activism, encapsulated in what I call “benevolence for”: white males and females, white ministerial students, poor whites, blacks, “heathens”, and white children. Such a multiplicity suggests benevolence in antebellum America remained a multifaceted phenomenon without crystal clear lines of demarcation or a contested space, especially when race and slavery came into the picture.<sup>84</sup> In this thesis, I complicate the intimate connection between class and benevolence historians such as Lockley, John G. Deal, and John W. Quist prize. The idea of benevolence and not just who participated in or benefited from benevolence is important because it illumines religious and gender ideals in antebellum America. In the religious realm, benevolence stood as part of antebellum moral philosophy, the science of human response to God, a staple collegiate course that influenced thousands of antebellum college students across the United States.<sup>85</sup> As for

---

<sup>83</sup> One of these is Manisha Sinha, *The Slave's Cause* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016). Here, I distinguish between antebellum reform movements that have little or no relation to New Divinity theology and the benevolent organizations that flow from Edwards' theological account of benevolence. The Oneida community is an example of the first, which I do not treat in this work. Thus, this paper distinguishes between benevolent organizations that have Presbyterian and/or Congregationalist leadership.

<sup>84</sup> This especially becomes clear when race and slavery came into contact with rhetoric and ideas about benevolence. Margaret Abruzzo parses out the tangled threads of benevolence in her analysis of slaveholders' “active benevolence” contrasted to their ridicule of abolitionist “emotive sentimentalism” in *Polemical Pain: Slavery, Cruelty, and the Rise of Humanitarianism* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), 192, 194-5, accessed April 13, 2018, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/bayloru/detail.action?docID=4398390>. Abruzzo and Susan Ryan both posit that benevolence remained a contested concept in antebellum America, see Abruzzo, *Polemical Pain*, 7 and Ryan, *The Grammar of Good Intentions* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 9.

<sup>85</sup> The definition of moral philosophy and a study of its deterioration can be found in Sarah Paretsky's book, *Words, Works, and Ways of Knowing: The Breakdown of Moral Philosophy in New England Before the Civil War* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2016), 2ff.

gender, much outstanding scholarship on female benevolence has been produced.<sup>86</sup>

Nevertheless, historical scholarship has been comparatively weak in analyzing male gender and male leadership in the antebellum ideas of benevolence.<sup>87</sup> Fine pieces of scholarship tackled the transformation of the New England evangelical clergy and their gendered “status anxiety” in the antebellum period, but none focus on the educational ideals they put into their benevolent work to increase the number of ministers and their

---

<sup>86</sup> For female benevolent enterprises in the North and the United States at large, see Anne F. Scott, *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993) and Anne M. Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism, New York and Boston, 1797-1840* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002). On benevolent activity in the nineteenth century South, see In *We Mean to Be Counted: White Women and Politics in Antebellum Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 182-183, Elizabeth Varon summarizes the historiography. She states there are two camps. The first camp holds an affinity between Northern and Southern antebellum benevolent activity and posits sexual egalitarianism as well as women's empowerment. These authors are John Quist, *Restless Visionaries: The Social Roots of Antebellum Reform in Alabama and Michigan* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1998), Anne Firor Scott, *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993), Suzanne Lebsock and Kym S. Rice, “A Share of Honour: Virginia Women, 1600-1945” (Richmond, VA: The Project, 1984), and Frederick Bode, “A Common Sphere: White Evangelicals and Gender in Antebellum Georgia,” *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 79, no.4 (1995): 775-809. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40583337>.

The second group distinguish between Southern and Northern reform movements and maintain Southern benevolence upheld separate spheres ideology at the heart of the Southern social order as well as white female privilege. Authors in this camp include Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), Jean Friedman, *The Enclosed Garden: Women and Community in the Evangelical South, 1830-1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), Barbara L. Bellows, *Benevolence Among Slaveholders: Assisting the Poor in Charleston, 1670-1860* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1993), Stephanie McCurry, *Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, and the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), and Gail S. Murray, “Charity Within the Bounds of Race and Class: Female Benevolence in the Old South,” *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 96 no.1 (1995): 54-70. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27570050>.

<sup>87</sup> Ann Douglas's *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Knopf, 1977) makes a gendered contention about voluntary organizations and the press feminizing New England “liberal” clergy in the antebellum era. James Walvin and J.A. Mangan's *Manliness and Morality: Middle Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1900* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987) has a wonderful chapter by E. Rotundo that argues for the gender ideal of the “Christian Gentleman,” which includes benevolence as a characteristic, but delves into the familial and not ministerial facet of that ideal. Lastly, Gail Bederman in *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995) opens with a brief encapsulation of antebellum manliness as toughness of character, self-reliance, and great willpower that grounds my gender analysis but does not delve into the religious or ministerial realms I am concerned with.

institutions of higher learning.<sup>88</sup> Furthermore, few historians have grappled with male gender and the antebellum ministerial ideal or with benevolence as a disputed concept between women and men.<sup>89</sup> One reason why such a void remains is the tie between female benevolent activity and notions of benevolence and sympathy in nineteenth-century literature, generally considered in historical scholarship as a monochromatic realm dominated by female leadership.<sup>90</sup> Ministers and national benevolence were not evaluated in the writings of David Allmendinger and Natalie Naylor on the AES because

---

<sup>88</sup> Three such studies are Ann Douglas's *The Feminization of American Culture*, Donald M. Scott's *From Office to Profession: The New England Ministry 1750-1850* (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978) and Brian Fehler's *Calvinist Rhetoric in Nineteenth-Century America: The Bartlet Professors of Sacred Rhetoric and Andover Seminary* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2007).

<sup>89</sup> Charity R. Carney analyzes Methodist ministerial masculinity as a delicate balance of spiritual and gender egalitarianism with the Southern patriarchal honor culture in *Ministers and Masters: Methodism, Manhood, and Honor in the Old South* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2011), accessed April 15, 2018, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://site.ebrary.com/lib/baylor/docDetail.action?docID=10503277>. Ann Douglas dissects liberal New England clergy and gender in *The Feminization of American Culture*. For the Western United States, Kenneth H. Wheeler asserts gender did not play a major part in its formation in *Cultivating Regionalism: Higher Education and the Making of the American Midwest* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2011), 4. In my third chapter, I press back against his argument with a section on the importance of male gender for the AHMS.

<sup>90</sup> On this topic, see Claudia Stokes, *The Altar at Home: Sentimental Literature and Nineteenth Century American Religion* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 5. Sarah Knott mentions this as regards sensibility's shift to sentimentalism for men from the Revolutionary era to the antebellum period in "Sensibility and the American War for Independence," *The American Historical Review* 109, no. 1 (Feb. 2004), 36, accessed March 17, 2017, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/530150>. A recent burst of works on the concept of sentimentalism in literature, culture, and religion include Wendy D. Johnson, *Antebellum American Women's Poetry: A Rhetoric of Sentiment* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2016); Kevin Pelletier, *Apocalyptic Sentimentalism: Love and Fear in U.S. Antebellum Literature* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2015); Mary De Jong, *Sentimentalism in Nineteenth-Century America: Literary and Cultural Practices* (Lanham, MD: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 2013), accessed March 24, 2017, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://site.ebrary.com/lib/baylor/docDetail.action?docID=10720761> and Glenn Hendler, *Public Sentiments: Structures of Feeling in Nineteenth-Century American Literature* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001). For an alternate vision to sentimentalism, see Gillian Brown, *Domestic Individualism: Imagining Self in Nineteenth-Century America* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990).

they focused, respectively, on its distinct national scope (compared to other educational societies at the time) and institutional history.<sup>91</sup>

I argue for the intersection of ministerial education and benevolence and a comparison and contrast between two of the most prominent national organizations in the “Benevolent Empire” of the United States: the American Education Society (AES) (originally named the American Society for Educating Pious Youth for the Gospel Ministry) and the American Home Missionary Society (AHMS) demonstrate a ministerial manliness—a distinct idea of male leadership and benevolence for ministerial education in antebellum America (1800-1860). Ministerial manliness remained an unearthed piece of the contested space of antebellum benevolence. This work goes beyond Naylor and Allmendinger's scholarly endeavors because it explains the AES and AHMS's important place in antebellum America and how those societies cross-pollinate nineteenth-century intellectual history and scholarship on benevolence and gender in that era. Benevolence, as it passed from Edwards and Hopkins to nineteenth-century Congregationalists and Presbyterians, contained distinct theological, social, and intellectual ties which will be investigated. For example, the AES and AHMS held a conservative viewpoint on slavery (common at their intellectual home, Andover Seminary) that found it inhumane but not contrary to biblical teaching. That belief sat between the liberal immediate and gradual abolitionists and the ultraconservative full-on biblical defense of the peculiar institution. Those two benevolent organizations worked for conservative social and moral reform as a part of their responsibility to society so long as reform did not overturn established

---

<sup>91</sup> See footnote 79 in this chapter for the “Big Five.”

social norms of distinct male and female roles (which a strain of the women's rights movement did) and the dominance of the white race.

Furthermore, ministerial manliness as an unseen piece of the plural visions of antebellum benevolence challenges entrenched scholarly notions of ministerial gender. Ann Douglas argued for the feminization of liberal Congregationalist (Unitarian) clergy in early national America *The Feminization of American Culture* (1974). This thesis studies the other half of antebellum Congregational ministers: the orthodox or conservative ones who held onto Calvinist theology. In addition, it rebuts Douglas's claim of women leading and feminizing ministers in benevolence and expounds the AES and AHMS idea of ministers leading women in benevolence. Ultimately, the intended meaning of national benevolent society publications and the intended mode of interpretation of their meaning (what the organizations themselves wanted their statements to convey) remain central to intellectual history today and my work here. Besides, I take the benevolent organizations listed above as fictional persons who have agency as individuals do. The individuals in the first two chapters of the thesis stand not as individuals in their agency but as pieces of the corporate historical agent, *i.e.* the benevolent organization. As historian of slavery Walter Johnson points out, agency consists of a complex weave of individual *and* collective actions instead of the classical liberal notion of agency as solely individual.<sup>92</sup> Thus, I maintain corporate bodies such as

---

<sup>92</sup> Walter Johnson, "On Agency," *Journal of Social History* 37, no.1 (Fall 2003): 113-124, accessed April 9, 2017, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=10885958&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.

the AES and AHMS hold historical agency because of their collective ideas and actions that transcend the individual agents within them.

The AES and AHMS were interdenominational societies. The two most active and influential denominations within their fold were the Congregationalists and the Presbyterians.<sup>93</sup> My focus in the first two chapters will fall upon the AES followed by the AHMS. Additionally, the racial and gender ideological similarities and departures of both organizations will be analyzed in light of their benevolent ideals. After all, the AES set curriculum standards and funded students at such seminaries and these theological training grounds mirrored the AES theological stance.<sup>94</sup> Finally, the last chapter evaluates whether or not the idea of benevolence for ministers given by the AES and AHMS shows itself in particular seminaries. It looks at the strong presence of the AES-AHMS benevolent ideal at Andover Theological Seminary in Andover, Massachusetts (Congregationalist) but the gradually smaller force of benevolence at Union Theological Seminary in Lexington, Virginia (Presbyterian), and the lack of a theology of benevolence at Danville Theological Seminary in Danville, Kentucky (Presbyterian). A study of the ideas of the male-dominated AES and AHMS and male seminary professors about benevolence will provide a glimpse into the masculine side of benevolence in the antebellum United States.

---

<sup>93</sup> Naylor, "Hold High the Standard," 481.

<sup>94</sup> Naylor, "Raising a Learned Ministry," 190-192 and "Hold High the Standard," 484-491.

## CHAPTER TWO

### The AES Idea of Benevolence

#### *Introduction: New England, The American Nation, and the AES*

This first chapter of the thesis analyzes AES ideas of benevolence, illumines the religious motivations of benevolence, and nuances the scholarship on gender and benevolence by highlighting the classically-educated men in the AES as key shapers of ideas about benevolence. Beyond their formative power, those men staked out novel territory in historical understanding of benevolent organizations—a male leadership space concerned with ministerial manliness—in the contested sphere of leadership in antebellum benevolence. The backdrop for the rise of the gendered benevolence of the AES came from social and theological changes in the antebellum United States flowing out of New England Congregationalism.

The Congregational clergy used Federalist politics and revivalism to fight atheism, immorality, and the democratic, egalitarian excesses and errors of the French Revolution spreading in 1790s America through a politics of deference and hierarchical order with a prominent place for religion.<sup>1</sup> Clerical emphases on classical education, self-discipline, doctrinal Christianity, and pre-Revolutionary clerical prerogatives correlated to Federalist policies such as state independence from large federal influence

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph W. Phillips, *Jedidiah Morse and New England Congregationalism* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1983), 50-51, 62-3, 69; Brian Fehler, *Calvinist Rhetoric in Nineteenth Century America: The Bartlet Professors of Sacred Rhetoric of Andover Seminary* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2007), 2.



and nativism.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, the Congregational clergy supported the infrastructure increase during the presidency of John Quincy Adams, though this was opposite their sectional and local political stance in the 1790s.<sup>3</sup> Such a change hinged on their comfort with the greater religiosity of American life and politics present in the 1820s than in the 1790s, caused by the wide swath of religious fervor in the early 1800s called the Second Great Awakening. The Congregationalist clergy facilitated and moderated revivals of religion through emphasis upon a period of individual reflection to determine genuine religious sentiments, the “awakening” or integration of the revival into the regional church community, and the orderliness (*i.e.* lack of noisy, emotional outbursts) of revivals.<sup>4</sup> Clerical power depended upon a consistent state of revival and this occurred in the many “awakenings” throughout the South, Northeast, and West.<sup>5</sup> Thus, by the second decade of the nineteenth-century, the Congregational clergy gained great influence and power over religious life in America.

The theological background for the AES’s rise to national prominence was the Congregationalist-Unitarian conflagration. The basis of the Congregationalist-Unitarian split stemmed from the instability of Congregational church structure: a species of ecclesiastical polity in which local congregations have sole ecclesiastical authority under

---

<sup>2</sup> Phillips, *Jedidiah Morse*, 66-67.

<sup>3</sup> Daniel Walker-Howe, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 144; Phillips, *Jedidiah Morse*, 9; for the local and sectional nature of New England politics at that time, see Walker-Howe, *What Hath God Wrought*, 69.

<sup>4</sup> Fehler, *Calvinist Rhetoric*, 19-21, 31-32.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 17-18.

a minister.<sup>6</sup> The decentralized character of the local congregation allowed continual tension between orthodoxy and heterodoxy in individual congregations within the confederacy. Moreover, there were three theological categories of Congregationalists in the 1800s: the “Old Calvinists” who believed in the absolute imputation of Adam’s sin to all mankind as individuals and double predestination of the elect and the reprobate by God; the Hopkinsians (or New Divinity) following Puritan theologian Jonathan Edwards and his disciple Samuel Hopkins who held that imputation of Adam’s sin happened to all humanity because Adam was the “federal head” of the human race and not to the individual believer; and the “liberals”, usually Unitarians or Universalists, who held the agency of free will and denied the Trinity, the Bible as revelation, the primacy of doctrine, and damnation (in the case of the Universalists) contrary to the Old Calvinists and Hopkinsians.<sup>7</sup> Surprisingly, Hopkinsians and Unitarians both urged social and moral reform through benevolence and its procession from individual experience of the divine.<sup>8</sup> Yet, Congregationalist revivals and the Unitarian experience of the “inner paradise” stood opposed to the Congregationalist’s moderate individualism of conversion within a church community led by a minister clashed with the radical individualism of the Unitarian’s direct divine experience that lead to enlightenment. Consequently, those were the

---

<sup>6</sup> *Encyclopedia of Christianity Online*, s.v. “Congregationalism,” accessed on November 18, 2016, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2211-2685\\_eco\\_C1177](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2211-2685_eco_C1177).

<sup>7</sup> Daniel Day Williams, *The Andover Liberals: A Study in Theology* (Morningside Heights, New York, NY: Kings Crown Press [a division of Columbia University Press], 1941), 2-5; Mary Kupiec-Cayton, “Who Were the Evangelicals?: Conservative and Liberal Identity in the Unitarian Controversy in Boston, 1804-1833,” *Journal of Social History* 31, no. 1 (Autumn 1997), 86, accessed September 15, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3789858>.

<sup>8</sup> Phillip Gura sees this for the Unitarians and their Transcendentalist successors, such as Ralph Waldo Emerson, in his book *American Transcendentalism: A History* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007), 210-211.

Congregationalist fault lines running from Old Calvinist “orthodoxy” to Unitarian “heterodoxy.”

The Unitarian-Congregationalist combat began in 1805 when Connecticut Congregationalist and Old Calvinist Jedidiah Morse denounced the appointment of Henry Ware, a liberal Congregationalist turned Unitarian, to the chair of divinity at Harvard College.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, the orthodox Congregationalists had two congregations but needed a partisan institution of higher education to counter Unitarian Harvard.<sup>10</sup> Andover Seminary arose as the solution and its ideology informed the AES’s thought. Old Calvinist theologian Leonard Woods desired to unite Hopkinsian and Old Calvinist parties under the roof of one seminary to present a united anti-Unitarian front and achieved that when Andover opened on Sept. 28, 1808.<sup>11</sup> Morse played a central role in Andover’s foundation as his despair over Harvard’s redemption from Unitarianism moved him to leave Harvard’s board of governance and work to establish Andover Seminary. Andover’s Hopkinsian professors emphasized the importance of church in secular society which led to a robust patriotism that later influenced the AES’s national aims.<sup>12</sup> Mitigated revivalism and rational arguments for the Christian faith both held prominent spots in Andover’s intellectual and social life and later gained great salience in AES organizational literature.<sup>13</sup> Another critical piece of the Andover education was a

---

<sup>9</sup> Kupiec-Cayton, “Who Were the Evangelicals?,” 87.

<sup>10</sup> Those churches were the Old South Meetinghouse and Park Street Church, future staging grounds for AES meetings and sermons. Phillips, *Jedidiah Morse*, 70.

<sup>11</sup> Williams, *The Andover Liberals*, 4-7.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 8-12.

“catholic” spirit or a mindset of universal cooperation that permitted involvement within the expanding structure of national benevolence.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, Andover Seminary remained a conservative Congregationalist bastion that formed the AES.

*The AES: An Arm of the Benevolent Empire*

The AES arose from the sacred precincts of Andover as one part of a nationally-minded religious viewpoint in the United States during the 1810s. The battle against Unitarianism necessitated more orthodox Congregational ministers. More ministers meant men with little or no money attending college and seminary and conversations about ministerial educational subsidies spread throughout the orthodox circles at Old South Church and Park Street Church. March 1815 saw the unofficial genesis of the AES at “a meeting of a female prayer circle” which called themselves the “Education Society of Boston and its Vicinity” and offered their idea of a national education society to the male wing of the group who created the AES on July 20, 1815.<sup>15</sup> Even though it served all denominations, Congregationalists and Presbyterians dominated AES leadership and infused the society with their moderate Calvinist vision.<sup>16</sup> The AES began as a New England Congregationalist phenomenon and but became national when it spread to the South and the West after 1827 through AES secretary Elias Cornelius and the Presbyterian Church. Moreover, as an organization, it funded over one thousand

---

<sup>14</sup> Phillips, *Jedidiah Morse*, 139.

<sup>15</sup> Natalie A. Naylor, “Raising a Learned Ministry: The American Education Society, 1815-1860,” (EdD diss., Columbia University, 1971), 36-37, accessed September 7, 2016 in ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

<sup>16</sup> Naylor, “‘Hold High the Standard’,” 481.

students' ministerial training from 1832-1837 and many hundreds more in the previous decade.<sup>17</sup>

Structurally, the AES had a federal organizational model and strict rules for AES candidates. The federal organizational plan was that of a single corporate entity with numerous affiliate branches voted in by the national board of directors and operating within the ideological purview and purse of the national organization.<sup>18</sup> This system of governance remained quite decentralized in most matters except for the vetting of ministerial candidates. Furthermore, the required qualities of AES candidates display the idealistic goals of the society. Candidates were chosen, as the sixth article of the AES constitution states, according to their upright moral character, poverty, piety, and continued scholastic progress combined with an intention to join the ministry.<sup>19</sup> The standard of piety never diminished as the 1835 annual report marked one of the two main characteristics the Society wished to foster as “personal holiness.”<sup>20</sup> The second central trait the Society always encouraged was “a thorough course of education.”<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Naylor, “‘Hold High the Standard’,” 482.

<sup>18</sup> Directors of the American Education Society, *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Directors of the American Education Society. Presented at the Annual Meeting Held in the City of New York, May 1830*. Vol. 16. (New York: Jonathan Leavitt, 1830), 4-5, Nineteenth Century Collections Online, accessed November 10, 2016, <http://tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/3wJVE>.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 4.

<sup>20</sup> Directors of the American Education Society, *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Directors of the American Education Society, Presented at the Annual Meeting, Held in the City of Boston, May, 1835, with the Constitution and Rules of the Society*, vol. 21 (Boston: Perkins, Marvin, & Co., 1835), 41-43, Nineteenth Century Collections Online, accessed October 23, 2016, <http://tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/6NWSU8>.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 41-43.

Consequently, these two traits illuminate the main goals of the AES in its selection of candidates for aid.

Congregational ministers such as Rev. Dr. Ebenezer Porter and a vibrant press contributed to the quick expansion of the American Education Society. Rev. Porter—a Dartmouth graduate, Congregational minister, and professor of preaching at Andover Seminary—drew up the constitution of the society alongside two other Andover professors, fundraised for the AES, and sat on its Board of Directors until his death in 1834.<sup>22</sup> The primary organ of the AES, the *American Quarterly Register (QR)*, spread the AES message to Americans. Moreover, *QR* subscription totals ranged from less than 1,000 in 1830 to 2,500 in the mid-1830s, the heyday of religious journals, newspapers, and magazines.<sup>23</sup> Importantly, the magazine changed its name in 1843 to the *Quarterly Journal of the American Education Society*. The AES suspended its publication for some months after the May 1843 edition (the fifteenth volume) but published it again under the new title in 1844 with a smaller readership than its predecessor. Furthermore, the AES thirtieth report states the *QR* was only “sent to clergymen, to officers and members of the

---

<sup>22</sup> Lyman Matthews, *Memoir of the Life and Character of Ebenezer Porter, D.D., Late President of the Theological Seminary, Andover* (Boston: 1837), 54-61, 69, 75, 82, accessed September 20, 2016, <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015062971331>. For more on Porter’s pastorate at Washington, CT see Wilbur Deming Stone, *The Church on the Green: The First Two Centuries of the First Congregational Church at Washington, Connecticut, 1741-1941* (Hartford, CT: Bretano’s, 1941), 27, 61-74. For more information on Porter professorship at Andover, see Ronald F. Reid, “Disputes Over Preaching Method, The Second Awakening and Ebenezer Porter’s Teaching of Sacred Rhetoric,” *The Journal of Communication and Religion*, 18 (1995) 11-12 and Henry K. Rowe, *History of the Andover Theological Seminary* (Newton, MA, 1933), 57-58. On Porter’s AES involvement, see Naylor, *Raising and Learned Ministry*, 37-39, 44.

<sup>23</sup> Naylor, “Raising a Learned Ministry,” 241 and Gaylord P. Albaugh, “The Role of the Religious Press in the Development of American Christianity, 1730-1830,” *Historical Papers: Canadian Society of Church History* (1968), 17-18, accessed July 24, 2017, <http://historicalpapers.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/historicalpapers/issue/view/2256>.

Society, and its auxiliaries....”<sup>24</sup> The magazine ran until May 1846, when the AES ceased publication. Their primary stated reason consisted of an apprehension to burden ministers with another publication among the many others such men received, since ministers held most of the subscriptions as major AES donors, magazine editors, and college presidents.<sup>25</sup> Additionally, the AES board of directors deemed it best to utilize the weekly religious papers of the United States to broadcast its message in the wake of the Panic of 1837’s damper on subscription numbers and AES funds.<sup>26</sup> The *QR*’s age of nineteen years was rare for its time, when three quarters of religious journals went under between a few months and four years.<sup>27</sup>

### *Benevolence: An Idea in Print*

Excerpts from the *QR*’s expansive coverage and Rev. Samuel Worcester’s 1816 AES sermon, *True Liberality*, captured the AES idea of benevolence *for* ministers or ministers as a point of benevolence, in two ways: first, through any statement of the AES mission, its principles of ministerial education, and its tenets about the essence and qualities of a minister; second through, general statements about benevolence. An understanding of the AES idea of benevolence necessitates inquiry into both ways because benevolence conceived of in a general manner connected the AES to other

---

<sup>24</sup> Directors of the American Education Society, *Thirtieth Annual Report of the Directors of the American Education Society, Presented at the Annual Meeting, Held in the City of New York, May 1846* vol. 32 (Boston: T.R. Marvin, 1846), 16, Nineteenth Century Collections Online, accessed July 12, 2017, <http://tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/6RKqG2>.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 16; Naylor, “Raising a Learned Ministry,” 241.

<sup>26</sup> *Thirtieth Annual Report*, 16. A post-1815 trend that Albaugh mentions in “The Role of the Religious Press,” 19. The AES was not up with the times in this regard in 1815. It took them thirty years to “catch up.”

<sup>27</sup> Albaugh, “The Role of the Religious Press,” 17.

benevolent societies. The *QR* touched on the notion of benevolence in many different areas: biographies of important Congregational ministers, reports of AES agents, stories of foreign missions, and numerous other topics. Worcester's sermon, given on behalf of the AES, defined how the liberal man and his actions related to benevolence.

Consequently, this section maintains the AES idea of benevolence *for* ministers rested upon seven traits: expansive, systematic, a *via media* between action and feeling, a cause and an active spirit, grounded in God and piety, Christian and a quality of the churches, and in tension with the primacy of foreign missions in benevolence.

A first striking claim about benevolence in the *QR* resides in its expansiveness. Benevolence is "public," embraces "the great family of man" and remained a chain "designed to encircle the known world."<sup>28</sup> The use of such adjectives and descriptors from 1827-1842 demonstrated benevolence's large place in the AES's ideology. All factions and benevolent endeavors—from educating ministers to poor relief—fell under its influence. In addition, benevolence theoretically included men, women, children of all races and creeds and geographically encompassed the whole known world. It is "infinite" because it flowed from God, Who is infinite in His actions, plans, and attributes, as Jonathan Edwards and his theological disciples held.<sup>29</sup> In those instances, the inclusion of the whole human family corresponded to the idea that Edwards gave in *True Virtue* of benevolence as ordered toward being-in-general—God and every human

---

<sup>28</sup> *QR*, Nov. 1831 p. 160; Aug. 1837 p. 99.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, Nov. 1835 p.169; Gerald R. McDermott, *Jonathan Edwards Confronts the Gods: Christian Theology, Enlightenment Religion, and Non-Christian Faiths* (Oxford University Press, 2000), 58-59.



being in the world.<sup>30</sup> Benevolence as “public” also points to its expansiveness because it embraced the whole of society and not just private individuals, a Hopkinsian understanding that benevolence intended the common good.<sup>31</sup> Thus, expansiveness is a primary characteristic of the AES conception of benevolence.

Next, a piece of AES language about benevolence maintains a view of benevolence as a system or systematic concept. Systematic, in this case, referred to a complex but ordered relationship of means to carry out the activities of benevolence. The AES attributed to benevolence “personal objects,” expressions, and “a thorough, systematic, and bodily culture,” plans, departments, and schemes.<sup>32</sup> Finally, the AES self-identified as a “great and important branch” and “great arm” of benevolence.<sup>33</sup> Benevolence, in the AES conception, remained analogous to an active human person. Motives, arms, a bodily culture, personal objects, and schemes all characterize human moral life. Through benevolence, the human person systematized his or her understanding of and action upon the world. The human qualities of benevolence pointed to an important facet of the nineteenth century: a strong belief in human agency. Even though divine agency was affirmed, human agency and instrumentality took

---

<sup>30</sup> *QR*, Aug. 1837 p. 99; Feb. 1837 p. 282; McDermott, *One Holy and Happy Society: The Public Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 97-101.

<sup>31</sup> Hopkins, *True Holiness*, 94.

<sup>32</sup> *QR* Feb. 1830 p. 145, Aug. 1830 p. 72, May 1831 p. 262, May 1832, p. 260, 347, May 1833, p. 346, 359; May 1840 p. 419; Aug. 1845 p.12; Nov. 1844 p.25.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid*, Nov. 1833 p. 126; Nov. 1843 p. 207.

precedence.<sup>34</sup> Thus the AES idea of benevolence viewed it as a system of parts akin to the human person.

Additionally, the AES idea of benevolence sought a *via media* between action and feeling. The 1837 *QR* mentioned: “The times in which we live are times of excitement, and Christians believe that they can do but little in the cause of benevolence unless their feelings are wrought upon by exciting causes. But it should not be so.”<sup>35</sup> Benevolence, in that instance, should not primarily reside in the affections or emotions. On the contrary, an AES memoir of Dr. Fitch described his charitable acts when an object of benevolence came into his purview.<sup>36</sup> With Dr. Fitch as a model, benevolence was an equilibrium of action and affection as benevolent actions complemented benevolent feelings. Therefore, the AES advocated a middle path between feeling and action in benevolence.

Next, the AES depicted benevolence as a cause and an active spirit. Benevolence described as a “cause” received frequent mention in the *QR*.<sup>37</sup> Such a term evoked an object that one struggles to achieve or dies for. Also, the AES defined benevolence with the phrase, “an active spirit” or in a couple of cases, “an active and fearless spirit.”<sup>38</sup> “Spirit” as a rhetorical device pairs well with an understanding of action. In a Christian lexicon, the Holy Spirit sanctifies. Sanctification connotes an active work. Benevolence

---

<sup>34</sup> Joseph Stubenrauch touched on this subject in nineteenth-century Great Britain in *The Evangelical Age of Ingenuity in Industrial Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 17, 24, 32-40.

<sup>35</sup> *QR*, Nov. 1837, p.202.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, May 1843, p. 372.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, Apr. 1828, p.67, July 1828 p. 101; May 1830 p. 258; Aug. 1830 p. 83. There are other numerous instances beside these.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, Apr. 1828 p. 79; Feb. 1830 p. 204, Feb. 1832 p. 245; May 1843 p. 514; “an active and fearless spirit” is found on Apr. 1828, p. 83 and Feb., 1832 p. 173.

as a spirit moved about in the world, sanctified, and raised the world to the status of the Kingdom of God. Benevolence manifests its “spirit” through action. For the AES, activity and spirit in benevolence intermingled as one cannot be observed without the other—a mature development of the Edwardsean concept of benevolence as a religious virtue. Consequently, benevolence for the AES also included the notion of a cause and an active spirit.

In addition, benevolence for ministers in the AES’s mind encapsulated the Christian religion—concepts of God and piety. Benevolence in the AES conception included God in how it operates. Man learned about God’s benevolence through the study of the Hebrew language and human deliberation sometimes preceded God’s Providence as the foundation for benevolent activity<sup>39</sup> A tension between human agency with divine assistance characterized the AES idea of benevolence. God’s benevolence grounded human benevolence, and human instruments demonstrated divine benevolence to the world. Writing to the AES’s charges, the Board of Directors stated they “are deeply convinced that an increase of piety is the only thing that can secure the onward course of any enterprise which depends on Christian benevolence.”<sup>40</sup> Benevolence flourishes in a pious person or culture. The AES stressed piety’s positive influence on benevolence because it saturated the mind of the ministerial student with divine charity and benevolence, which aided him in converting the world.<sup>41</sup> Hence, benevolence’s

---

<sup>39</sup> *QR*, Apr. 1829 p. 199; July 1827 p. 4.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, Nov. 1835 p. 185.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, Nov. 1837 p. 196.

activity in theological and social manifestations necessitated God's existence and personal piety.

Benevolence directly related to the churches as it moved them to benevolent activity through ministers. The AES does not clearly define the word "church" or "churches" in the *QR*.<sup>42</sup> In February 1830, the AES published a sermon entitled "The Claims of Education Societies; especially on the Young Men of our country" that spoke of "the young men whom benevolence of the churches is aiding in their course" and in a later piece the theological seminary in Gilmanton, New Hampshire pleaded for the benevolence of the Christian churches to garner monetary aid.<sup>43</sup> Those examples demonstrated benevolence was a quality applied to corporate bodies as well as individuals. Also, the AES wrote of benevolence as a tool, stating, "As our love is, to dying men, and according as our benevolence is employed in prompting the prayers and efforts of the church, so will advance this great work."<sup>44</sup> This line came amid a piece on love as a trait of the minister, an article aimed at ministerial readers. The "great work" is the evangelization of the world. In that passage, a minister prodded a church or congregation into evangelical action through benevolence and exhibited his lofty role in engendering benevolence. Finally, Rev. Samuel Worcester, in his 1816 AES sermon, noted that the Apostles and the early Christian church gave an example of active benevolence toward humans that the Christians of their time imitated in benevolent

---

<sup>42</sup> Considering the denominational makeup of the AES, Congregational and Presbyterian church polities are assumed.

<sup>43</sup> *QR*, Feb. 1830 p. 148, Aug. 1832 p. 102.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, May 1839 p. 414.

organizations.<sup>45</sup> Therefore, benevolence as a facet of a church or churches through ministerial agency, and not the actions of the laity, remained a theme in AES publications.

Benevolence as religious or Christian encapsulated one of the most frequent definitions of benevolence for the AES.<sup>46</sup> On countless pages in the *QR*, “Christian” is the adjective of choice for benevolence. The report of the Boston auxiliary of the AES stated in August 1834 that a scheme to bring forth ministers was a happy result of “modern Christian benevolence.”<sup>47</sup> Furthermore, the relationship of the idea of benevolence and Christianity took on various forms. Christianity inspired benevolence in men when she descended from Love in her pure form.<sup>48</sup> Here, Christianity determined benevolence and benevolence in this world originated in God. Yet, religion and benevolence constantly received equal promotion alongside each other when the author of the November 1829 “Examination of Strictures upon the American Education Society” lamented that funds are given to other institutions which promoted religion and benevolence but not the AES.<sup>49</sup> The November 1831 edition states, “Christianity is a religion of love, which is a religion of benevolence.”<sup>50</sup> In that case, benevolence and

---

<sup>45</sup> Samuel Worcester, *True Liberty. A Sermon Preached in Boston on The First Anniversary of the American Society for Educating Pious Youth for the Gospel Ministry. October 23, 1816* (Andover, MA: Flagg and Gould, 1816), 9-13, accessed March 3, 2017, <http://opac.newsbank.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/select/shaw/39874>.

<sup>46</sup> Here, I assume that “religious” and “Christian” are equivocal terms. The Congregational and Presbyterian ministers saw it this way as well. For them, worship of God (religion) meant worship of Jesus Christ as Redeemer, which is Christianity. They believed in Christianity as the true religion.

<sup>47</sup> *QR*, Aug. 1834 p. 79.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, Apr. 1828, p. 69.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, Nov. 1829 p. 100.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, Nov. 1831 p. 154.

Christianity were conflated, with benevolence as the essence of the Christian religion. For the AES, Christian religion was synonymous with benevolence.

A final thematic relationship in the AES conception of benevolence entailed the tension between foreign missions and ministerial education. In 1827, the AES published a sermon by Dr. Wisner, an AES leader, who quoted a certain Pastor Newman, stating, “There are many objects, and noble objects, of christian charity; and all that I ask is, that each may receive a share, and a just share, of christian benevolence. I do not ask you to forget your fellow man, who sits in the region of moral darkness. . . .but I do ask you, that you would also remember the indigent scholar, in his discouragements and his struggles.”<sup>51</sup> Wisner said Newman posited the ideal equality of all benevolent activity in the Congregationalist imagination. However, in an outline of benevolent societies in the 1829 *QR*, the AES clearly stated the primacy of foreign missions: “Among the various departments of Benevolent exertion, the subject of Foreign Missions, unquestionably holds the first place.”<sup>52</sup> After that line, the AES listed the stats of various national and international benevolent endeavors in this order: Native American missions, foreign missions by other denominations, U.S. foreign missions (by country), home missions, Bible societies, sabbath schools, education (AES included), religious tracts, colonization, British slaves, temperance, prison improvement, Jews, and a miscellaneous group.<sup>53</sup> Here, the AES placed foreign missions as primary and even cancelled the loans of all ministers that received AES assistance if they became foreign missionaries.<sup>54</sup> It did that

---

<sup>51</sup> *QR*, July 1827, p.9

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, Aug. 1829, p. 21.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21-50.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, May 1837, p. 394-395.

because foreign missions moved the hearts of the AES men more than any other benevolent cause since it was an unmistakable sign of success in converting pagans, those non-Europeans living in the world. Additionally, the AES acknowledged popular estimation of benevolent endeavors dominated objective considerations of financial need and ideological importance.<sup>55</sup> Yet, the AES clearly conceived a reciprocal relationship between benevolence in foreign missions and its own aims. That relation came through the necessity of “a profound Christian scholarship” for the success of foreign missions.<sup>56</sup> Overall, AES thought on benevolence prized foreign missions higher than its own cause of ministerial education.

Although the AES recognized the greater attraction of foreign missions, the organization constantly argued for the preeminence of ministerial education and education societies above all other benevolent endeavors. Naturally, that concern comprised most of AES rhetoric about benevolence and exalted the *role* of the ministers in *all* benevolent endeavors. Samuel Worcester preached in his AES sermon that the Christian ministry immediately stemmed from the disinterested benevolence of God for the salvation of men.<sup>57</sup> The AES further emphasized that when it spoke of ministers as the executors of the designs of benevolence, her almoners toward benighted men, and the primary solicitors of the benevolence of their congregations.<sup>58</sup> Furthermore, the AES claimed many times between 1837-1842 that AES-aided ministers sustained all

---

<sup>55</sup> *QR*, May 1837, 394.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, Feb. 1833, p. 26.

<sup>57</sup> Worcester, *True Liberty*, 5, 7.

<sup>58</sup> There are twenty-five instances of the superiority of ministerial education in the *QR*.; *QR*, Apr. 1828 p. 80, 82; Feb. 1839, p. 329.

benevolent enterprises in the United States because those ministers wrote tracts and converted the heathen abroad.<sup>59</sup> In those cases, ministers played a significant role in the AES conception of benevolence because they were the chief instruments of divine agency as they illuminated benevolence for others through preaching and benevolent acts. Indeed, the AES believed that if large numbers of Congregationalist and Presbyterian ministers monetarily supported the AES, that would free up public funds for other benevolent efforts.<sup>60</sup> Ministers stood at the heart of benevolence, either by personal example or exhortation of their congregations and the American public. Consequently, the primacy of ministers and their education consistently dominated the AES idea of benevolence.

#### *The AES and Gender: Ministers, Manliness, and Femininity*

Moreover, the AES gendered leadership of benevolence and the social order as male and ministerial and cast females as buoys to ministerial work despite scholarly analysis that paints leadership of benevolence as a female role in this era.<sup>61</sup> Moreover, women took on a larger role in funding and forming New England auxiliaries for

---

<sup>59</sup> *QR*, Nov. 1830 p. 157, Feb. 1837 p. 29, Nov. 1837 p. 210, Feb. 1838 p. 311, Nov. 1838 p. 209-210, May 1839 p. 214, and Feb. 1842 p. 316, May 1839 p. 413.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, Feb. 1831 p. 171.

<sup>61</sup> Phillips mentioned women initiated many revivals and accounted for two-thirds of the regenerate at those revivals, *Jedidiah Morse*, 121. Catherine Brekus, *Sarah Osborn's World: The Rise of Evangelical Christianity in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013) and *Strangers and Pilgrims, Female Preaching in America 1740-1845* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998) discusses the widespread influence of female revival preachers such as Harriet Livermore and Sarah Osborn.



benevolent organizations than men did.<sup>62</sup> Leadership in benevolent organizations was mostly female in that region.

Nonetheless, Joseph Phillips also mentions that female benevolence boosted the status of the clergy because ministers praised female benevolent actions as reinforcing gender norms of piety, purity, and sensitivity and I maintain ministerial recognition of benevolence formed their manhood or manliness because it solidified their leadership role in benevolence.<sup>63</sup> Women supported the clergy who encouraged their newly-exalted social role in benevolent activity. Yet, the Congregational minister's manhood (what it meant to be a minister) in his ministerial role was challenged by the rise of Baptist and Methodist gyrovagues.<sup>64</sup> Moreover, the minister's manliness was linked to his ministerial call, chiefly expressed in learned preaching. Methodist and Baptist preachers of the early antebellum era usually eschewed traditional higher education and clerical training. Their rise on the national scene, especially the frontier, refined the AES part of ministerial manhood: the stable oratorical and societal authority of Congregationalist ministers to inspire benevolence.

Federalist-leaning AES leaders crafted a gender hierarchy in the religious rather than political sphere. Historian Mark Kann maintains that American leaders in the Founding era employed a "grammar of manhood" to get unruly men in line and doubled-

---

<sup>62</sup> Phillips, *Jedidiah Morse*, 121 and Anne M. Boylan discusses this in *The Origins of Women's Activism: New York and Boston, 1797-1840* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

<sup>63</sup> Phillips, *Jedidiah Morse*, 121-122, for the first part of the sentence. My argument about the conservative minister-female relationship is contrary to what Douglas mentions about the relationship of liberal ministers and women in *The Feminization of American Culture*, 78. I avow conservative ministers did not follow the path of the liberals Douglas lays out.

<sup>64</sup> Fehler, *Calvinist Rhetoric*, 101-140.

down on patriarchalism, hierarchy among males, and social stability.<sup>65</sup> What Kann examined in the political sphere, the AES reinforced for ministers with the strict code of piety and diligence in studies to ameliorate the decline in social importance for Congregational ministers caused by disestablishment. Similarly, David Nelson contends Federalist ideologues solved the antebellum crisis in manhood that stemmed from democratic ideology with an anti-democratic, white, and unified “national manhood” embodied in the American chief executive or president.<sup>66</sup> The AES concern for a balanced yet hierarchical social order stemmed from their Congregationalist background and ideas about the central role of the minister in benevolent activity. Hence, conflicting social pressures in the antebellum period contributed to the AES push for a stable ministerial manhood.

AES materials constructed leadership of benevolent endeavors as masculine. In Oct. 1828, the *QR* mentioned ministers should exemplify benevolent works to their congregations and society before the religious press.<sup>67</sup> On the other hand, female and male spaces within the AES should not overlap. The 1832 Report of the Western Agency of the AES stated, “I could mention many of the mother and daughters in our churches, who, by the fruits of their industry—by the use of their needles, pay their annual subscription of from five to ten dollars to this cause.”<sup>68</sup> Males preached and spread news

---

<sup>65</sup> Mark E. Kann, *Republic of Men: The American Founders, Gendered Language, and Patriarchal Politics* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 1, 3, accessed September 10, 2017, <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/stable/j.ctt9qg73c>.

<sup>66</sup> David D. Nelson, *National Manhood: Capitalist Citizenship and the Imagined Fraternity of White Men* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998), ix, xi.

<sup>67</sup> *QR*, Oct. 1828 p. 139.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, May 1832 p. 343.

of benevolence while females provided economic sustenance for benevolent organizations. Additionally, women proffered the human “material” for benevolent activity. A report of an AES auxiliary read: “Some mothers have brought up their sons to me, at the foot of the pulpit, when the congregation has been subscribing, and said with tears, *that they wished to give their sons to this work.*”<sup>69</sup> A clear division of the sexes was represented there. Women offered male children for benevolent causes similar to their offering of money through subscriptions. Again, for the AES, men promoted benevolence while women supported it. That idea of gendered separation assured the male minister of his stable role free from the threat of female encroachment. Moreover, women eschewed AES leadership from its conception. The female “Education Society of Boston and its Vicinity” had the idea for the AES at a women’s prayer group in March 1815.<sup>70</sup> Nevertheless, the women quickly transferred power over the inception of the society to men because “it was business Ladies o’d not ever sustain alone.”<sup>71</sup> Bostonian women left leadership of benevolence for male ministers in an odd gender reversal for antebellum New England benevolent societies.

More concretely, the Old South Meetinghouse, where Rev. Ebenezer Porter preached his 1820 AES sermon, pointed to ministerial spaces as gendered male. A Boston newspaper account revealed that Porter preached the sermon at the Old South Meetinghouse in Boston at 7 o’clock in the evening in the format of a public gathering

---

<sup>69</sup> *QR*, Nov. 1832 p. 170. Emphasis in the original.

<sup>70</sup> Naylor, “Raising a Learned Ministry,” 36.

<sup>71</sup> Quoted in Naylor, “Raising a Learned Ministry,” 36.

following the annual AES board meeting.<sup>72</sup> Old South's interior was expansive and whitewashed with intricate trim on the ceiling and elongated Federalist style windows and seating in two mezzanine levels as well as a floor-level closed grid of wooden pews with doors. Moreover, the pulpit jutted out in a semi-circle from the wall with a wooden canopy, and significantly elevated above the ground-level pews.<sup>73</sup> Furthermore, the preacher was physically separated from the congregation in Old South due to the great height of the pulpit. This gave his sermon a more commanding effect, as if he was God speaking from the *shekinah*. Roxanne Mountford states that the masculine metaphors of ship and fortress used in Herman Melville's *Moby Dick* to describe Father Mapple's pulpit "reinforce the masculine offices represented by this pulpit" because "it requires physical strength to mount" and its height and distinct separation from the congregation emphasized ministerial elevation in social and moral stature.<sup>74</sup> A similar approach stood out in the construction of the Old South pulpit that left the masculine office of preaching the Gospel central to the AES out of reach for women. Such pulpits reinforced masculine leadership through an architectural incarnation of ministerial manhood.

---

<sup>72</sup> "The American Education Society," *Columbian Centinel*, October 4, 1820. I use the term "Old South Meetinghouse" or "Old South" in this analysis to distinguish the original structure (now a National Historical Park) from the "New" Old South Church constructed in the mid-1870s. Old South was a Congregationalist church. For direct reference to Old South's Congregational identity, see Hamilton Andrews Hill, *History of the Old South Church (Third Church) Boston, 1669-1884*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press, 1890), 332, 411-412, 448-449, Google Book.

<sup>73</sup> This description of the interior comes from an 1876 sketch and a 1912 photo but remains true of the meeting house in its 1820 days because its only interior restoration was completed directly after the end of the Revolutionary War, "Interior of Old South Church. Boston, Massachusetts," *Architectural Record*, 31 (Jan.-Jun. 1912): 552 in the Avery Index of Architectural Periodicals, EBSCOhost, accessed October 26, 2016; "Old South Church Boston Mass" In "The Old South Meeting-House." *American Architect & Building News* 1 (Oct. 7, 1876): 325 in the Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals, EBSCOhost, accessed October 28, 2016.

<sup>74</sup> Roxanne Mountford, *The Gendered Pulpit: Preaching in American Protestant Spaces* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2003), 17-18, 21.

One other gendered juxtaposition in AES rhetoric consisted of the militant minister with the pious, long-suffering female. Daniel Dana delivered a sermon on Sept. 30, 1818 at the Old South Meeting House in Boston, the same location of Porter's sermon two years later.<sup>75</sup> This particular sermon began with the Scriptural text of Matthew 13:14 and Dana's *exordium* or sermon roadmap was a "few reflections illustrative of the importance of Christian ministry."<sup>76</sup> He stated that "the Christian ministry is the great instrument of enlightening and purifying the world," especially through the promotion of virtue.<sup>77</sup> Dana posited a major piece of ministerial inculcation of virtue was warfare against vice when he declared the minister ought to be at the "forefront of battle; and must repel, by the sacred shield of truth, the attacks of error and infidelity" and "level the artillery of heaven against the proudest and most imposing forms of wickedness."<sup>78</sup> Battle imagery of "artillery" and "shield" connoted the virility and masculinity of ancient and contemporary soldiers. Hence, Dana constructed ministerial work as essentially masculine. On the other hand, Porter's 1820 sermon used an *exemplum* of a Christian mother grieving over the wicked ways of her husband and sons and her inability to baptize or dedicate her newborn because of the lack of a minister.<sup>79</sup> Male ministers engaged the world and its evils in combat while females exercised redemptive suffering.

---

<sup>75</sup> Daniel Dana, *The Importance of the Christian Ministry: A Sermon Preached before the American Society for Educating Pious Youth for the Gospel Ministry, at Their Third Anniversary, Boston, Sept. 30, 1818*. Vol. 4. (Andover: Flagg and Gould, 1818), Nineteenth Century Collections Online, accessed November 15, 2016, <http://tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/3zQiZX>.

<sup>76</sup> Matthew 13:14- "Ye are the salt of the earth. — Ye are the light of the world"; Dana, *The Importance of the Christian Ministry*, 4.

<sup>77</sup> Dana, *The Importance of the Christian Ministry*, 4-10.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 7, 10.

<sup>79</sup> Porter, *Sermon*, 23-24.

Therefore, the AES bolstered ministerial manhood through masculine battle imagery and church leadership and gendered grieving as a female action in a predominant part of its ideology of benevolence.

### *The AES and Race*

The AES held the racial theory of the racially conservative American Colonization Society (ACS) through its shared leadership and literary praise of the ACS. For example, Theodore Frelinghuysen, a prominent early national New Jersey statesman, was vice-president of the ACS and an honorary vice-president of the AES.<sup>80</sup> Beyond leadership, the AES *QR* praised and published material about the ACS. The 1827 *QR* published a short article entitled “The slave trade” which read, “What friend of humanity, or of religion, will not, then, bid such a society as the *American Colonization society*, God speed, in its noble undertaking; be the degree of its influence in mitigating the evils of slavery in America, what it may?”<sup>81</sup> In that extract, the AES praised the ACS’s plan of Christian colonization as a remedy for the slave trade. Two other mentions of the ACS in the *QR* chronicled the high popular estimation of the ACS in a piece on its 1831 meeting and lauded the achievements of Jehudi Ashmun, a former professor at Bangor Theological Seminary and one-time governor and agent of the ACS colony of Liberia.<sup>82</sup> Bangor took ministers-in-training supported by the AES and its connection to the ACS

---

<sup>80</sup> Directors of the American Education Society, *Twenty-First Annual Report of the Directors of the American Education Society, Presented at the Annual Meeting, Held in the City of Boston May, 1837; with the Constitution and Rules of the Society* vol. 23 (Boston: Perkins & Marvin, 1837) 33, Nineteenth Century Collections Online, accessed November 8, 2017, <http://tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/6RMP48> ; G.P. Disosway, “The Presidents of the American Bible Society: Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen, LL.D.,” *The Methodist*, October 3, 1863, p. 305.

<sup>81</sup> *QR*, 1827, p. 13.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, Jan. 1831, p. 61; Aug. 1841 p. 29.

through Ashmun further illustrated the tight network of benevolent leadership in early America. AES commendation of the ACS and its mission implicitly endorsed its motives and racial theory, a sign of its conservative notion of social reform. Networks of higher education and benevolence cannot be separated from racism, pro-slavery thought, and the Christian missionary spirit of the ACS in the first half of the nineteenth-century in America.<sup>83</sup>

The ACS racial vision, which the AES implicitly subscribed to through its support, was social environmentalism—the theory that different environments engendered racial disparities.<sup>84</sup> The black colonization movement run by the ACS rested upon that tenet because the black person could never be fully developed morally, mentally, or politically among white persons and had to live among his racial “brethren” in Africa to achieve full stature as a “man” in contrast to abolitionism or a pro-slavery

---

<sup>83</sup> For recent scholarship on this, see Craig Steven Wilder, *Ebony and Ivy: Race, Slavery and the Troubled History of America's Universities* (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2013). Gale Kenny discusses how Andover Theological Seminary, the well-spring of the ACS, also remained a fountain for the ACS in her chapter, “Race, Sympathy, and Missionary Sensibility in the New England Colonization Movement,” in *New Directions in the Study of African-American Recolonization*, edited by Beverly C. Tomek and Matthew J. Hetrick (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2017), 36-7. Kenny mentions Ralph Gurley and Leonard Bacon, two ACS leaders, were educated at Andover.

<sup>84</sup> The key text for distinguishing the racial theories of the early nineteenth century is Melissa Stein's *Measuring Manhood: Race and the Science of Masculinity, 1830-1934* (Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota Press, 2015). Stein notes in the first chapter a central shift in racial science. The debate prior to 1830 was encapsulated in the thought of Presbyterian minister and president of the College of New Jersey (now Princeton), Samuel Stanhope Smith. He argued for monogenesis (the fact that the human race had one set of parents) against polygenesis (the argument the human race had more than one set of parents). Nevertheless, Smith, in 1810, contended that physical or racial difference originated from disparate environments—also known as social environmentalism—and racial inequality could be eliminated through life in a different social climate. Then, Stein states that Charles Caldwell's 1830 *Thoughts on the Original Unity of the Human Race*, a text that refuted Smith's monogenesis, advocated polygenesis, and birthed American ethnology. He popularized the belief in biological difference garnered through phrenology—the science that measured racial difference through cranial discrepancies—between the races that defined the 1840s-1850s in America. Most ACS members held Smith's position of monogenesis and social environmentalism, even after the 1840s. Other works relevant to scientific racism and antebellum racial theory are the essential study by George Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971) and Ann Fabian's *The Skull Collectors: Race, Science, and America's Unburied Dead* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010).

apologetic. A report of the July 1848 ACS fundraising meeting in Philadelphia claimed, “the existence of the Colony of Commonwealth of Liberia, crowned by her last act of independence, has done more, a thousandfold, to establish the claims of the colored race to the full stature of manhood in its broadest sense.”<sup>85</sup> AES support for the “noble undertaking” of the ACS allied the society with the ACS racial vision of a white America. Moreover, AES (and ACS) patrons acted benevolently when they supported the “return” of freed slaves to Africa in the Liberian colony. Thus, the racial theory of social environmentalism affected the AES through its ACS leadership connections and support in the *QR* and spurred its idea of an exclusively white ministerial manhood.

### *Conclusion*

Essentially, the AES idea of benevolence flowed from an organization dominated by male ministerial leadership. The AES concept of benevolence consolidated personal loyalties to God, all mankind, the church, and *every* benevolent society with the missionary societies over and above all other societies. The AES voice on the idea of benevolence needed scrutiny to see where unexplored antebellum ideas about higher education, the Christian ministry, and benevolence intersected. I maintain that the AES concept of benevolence in this chapter illumines how an idea of ministerial manliness grew out of ministerial leaders in early nineteenth-century America.

---

<sup>85</sup> “Sympathy Meeting in Philadelphia.” *African Repository* Jul. 1848 p. 217.



## CHAPTER THREE

### Benevolence and the AHMS

This chapter explicates the AHMS idea of benevolence and how its ideas about race and gender related to benevolence. The chroniclers of the AHMS, Victor Howard and Colin B. Goodykoontz, pass over the AHMS conception of benevolence in their institutional histories.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the AHMS did not dialogue with other national benevolent organizations in its publications, and only Goodykoontz's monograph explores the AHMS and education.<sup>2</sup> He claimed ministerial education in the West stemmed from a fear of academically excellent Catholic schools and also noted that the relationship of the AHMS and education is "exceedingly important."<sup>3</sup> Such a fear prompted Protestants to establish colleges in the Western states and to entrench Protestant influence.<sup>4</sup> Goodykoontz devoted a handful of pages to ministerial education and the AHMS but made little analysis of how theological concepts played a role in the formation and rise of the AHMS. Moreover, this section sets the AHMS's ideas about race and benevolence against the background on those issues in antebellum America given by Susan Ryan in her book, *The Grammar of Good Intentions*. Most importantly, gender did

---

<sup>1</sup> Colin Brummitt Goodykoontz, *Home Missions on the American Frontier with Particular Reference to the American Home Missionary Society* (New York: Octagon Books, 1971); Victor B. Howard, *Conscience and Slavery: The Evangelistic Calvinist Domestic Missions, 1837-1861* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1990).

<sup>2</sup> See Goodykoontz, *Home Missions*, chapter 12.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 364.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 362.

matter in the antebellum West for the AHMS, contrary to Kenneth H. Wheeler's assertion in *Cultivating Regionalism* that gender as a marker of social difference and historical change was less important in the Midwestern United States because of greater sexual egalitarianism present there than in the East.<sup>5</sup>

In essence, the AHMS stood as an egalitarian partner to the AES because each organization placed ministers at the heart of its mission. The AHMS sent Congregationalist or Presbyterian ministers to church communities in parts of the United States that did not have consistent preaching by such ministers and emphasized healthy minister-congregation relations; the AES focused on training pious and learned ministers for AHMS congregations and other ministries. Furthermore, the AHMS concept of benevolence deserves study because it was a key ideological tenet of its dominant Congregationalist faction. Benevolence shaped Congregationalist conceptions of race and gender in various ways and had relevance in the daily life of Christians in the West insofar as they took to heart their minister's preaching. As this section demonstrates, the AHMS and AES mirrored each other in a general ideology of benevolence as ministerial manliness because of a ministerial membership and focus. On the other hand, major distinctions between the two societies turned on disparate conceptions of ministerial utility. For example, the AHMS's nationalist rhetoric (not found in the AES) reacted to a growing party spirit in the West and the divisive debates over slavery and slaveholding in Southern and Western congregations while its ideology of the "man of the West" more sharply defined gender than the AES did. In this chapter, I contend that unity between

---

<sup>5</sup> Kenneth H. Wheeler, *Cultivating Regionalism: Higher Education and the Making of the American Midwest* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2011), 4. Wheeler uses Oberlin's coed foundation as an indication of this, among other pieces of evidence.

the AES and AHMS on the idea of benevolence highlighted a distinctly ministerial and masculine understanding of benevolence that included its Christian and systematic character and a specific racial hierarchy (whites above blacks and Native Americans). Finally, such a perception is a novel piece of the pluralistic concept of benevolence—benevolence as an idea with multiple forms or definitions—historian Susan Ryan posits.<sup>6</sup>

### *Early Tensions*

Historically, many of the same forces that brought the AES to prominence shaped the AHMS. The orthodox Hopkinsian and Old Calvinist theology at Andover Seminary molded the social activity of the AES and AHMS because their leaders came from the Andover circle. After all, Ebenezer Porter, a Congregationalist minister, was Andover's professor of Pulpit Eloquence and Thomas Skinner, another faculty member at Andover, gave a sermon on behalf of the AHMS at one of its national meetings, promoting the society's work.<sup>7</sup> It is also known that Rev. Justin Edwards, Andover's president from 1836-1842, "maintained friendly relations with the strongly New School [Presbyterian] organization, the AHMS."<sup>8</sup> That society started in 1826 as a joint venture between the Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Associate Reformed Presbyterians, and Reformed Dutch churches.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, the AHMS sent ministers in the Western United States to make the frontier part of the Kingdom of God for the future millennium through

---

<sup>6</sup> Susan M. Ryan, *The Grammar of Good Intentions: Race and the Antebellum Culture of Benevolence* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 9-10.

<sup>7</sup> Hirrel, *Children of Wrath*, 57.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Howard, *Conscience and Slavery*, 5.

evangelization.<sup>10</sup> Greater clerical mobility, national allegiance, the united benevolent activity of the Congregationalist and Presbyterian churches, and revivals pushed the AHMS westward.

In addition to those upheavals, historians note that shifting gender norms manifested themselves in heightened benevolent activity. For instance, Susan Klepp argues modifications in childbirth and childrearing instilled a more benevolent attitude in mother and child during the first half of the nineteenth century.<sup>11</sup> Diverse and dynamic Western colleges sprung up quickly and heavily shaped the region.<sup>12</sup> The AHMS agreement with the above aspects remained primarily uncontentious in the early nineteenth century. However, the most hotly-debated part of the AHMS project was its relationship to slavery and slaveholders. Victor B. Howard's seminal text on the AHMS viewed the pre-Civil War identity of that society as a clash between slaveholding and anti-slavery ministers. Howard argued the AHMS slowly and fitfully jettisoned their support for slaveholding churches and ministers from 1837 until 1861. Other AHMS roadblocks included rejection by the Old School Presbyterians in 1837 along with the AES and Presbyterian jealousy of the priority given to Congregationalist ministers in newly-planted AHMS churches in 1860.<sup>13</sup> The latter dispute ended with the

---

<sup>10</sup> Howard, *Conscience and Slavery*, xiii.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 6. Also, see Susan E. Klepp, "Revolutionary Bodies: Women and the Fertility Transition in the Mid-Atlantic Region, 1760-1820," *The Journal of American History* 85, no. 3 (Dec. 1998): 910-945. She notes pregnancy and languages of the body were tied to sensibility and affect instead of robustness and high fertility.

<sup>12</sup> On the diversity of Western antebellum colleges, see Wheeler, *Cultivating Regionalism*, 3. For their dynamism, read Colin B. Burke, *American Collegiate Populations: A Test of the Traditional View* (New York: New York University Press, 1982), 6-7.

<sup>13</sup> Hirrel, *Children of Wrath*, 171-2.

Presbyterians breaking away from the AHMS and fracturing the unified benevolent endeavor.<sup>14</sup>

### *A Christian, Patriotic System*

First, the AHMS held a view of benevolence as a system. As the AES pronounced in 1837, benevolence included the activity of numerous reform organizations, it was “systematic.”<sup>15</sup> The AHMS said something similar in the following year: “The work of Home Missions is closely associated with every other department of christian effort. Our missionaries, as charged in their instructions, had done much to help the cause of benevolence around them.”<sup>16</sup> Home missions was only a piece of the entire coordinated effort of benevolence. Such an example demonstrates why the language of a “Benevolent Empire” is quite apt. New England and other Eastern localities were the “metropole” while the West was the “colony” within an American empire. Robert Breckinridge of Danville Theological Seminary conceived of America as an empire in 1853 when he said at the seminary’s inauguration, “We act, to-day, with the sanction and in the name of the whole Presbyterian Church in this great and free empire.”<sup>17</sup> In exact

---

<sup>14</sup> Hirrel, *Children of Wrath*, 172.

<sup>15</sup> The AHMS uses the exact term, “systematic” to describe the type of benevolence it leaned upon. See American Home Missionary Society, *Report of American Home Missionary Society*, 11 (New York: William Osborn, 1837), 63, Sabin Americana, accessed November 8, 2017, <http://galenet.galegroup.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY109605310&srchtp=a&ste=14>. Hereafter cited as “RHMS” with the year included.

<sup>16</sup> RHMS, 1831, 63.

<sup>17</sup> Robert J. Breckinridge, “The Inaugural Discourse of Robert J. Breckinridge, D.D., L.L.D, Professor of Theology, &C. Delivered by Order of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary, Under the Care of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, at Danville, KY., On the Opening of Its First Session, in The First Presbyterian Church in Danville, October 13, 1853,” in *Addresses Delivered at the Inauguration of the Professors in the Danville Theological Seminary, October 13, 1853* (Cincinnati: T. Wrightson, 1854), 25, HathiTrust accessed March 19, 2018, <http://catalog.hathitrust.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/api/volumes/oclc/39997254.html>.

terms, the AHMS also spoke of the Central Committee for Home Missions in the West as “one branch of the great system of benevolence, which is to fill the world with the riches of redeeming grace.”<sup>18</sup> Here, a religious *imperium* subsumed all benevolent organizations. Furthermore, AHMS ministers did not harbor jealousy for the AHMS above other benevolent societies as “they [were] also the advocates of other causes of benevolence as they have opportunity.”<sup>19</sup> Benevolence relied on a framework of co-equal and mutually-supportive societies, with foreign missions on the same plane as home missions. Even individual Christians could not “be zealously affected in advancing one department of the cause of benevolence without feeling a sympathy for the rest.”<sup>20</sup> In those words, both persons and institutions could never exclude any benevolent organization from their feelings or monetary donations. Consequently, the AHMS construed benevolence as systematic for a variety of vocations and organizations.

Much like the AES, the AHMS conceived of benevolence as an enterprise. The early nineteenth-century person defined his or herself as a human of stringent action or enterprise with an attendant vocabulary of means and instrumentality. For the antebellum American Protestant, human instruments acted upon the world in a significant way and marked the world for God through their action. That belief held sway because, as Congregationalist divine Eliphalet Pearson stated, the “age of inspiration and miracles is past” and God rarely directly intervened in human affairs anymore.<sup>21</sup> The AHMS

---

<sup>18</sup> *RHMS*, 1831, 54.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 1834, 69.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 1839, 66.

<sup>21</sup> Eliphalet Pearson, *A Sermon Delivered in Boston Before the American Society for Educating Pious Youth for the Gospel Ministry*. Oct. 26, 1815 (Andover, MA: Flagg and Gould, 1815), 8, Nineteenth

especially noted heightened regard for the involvement of all men in benevolent associations in an essay on benevolent institutions which read, “And even the poor, when their hearts are touched with the love of God, do not ask to be excused from taking part in these enterprises of benevolence.”<sup>22</sup> In that example, benevolence was fervent uplift of the impoverished but even those with little means in a lower class partook in it because benevolence was not of man but of God and His grace. Besides, benevolence was for every person as AHMS director Absalom Peters and the society’s committee wrote: “Finally, let *all* who love the Lord, and the souls of men, contribute according to their ability, to this and kindred enterprises of Christian benevolence, and accompany every donation with a prayer.”<sup>23</sup> Christian duty required benevolent undertakings with as much personal and spiritual might and money as one could muster. Finally, Rev. Thomas H. Skinner, in his sermon eulogizing an AHMS founder, Rev. Matthias Bruen, spoke of the “mighty enterprises and endeavours of benevolence” he hoped would result from grief and mourning at Rev. Bruen’s death.<sup>24</sup> Benevolence was a great work that emerged from grief or sympathy with Bruen’s own enterprising attitude in benevolent works. Therefore, benevolence consisted of enterprise for the AHMS.

---

Century Collections Online, accessed February 23, 2017,  
<http://tinyurl.galegroup.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/tinyurl/4mnso7>.

<sup>22</sup> *RHMS*, 1831, 54, 56. On 54, a mention of benevolence as enterprise occurs, but is not quoted here.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 1832, 59. Emphasis mine.

<sup>24</sup> Thomas H. Skinner, *A Sermon Occasioned by the Death of the Rev. Matthias Bruen, Preached in the Bleecker-Street Church, New York, September 20, 1829* (New York: J. Seymour, John-Street, 1829), 21, Sabin Americana, accessed November 8, 2017,  
<http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY111022628&srchtp=a&ste=14&q=txshracd2488>.

Additionally, Christian churches and Christ Himself modeled benevolence for the world. Rev. D.H. Riddle's 1851 sermon for the AHMS marked benevolence as a main quality of the ancient church while the 1854 *RHMS* pegged benevolence as "liberal, apostolic and Christian."<sup>25</sup> Clearly, the AHMS defined benevolence as an integral part of the contemporary Christian church through the example of the early church. It stated benevolence was "of the church" in the 1830 *RHMS* while the AHMS *Constitution* named benevolence as a quality of the Christian community, another name for the church.<sup>26</sup> The AES saw the church's benevolence helping young men through ministerial studies at Bangor and other seminaries just as the AHMS noted benevolence as a part of the Christian church of its day.

Moreover, Christ and the Trinity played a role in the AHMS idea of benevolence analogous to that given in AES rhetoric. Benevolence in the address of Rev. Samuel Fisher in Albany, New York on the AHMS's twentieth anniversary touched on Christ. Fisher said, "while he [Christ] did not impair the obligation of universal benevolence, he yet wisely directed the order of their efforts, and made their patriotism subservient to the spread of his Gospel."<sup>27</sup> In those passages, the AHMS affirmed that benevolence originated in the Second Person of the Trinity and that humans learned of it through the

---

<sup>25</sup> D.H. Riddle, *Our country for the sake of the world: a sermon in behalf of the American Home Missionary Society preached in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, May 1851* (New York: Baker, Godwin, & Co., 1851), 3, Sabin Americana, accessed November 8, 2017 <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY108352777&srchtp=a&ste=14&q=txshracd2488>. *RHMS*, 1854, 69.

<sup>26</sup> *RHMS*, 1830, 51; American Home Missionary Society, *Constitution of the American Home Missionary Society: recommended by a convention of the Friends of the Missions held in the city of New-York, May 10, 1826, and adopted by the United Domestic Missionary Society* (New York: D. Fanshaw, American Tract Society House), 74, Sabin Americana, accessed November 8, 2017, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY101666896&srchtp=a&ste=14&q=txshracd2488>.

<sup>27</sup> *RHMS*, 1850, 74; Fisher, "Address of the Rev. Samuel Fisher," *RHMS*, 1846, 104.



Word of God and the church that spread the Bible. For the AES, humans discovered God's benevolence through study of the Hebrew language in which the Old Testament was composed.<sup>28</sup> Thus, in both societies, God's benevolence and benevolence as a human necessity comes through the Bible.

The centrality of the minister factored into AHMS and AES ideology about benevolence. In the 1842 edition of the AHMS *RHMS*, a piece stated that "when he [the minister] sees that morality, benevolence, and piety, are increasing among his people, and that some fallen spirits have been born again; he adores the graces that put him into the ministry,—he thanks God and takes courage."<sup>29</sup> Within the 1835 *RHMS*, the twelfth annual report of the Central Agency of New York State delineated that the minister operated as a channel of benevolence from God to the Christian people. AHMS publication of one of its agency's reports clearly demonstrated it prized the ministry's role and it paralleled AES rhetoric on the minister's instrumentality. Also, the AHMS argued the ministry was a primary conduit of benevolence for the AHMS because it fostered benevolence in the Christian people and received benevolence from God Himself in prayer. The 1835 *RHMS* intimated that an evangelical ministry and religious inquiry into Christian doctrines and practices remained two of the main objects of benevolence.<sup>30</sup> Hence, the AHMS placed the minister at the heart of its ideology about benevolence and benevolent acts.

---

<sup>28</sup> *QR*, Apr. 1829 p. 199.

<sup>29</sup> *RHMS*, 1842, 91.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 1835, 72-3.

Next, the AHMS avowed benevolence was expansive and universal as the AES did. A former president of the AHMS, Mr. Henry Dwight, had a “large-hearted benevolence.”<sup>31</sup> Benevolence was not narrow or constricted but something expansive in human beings. Moreover, the language of a heart brimming with benevolence continually showed up in AHMS literature. In the sermon, *Our country for the sake of the world*, Rev. Riddle exclaimed: “Yea we must personally labor in our respective posts, learn the luxury of making money to give away in large-hearted schemes of benevolence, if we would not see another generation, seduced by the gorgeous ceremonies and splendid pageants of Popery, forsaking the religion of their forefathers, and surrendering the institutions of America to the power of the Antichrist.”<sup>32</sup> Only a large benevolent spirit held Catholic encroachment at bay because largesse in benevolence translated into successful Protestant spiritual conquest. Again, the *RHMS* spoke of limitless benevolence in 1854 when it characterized it as “not contracted or limited, but liberal, apostolic, and christian.”<sup>33</sup> Such phrasing painted the ideal picture of benevolence broadcast by the AHMS: a religious virtue grounded in the purity of the early church from which its liberality and unboundedness flowed. One senses the editors desired—for the purpose of frontier evangelization—an uncorrupted and simple Protestant church opposed to Catholic excesses. Benevolence needed to sustain Protestant spirits in the intellectual and moral struggle with Catholicism for America. Moreover, the early church modeled benevolence when Riddle postulated: “Even in the

---

<sup>31</sup> *RHMS*, 1858, 117.

<sup>32</sup> Riddle, *Our country for the sake of the world*, 23.

<sup>33</sup> *RHMS*, 1854, 69.

ancient church, when under tutors and governors, till the times appointed by the Father, there was cultivated an expansive benevolence.”<sup>34</sup> Here, American benevolence conformed to the exemplar of the early church free from later, harmful, and Catholic accretions in the AHMS vision. Lastly, the AHMS affirmed the universality of benevolence on two occasions: (1) in reporting the 1846 address of Rev. Samuel Fisher on Christ and (2) on benevolence and its Constitution. Fisher, a pastor from Albany speaking on the twentieth anniversary of the AHMS, stated that Christ “did not impair the obligation of universal benevolence” and the Constitution boldly proclaimed: “And the millennium is to be brought by the offerings of the rich, and the circulation of such a benevolence as shall consider the misery of one the suffering of all.”<sup>35</sup> Ideally, benevolence propounded by Christ and practiced by men included all people throughout the world as Edwards and Hopkins taught and fed antebellum millennialism. Thus, the AHMS partially defined benevolence as a large-hearted quality reaching all persons throughout the world with the Gospel.

The last parallel facet of benevolence in the AHMS and the AES was the primacy and aid of foreign missions. The AES posited a tension between the need for foreign missions and ministering to Americans but simultaneously exerted its chief role in preparing ministers for overseas benevolent activity. For the AHMS, foreign missions played a similar role in its language about benevolence, but the quantity of the language was smaller than for the AES because the *RHMS* did not publish about many benevolent organizations outside of the AHMS. In 1836, the AHMS president Absalom Peters

---

<sup>34</sup> Riddle, *Our country for the sake of the world*, 3.

<sup>35</sup> Fisher, “Address of Rev. Samuel Fisher,” *RHMS*, 1846, 104.

reported that the AHMS “is again commended to the best affections and the fervent prayers of the disciples of the Cross in every land” and “every enlargement of its action abroad [foreign missions] will indicate an increase of that benevolence on which along we can depend for the means of continued efficiency at home.”<sup>36</sup> In that passage, there was a one-way relationship between foreign and home missions because foreign missions inspired greater benevolence, a “surplus” that home missions used for its own purposes.<sup>37</sup> Hence, foreign missions maintained its primacy to benevolent endeavors in the United States for the AHMS and fed those benevolent societies with its “leftover” benevolence.

### *The Patriotic Piece of the System*

Nevertheless, the differentiating feature of the AHMS idea of benevolence when compared to the AES was the patriotic element. The AHMS stated in the 1834 *RHMS* that its patriotic character arose from love to God and the “souls of men universally.”<sup>38</sup> Love of country melded with the Edwardsean strain of benevolence when the entire American nation illustrated love for God and all people. In 1854, the AHMS stated, “Therefore, while we felicitate ourselves on the work of *patriotic* benevolence, which our Society has done and will yet do, much more do we exult in its contribution to the progress and completion of the kingdom of Christ.”<sup>39</sup> Benevolence for the AHMS included religious feeling for one’s own country. Yet, as the 1854 *RHMS* said, love of country remained consistently subordinate to the establishment of Christ’s kingdom. The

---

<sup>36</sup> *RHMS*, 1836, 81.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.* The AHMS used “surplus” to describe this phenomenon of foreign missions when it states, “By allowing its surplus influences to overflow and fertilize a wider field...”

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 1834, 11-12.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 1854, 117.

nation, while exalted, never preceded the universal reign of Christ the King. Unlike the AES, the AHMS frankly echoed the notion of the national common good present in Samuel Hopkins's writings.<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, the AHMS idea of benevolence culminated in its theory about the federal government's role in benevolence. An AHMS sermon from 1858 read under the heading "Government": "Every true-hearted American must desire that his government should be permeated with the genuine Christian spirit; and in all its treaties, and intercourse, and action should be continually showing that elevation, that unanimity, and broad benevolence, which is worthy of the christian name."<sup>41</sup> Benevolence remained a quality of the American government desired by Christian subjects, a fruit that government actions bore, and not limited to individuals or extra governmental associations. In other words, patriotism fostered benevolence in the government. That sermon on government called itself a cross-section of an argument for home missions and that endowed importance to the philosophy of governmental benevolence it advanced. Moreover, 1858 stood as a critical year because the tension of disunion fell heavily upon the United States at that time. The AHMS hoped to affirm its American character through an emphasis on patriotism, a loyalty jeopardized by the coupling of slavery and secession in that year. On numerous occasions, the AHMS received criticism for its support of slaveholding congregations.<sup>42</sup> Any affirmation of union under the national government at a time of heavy Southern criticism of that government masked the slaveholding past of the AHMS. Thus, the unique patriotic

---

<sup>40</sup> Hopkins, *True Holiness*, 94. See introduction for the full quote.

<sup>41</sup> *Our country: no. 2., a plea for home missions*, 1858, 22-23.

<sup>42</sup> Howard, *Conscience and Slavery*, 54, 57-8.

character of the AHMS conception of benevolence bolstered patriotism at a time of precarious national sentiment but also subjected that patriotism to the future millennial reign of Christ over all nations.

Overall, the AHMS idea of benevolence mirrored the AES concept. Benevolence for both the AHMS and AES stood as a distinctly Christian undertaking. Both societies spoke of benevolence as a quality of the Christian churches, ministers, and individual Christians, and of Christ's role in inculcating benevolence through Scriptural reading and conversion. For instance, the AES consciously stressed the need for piety to foster a benevolent attitude in the minister and ministerial piety to energize the benevolence of the congregation that followed upon AES prejudice in its annual report toward personal piety as the prime trait of ministerial candidates; the AHMS, as will be seen in the next section on gender, wanted strong and pious ministers to convert the West.<sup>43</sup> Furthermore, the importance of ministry formed a common theme in the AES and AHMS idea of benevolence. Both organizations avowed that the minister modeled benevolence for his congregation and was a main object of benevolent activity because both stressed the need for *learned* ministers, as the following section will show in AHMS rhetoric. Gender ideals about ministerial leadership of benevolence and ministers explicated by the AES and AHMS nuance historical understandings of male gender and Christianity in antebellum America.

Finally, the AHMS and AES promoted their relationship to foreign missions in disparate ways through their rhetoric about the expansive and universal nature of benevolence. Interrelated goals shared by different benevolent societies, the large

---

<sup>43</sup> *QR*, Nov. 1837 p. 196.

geographical and human expanse of benevolence, and its origin in God's infinite nature carried primacy in the AES's concept of benevolence as expansive. On the other hand, the AHMS trumpeted a universal and expansive benevolence because Catholic unity threatened Protestant unity in frontier and foreign evangelization. The Catholic threat forced the AHMS to urge an expansive benevolence because, for the AHMS, willing the good of every person meant willing conversion to Calvinism and not Roman Catholicism. On foreign missions, the AES *QR* vaunted their superiority to ministerial education but argued the AES made foreign missionary work possible through ministerial education. The AHMS saw its relationship to foreign missions reversed. The "surplus" of benevolence that American Christians possessed from sentiments toward foreign missions stocked home missions with sufficient benevolent sentiment to prompt adequate generosity. The AES valued its work as the root of all benevolence since it funded future foreign missionaries while the AHMS reconciled itself with a secondary spot behind foreign missions. Ultimately, the AHMS and AES focused on the idea of benevolence for ministers as Christian and expansive despite the divergent manner the two organizations discussed the hierarchy of benevolence.

### *Essentializing the Western Man*

Sermons on behalf of the AHMS and its leaders which mentioned benevolence also provided a coherent philosophy of manhood, one that centered around the educated minister and marginalized discussion of womanhood. After all, Rev. Thomas Skinner noted in his 1829 sermon: "the increase of apostolic ministers" is "the great desideratum of the age."<sup>44</sup> A priority of ministerial formation among all other social goods stood out

---

<sup>44</sup> Skinner, *Sermon*, 45.

as a common feature of AHMS sermons as it did for the AES. Both societies wanted more ministers and agreed those ministers should receive higher education and be tough men in order to successfully battle anti-Protestant forces in America. AHMS concepts about gender stemmed from its ideas about the Western United States and solidified its idea of benevolence as a male realm. There were four key elements of AHMS rhetoric about male gender in its sermon literature: (1) the miniscule treatment of women and children with a clear emphasis upon struggle and manhood; (2) the androcentric concept of the Western “mind”; (3) a clear-cut portrait of a “man of the West”; and (4) the male minister and his manhood as the foil and religious salve to the “man of the West.”

For the AHMS, the West remained a space of conflict until one force or another achieved mastery, an idea wrapped up in the “male” quality of exertion. The AHMS sponsored sermons that dealt with benevolence and manhood but pushed womanhood aside. Rev. Skinner’s memorial sermon for Rev. Matthias Bruen gendered Bruen’s congregation and his family as ones who wept after losing their head.<sup>45</sup> Such a vivid scene paralleled the long-suffering female portrayed in Rev. Porter’s 1820 AES sermon.<sup>46</sup> A woman’s place was in pious mourning instead of work in the West. The Western enterprise belonged to the “contending elements in that field for the mastery,” according to Rev. Albert Barnes in 1849.<sup>47</sup> Words such as “contending” and “mastery” connoted labor and struggle, both male spaces in antebellum America. Men fought and farmed

---

<sup>45</sup> Skinner, *Sermon*, 23.

<sup>46</sup> Porter, *Sermon*, 23-24.

<sup>47</sup> Barnes, *Home Missions*, 4.



while women kept house and practiced religion.<sup>48</sup> Furthermore, male industry secured money that disposed *him* to act with “large-hearted” benevolence because the AHMS attributed benevolent activity to men. Moreover, Barnes stated, “the boundless prairies seem as if they had been cleared by the patient labor of another race of men.”<sup>49</sup> Again, males and not females were apportioned labor in the West because the delicate female mind and body could not withstand it.<sup>50</sup> Barnes assumed a gendered conception of labor even though he ultimately placed the clearing of the West in God’s hands instead of human ones.<sup>51</sup> Nevertheless, women were minutely included in the AHMS gender hierarchy of the West because of their spiritual qualities. Skinner’s sermon on the occasion of the death of Rev. Bruen focused on the feminine piece of the *ars moriendi*: the human spirit as gendered female. Skinner said, “Whether their last hours are full of victory and mighty joy, or are only calm and peaceful; or are hours of alternate temptation and triumph, darkness and light; they are hours when the spirit still obeys the divine will as the law of her being; still confesses her guilt and abases herself before the infinite majesty and purity of God; still witnesses her supreme love of the divine

---

<sup>48</sup> Marilyn J. Westerkamp mentions piety and purity as two of the gendered ideals for women at this time in *Women and Religion in Early America, 1600-1850* (London: Routledge, 1999), 132. Gail Bederman mentions the manly quality of mastery as a key gender ideal in antebellum America in *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 11. Additionally, E. Rutondo mentioned mastery and conquest as a key descriptors of the male gender ideals of the “Masculine Achiever” and the “Christian Gentleman” in antebellum America in “Learning About Manhood: Gender Ideals and the Middle Class Family in Nineteenth Century America,” in *Manliness and Morality: Middle Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1987), 40.

<sup>49</sup> Barnes, *Home Missions*, 9.

<sup>50</sup> Westerkamp, *Women and Religion*, 110.

<sup>51</sup> Barnes, *Home Missions*, 10.

excellence...”<sup>52</sup> The litany of what the feminized spirit of a person did in a good death pointed to the AHMS construction of the antebellum American women as more spiritual than men. Yet, the AHMS did not raise that point in its discussion of the conversion of the West but left the religious and spiritual part to the minister. Skinner’s sermon discussed the life of an AHMS founder who mostly lived and ministered in New York State, not a home missionary in the Western United States, and gave an incomplete picture of the AHMS’s androcentric concept of the West.<sup>53</sup> Thus, the AHMS played up the masculine character of the West and deemphasized the feminine role in the conversion of the West.

The idea of the West mainly turned on a masculine idea of the “Western mind.” Rev. Barnes, preaching on behalf of the AHMS, elucidated the idea of the “Western mind.” He spent eight pages of his sermon, *Home Missions*, on the character and qualities of the “Western mind,” that contained numerous gendered elements. For example, the attitude of the West included the issue of deference to ministers. Barnes related: “A minister of the gospel may be certain that he may travel there any where without being insulted; or, if he is insulted by *one*, there will be a *dozen* who will defend him simply because he *is* a minister...; and an unprotected female in the West, in public conveyances, may be sure of a defence from insult which could not have been enjoyed in the best days of chivalry.”<sup>54</sup> In that passage, the minister retained more commonality with the helpless woman bereft of the communal protection she needed than to the man

---

<sup>52</sup> Skinner, *Sermon*, 11-12.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 31-32.

<sup>54</sup> Barnes, *Home Missions*, 18.

who cultivated and “subdued” Western lands.<sup>55</sup> Ministers held a liminal state between the laboring man and the religious woman, leaning more toward the female end of the spectrum. Furthermore, the ‘Western mind’ remained a partial outcropping of the Puritan mind insofar as

it is rather the *active* than the *contemplative* form of that mind that is there; rather the portion of the Puritan mind that would be represented by Pym, and Cromwell, and Hampden, than that which would be represented by Selden, and Owen, and Milton. It is not always the best educated, or the most religious, or the most literary in its tendencies, but that which is most bold and enterprising. The roving and unsettled migrate there. Those who would not be contented on a small farm, with slow gains, and with the staid and settled habits of New England, go there. Those who fail at the East, often go there to better their circumstances. Those who have less of the “home” feeling, in whom the ties which bind them to the scenes of childhood and youth are feebler, and the love of new scenes stronger, go there. Intermingled with these, there are not a few also who go with settled principles of morals and religion; men whose power *would* be felt any where, and *will* be felt there; men who go with a determination to attempt to mould the public mind, and to make the West what it should be.<sup>56</sup>

Gender roles of feminine care for the home and male exertion outside of it grounded Barnes’s account of the West. Barnes contrasted domestic sentiment to the daring and rootless “nature” of the West. For him, as for many during his time, the feminine was domestic, child-like, communal, and youthful while masculinity was indomitable and untethered.<sup>57</sup> Besides, the focus on the *active* part of the Puritan tradition and its male exemplars illustrates the affinity of active masculinity to enterprise, a central trait of benevolence. Such unfettered male activity reacted, according to Barnes, to “the immensity of the rich domain spread out there [in the West],” which could not “but make

---

<sup>55</sup> Janet Moore Lindman points out the empowering communal nature of female religious activity in “Beyond the Meetinghouse: Women and Protestant Spirituality in Early America,” in *The Religious History of American Women: Reimagining the Past* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 143.

<sup>56</sup> Barnes, *Home Missions*, 12-13.

<sup>57</sup> Lindman, “Beyond the Meetinghouse,” 152-153 and Westerkamp, *Women and Religion*, 132.

man vast in his schemes, gigantic in his purposes, large in his aspirations, boundless in his ambition.”<sup>58</sup> The West created a masculine, individualized, and accumulative religious attitude used for good or evil because ambition and vast schemes pertained to antebellum American male leadership. Methodist Francis Asbury used that attitude as a model for his Methodist frontier circuit-riding preachers as single men without the domestic tie to a woman.<sup>59</sup> In Barnes’s mind, AHMS preaching stood as the force which would make the male disposition work for good against Roman Catholicism, infidelity, and barbarity.<sup>60</sup> Additionally, such gendered sentiment of individual masculine ambition dovetailed the AHMS’s idea of “large-hearted schemes of benevolence” since laboring men could be used for benevolent activity. Therefore, manliness in endeavor, activity, and deference pervaded Barnes’s idea of the “Western mind” in *Home Missions*.

Beyond the “Western mind,” the AHMS held a paradoxical conception of self-reliance in “men of West” as an evil when in strict reference to worldly matters and a good when a balance of spiritual and material factors. Rev. Riddle stated this ideal most succinctly in *Our Country for the Sake of the World*, but Barnes, Skinner, and other preachers for the AHMS added characteristics. For instance, Riddle said: “The errors of the West are of gigantic proportions. Their leaders are bold, reckless, and revolutionary. One of the most striking characteristics of the West, too, is the spirit of self-reliance, not to term self-assurance, which manifests itself in church and state, among saints and sinners.”<sup>61</sup> An air of superiority to other humans and extreme religious and intellectual

---

<sup>58</sup> Barnes, *Home Missions*, 19.

<sup>59</sup> Westerkamp, *Women and Religion*, 116.

<sup>60</sup> Barnes, *Home Missions*, 34.

<sup>61</sup> Riddle, *Our country for the sake of the world*, 21

opinions also defined the men of the West.<sup>62</sup> Overall, Riddle painted Western men (and the rootless Methodist circuit riders by extension) as immoral, lawless, lacking religious belief, and familial stability. Yet, self-reliance never gained a completely negative connotation among Presbyterian and Congregationalist Christians. The literary collection, *Our country no.2, a plea for Home Missions*, placed the self-reliant man as part of the manhood the West needed, calling for every Westerner to be “an educated, civilized, self-reliant man, conscious of his duties and his rights.”<sup>63</sup> In that case, the idea of manhood in the West was a fluid concept employed according to the needs of the minister. It mainly attacked the rise of ignorance (and the concomitant lack of higher education) and uncivilized or frenzied religious fervor among the Western population.<sup>64</sup> Riddle’s sermon on behalf of the AHMS used the image of a Western man to convey the benevolent responsibility of Christian conversion through the West to the rest of the world. Such a portrait remained akin to the ideal man for the Western United States consonant with AHMS aims of piety and church planting. Therefore, the AHMS sought a plastic concept of the archetypal Western man in order to pursue its organizational aims and warn against infidelity and ignorance.

Ministerial manhood as a foil to the “man of the West” frequently received mention in AHMS publications. The AHMS’s focus on church foundation placed the minister at the center of home missions since every church had to have a minister.

---

<sup>62</sup> Riddle, *Our country for the sake of the world*, 21-22.

<sup>63</sup> *Our country: no.2, a plea for Home Missions* (New York: The American Home Missionary Society, 1858), 16, Sabin Americana, accessed November 8, 2017, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY103636509&srchtp=a&ste=14&q=txshracd2488>.

<sup>64</sup> Westerkamp, *Women and Religion*, 121.

Moreover, the contrariety of the minister and “man of the West” came forth in numerous ministerial facets outlined by Barnes:

A Home Missionary of this Society is, or should be, and usually is, a man of a strongly-marked character. He is an educated man, having enjoyed the best advantages of our literary and theological Seminaries. He is himself a friend of education and will be a patron of colleges and schools. He is a man who will himself possess a library, if he can, and who will aim that there shall be a library in every neighborhood. He is a man who will be an advocate of temperance a patron of every institution of benevolence. He is a man who will make his appeals to the reason and consciences of men, rather than to excited feelings. He is a man qualified to guide public opinion, and to grapple with thinking minds, and to show them that Christians are not necessarily fools. This Society regards the western mind as needing a high order of educated intellect as really as that in the East, and would feel that of two men, one of whom should have a strong and well-cultivated intellect and the other of whom should sink below mediocrity, he of humbler endowments should find his place in some city or country parish in the East:—his more gifted brother should receive a commission to go beyond the mountains.<sup>65</sup>

Ministerial manliness consisted of higher education, moderation, patronage, reason, and a public spirit. Yet, education was primary for Barnes and the AHMS he preached to, though not for the rising Methodist and Baptist denominations. For the AHMS, the minister’s manhood in benevolent works, reason, and higher learning overcame the excessive, passionate ambition of the rough, laboring, and self-reliant Western man typical of their Methodist counterparts. Such words prized the intellectual formation of ministers as the chief facet of ministerial manhood in contrast to the ignorant male ministers already in the Western United States.

Furthermore, other AHMS sermons and documents emphasized learning as the main component of the home missionary. Riddle stated that the manhood of the church depended on the degree to which Christian religion informed love of country when he said, “If we are true to our mission, and imbibe the spirit of our Master, and walk worthy

---

<sup>65</sup> Barnes, *Home Missions*, 37.

of the manhood of the church, and be not rebuked by the manifestations even of its pupilage; American patriotism, baptized by piety, must become a blessed world-embracing—world-benefiting—world-saving philanthropy.”<sup>66</sup> That passage linked manhood and education through the identification of patriotism as a pupil in the schoolroom of religion. The AHMS viewed manhood as a mix of higher learning and patriotism and because it was “of the church.” Ministers modeled and participated in love of country as leaders of the church. Additionally, Rev. Skinner elucidated the meshing of manhood and patriotism in his sermon by frequent mention of his “brethren” (other ministers) and in one instance addressing them as “lovers of your country” and servants of Jesus Christ. That rhetoric indicated that Skinner saw his fellow preachers as both learned insofar as they are churchmen and patriotic in their love for the United States.<sup>67</sup> Moreover, the AHMS attested in *Our country no. 2* that the minister became a martyr after the fashion of Christ by undergoing privations for the sake of his flock and Christ’s gospel. That society also avowed that the minister went to the West to set up churches that would one day give birth to the colleges and seminaries similar to those he attended and held dear.<sup>68</sup> The central place for higher education in the idea of manhood came through again in the mention of ministerial affection for his higher learning and the foundation of Western colleges. Finally, the AHMS used a poignant story of a pair of Home Missionaries who educated a young man from “among the wild people of the prairies and forests” and funded his studies at the newly-formed Illinois College in 1832

---

<sup>66</sup> Riddle, *Our country for the sake of the world*, 6.

<sup>67</sup> Skinner, *Sermon*, 29.

<sup>68</sup> *Our country no. 2*, 129-130.

in order that he would attend that college and Lane Seminary to study for the ministry. Eventually this young man became a Home Missionary and turned his efforts to education.<sup>69</sup> Such a vignette demonstrated the AHMS's commitment to ministerial manhood civilizing the wild passions of the Western man through education. Besides, that passage shows the sharp contrast of the AHMS that grounded their gendered conception of a refined ministerial manhood as appropriate and necessary for the Western United States. Hence, the AHMS included higher learning as a key factor in its idea of ministerial manhood.

### *One of Racism's Compatriots*

In an America deeply divided over slavery, the AHMS's tenure as a benevolent organization was fraught with the issue of whether or not to grant membership to slaveholding churches. This section explores the AHMS idea of race and whether it accorded with the AES idea of race and benevolence as well as its similarity to racial theory prevalent in nineteenth-century America. Overall, this section argues the AHMS was complicit by association in the racial theories of its age because of its conservative stance on race and slavery.

Very few mentions of benevolence and race come through in the AHMS periodical and sermons, so its racial theory was that of a society it shared leadership with, the American Colonization Society (ACS). For example, the AHMS and ACS had deep ties and support at Andover Theological Seminary where its professor of theology, Leonard Woods, was an AHMS leader and Andover defended colonization against abolitionism because its biblical scholars did not believe the Bible condemned slavery or

---

<sup>69</sup> *Our country* no. 2, 138.



promoted racial equality.<sup>70</sup> Furthermore, Leo Hirrel states that Andover's leadership and the AHMS had a cordial relationship.<sup>71</sup> Andover's racial beliefs were intertwined with its support for racial benevolence in the ACS and its aid for the AHMS because higher education and benevolence in antebellum America cannot be separated from Christian missions, racism, and pro-slavery thought.<sup>72</sup> Furthermore, Susan Ryan argues for benevolence as "a central paradigm in antebellum culture" or a national phenomenon beyond its subordination within sentimentalism. Racial hierarchies and good intentions in reform melded to create a paradoxical Christian racism, according to Ryan.<sup>73</sup> She correctly diffuses the idea of benevolence, covers later national benevolent societies such as the American Missionary Association, and highlights the "antisentimental strain" of benevolence—benevolence as a system removed from identification with suffering—the AES and AHMS represented.<sup>74</sup> This section fleshes out Ryan's discussion of anti-sentimental benevolence in the AHMS.

AHMS implicitly acknowledge the ACS racial ideology of social environmentalism—the theory that different environments engendered racial disparities—until the AHMS became anti-slavery.<sup>75</sup> The AHMS was silent about the ACS in its publications. The silence is interpreted as an endorsement of its conservative

---

<sup>70</sup> Howard, *Conscience and Slavery*, 9-11, 13, 26.

<sup>71</sup> Hirrel, *Children of Wrath*, 57.

<sup>72</sup> See footnote 84 in chapter two for more information on this.

<sup>73</sup> Ryan, *The Grammar of Good Intentions*, 4-5.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 21. Margaret Abruzzo also demonstrates that Southern slaveholders in the antebellum period propounded an "active benevolence" contrary to the sentimentalism of Northern abolitionists in *Polemical Pain*, 192.

<sup>75</sup> See the section in the second chapter entitled *The AES and Race* for a more detailed account of what social environmentalism was.

racial theory, at least until the AHMS firmly opposed and defunded slaveholding churches in 1853 due to pressure from Congregational abolitionist ministers in its membership.<sup>76</sup> AHMS (and ACS) patrons acted benevolently when they supported the “return” of freed slaves to Africa in the Liberian colony, a part of the “benevolent racism” of early nineteenth-century America, a coterie of racial tenets and agendas shared by numerous antebellum reform movements.<sup>77</sup> AHMS-supported congregations led by abolitionist ministers could have held parts of “benevolent racism,” such as the inferiority of blacks and blacks’ status as a point of benevolent interest. Yet, the widespread polygenesis of Louis Agassiz did not dominate the other racial opinions of that age open to anti-slavery ministers since anti-slavery sentiment and “benevolent racism” were coterminous in early nineteenth-century America. Lester Stephens contended a figure such as Rev. John Bachman, a Lutheran minister and leading Southern mammologist among the Charleston, South Carolina circle of naturalists, bucked the conventions of his own circle and era to argue for monogenesis while holding slavery as a divine and Biblical ordinance.<sup>78</sup> Racial ideas varied throughout the American nation, but racism remained a staple of AHMS benevolence because of its attachment to the racial hierarchy at the heart of antebellum America. Thus, the racial theory of social environmentalism and “benevolent racism” affected the AHMS through its ACS leadership connections despite its post-1853 anti-slavery stance.

---

<sup>76</sup> Howard, *Conscience and Slavery*, 100-101, 108-109.

<sup>77</sup> Ryan uses this term in *The Grammar of Good Intentions*, 16.

<sup>78</sup> Lester D. Stephens, *Science, Race, and Religion in the American South: John Bachman and the Charleston Circle of Naturalists, 1815-1895* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 165-194.

### *Conclusion*

On the whole, benevolence *for* ministers in the mind of the AES and the AHMS remained male, white, systematic, Christian and, most importantly, a creature of higher education. Rhetoric and ideology in both organizations contained numerous similarities. The AES and the AHMS trumpeted the supreme importance of an educated ministry but differed on what that ministry was *for*. Such variation is understandable. These were two separate organizations with different purposes. For instance, the AHMS displayed greater concern with the nation and cultivating national sentiment than the AES because of the factional and regional tendencies in the AHMS explanation of the character of the West. Moreover, “patriotic benevolence” provided a framework of commonality in a reform body bitterly divided over slavery in the late antebellum period. While a mutual notion of masculine and feminine roles allied the AES and AHMS, the AHMS’s pervasive emphasis on the Western man determined its more sharply defined ideas of gender. Yet, the common bonds between the two organizations cannot be overlooked. Shared concepts of systematic, extensive, and Christian benevolence as well as a special relationship of their cause to foreign missions and ministerial gender through higher education forged a united ideology of benevolence. Additionally, disparate racial ideology did not divide the AHMS from the AES, rather “benevolent racism” united them. Susan Ryan’s evaluation of benevolence as “a contested paradigm rather than a delimited and conservative set of beliefs and practices” opens the door for many definitions of benevolence, i.e. local, national, poverty relief, etc.<sup>79</sup> Both the AES and

---

<sup>79</sup> Ryan, *The Grammar of Good Intentions*, 9-10.

AHMS shared an idea of benevolence as ministerial manliness that broadens the scholarly horizon of ideas of benevolence.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Ideas of Benevolence in Antebellum Seminaries

What did the ideology of benevolence as ministerial manliness have to do with the antebellum theological seminary? Such a seminary was an institution of higher learning that taught sacred doctrine, produced theological scholarship, and trained ministers for pastoral work.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, seminaries imbued students with a love for the church, a ministerial career, and millennial zeal for the establishment of God's Kingdom through benevolent societies. By 1860, the seminary was a well-established form of theological education with about sixty-one iterations throughout the United States and a four-fold institutional increase and six-fold rise in enrollment since 1820.<sup>2</sup> Yet, one-on-one theological study with a minister of choice, a "school of the prophets" or no advanced study at all still remained the norm across all denominations.<sup>3</sup> Despite the small quantity of seminary-trained ministers, historians pointed out the seminaries'

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the definition that Glenn Miller uses in *Piety and Intellect: The Aims and Purposes of Antebellum Theological Education* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 12.

<sup>2</sup> Gerald Gene Winkleman, "Polemics, Prayers, and Professionalism: The American Protestant Theological Seminaries from 1784 to 1920" (PhD diss., State University of New York at Buffalo, 1975), 146, 176, 181, 207, accessed March 1, 2018, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 182-3. The commonality of "schools of the prophets" through 1825 is illustrated by David W. Kling in "New Divinity Schools of the Prophets, 1750-1825: A Case Study in Ministerial Education," special issue, *History of Education Quarterly* 37, no. 2 (Summer 1997), 204-207, accessed March 23, 2018, <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/ehost/detail/detail?vid=10&sid=1f6c63cb-d322-4247-a786-8f3a5106cf1b%40sessionmgr4009&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZW9vc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=a9h&AN=9706251940>.

significance for antebellum American life. Such institutions fostered religious revival and inculcated pupils with a knowledge of the early Church Fathers.<sup>4</sup>

Gerald Winkleman's 1975 study of American seminaries summarized over 200 denominational seminary histories for the first time. He also argued that the seminary moved from an antebellum emphasis on polemical theology toward a late nineteenth and early twentieth century professionalism that bore fruit in four stages: (1) institutionalization (1784-1820); (2) multiplication (1820-1860); (3) adaptation to mass immigration (1860-1890); and (4) professionalization (1890-1920).<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, Winkleman used Richard Hofstadter's definition of polemicism, which placed the many seminary professors who wrote polemical tracts in a negative, "unenlightened" cast compared to the awe-inspiring professionalism of their post-bellum counterparts.<sup>6</sup> In 1990, Glenn Miller challenged Winkleman's work and contended that Andover, the first and model antebellum theological seminary, sought professional, scholarly, and orthodox theology as an institutional and curricular goal with a heavy dose of nationalism.<sup>7</sup> More recently, Justo Gonzalez maintained in the wide-ranging *The History of Theological Education* that "modern" theological education in America leaned toward the pastoral as opposed to the doctrinal side of ministry.<sup>8</sup> Additionally, Gonzalez asserts Protestant

---

<sup>4</sup> Miller, *Piety and Intellect*, 23, 97; Elizabeth A. Clark, *Founding the Fathers: Early Church History and Protestant Professors in Nineteenth-Century America* (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 1-2.

<sup>5</sup> Winkleman, "Polemics, Prayers, and Professionalism," 2.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 68, 101.

<sup>7</sup> Miller, *Piety and Intellect*, 4-5, 27.

<sup>8</sup> Justo Gonzalez, *The History of Theological Education* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2015), 107-111.

scholasticism left a heavy mark upon the curriculum of American seminaries in the antebellum era.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, historians neglect the connections between the seminary in antebellum America, the Protestant religious virtue of benevolence, and national benevolent organizations.<sup>10</sup> Miller clearly thought seminaries formed nationally-minded, scholarly ministers and Winkleman saw seminaries creating dogmatic expositors. On the other hand, I ask whether seminaries, through professors and their charges, contributed to the idea of benevolence in the AES and AHMS. Did the ideology of benevolence as ministerial manliness exist in seminaries throughout all sections of the nation or only in a section or two and how did those seminaries define benevolence?

This chapter explores the intellectual streams of benevolence in three seminaries in America: Congregationalist Andover Seminary in the Northern United States (Massachusetts), the Presbyterian Union Theological Seminary in the South (Virginia), and the Presbyterian Danville Theological Seminary in the West (Kentucky). Such a diverse regional sweep will uncover whether or not benevolence was as national in reach as the AES and AHMS claimed. Furthermore, seminary curricula, writings, sermons, and speeches given by seminary faculty at those three institutions will form the evidence for this chapter as will specific analysis of the writings of a member of the theology faculty, a one-man department at most of the institutions. A theologian is more likely to discuss benevolence than the professor of sciences or letters. For this chapter, the seminaries and their ideology of benevolence will be examined in chronological order of their founding:

---

<sup>9</sup> Gonzalez, *The History of Theological Education*, 89-91.

<sup>10</sup> Again, Naylor's dissertation and journal article as well as Allmendinger's article on the AES are the only works to look at the AES and antebellum seminaries. As for the AHMS, Goodykoontz's book, *Home Missions*, deals with the AHMS and higher education in a marginal way.

Andover (1808), Union (1812), and then Danville (1853). Besides, this chapter also illumines how intradenominational divisions affected the teaching of benevolence. Union and Danville seminaries were tied to the Old School Party of the Presbyterian Church and Danville was one of the newest arms of the Old School. Andover was mostly tied to the Hopkinsian party in Congregational theology and the New School Presbyterian faction. As a seminary, it was my choice to represent Congregationalism because it birthed and sustained the AES and AHMS and thereby embodied the wellspring of benevolent ideology for the nation. Historians mainly tie benevolence as an idea to Northern Congregationalists and Northern New School Presbyterians at Western seminaries such as Lane (Ohio) and New Albany (Indiana), but I chose Old School Presbyterian seminaries in the South (Union) and West (Danville) as case studies for benevolence at Old School institutions and found that Union had few ties to the AES and AHMS and Danville none.<sup>11</sup> Most importantly, this chapter contends that the idea of benevolence at Andover fed the notion of benevolence as ministerial manliness that the AES and AHMS promoted in their magazines and annual reports while Union and

---

<sup>11</sup> For an explanation of the Old School-New School Presbyterian controversy and its relation to benevolence, see Bradley J. Longfield, *Presbyterians and American Culture: A History* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2013), 94. D.G. Hart and John R. Muether, *Seeking a Better Country: 100 Years of American Presbyterianism* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2007), 121-124; George M. Marsden, *The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience: A Case Study in Thought and Theology in the Nineteenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970); and Ernest Trice Thompson, *Presbyterians in the South*, vol. 1 (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1967). For case studies on the controversy, see Elywn A. Smith, "The Role of the South in the Presbyterian Schism of 1837-1838," *Church History* 29, no. 1, (March 1960), accessed October 3, 2016, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3161616>; Earl R. McCormac, "Missions and the Presbyterian Schism of 1837," *Church History*, 32, no. 1 (March 1963), accessed October 3, 2016, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3162539>; James H. Moorhead, "The 'Restless Spirit of Radicalism': Old School Fears and the Schism of 1837," *The Journal of Presbyterian History*, 78, no.1 (Spring 2000), accessed January 22, 2017, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23335295> and C. Bruce Staiger, "Abolition and the Presbyterian Schism, 1837-1838," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 36, (December 1949), accessed October 3, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1893014>.



Danville did little to engage with national benevolence or buttress it, hinting that ministerial manliness was an idea separate from ideology in Presbyterian seminaries.

*Andover Seminary: The Beating Heart of Benevolence*

Andover Seminary was founded in 1808 as an institution of higher learning for training orthodox Congregationalist ministers to battle Unitarianism and write high-end biblical scholarship. Andover balanced Hopkinsian and Old Calvinist loyalties in the tension between those two groups and the Unitarians who together comprised the three divisions within New England Calvinism.<sup>12</sup> Congregationalist theologian Leonard Woods coalesced Hopkinsian and Old Calvinist parties under the roof of one seminary to present a united front against the Unitarians when Andover opened on Sept. 28, 1808.<sup>13</sup> In fact, that action was Woods's claim to fame in later histories and one of the most significant events in nineteenth-century New England Congregationalism.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, Andover sought theological scholarship alongside theological orthodoxy. Glenn Miller stated Timothy Dwight's (Yale College president) list of seven seminary standards for Andover at its 1808 institutional inauguration made Andover unique in its push for theological research added onto the already-commonplace pastoral training.<sup>15</sup> For example, Moses Stuart, an Andover theology professor, read and dialogued with

---

<sup>12</sup> Daniel Day Williams, *The Andover Liberals: A Study in Theology* (Morningside Heights, New York, NY: Kings Crown Press [a division of Columbia University Press], 1941), 2-5.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 4-7.

<sup>14</sup> Williston Walker, *Ten New England Leaders* (New York: Arno Press, 1969), 363.

<sup>15</sup> Miller, *Piety and Intellect*, 68-9.

contemporary liberal German theologians but stayed an orthodox Calvinist.<sup>16</sup> He created a model seminary for biblical research because Andover educated the most prominent nineteenth-century American biblical critics and started a PhD program in 1860.<sup>17</sup> Andover's dual purposes and its status as the first U.S. theological seminary make it an important institution for the ideology of benevolence.

Andover's early days were filled with major connections to benevolent organizations. In 1815, the AES received its start and early leadership from Andover's professors. Rev. Dr. Ebenezer Porter, Andover's Professor of Pulpit Eloquence, had a major hand in its formation because he co-penned its constitution with fellow Andover divines Moses Stuart and Eliphalet Pearson since "their connections with the theological seminary made them authorities on the subject of ministerial education and their residence in Andover made it convenient for them to meet together."<sup>18</sup> Porter and Pearson also contributed to the organizational survival of the AES.<sup>19</sup> Miller states Stuart made a connection with the AES so that it would fund Andover and fortify the classical liberal arts curriculum as an adequate preparation for future ministers to enter seminary studies.<sup>20</sup> Additionally, Andover also forged relationships to other organizations in the

---

<sup>16</sup> Miller, *Piety and Intellect*, 71. For two good studies of nineteenth-century liberal German theology and American theology, see David L. Ellis, "Echoes of Halle: Halle's Contested Legacy in Prussia and the United States in the Nineteenth Century," in *Halle Pietism, Colonial North America, and the Young United States*, ed. Hans-Jurgen Grabbe (Stuttgart, Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2008), 273-288, ILL and Patrick Labriola, "German Intellectual History and American Romanticism: Spirit, Nature Philosophy, and the Occult," *Yearbook of German-American Studies* 27 (2002), 79-90.

<sup>17</sup> Miller, *Piety and Intellect*, 72-74.

<sup>18</sup> Natalie A. Naylor, "Raising a Learned Ministry: The American Education Society, 1815-1860," (EdD diss., Columbia University, 1971), 37, accessed September 7, 2016, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 38-39.

<sup>20</sup> Miller, *Piety and Intellect*, 75.

Benevolent Empire. Andover professor Thomas Skinner delivered a sermon in support of the AHMS and president Justin Edwards facilitated a warm relationship with the AHMS.<sup>21</sup> Beyond those two societies, Andover birthed the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions (ABCFM), and Leonard Woods promoted foreign missions and co-founded the American Tract Society (1813), the AES, and the American Temperance Society (1826).<sup>22</sup> More importantly, Andover supplied forty percent of ABCFM missionaries within the board's first fifty years of existence.<sup>23</sup> Thus, Andover held a prominent place in the founding or workings of many of the major national benevolent institutions of the early nineteenth century.

As previously mentioned, Woods conciliated both Hopkinsian (New Divinity) and Old Calvinist parties in Congregationalism in order to secure the establishment of Andover and did so because of a distinctive upbringing and training in Congregational theology. He was born in a pastoral setting in Princeton, Massachusetts in 1774 and left his family farm to attend Harvard in 1792. After his encounter with Harvard's Unitarianism, Woods studied with an eminent New Divinity cleric, Rev. Charles Backus, for three months in summer 1797 and then finished his studies in Rev. Prince's library at Old South Church, Princeton. He was called and subsequently ordained in December 1798 at Second Church in West Newburyport, Massachusetts and set a New Divinity-inspired Confession of Faith for his congregation but also befriended Old Calvinist

---

<sup>21</sup> Hirrel, *Children of Wrath*, 57.

<sup>22</sup> Gale L. Kenny, "Race, Sympathy, and Missionary Sensibility in the New England Colonization Movement," in *New Directions in the Study of African-American Recolonization* eds. Beverly C. Tomek and Matthew J. Hetrick (Gainesville, FL: The University Press of Florida, 2017), 35; Walker, *Ten New England Leaders*, 389.

<sup>23</sup> Miller, *Piety and Intellect*, 77-78.

ministers such as David Tappan, Eliphalet Pearson, and Jedidiah Morse.<sup>24</sup> He wrote for Morse's *Panoplist* during the beginning of the Unitarian crisis and advocated for a united orthodox Calvinist seminary at Andover (where Phillips Academy was already teaching ministers), which he led beginning in October 1807 after a brief stint at a New Divinity seminary at West Newburyport in early 1807. The union of the orthodox Congregationalist parties was complete. Finally, Woods's frequent authorship of polemical pieces for periodicals and a few books as well as high demand for his ordination sermons ornamented an illustrious tenure at Andover where he taught over 1,500 students, 1,000 of those finishing the entire course of study.<sup>25</sup> His respectable literary output and lengthy teaching career recommends him as a window into the ideology of benevolence at Andover.

Woods, as professor of theology, taught benevolence at Andover but his sermons and tracts outside of Andover also provide evidence of what he believed and said in the classroom. Woods spent much of his time outside of teaching duties writing against

---

<sup>24</sup> For more recent contributions to the historiography on the New Divinity school of theology, see Oliver D. Crisp and Douglas A. Sweeney, eds. *After Jonathan Edwards: The Courses of the New England Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), Douglas A. Sweeney and Allen C. Guelzo, eds. *The New England Theology: From Jonathan Edwards to Edwards Amasa Park* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006), David W. Kling, "The New Divinity and the Origins of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions," *Church History* 72, no.4 (Dec. 2003): 791-819, Kling, "New Divinity Schools of Prophets, 1750-1825: A Case Study in Ministerial Education," *History of Education Quarterly* 37, no. 2 (Summer 1997): 185-206, Joseph A. Conforti, *Samuel Hopkins and the New Divinity Movement: Calvinism, the Congregational Ministry, and Reform in New England Between the First and Second Great Awakenings* (Grand Rapids, MI: Christian University Press, 1981), William Breitenbach, "Unregenerate Doings: Selflessness and Selfishness in New Divinity Theology," *American Quarterly* 34, no. 5 (Winter 1982), 479-502 accessed April 27, 2018, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2712641>, Breitenbach, "Piety and Moralism: Edwards and the New Divinity," in *Jonathan Edwards and the American Experience*, ed. Nathan O. Hatch and Harry S. Stout (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), Stephan Garrard Post, "Love and Eudaemonism: A Study in the Thought of Jonathan Edwards and Samuel Hopkins" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago Divinity School, 1983), accessed April 27, 2018, ProQuest Dissertations and These Global and Mark Valeri, "The New Divinity and the American Revolution, *William and Mary Quarterly* 46, no. 4 (Oct. 1989): 741-769, accessed April 27, 2018, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1922781>.

<sup>25</sup> Walker, *Ten New England Leaders*, 365-386. Completion of the whole course of seminary studies was not common at this time.

heterodox theology: first, the Unitarians with Rev. William Ellery Channing as their main apologist, then, Nathaniel Taylor and his New Haven school of theology. Nathaniel Taylor was professor of didactic theology at Yale Divinity School and taught a soft Arminianism—(1) human ability to receive an impression of the truth prior to regeneration and (2) human aid in his or her own regeneration— at odds with orthodox Calvinist teaching on salvation.<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, Woods spoke of benevolence while engaged in literary exchanges with former students and in funeral sermons for friends, theological mentors, and prominent Congregational clerics. In short, most of Rev. Woods's works discussed benevolence in some form and his sermons outside of Andover were indicators of what he taught in the seminary. Thus, his classroom theology and public teaching both exemplified the ideology of benevolence at Andover.

After examining two volumes of Woods's works, a pattern emerged in his ideas of benevolence. For him, benevolence had an academic and a public dimension rooted in place and audience. The academic side delineated what he taught about benevolence at Andover geared towards students and wrote in polemics aimed at other scholarly ministers. On the other hand, the public rendering of benevolence concerned his sermons preached to laity and ministers alike. Woods let the academic conception of benevolence flow into its public rendering since his polemics against Unitarians and Dr. Taylor—containing doctrines and arguments taught within Andover's walls—provided the basis for his rhetoric of benevolence in his public sermons. Additionally, both his public works

---

<sup>26</sup> I realize that it remains quite a challenge to sum up the finely-tuned theological controversy between traditional Calvinism and the New Haven School of Theology. For a fuller treatment of the New Haven Theology, see the two-part study of Earl A. Pope. "The Rise of the New Haven Theology," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 44 no. 1 (March 1966): 24-44, accessed April 27, 2018, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23326009> and "The Rise of the New Haven Theology," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 44 no. 2 (June 1966): 106-121, accessed April 27, 2018, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23326179>.

and Andover teaching contained discussion of benevolence as related to God, Jesus Christ, regeneration, love, ministers, human actions, and human happiness. What Woods wrote in speculative polemics and preached in the collected sermons about the nature of benevolence were distinct yet related. The following paragraphs will draw out Woods's strains of scholarly and public (or polemical) benevolence and their relationship. Thus, Woods translated his academic conception of benevolence into useful, didactic terms at Andover that he, the AES, and AHMS constructed a benevolent ideology of ministerial manliness out of.

Leonard Woods's academic idea of benevolence was the notion that God, in His love, intends the greatest degree of happiness for all his creatures and humans should mirror that benevolence, especially ministers in their congregational and benevolent leadership. He stated that the theological course of study he drew up aimed to help other Andover professors and students understand the ideal and general order of subjects in theology and also guided his thirty-eight years of teaching.<sup>27</sup> Woods placed the "Benevolence of God" later in his instructional schema (as the ninth point) and dealt with these subtopics: "Can it be inferred from his natural perfections? The object of divine benevolence, and the ways in which it is displayed. Objections from the existence of natural and moral evil, answered. Practical uses."<sup>28</sup> The outline's prose is neither flattering nor engaging, but its order is important. Woods foregrounded speculative points, such as what benevolence is ordered to or what divine benevolence acts upon and what abstract points might dismiss the existence of benevolence. Then, he discussed its

---

<sup>27</sup> Leonard Woods, *The works*, vol. 4 (Andover, MA: Warren F. Draper, 1863), 549, accessed January 16, 2018, HathiTrust, <http://catalog.hathitrust.org/api/volumes/oclc/9391684.html>.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., 555-556.

quotidian application last. Next, Woods's theological teaching moved to "Christian Virtue, or Holiness" and the second heading under that section contained the words: "Consistency between general benevolence and private affections" and a list of texts he used to expound that truth.<sup>29</sup> Now, benevolence played a major role in Wood's conceptions of God and humans. Both have benevolence. Furthermore, Woods also taught benevolence in the section on election or salvation. The section "Divine Purposes, or Decrees" included the first objection to scriptural evidence of the decree of election: "The doctrine of Divine Decrees is inconsistent with the benevolence and justice of God" and Woods taught that objection in order to demonstrate that humans did not cooperate with God's grace for election because God's decrees were absolutely immutable.<sup>30</sup> The doctrinal battles of the Taylorite (New Haven Theology) controversy in Congregationalism showed how critical the Calvinist doctrine of election remained for orthodoxy or heterodoxy. Consequently, Woods's doctrinal teaching about God, human activity, and human salvation incorporated the idea of benevolence.

Beyond his Andover classroom, Woods broadened the academic idea of benevolence in order to include more about its relationship to God and God's love. In general, the fourth volume of Woods's writings contained the polemical addresses he gave, such as his Letters to Unitarians and Letters to Dr. Taylor. Those pieces were an extension of his academic theology because the polemics consisted of the same debates about nature and grace he taught seminary students. Such pupils would become ministers one day and fight Unitarianism in their congregations with the orthodox doctrines of

---

<sup>29</sup> Woods, *The works*, vol. 4, 571.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 562.

grace. Woods, in his second letter to Dr. Taylor, said that God, in setting up the Calvinist system of doctrine “has done what infinite wisdom and benevolence dictated. He has not done differently, because infinite wisdom and benevolence did not permit, or did not lead to it.”<sup>31</sup> God looked after humans in the best way possible by providing them with the Calvinist system, an act of His benevolence. As for love and benevolence, Woods clearly stated his understanding of it in his third letter to the Unitarians: “The sentiment, which forms the basis of our system, is that GOD IS LOVE. This declaration of Scripture we understand in its plain and obvious sense, and believe it happily expresses the whole moral character of God. *He is a Being of infinite and perfect benevolence.* This is the disposition of God toward his creatures... The object of benevolence or goodness is, to do good, to promote real happiness. The object of infinite benevolence must be to promote the *highest degree* of happiness.”<sup>32</sup> In that passage, God’s love is His benevolence towards man, the actions that instill complete happiness in man. Woods meant that God’s benevolence encompassed His love for men and their spiritual good of regeneration. Therefore, the idea of benevolence for Woods related to God in those two ways.

Besides, Woods’s academic polemics also included the central notion of human action and ministers in benevolence. His tenth letter to the Unitarians argued God’s benevolence causes the good end of human beings, happiness, when he wrote, “the great end of benevolence, that is, the happiness of the universe,” insisted that God’s grace makes human affections benevolent, and stated that “feelings of benevolence” should

---

<sup>31</sup> Woods, *The works*, vol. 4, 366.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 13. Emphasis in the original.



exist between theological opponents, *i.e.* Unitarians and orthodox Calvinists.<sup>33</sup> God acts benevolently when creating human happiness because humans are part of the universe and benevolence for Woods also consisted in human charity towards another person.

Additionally, Woods stated about orthodox Calvinist ministers:

It would be a great injustice to orthodox ministers and Christians, both in Europe and America, to pass over the influence, which their belief in divine goodness has, to produce *benevolent action*. It is because they believe that *God is love*, and that he is ready to pardon and save all who repent, that they are engaged in such plans of benevolence, and are striving to enlighten and convert the world. In these benevolent efforts, they are aiming at a humble imitation of him, who is the supreme object of their veneration and love.<sup>34</sup>

Such a rich quotation emphasized the efficacious influence of the minister and lay Christians in salvation. The minister accepted the repentant sinner because the minister's benevolence mirrored God's love or benevolence, which seeks human conversion. Moreover, Woods's understanding of masculine action and benevolence shed light on gender dynamics in benevolent organizations. Benevolence aimed at salvation in Woods's mind. He singled out ministers and distinguished them from the Christian populace in the above quotation to show their inspiration of benevolent action and regeneration. For Andover's professor of theology, an academic notion of benevolence set human benevolence on a pedestal with ministers at the top—yet subordinated it to God's love and causality of human happiness.

On the non-academic side, Woods broadened his conception of benevolence and it paralleled the AES and AHMS ideas of benevolence insofar as it spoke of plans and missions as parts of benevolence and ultimately prized benevolent endeavors that directly

---

<sup>33</sup> Woods, *The works*, vol. 4, 82, 107, 139, 183, 288.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

pertained to the ministry. Woods's conception influenced the rhetoric of those two benevolent societies because of his hand in their formation. Description of benevolence as a plan came about in Woods's funeral sermon for Rev. Dr. Samuel Spring, his Edwardsean mentor. He used examples of his mentor's benevolent efforts in order to demonstrate the chain-effect of benevolence. Woods said,

Those few efforts [of Dr. Spring] have, through divine favor, had a leading influence to set in motion engines of good, whose operation already beings to be felt in various parts of the Christian and pagan world, and whose blessed effects, uniting with the effects of other plans of benevolence, will we doubt not, constantly spread to a wider and wider extent, and reach to the end of time, and to everlasting ages.<sup>35</sup>

The idea of a plan rested on coordinated efforts toward a good end by different individuals or groups of people. Such "plans" worked alongside each other, just as in AES and AHMS acknowledgment of the necessity of promoting all benevolent endeavors and not just one. For the AHMS and especially for the AES, foreign missions played a large role in their organizational definition. The AES repeatedly defined foreign missions as the primary purpose of benevolence but also positioned itself as a nurturer of foreign missions because it educated ministers for missions (and other ecclesiastical tasks). In Woods's estimation, "The fact is, the *missionary cause* is the same as that, which every minister labors to advance. It is the same cause, taken in a more extended sense. and "if the preaching of the gospel is the appointed means of bringing men to enjoy that salvation; then it is utterly impossible to separate the exercise of *benevolence* from the cause of *missions*."<sup>36</sup> Woods, similar to the AHMS and the AES, melded

---

<sup>35</sup> Woods, *The works*, vol. 5 (Andover, MA: Warren F. Draper, 1863), 240, accessed January 10, 2018, <http://catalog.hathitrust.org/api/volumes/oclc/9391684.html>.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 249-250. Emphasis in the original.

benevolence with missions. Furthermore, Woods listed a hierarchy of benevolent objects and home missions ranked fifth (and last) while foreign missions came in third behind construction of colleges and seminaries and ministerial education.<sup>37</sup> Such a ranking illustrates a central tension in the idea of benevolence also exhibited by the AES and AHMS: they stressed that all benevolent activity should be patronized but put their own benevolent concerns first.<sup>38</sup> Woods positioned institutions of higher learning for ministers as the primary object of benevolence in his list and this contrasted with foreign missions atop the AES and AHMS benevolent hierarchy. Woods, the AES, and AHMS constantly argued for universality in action and donation to follow upon benevolence (or universal feeling) but ranked benevolent organizations by importance to their livelihood, ministerial work.

Finally, “Christian” as a quality of benevolence had currency for Woods in gendered terms as it did for the AES and AHMS. In his sermon on the death of Rev. Dr. Samuel Worcester, Woods preached: “It is the greatness of *Christian benevolence*, that we admire; it is the greatness. . . .of the man whose superior endowments are devoted to the cause of Christ...”<sup>39</sup> Again, in a funeral sermon for wealthy Andover co-founder Moses Brown, Woods exhorted: “My position is, that *those who are rich are under sacred obligations to devote a portion of their substance to benevolent purposes*. I here speak of benevolence in its highest sense—benevolence directed to objects peculiarly Christian.”<sup>40</sup> In the Brown funeral sermon chronology, Woods delivered the line about

---

<sup>37</sup> Woods, *The works* vol. 5, 268.

<sup>38</sup> See *ibid.*, 257, 288 for Woods’s assertion of the need to support all benevolent endeavors.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 243. Emphasis in the original.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 266. Emphasis in the original.

Christian benevolence prior to his explicit benevolent hierarchy. All the ranks of benevolence presumed a Christian foundation and motive. Hence, Woods made Christianity the guiding ideological force of benevolence in no uncertain terms in both funeral sermons. More strikingly, Woods elucidated Christian benevolence as an excellence of ministers—in Rev. Worcester’s case—and men, in Brown’s situation. Furthermore, Woods’s exhortation about “sacred obligations” came in a specific circumstance because he devoted his funeral sermon to the notion that Christianity demanded the rich support benevolent works and exercise benevolence in imitation of Moses Brown’s generous donations of \$10,000, \$1,000, and \$25,000 to Andover.<sup>41</sup> One key to Andover’s success rested upon its money-laden male donors, such as Brown, who whole-heartedly applauded the seminary’s national scope, according to Miller.<sup>42</sup> Hence, Woods stressed benevolence as a manly, Christian duty to garner more money for Andover, and the AHMS and AES did the same for their organizations. Woods and the two benevolent societies for ministers shared a basic idea of public benevolence as Christian in all its aspects, concerned with missions, and a planned endeavor run and funded by men and ministers.

#### *Union Seminary: Minor Engagement in Benevolence*

For historians, a discussion of benevolence in New England may not be as surprising as one in the Southern United States in the early national period. Numerous historians interpreted Union Seminary, a Presbyterian seminary in Lexington, Virginia, as a regional and Southern institution. William B. Sweetser Jr. pegged Union as a Southern

---

<sup>41</sup> Woods, *The works* vol. 5, 277.

<sup>42</sup> Miller, *Piety and Intellect*, 187-88.

seminary in the 1830s-1840s after its early nationalist leaning in the first two decades of that century.<sup>43</sup> Miller characterizes Union as a Western seminary until 1853, when under the leadership of R.L. Dabney, it became distinctively Southern.<sup>44</sup> In Miller's mind, Old School forces at Union precipitated its fall from grace as a piece of the "broad American Calvinism" of the early nineteenth-century.<sup>45</sup>

Those two recent works about Union follow a scholarly trend that views Southern Presbyterianism as relatively unconnected from national life in antebellum America.<sup>46</sup> However, recent scholarship by William Harrison Taylor illuminates the interdenominational and national vision of Southern Presbyterianism.<sup>47</sup> Taylor argued that "although there were Presbyterians in the South whose interdenominational nationalism aligned with the vision of the General Assembly, there were also other Presbyterians whose varied local attempts proved irksome to the ruling body" and "these

---

<sup>43</sup> William B. Sweetser Jr., *A Copious Fountain: A History of Union Presbyterian Seminary, 1812-2012* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016).

<sup>44</sup> Miller, *Piety and Intellect*, 214.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> Bradley J. Longfield contended that Southern Presbyterians did not seek social reform as their Northern brethren in faith did in *Presbyterians and American Culture*, 75. Additionally, Anne C. Loveland stated Southern evangelicals sought individual reformation but not social reform in *Southern Evangelicals and the Social Order, 1800-1860* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1980), 161-2. She continues in the tradition of Donald Mathews who contends in *Religion in the Old South* that the individualization of the slavery issue in consequence individualized all other moral issues. Moreover, she also follows Sydney Ahlstrom and John L. Thomas who posit that the strict Calvinism of the Southern Presbyterians had no room for the Arminian and New Divinity notion of societal reform. John B. Boles contested the early national Southern revivals (1800-1805) aimed at individual and not social restoration in "Revivalism, Renewal, and Social Mediation in the Old South," in *Modern Christian Revivals* eds. Edith L. Blumhofer and Randall Balmer (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993). Glenn Miller states that Presbyterians sadly left behind a national focus when they constructed numerous Western and Southern seminaries instead of one national seminary for the entire church and that the South was not conducive to seminary education in *Piety and Intellect*, 208-9, 215-216.

<sup>47</sup> William Harrison Taylor, *Unity in Christ and Country: American Presbyterians in the Revolutionary Era, 1758-1801* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2017).

difficulties were *in* the South rather than *of* the South.”<sup>48</sup> His careful distinction between the South’s accidentals ( “in”) and its “nature” or “essence” ( “of”) remains crucial to my argument in this section. Through the life of George Addison Baxter, professor of theology at Union Seminary from 1831-1841 and other professors and students, I contend Union in the mid-antebellum period—was a national seminary with a relationship to national benevolent organizations.

Union Theological Seminary’s roots go back to its beginnings at Hampden-Sydney College, but its reach eventually extended throughout the American nation by 1831. Founded in the 1775 as a nominally interdenominational but mainly Presbyterian college, Hampden-Sydney received a theological library when the Hanover Presbytery funneled Andrew Baker’s gift of 400 pounds for that purpose in 1806.<sup>49</sup> From that library in his attic, Hampden-Sydney president Moses Hoge educated Presbyterian ministerial candidates and he and other Virginia Presbyterians looked to Andover as the model of an ideal seminary.<sup>50</sup> Meanwhile, the Presbyterian General Assembly debated the efficacy of a single national seminary encompassing north and south and the 1812 establishment of a seminary at the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University) brought that vision to fruition.<sup>51</sup> The Hanover Presbytery abstained from monetary support for the Princeton seminary and on October 22, 1812 created a committee that explored and then constructed Union Theological Seminary (with the aid of Northern financiers) as “a southern school for southern churches,” according to Rev. John Holt

---

<sup>48</sup> Taylor, *Unity in Christ and Country*, 98. Emphasis mine.

<sup>49</sup> Sweetser, *A Copious Fountain*, 26.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 28, 31. 37.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 33-34, 37.

Rice, president of Union from 1826-1831.<sup>52</sup> In Sweetser's judgement, Rice's rise and leadership launched Union firmly onto the national religious stage and it was George Baxter who rolled back that national prominence.<sup>53</sup> Thus, through John Holt Rice's tenure, Union's national character grew until Baxter and Southern sectionalism ended that trend.

For Sweetser, slavery primarily inhibited Union's classification as a national institution committed to social reform in Sweetser's own evaluation of Baxter's tenure. Sweetser wrote about how Northern seminary students fled north of the Mason-Dixon line when Baxter took office as theology professor (and president). Such actions indicated, for Sweetser, a growing sectionalism.<sup>54</sup> Indeed, slavery remained an important part of Union and the surrounding culture. Jennifer Oast wrote about slavery's ubiquity in antebellum Virginia Presbyterianism and Hampden-Sydney College, Union's first home, was one of her case studies.<sup>55</sup> Oast argued for "institutional slavery," defined as "a slave who was owned by a group of people united in a common purpose—nonprofit educational and religious organizations, the public (as organized into state government), and for-profit companies" as a understudied relative of plantation slavery.<sup>56</sup> She demonstrates white men beyond the planter class defended slavery as an bulwark of the common good and a "necessary" societal fixture because such persons encountered

---

<sup>52</sup> Rice, quoted on p. 39 of Sweetser, *A Copious Fountain*. Ibid., 31-34, 37-39.

<sup>53</sup> Sweetser, *A Copious Fountain*, 99.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 104fn29.

<sup>55</sup> Jennifer Oast, *Institutional Slavery: Slaveholding Church, Schools, Colleges, and Businesses in Virginia, 1680-1860* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 159-174.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 1, 3.

slavery's centrality in colleges, churches, and businesses outside of the plantation. Hampden-Sydney was one of those institutions but there remains no recorded instance of brutality toward slaves there due to its evangelicalism and the presence of professors and early anti-slavery partisans such as Hoge.<sup>57</sup> The college hired Billy Brown as a campus slave on January 1, 1803 and students and professors brought their own slaves to campus for menial tasks.<sup>58</sup> Another Hampden-Sydney slave, David Ross, debated astronomy with juniors and seniors (the other two classes were below his rank) after he was hired by the college in 1850 and did other sundry tasks for the college that personal slaves performed for faculty and students.<sup>59</sup> Local protection for slaves and the close proximity of Union to Hampden Sydney (both institutions sat on the same piece of land) brought the scourge of institutional slavery upon Union. Low enrollment that stemmed from Union's pro-slavery culture, Baxter's defense of slavery in an 1836 pamphlet, and the resignation of three professors and a trustee due to their anti-slavery sentiment in September 1838 marked Union as an institution enmeshed in Southern slavery.<sup>60</sup> In Sweetser's estimation, those events firmly placed Union as an anti-national institution. Therefore, Union's aversion to moral reform came from its close connection to Hampden-Sydney's slave culture and its own pro-slavery stance.

However, George Baxter's early adult life sheds light upon the qualities he brought to Union as its leader and made it a modern and national seminary. He graduated from Hampden-Sydney College in 1796 and became a Presbyterian minister and

---

<sup>57</sup> Oast, *Institutional Slavery*, 161-163, 174.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 171-4.

<sup>60</sup> Sweetser, *A Copious Fountain*, 110-112.



president at Washington College from 1805-1813, acting president in 1835 at Hampden-Sydney College, and professor at Union Theological Seminary from 1831-1841.<sup>61</sup>

Moreover, Baxter participated in the national work of the AES because he was a member of its examining committee from 1833-1840 while a professor at Union.<sup>62</sup> An AES examining committee vetted potential candidates for AES funding of their four-year college and three-year seminary education in their state. Thus, Baxter's early adult life and presidency of numerous Virginia colleges demonstrates his encounters with national benevolent organizations.

Baxter's reputation as a Southern "ultraconservative" stemmed from his leadership in the Old School Minority Convention of 1837 in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. In the late 1830s, the Presbyterian Church was divided into two parties: (1) the conservative and "orthodox" Old School faction which propounded total human depravity as well as suspicion of revivals and interdenominational benevolent organizations and (2) the New School party that allowed for a free will rejoinder to God's gift of grace and welcomed revivals and

---

<sup>61</sup> Directors of the American Education Society, *Fifteenth Annual Report of the Directors of the American Education Society, Presented at the Annual Meeting, Held in the City of Boston, May, 1831* vol. 17 (Boston: Perkins & Marvin, 1831), 10, 44, Nineteenth Century Collections Online, accessed November 6-12, 2016, <http://tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/3xvKa8>; For Baxter's tenure at Hampden-Sydney see, <http://www.hsc.edu/Academics/Academic-Catalogues/Catalogue-2016-17/Presidents.html>, accessed March 4, 2016; For a Baxter's tenure at Washington College (now Washington and Lee University) see Margaret Sumner, *Collegiate Republic: Cultivating an Ideal Society in Early America* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2014) and <https://www.wlu.edu/presidents-office/about-the-presidents-office/history-and-governance/past-presidents/george-addison-baxter>, accessed March 4, 2016.

<sup>62</sup> Directors of the American Education Society, *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Directors of the American Education Society, Presented at the Annual Meeting, Held in the City of Boston, May, 1833*, vol. 19 (Boston: Perkins & Marvin, 1833), 28, Nineteenth Century Collections Online, accessed November 6-12, 2016, <http://tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/3xvWt1>; See page 28 in the eighteenth through twenty-fourth annual reports on Nineteenth Century Collections Online for the remainder of the records of the examining committees.

interdenominational cooperation on benevolent activities.<sup>63</sup> The Minority Convention of May 11, 1837 was the final meeting of the Old School group prior to the General Assembly of that year. They set forth their objectives in that meeting and crafted a manifesto entitled *Testimony and Memorial*. Baxter fell into the Old School category because of his presidency of the Minority Convention.<sup>64</sup> As president, he reviewed the body's resolutions and approved them. One of the most curious statements of the Convention's *Testimony and Memorial*—its final manifesto—was the expressed desire to continue “a friendly correspondence and interchange of annual visits, with the evangelical associations of New-England—we are anxiously looking to the General Assembly in the hope and belief that it will take into immediate consideration the plan of union adopted by the Assembly of 1831.”<sup>65</sup> Here, Baxter and his Old School compatriots took a moderate stance. They simply wished that the 1837 General Assembly break ties with interecclesial benevolent organizations but not disavow national benevolent activity. This is an example of what Beth Barton Schweiger calls the Southern Protestant “apprehension about liberal theology that bore no relation to their embrace of modern bureaucratic methods.”<sup>66</sup> Baxter's involvement with the AES made him wary of outright condemnation of national benevolence. He aligned with the administrative structure of the AES while questioning some of its theological tenets as a member of the Old School

---

<sup>63</sup> See footnote 26 in this chapter.

<sup>64</sup> Minority of the General Assembly of 1836, *Minutes of the Philadelphia Convention of Ministers and Ruling Elders in the Presbyterian Church in the United States, Called by the Minority of the General Assembly of 1836, May 11, 1837* (Philadelphia: 1837), 19, Google Book.

<sup>65</sup> Minority of the General Assembly, *Minutes*, 17-18.

<sup>66</sup> Beth Barton Schweiger, *The Gospel Working Up: Progress and the Pulpit in Nineteenth-Century Virginia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 5.

faction. Consequently, Baxter's integral role as the convention's president with such statements under his approval marked him a religious moderate towards benevolent societies.

Baxter's time as professor of Christian theology at Union remained a period where the professors (Baxter included) encouraged benevolent organizations. Baxter's participation in benevolent societies during his Union days—even after his “rift” with them as an Old School Presbyterian—demonstrated his unwavering commitment to benevolent activity. Besides his involvement with the AES before and after the Old School split, Baxter also governed the AHMS. For instance, the AHMS reports for 1832-1833 and 1836-1837 listed him as one of the organization's vice presidents.<sup>67</sup> He held that role alongside Congregationalists Leonard Woods and Nathaniel Taylor. At the sixth anniversary AHMS meeting in 1832, Baxter made a speech on a resolution that read: “*Resolved*. That, in view of the extraordinary influences of the Holy Ghost, manifested especially in numerous revivals of religion reported, and the large number of additions to the churches under the labours of Missionaries of this Society, the last year, devout gratitude is due to Almighty God.”<sup>68</sup> Notably, Baxter saw revivals as a salutary means of spreading the Christian faith and an aid to benevolent work. Such a statement came within his first year as a professor at Union Seminary and he mingled at that AHMS

---

<sup>67</sup> American Home Missionary Society, *RHMS*, vol. 6 (New York: Clayton and Van Norden, 1832), Sabin Americana, accessed March 19, 2018, <http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY3809516212&srchtp=a&ste=14>; *RHMS*, vol. 7 (New York, 1833), Sabin Americana, accessed March 19, 2018, <http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY3809605003&srchtp=a&ste=14>; *RHMS*, vol. 10, (New York, James Van Norden 1836), Sabin Americana, accessed March 19, 2018, <http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY3809605199&srchtp=a&ste=14>; *RHMS*, vol. 11 (New York: William Osborn, 1837), Sabin Americana, accessed March 19, 2018, <http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY3809605311&srchtp=a&ste=14>.

<sup>68</sup> *RHMS*, 1832, 3.

meeting in New York with some of the most prominent Northern Calvinist ministers and famous financiers of abolitionism, such as Lewis Tappan. Nevertheless, beyond his role as vice-president Baxter did not receive mention in AHMS report in the post-Presbyterian schism editions of 1836-1837. Yet, he remained involved in the AHMS in those years and it was only after 1837 that he disappeared from its leadership rolls. Baxter stayed an AHMS member for six years out of the ten he led Union Seminary. That evidence demonstrates Baxter encouraged benevolence at Union.

Moreover, Baxter's Union colleague and professor of ecclesiastical history, Stephen Taylor, said in his 1835 inaugural address: "Our Education Societies, our Missionary Societies, yea, every benevolent institution is deeply concerned in the character of the Theological Seminaries, and dependant, to a great extent, upon them for its ultimate success."<sup>69</sup> Taylor also seconded a motion at the 1835 AHMS meeting. In terms of benevolence, he practiced what he preached. Baxter and Taylor illuminated the reality that Union participated in national benevolent societies and did not retreat from national relevance as a Western or Southern institution. Sweetser concedes that point in small manner when he noted that some members of the foreign missionary benevolent society at Union, the Society for Missionary Inquiry (SMI), corresponded nationally and internationally after 1838.<sup>70</sup> However, Sweetser incontrovertibly states Union became more Southern after the 1838 synodal pro-slavery statement. Stephen Taylor would not sign it and he left Union (along with assistant professor Elisha Ballantine) and the SMI

---

<sup>69</sup> Stephen Taylor, *Address of the Revd. Stephen Taylor, Upon His Inauguration as Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government in The Union Theological Seminary, Virginia...* (Richmond, VA: Thomas W. White, 1835), 5, Sabin Americana, accessed March 19, 2018, <http://galenet.galegroup.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY3812655306&srchtp=a&ste=14>.

<sup>70</sup> Sweetser, *A Copious Fountain*, 117.

mostly subscribed to Southern and not Northern newspapers to avoid anti-slavery sentiment after 1838.<sup>71</sup> Sweetser acknowledges Baxter's legacy as a strong administrator and Baxter's fight to keep the seminary curriculum stable, but overall judges Baxter's tenure as one of declension.<sup>72</sup> On the other hand, viewing Baxter, Taylor, and Union, through involvement in national benevolent societies positions Union, its students, and faculty as participants in the national culture of benevolence through the middle of the antebellum period.<sup>73</sup> Sweetser's narrative of decline stands as more abrupt with a sudden break in 1838 when seen through the lens of benevolence instead of a gradual intellectual and cultural hibernation after John Rice's presidency. Thus, Baxter fostered benevolent activity during most of his years at Union Theological Seminary but never participated in crafting the Andover-AES-AHMS ideology of benevolence as ministerial manliness.

*Danville Theological Seminary: No Place for Benevolence*

Danville Theological Seminary was the farthest in ideological distance from the AHMS-AES-Andover notion of benevolence. In addition to its Western identity, Danville rightfully claimed a Presbyterian identity. Presbyterians in the West first desired Transylvania University, founded in 1785, and then Centre College, established in 1824, to be "the Princeton of the West" and train ministerial candidates. Such dreams were not realized until Old School minister Rev. Robert Breckinridge and other Kentuckians sought a seminary ideologically opposed to the anti-slavery one at New Albany, Indiana and made it reality in 1853 when the regional synod voted to create the

---

<sup>71</sup> Sweetser, *A Copious Fountain*, 112-114.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 120-1.

<sup>73</sup> William Harrison Taylor discusses this in general terms in *Unity in Christ and Country*, 125.

seminary at Danville, Kentucky instead of St. Louis, Missouri.<sup>74</sup> Danville has been characterized as an Old School Presbyterian institution because of its founding after the schism and the Old School mark of its leaders. Rev. Robert Breckinridge, its primary founder and professor of theology, was relatively uneducated, unorthodox, and hyperdenominationalist, according to Glenn Miller.<sup>75</sup> Yet, Breckinridge had a broader background than Miller realized because Breckinridge studied under Congregationalist Eliphalet Nott at Union College in New York state and remained a Unionist throughout his entire life.<sup>76</sup> If Breckinridge was an unflagging Presbyterian partisan, he might have sought education at the Presbyterian theological seminary at Princeton instead of Union College. Breckinridge was not the only Northern-educated faculty member at Danville. Edward Humphrey, Danville's professor of church history, received his Bachelor of Arts from Amherst College and his seminary training at Andover in 1828 and 1833, respectively.<sup>77</sup> Thus, Danville was not strictly sectional and Western because its leaders were Northern-educated. Nevertheless, Danville did have an Old-School character in its founding when compared to other Western seminaries, but the Northern roots of its founding faculty illuminate the complexity of the Old School party. Breckinridge did not care for the New School domination of Lane Seminary in Ohio or

---

<sup>74</sup> Robert Stuart Sanders, *History of Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, 1853-1953* (Louisville, KY: Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, 1953), 13, 16, HathiTrust, accessed March 19, 2018, <http://catalog.hathitrust.org/ezproxy.baylor.edu/api/volumes/oclc/4284247.html>. Danville merged with Louisville Seminary in the early 20th century, which is why the history has Louisville in its title. Winkleman mentions the sectional nature of Danville as a rival school to the New Albany seminary in "Polemics, Prayers, and Professionalism," 175.

<sup>75</sup> Miller, *Piety and Intellect*, 272-3.

<sup>76</sup> Sanders, *History of Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary*, 19-21.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

New Albany Seminary, especially because of the Lane controversy in 1834—after a debate over slavery at that seminary, the students openly agitated for abolitionism. In contrast, Breckinridge envisioned Danville as a ministerial school unstained by New School doctrinal errors and the “radical” social reform of abolitionism in contrast to conventional reform causes such as temperance that did not disturb the white man’s dominance of the American social order. Southern Presbyterians flocked to Danville because of its conservative atmosphere until the Civil War broke out 1861.<sup>78</sup>

Breckinridge undoubtedly established Danville with a specific theological mindset but it was not an attitude closed off to non-Western or non-Southern influences. Therefore, the founding and early days of Danville exemplified the multifaceted nature of Old School Presbyterianism and the seminary’s national connections despite its sectarian beginnings.

Danville Seminary did not employ the term benevolence in literature about the school. For example, the 1853 plan of Danville Theological Seminary mentioned the “social culture” of its students, saying that “all destined to the same sacred, though self-denying work, ought, of their own accord, and must under suitable performing for each other, mutually, the most important service in the way of social culture, in piety, learning, and the practical exercise of many gifts of the greatest value to them all in their future professional career.”<sup>79</sup> That passage showed how the seminary’s official policy eschewed benevolent activity as a part of student life. Danville did not support benevolent activity as Andover did and formally did not condone benevolent societies akin to Union’s SMI because of the association of benevolence with New School

---

<sup>78</sup> Sanders, *History of Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary*, 18.

<sup>79</sup> *Plan of the Danville Theological Seminary Under the Care of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America* (Louisville, KY: Morton and Griswold, 1854), 26.

Presbyterian abolitionism and increasing polarization on the slavery issue in 1850s America. Therefore, Danville avoided official ties to benevolent ideas and reform associations.

Moreover, at Danville's beginning, the three most important inaugural addresses do not discuss benevolence. I contend that those addresses deal with similar concepts as benevolence in the AES and AHMS did, but do not share their ideology. For instance, Edward Humphrey spoke about ecclesiastical history and avowed Danville was a new and purer Council of Nicaea.<sup>80</sup> Such a reminder of the ancient church correlated to the AHMS and AES discussion of the parallels of contemporary benevolence and that of the early church. J.C. Young, Presbyterian minister and member of the Danville Board of Trustees, argued for Western regionalism when he stated, "those who design to preach the gospel, should be raised up, as far as it is possible, among the people to whom they are to minister" since dress and mannerisms differ between East and West despite the unity of U.S. citizens.<sup>81</sup> That idea remained akin to the AHMS promotion of a distinctive "Western" man and mission for evangelization but contrasted to the AHMS idea of less-domestic Eastern men and ministers traveling to "civilize" Western men. Nevertheless, Breckinridge's inaugural address touched upon the largest number of ideas similar to the AES and AHMS conception of benevolence. It spoke of the systematic and extensive

---

<sup>80</sup> Edward P. Humphrey, "Inaugural Address, Delivered at the Danville Theological Seminary, October 13, 1853," in *Addresses Delivered at the Inauguration of the Professors in the Danville Theological Seminary, October 13, 1853* (Cincinnati: T. Wrightson, 1854), HathiTrust, accessed March 19, 2018, <http://catalog.hathitrust.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/api/volumes/oclc/39997254.html>.

<sup>81</sup> J.C. Young, "Address of J.C. Young, D.D. Delivered at the Inauguration of the Professors, At Danville, By Order of the Board of Directors, October 13, 1853," in *Addresses Delivered at the Inauguration of the Professors in the Danville Theological Seminary, October 13, 1853* (Cincinnati: T. Wrightson, 1854), HathiTrust, accessed March 19, 2018, <http://catalog.hathitrust.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/api/volumes/oclc/39997254.html>.



nature of the Christian ministry and the imperial goals of the United States. Breckinridge characterized Christian seminary education as “thorough, broad, and exact” because it was “seeing that all parts of knowledge have certain relations to each other, and every method of superior education in order to advance at all, must have a certain respect to the methods that lie beneath it.”<sup>82</sup> Breckinridge stressed the interdependent aspect of seminary education just as the AES and AHMS stressed the interrelation of all benevolent enterprises. Additionally, Breckinridge noted the educational program of Danville was systematic. First, he listed the study of Hebrew and Greek and then “next, in the natural order of the subject, comes the systematic study of this blessed truth of God, to be nearer to which are all the labors indicated above.”<sup>83</sup> Here, Breckinridge touched on the rigorous study of the Bible, the deposit of divine revelation. Scriptural study came after learning the Scriptural languages. He treated biblical theology as a system as the AES and AHMS did for benevolence. Finally, Breckinridge shunned reference to benevolence in 1858 theological tome, *The Knowledge of God Objectively Considered*, and instead dealt with God’s beneficence, His goodness in creation and conservation of the universe or good works, and not goodwill or benevolence.<sup>84</sup> Such a concept is analogous to Woods’s understanding of God’s benevolence as creation of man

---

<sup>82</sup> Robert J. Breckinridge, “The Inaugural Discourse of Robert J. Breckinridge, D.D., L.L.D., Professor of Theology, &C. Delivered by Order of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary, Under the Care of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, at Danville, KY., On the Opening of Its First Session, in The First Presbyterian Church in Danville, October 13, 1853,” in *Addresses Delivered at the Inauguration of the Professors in the Danville Theological Seminary, October 13, 1853* (Cincinnati: T. Wrightson, 1854), 31, HathiTrust accessed March 19, 2018, <http://catalog.hathitrust.org/ezproxy.baylor.edu/api/volumes/oclc/39997254.html>.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 36.

<sup>84</sup> Robert Breckinridge, *The Knowledge of God, Objectively Considered. Being the First Part of Theology Considered as a Science of Positive Truth, Both Inductive and Deductive* (New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1858), 294.

and the universe out of love but without the emphasis upon love Woods had. Therefore, the rhetoric of Danville's leaders displayed a similarity to parts of the AES-AHMS-Andover understanding of benevolence.

### *Conclusion*

Overall, this chapter demonstrated the variable use of benevolent ideology and action at seminaries across all sections of the United States. The heart of the world of benevolence, Andover, clearly adhered to benevolence because Woods taught and used ideas of benevolence. Moreover, such ideas were similar to AES and AHMS ideas because those societies were born at Andover and received much ministerial support there. Hence, Andover fostered the AES and AHMS ideology of benevolence as ministerial manliness. Nevertheless, Union, a Southern and increasingly Old-School Presbyterian institution, did not provide a concept of benevolence but acted benevolently. Union's leader and theology professor, George Baxter, remained involved in the AHMS until the Old-School/New School split and retained his position as an AES examiner years after the divide. Up to the Civil War, Union's Society for Missionary Inquiry corresponded nationally and internationally. Union linked itself to benevolence, but in a less conspicuous and smaller manner than Andover. A helpful aid to understanding the lessening influence of the idea of benevolence upon seminaries is the picture of a concentric circles around a central point of benevolent ideology in Congregationalist/New School Presbyterian theology. Ideological environment played a major role in use of benevolence as greater ideological distance from New School theology diminished the importance of that idea. Andover's circle was closest to the New School and Union's farther out. Finally, Danville's circle held the farthest place from the

benevolent middle because benevolent ideology did not play a role in Danville's later founding and Old School character. Only Andover's idea of benevolence coincided with the ministerial manliness as benevolence the AHMS and AES promulgated. Consequently, the three seminaries elucidate the ideological depth and possibly Congregationalist boundaries of the imagined empire of benevolence *for* ministers the AES and AHMS constructed.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Conclusion: Ministers and American Intellectual Life

This thesis began in the ferment of eighteenth-century Great Britain. Calvinist theology, philosophical ideas, and the social forces of gender, race, and class in that period combined and shaped a distinct theological and philosophical idea of benevolence (goodwill). Such ferment was transatlantic in scope. Scotland, England, and America were transformed by benevolence. Societies for social reforms such as temperance, anti-slavery, prison improvement, and others grew in number as the century wore on and gained greater social and religious influence.

In the first chapter, benevolence's intellectual lineage was traced out of the thought of Scottish philosopher Francis Hutcheson. He posited it as a natural virtue based in human nature. One of Hutcheson's disciples, moral philosopher Adam Smith, deepened Hutcheson's understanding of benevolence by linking it to the concept of the common good opposed to private benefit in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759). Many literate Americans read and engaged with *Moral Sentiments* in late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century America. On the other side of the Atlantic, Jonathan Edwards replied to Hutcheson with his philosophical tract, *The Nature of True Virtue* (1765). That work grounded benevolence in God. Benevolence was God's love for humans as far as He willed their good and human love for God and all other humans. Edwards gave benevolence a supernatural quality in *True Virtue* and provided deeper theological meaning for that idea in other works, such as *Charity and Its Fruits* (preached in 1738).

Moreover, the Edwardseans—Edwards’ theological disciples—analyzed *True Virtue* and his other works and explicated strains of his theology in their own age. Samuel Hopkins, a famous disciple of Edwards and progenitor of the Hopkinsian school of Congregationalist theology, developed Edwards’s teaching on benevolence in his theological musings. In *The Nature of True Holiness*, Hopkins based a Christian conception of the common good on Edwards’s definition of benevolence in the context of the unifying days of the American Revolution. Furthermore, Hopkins also asserted the evil of black chattel slavery was a grave violation of human and divine benevolence in *A Dialogue Concerning the Africans* (1776). Hopkins and a tiny number of other Edwardseans could not convince many Americans to free their slaves.<sup>1</sup> For those theologians, that frustrated the cause of benevolence. Consequently, Hutcheson, Smith, Edwards, and Hopkins remained the major thinkers whose ideas about benevolence filtered into the American intellectual landscape of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Nevertheless, an alternative idea to benevolence, philanthropy, existed in the early nineteenth-century that might diminish the importance of benevolence as an idea. Philanthropy, love of humankind, denoted a non-religious idea of social uplift while benevolence, goodwill toward humankind, contained a religious point of human salvation through God alongside work to improve the human condition. I maintain philanthropy and benevolence are analogously and respectively, natural benevolence or “the fragile

---

<sup>1</sup> Edwards owned a slave despite the Hopkinsian camp’s opposition to slavery. See Kenneth P. Kinema and Harry S. Stout, “The Edwardsean Tradition and the Anti-Slavery Debate, 1740-1865,” *Journal of American History* 92, no. 1 (June 2005), 50, accessed April 14, 2018, <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=19324139&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.

restraint of God's common grace" upon humans as related to supernatural benevolence, God's grace prompting humans to love God and all other humans, in Edwards's *True Virtue*.<sup>2</sup> Historian Olivier Zunz contrasted the noble sentiment of progressive improvement in philanthropy with the Christian narrowness of benevolence in *Philanthropy in America: A History* (2012). Zunz's analysis downplayed the common universality that benevolence and philanthropy shared. Both ideas sought to encompass all humans within their bounds. Other historians maintained benevolence and philanthropy co-existed in the antebellum period and for antebellum ministers they were interchangeable rhetorical devices but, as I perceive, not the same idea because of the supernatural-natural distinction in Calvinist theology. Benevolence as a concept deserved closer examination precisely because of its religious connotations.

For a definition of benevolence in nineteenth-century America, the Edwardsean and Hopkinsian versions of benevolence seem monolithic. Their definitions provide theological and philosophical justifications for all benevolent endeavors, but hardly distinguish between the numerous reform societies present in the United States. Historians identified and analyzed benevolent societies that claimed national and local jurisdiction and influence.<sup>3</sup> Recently, historical scholarship on benevolence challenged a unified idea of benevolence under the term "Benevolent Empire."<sup>4</sup> In that vein, this

---

<sup>2</sup> See chapter 1, footnote 23.

<sup>3</sup> On the "Big Five" national benevolent societies, see John W. Kuykendall, *Southern Enterprise: The Work of the National Evangelical Societies in the Antebellum South* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982), 14-15. An excellent study of local benevolence is John W. Quist's *Restless Visionaries: The Social Roots of Antebellum Reform in Alabama and Michigan* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1998).

<sup>4</sup> Two of those are: Manisha Sinha's *The Slave's Cause* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016) and Susan M. Ryan's *The Grammar of Good Intentions: Race and the Antebellum Culture of Benevolence* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003).

thesis concentrates on the idea of benevolence *for* ministers—ministers as a benevolent object—in two benevolent societies, the AES and the AHMS. It moves beyond the class focus of much scholarship on benevolence and turns scholarly attention to the neglected field of male gender and benevolence, especially in those two ministerial-focused societies.<sup>5</sup> I argued in the thesis that the AES and AHMS idea of benevolence for ministers formed a novel concept of ministerial manliness in antebellum America. Such an idea is novel ground in the contested field of leadership of antebellum benevolence and rebuts Ann Douglas’s claim of antebellum ministerial feminization through the idea of a learned and spiritually-warring minister leading his female congregants. In two separate chapters I explored the AES and AHMS ideas of benevolence for ministers and their conservative position as defenders of the biblical foundation of slavery but detestation of its inhuman cruelty compared to the liberal stance of abolitionism and the arch-traditional pro-slavery ideology. Then, in the final chapter, I analyzed whether three antebellum seminaries—Andover in Massachusetts, Union in Virginia, and Danville in Kentucky—held their idea of benevolence as ministerial manliness or any idea of benevolence at all.

I maintained in the second chapter that the AES idea of benevolence for ministers expressed by the male leaders of the AES shaped a distinct concept of benevolence: a leadership space for ministerial manliness amidst an antebellum benevolent culture saturated with female leadership of benevolence. The AES idea of ministerial manliness had eight traits that clearly outlined its Christian character and the primacy of ministers in its idea of benevolence in its main publication, the *American Quarterly Register*.

---

<sup>5</sup> See footnote 86 in chapter one.

Moreover, the AES defined the minister in gendered terms in its anniversary sermons as a bellicose and strong preacher of orthodoxy. Finally, the first chapter closed with an elucidation of the AES's connections with the American Colonization Society (ACS) and its acceptance of the racial theory of social environmentalism that undergirded colonization.

Furthermore, the third chapter explored the idea of benevolence *for* ministers in the AHMS and its racial and gendered elements. There, I contended the AHMS concept of benevolence as patriotic, expansive, systematic, Christian, white, ministerial, and male highlighted ministerial manliness as the AES did. On the other hand, the AHMS and AES differed on the facet of ministerial life they aided. The AHMS helped build the relationship of the minister to an individual congregation while the AES focused on ministerial education and piety. Nevertheless, both organizations put ministerial manliness at the heart of their idea of benevolence and characterized benevolence as systematic, extensive, and Christian. In addition, the *Report of the Home Missionary Society* delineated the contours of AHMS benevolence and supplemented the large discussion of the Western man in AHMS sermons. The AHMS gendered understanding of the “man of the West” and its relationship to ministers deepened the idea of benevolence as manliness for Congregationalist and Presbyterian ministers elucidated by the AES. Lastly, the “benevolent racism” of social environmentalism held sway in the AHMS even after its 1853 rejection of slaveholding congregations. Thus, the AES and the AHMS concept of benevolent leadership as ministerial manliness contests the reigning scholarly notion of antebellum benevolence as an endeavor dominated by female leadership.



The fourth and final chapter asked whether benevolence as ministerial manliness was taught in three antebellum seminaries within and beyond the New School Presbyterian and Congregationalist fold or whether those seminaries explicated any concept of benevolence. Andover Seminary in Massachusetts (Congregationalist) was the cornerstone of benevolence because of its intimate involvement in the formation of numerous national benevolent societies and large supply of foreign and home missionaries. Leonard Woods, professor of theology at Andover from 1808-1846, defined benevolence as God willing the greatest happiness for man or salvation, which linked his idea to that of the AHMS and AES on benevolence through the importance of the ministry as the principal means of salvation. Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, an Old School Presbyterian institution, and its professors George Baxter and Stephen Taylor illuminated the presence and short involvement of Union in the AES and AHMS from 1831-1841. Yet neither Baxter nor Taylor contributed to or taught any idea of benevolence, let alone the idea of benevolence as ministerial manliness. Danville Theological Seminary was founded in 1853 as an Old School Presbyterian alternative to the abolitionist New School seminaries of Lane in Ohio and New Albany in Indiana. It provided a case study for benevolence in an unlikely denomination in the Western United States. Danville's president and theology professor, Robert Breckinridge, and professor of Ecclesiastical History Edward Humphrey did not mention benevolence in their inaugural addresses. Moreover, Breckinridge only covered God's beneficence (doing good as opposed to willing good or loving) in his 1858 theological tome, *The Knowledge of God Objectively Considered*. No recorded benevolent organizations or activity occurred at Danville. Benevolence as ministerial manliness was not an idea found at all

three chosen institutions of the Congregationalist and Old School Presbyterian denominations in the North, South, and Western United States. Therefore, that suggests ministerial manliness was a gendered and imagined construct limited to the Congregationalist faction and its main seminary, Andover.

Overall, the thesis argued for ministerial manliness as the AES and AHMS idea of benevolence in the antebellum United States. Its argument emphasized the religiosity of benevolent ideology instead of class factors. Gendered ideas about manliness and the ministerial career formed much of the AES and AHMS ideals of a strong, learned minister leading a congregation in God's ways. This thesis thus nuances the contested space of antebellum benevolence in historical scholarship by emphasizing manliness as a category of benevolence. Future scholarship building on ministers and gender might highlight the manifold ways that religion gendered benevolence for men and how class tensions lessened or increased such gendering. In addition, other scholars might find a study of antebellum "orthodox" Congregationalist and Presbyterian ministers, gender, and denominationalism fruitful since Ann Douglas's *The Feminization of American Culture* focuses on the liberal pastors in that light. Lastly, this thesis remains a small contribution to historical comprehension of the manifold ways antebellum Calvinist ministers molded American intellectual life and the study of intellectual history today through their gendered ideas.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abruzzo, Margaret Nicola. *Polemical Pain: Slavery, Cruelty, and the Rise of Humanitarianism*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.  
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/bayloru/detail.action?docID=4398390>.
- Abzug, Robert. *Cosmos Crumbling: American Reform and the Religious Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Addresses Delivered at the Inauguration of the Professors in the Danville Theological Seminary, October 13, 1853*. Cincinnati, OH: T. Wrightson, 1854.  
 HathiTrust. <http://catalog.hathitrust.org/ezproxy.baylor.edu/api/volumes/oclc/39997254.html>.
- Albaugh, Gaylord. "The Role of the Religious Press in the Development of American Christianity, 1730-1830." *Historical Papers: Canadian Society of Church History* (1968). Accessed July 24, 2017.  
<https://historicalpapers.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/historicalpapers/article/view/39613>.
- Allmendinger, David F. "The Strangeness of the American Education Society: Indigent Students and the New Charity, 1815-1840." *History of Education Quarterly* 11, no. 1 (1971): 3-22. <https://doi.org/10.2307/367057>.
- American Home Missionary Society. *Report of the Home Missionary Society*. Vol. 4-34, 1830-1860. New York: Clayton and Van Norden, etc. Sabin Americana.
- . *Our Country: No. 2., a Plea for Home Missions*. New York: American Home Mission Society, 1858.  
<http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY103636509&srchtp=a&ste=14&q=txshracd2488>.
- . and United Domestic Missionary Society, eds. *Constitution of the American Home Missionary Society: Recommended by a Convention of the Friends of Missions Held in the City of New-York, May 10, 1826, and Adopted by the United Domestic Missionary Society*. New-York: D. Fanshaw, American Tract Society House, 1826.  
<http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY101666896&srchtp=a&ste=14&q=txshracd2488>.
- Barnes, Albert. *Home Missions: A Sermon in Behalf of the American Home Missionary Society: Preached in the Cities of New York and Philadelphia, May, 1849, 1849*. Sabin Americana.

- Bederman, Gail. *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Bellows, Barbara L. *Benevolence Among Slaveholders: Assisting the Poor in Charleston, 1670-1860*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1993.
- Blumhofer, Edith Waldvogel, and Randall Herbert Balmer, eds. *Modern Christian Revivals*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Bode, Frederick A. "A Common Sphere: White Evangelicals and Gender in Antebellum Georgia." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 79, no. 4 (1995): 775–809.
- Boylan, Anne M. *The Origins of Women's Activism: New York and Boston, 1797-1840*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Breckinridge, Robert J. *The Knowledge of God, Objectively Considered: Being the First Part of Theology Considered as a Science of Positive Truth, Both Inductive and Deductive*. New York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1858.
- Breitenbach, William. "Unregenerate Doings: Selflessness and Selfishness in New Divinity Theology." *American Quarterly* 34, no. 5 (1982): 479–502.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2712641>.
- Brekus, Catherine A. *Sarah Osborn's World: The Rise of Evangelical Christianity in Early America*. New Directions in Narrative History. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.
- . *Strangers & Pilgrims: Female Preaching in America, 1740-1845*. Gender and American Culture. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- , ed. *The Religious History of American Women: Reimagining the Past*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Broadie, Alexander. *A History of Scottish Philosophy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.  
<http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1r1znr>.
- Brown, Gillian. *Domestic Individualism: Imagining Self in Nineteenth-Century America*. The New Historicism 14. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990.
- Brown, Leslie Ellen. *Artful Virtue: The Interplay of the Beautiful and the Good in the Scottish Enlightenment*. Burlington, UK: Ashgate, 2015.
- Burke, Colin B. *American Collegiate Populations: A Test of the Traditional View*. New York: New York University Press, 1982.

- Camic, Charles. *Experience and Enlightenment: Socialization for Cultural Change in Eighteenth-Century Scotland*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- Campbell, Tom. *Adam Smith's Science of Morals*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1971.
- Carney, Charity R. *Ministers and Masters: Methodism, Manhood, and Honor in the Old South*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2011.  
<http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://site.ebrary.com/lib/baylor/docDetail.action?docID=10503277>.
- Cayton, Mary Kupiec. "Who Were the Evangelicals?: Conservative and Liberal Identity in the Unitarian Controversy in Boston, 1804-1833." *Journal of Social History* 31, no. 1 (1997): 85–107.
- Chai, Leon. *Jonathan Edwards and the Limits of Enlightenment Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.  
<http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=23517&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *Founding the Fathers: Early Church History and Protestant Professors in Nineteenth-Century America*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- Conroy-Krutz, Emily. *Christian Imperialism: Converting the World in the Early American Republic*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015.
- Dana, Daniel. *The Importance of the Christian Ministry: A Sermon Preached before the American Society for Educating Pious Youth for the Gospel Ministry, at Their Third Anniversary, Boston, Sept. 30, 1818*. Vol. 4. Andover: Flagg and Gould, 1818.  
<http://tinyurl.galegroup.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/tinyurl/4mnud6>.
- Danaher Jr., William J. "Beauty, Benevolence, and Virtue in Jonathan Edwards's The Nature of True Virtue." *Journal of Religion* 87, no. 3 (July 2007): 386–410.
- Danville Theological Seminary. *Addresses Delivered at the Inauguration of the Professors in the Danville Theological Seminary, October 13, 1853*. Cincinnati, 1854.  
<http://catalog.hathitrust.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/api/volumes/oclc/39997254.html>.
- De Jong, Mary, ed. *Sentimentalism in Nineteenth-Century America: Literary and Cultural Practices*. Lanham, MD: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2013.  
<http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://site.ebrary.com/lib/baylor/docDetail.action?docID=10720761>.

- Deming, Wilbur Stone. *The Church on the Green; the First Two Centuries of the First Congregational Church at Washington, Connecticut, 1741-1941*. Hartford, CT: Brentano's, 1941. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/005947856>.
- Directors of the American Education Society, *Annual Report of the Directors of the American Education Society*. Vol. 16-17, 19-21, 23, 32. Nineteenth Century Collections Online. <http://tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/3xvKa8>.
- Douglas, Ann. *The Feminization of American Culture*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. New York: Knopf, 1977.
- Ellis, David L. "Echoes of Halle: Halle's Contested Legacy in Prussia and the United States in the Nineteenth Century." In *Halle Pietism, Colonial North America, and the Young United States*, edited Hans-Jurgen Grabbe, 273-288. Stuttgart, Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2008.
- Fabian, Ann. *The Skull Collectors: Race, Science, and America's Unburied Dead*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Fea, John. *The Bible Cause: A History of the American Bible Society*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Fehler, Brian. *Calvinist Rhetoric in Nineteenth-Century America: The Bartlet Professors of Sacred Rhetoric of Andover Seminary*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2007.
- Fiering, Norman. *Jonathan Edwards's Moral Thought and Its British Context*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981.
- Foster, Gaines M. *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865 to 1913*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South*. Gender & American Culture. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Fredrickson, George M. *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- Friedman, Jean E. *The Enclosed Garden: Women and Community in the Evangelical South, 1830-1900*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985.
- Friedman, Lawrence Jacob, and Mark D. McGarvie, eds. *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Genovese, Eugene D., and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese. *Fatal Self-Deception: Slaveholding Paternalism in the Old South*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

- Gonzalez, Justo L. *The History of Theological Education*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2015.
- Goodykoontz, Colin Brummitt. *Home Missions on the American Frontier, with Particular Reference to the American Home Missionary Society*. New York: Octagon Books, 1971.
- Gura, Philip F. *American Transcendentalism: A History*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2007.
- Hendler, Glenn. *Public Sentiments: Structures of Feeling in Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Hill, Hamilton Andrews. *History of the Old South Church (Third Church) Boston, 1669-1884*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press, 1890. Google Book.
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. *The Roads to Modernity: The British, French, and American Enlightenments*. 1st ed. New York: Knopf, 2004.
- Hirrel, Leo P. *Children of Wrath: New School Calvinism and Antebellum Reform*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1998.
- Howard, Victor B. *Conscience and Slavery: The Evangelistic Calvinist Domestic Missions, 1837-1861*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1990.
- Howe, Daniel Walker. *Making the American Self: Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- . *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- “Interior of Old South Church. Boston, Massachusetts.” *Architectural Record* 31 (Jan.-Jun. 1912): 552. *Avery Index of Architectural Periodicals*. Accessed October 26, 2016. EBSCOhost.
- Johnson, Walter. “On Agency.” *Journal of Social History* 37, no. 1 (Fall 2003): 113-125.
- Johnson, Wendy Dasler. *Antebellum American Women’s Poetry: A Rhetoric of Sentiment*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2016.
- Kann, Mark E. *A Republic of Men: The American Founders, Gendered Language, and Patriarchal Politics*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.  
<http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/j.ctt9qg73c>

- Kling, David W. "New Divinity Schools of the Prophets, 1750-1825: A Case Study in Ministerial Education." *History of Education Quarterly* 37, no. 2 (Summer 1997): 185.
- Kuykendall, John W. *Southern Enterprise: The Work of National Evangelical Societies in the Antebellum South*. Contributions to the Study of Religion, no. 7. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982.
- Labriola, Patrick. "German Intellectual History and American Romanticism: Spirit, Nature, Philosophy and the Occult." *Yearbook of German-American Studies* 37 (2002): 79-90.
- Lebsock, Suzanne, and Kym S. Rice. *"A Share of Honour": Virginia Women, 1600-1945*. Richmond, VA: The Project, 1984.
- Lockley, Timothy James. *Welfare and Charity in the Antebellum South*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2007.
- Longfield, Bradley J. *Presbyterians and American Culture: A History*. 1st ed. Louisville, KY Westminster John Knox Press, 2013.
- MacCormac, Earl R. "Missions and the Presbyterian Schism of 1837." *Church History* 32, no. 1 (March 1963): 32-45. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3162539>.
- Mangan, J. A., and James Walvin, eds. *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.
- Marsden, George M. *Jonathan Edwards: A Life*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Matthews, Lyman. *Memoir of the Life and Character of Ebenezer Porter, D. D., Late President of the Theological Seminary, Andover*. Boston, 1837. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015062971331>.
- May, Henry F. *The Enlightenment in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- McCurry, Stephanie. *Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, and the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- McDermott, Gerald R. *Jonathan Edwards Confronts the Gods: Christian Theology, Enlightenment Religion, and Non-Christian Faiths*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.



- McLean, Iain. *Adam Smith, Radical and Egalitarian: An Interpretation for the 21st Century*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.  
<http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1r2464>
- Miller, Glenn T. *Piety and Intellect: The Aims and Purposes of Ante-Bellum Theological Education*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Minkema, Kenneth P., and Harry S. Stout. "The Edwardsean Tradition and the Antislavery Debate, 1740 - 1865." *Journal of American History* 92, no. 1 (June 2005): 47–74.
- Moorhead, James H. "The "Restless Spirit of Radicalism": Old School Fears and the Schism of 1837." *The Journal of Presbyterian History* (1997-) 78, no. 1 (2000): 19–33.
- Mountford, Roxanne. *The Gendered Pulpit: Preaching in American Protestant Spaces*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2003.
- Murray, Gail S. "Charity within the Bounds of Race and Class: Female Benevolence in the Old South." *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 96, no. 1 (1995): 54–70.
- Oast, Jennifer. *Institutional Slavery: Slaveholding Churches, Schools, Colleges, and Businesses in Virginia, 1680-1860*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- "Old South Church Boston Mass" In "The Old South Meeting-House." *American Architect & Building News* 1 (Oct. 7, 1876): 325. *Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals*. Accessed October 28, 2016. EBSCOhost.
- Paretsky, Sara. *Words, Works, and Ways of Knowing: The Breakdown of Moral Philosophy in New England before the Civil War*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2016.
- Pearson, Eliphalet. *A Sermon Delivered in Boston Before the American Society for Educating Pious Youth for the Gospel Ministry. Oct. 26, 1815*. Andover, MA: Flagg and Gould, 1815. Accessed February 23, 2017. Nineteenth Century Collections Online. <http://tinyurl.galegroup.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/tinyurl/4mnso7>.
- Pelletier, Kevin. *Apocalyptic Sentimentalism: Love and Fear in U.S. Antebellum Literature*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2015.
- Phillips, Joseph W. *Jedidiah Morse and New England Congregationalism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1983.
- Pope, Earl A. "The Rise of the New Haven Theology." *Journal of Presbyterian History* 44, no. 1 (1966): 24–44.

———. “The Rise of the New Haven Theology.” *Journal of Presbyterian History* 44, no. 2 (1966): 106–21.

Porter, Ebenezer. *Sermon, Delivered in Boston, On the Anniversary of the American Education Society, Oct. 4, 1820*. Andover, MA: Flagg and Gould, 1821, 4. Accessed October 1, 2016. HathiTrust. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.32044096981931;view=1up;seq=7>.

Post, Stephen G. “Love and Eudaemonism: A Study in the Thought of Jonathan Edwards and Samuel Hopkins.” Ph.D., The University of Chicago, 1983. <http://search.proquest.com/pqdtglobal/docview/251804075/citation/3CFB1E923AA9440EPQ/1>.

Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., *Minutes of the Philadelphia Convention of Ministers and Ruling Elders in the Presbyterian Church in the United States, Called by the Minority of the General Assembly of 1836, May 11, 1837*. Philadelphia: Published for the Convention, 1837.

Quist, John W. *Restless Visionaries: The Social Roots of Antebellum Reform in Alabama and Michigan*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1998.

Reid, Ronald F. “Disputes Over Preaching Method, the Second Awakening and Ebenezer Porter’s Teaching of Sacred Rhetoric.” *Journal of Communication & Religion* 18, no. 2 (September 1995): 5–15.

Klepp, Susan. “Revolutionary Bodies: Women and the Fertility Transition in the Mid-Atlantic Region, 1760-1820.” *Journal of American History* 85, no. 3 (December 1998), 910-945.

Riddle, D. H. *Our Country for the Sake of the World: A Sermon in Behalf of the American Home Missionary Society Preached in the Cities of New York and Brooklyn, May 1851*. New York: Printed for the American Home Missionary Society by Baker, Godwin & Co, 1851. <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY108352777&srchtp=a&ste=14&q=txshracd2488>.

Roberts, Sian Silyn. “Gothic Enlightenment: Contagion and Community in Charles Brockden Brown’s *Arthur Mervyn*.” *Early American Literature* 44, no. 2 (2009). Accessed July 26, 2017. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/268150/summary>.

Rowe, Henry K. *History of Andover Theological Seminary*. Newton, MA, 1933.

Ryan, Susan M. *The Grammar of Good Intentions: Race and the Antebellum Culture of Benevolence*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003.

- Saillant, John. "Lemuel Haynes's Black Republicanism and the American Republican Tradition, 1775-1820." *Journal of the Early Republic* 14, no. 3 (1994): 293–324. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3124515>.
- Sanders, Robert Stuart. *History of Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, 1853-1953*. Louisville, KY: Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, 1953. <http://catalog.hathitrust.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/api/volumes/oclc/4284247.html>.
- Scott, Anne Firor. *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Scott, Donald M. *From Office to Profession: The New England Ministry, 1750-1850*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978.
- Sinha, Manisha. *The Slave's Cause: A History of Abolition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016.
- Skinner, Quentin. "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas." *History and Theory* 8, no. 1 (1969): 3–53. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2504188>.
- Skinner, Thomas H. *A Sermon Occasioned by the Death of the Rev. Matthias Bruen: Preached in the Bleeker-Street Church, New-York, September 20, 1829*. New-York: Printed by J. Seymour, 1829. <http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY111022628&srchtp=a&ste=14&q=txshracd2488>.
- Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Edited by D.D. Raphael and A.L. Macfie. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1982.
- Smith, Elwyn A. "The Role of the South in the Presbyterian Schism of 1837–38." *Church History* 29, no. 1 (March 1960): 44–63. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3161616>.
- Staiger, C. Bruce. "Abolitionism and the Presbyterian Schism of 1837-1838." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 36, no. 3 (1949): 391–414. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1893014>.
- Stein, Melissa N. *Measuring Manhood: Race and the Science of Masculinity, 1830-1934*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2015.
- Stephens, Lester D. *Science, Race, and Religion in the American South: John Bachman and the Charleston Circle of Naturalists, 1815-1895*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

- Stokes, Claudia. *The Altar at Home: Sentimental Literature and Nineteenth-Century American Religion*. 1st ed. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.  
<http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/j.ctt7zw777>.
- Stubenrauch, Joseph. *The Evangelical Age of Ingenuity in Industrial Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Sweeney, Douglas A., and Allen C. Guelzo, eds. *The New England Theology: From Jonathan Edwards to Edwards Amasa Park*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Sweetser, William B. *A Copious Fountain: A History of Union Presbyterian Seminary, 1812-2012*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016.
- Taylor, Stephen. *Address of the Revd. Stephen Taylor, Upon His Inauguration as Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government in The Union Theological Seminary, Virginia*. Richmond, VA: Thomas W. White, 1835. Sabin Americana.  
<http://galenet.galegroup.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/servlet/Sabin?af=RN&ae=CY3812655306&srchtp=a&ste=14>.
- Taylor, William Harrison. *Unity in Christ and Country: American Presbyterians in the Revolutionary Era, 1758-1801*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 2017.
- Thompson, Ernest Trice. *Presbyterians in the South*. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1963.
- Tomek, Beverly C. and Matthew J. Hetrick, eds. *New Directions in the Study of African American Recolonization*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2017.
- Valeri, Mark. "The New Divinity and the American Revolution." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 46, no. 4 (1989): 741–69. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1922781>.
- Van Engen, Abram C. *Sympathetic Puritans: Calvinist Fellow Feeling in Early New England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Varon, Elizabeth R. *We Mean to Be Counted: White Women & Politics in Antebellum Virginia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- Walker, Williston. *Ten New England Leaders*. New York: Arno Press, 1969.
- Wedell, Marsha. *Elite Women and the Reform Impulse in Memphis, 1875-1915*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1991.

- Wells, Jonathan Daniel, and Jennifer R. Green, eds. *The Southern Middle Class in the Long Nineteenth Century*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2011.
- Westerkamp, Marilyn J. *Women and Religion in Early America, 1600-1850: The Puritan and Evangelical Traditions*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Wheeler, Kenneth H. *Cultivating Regionalism: Higher Education and the Making of the American Midwest*. Early American Places. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2011.
- Whites, LeeAnn. *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender: Augusta, Georgia, 1860-1890*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995.
- Wilder, Craig Steven. *Ebony & Ivy: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America's Universities*. 1st U.S. ed. New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2013.
- Williams, Daniel Day. *The Andover Liberals: A Study in Theology*. Morningside Heights, New York, NY: Kings Crown Press [a division of Columbia University Press], 1941.
- Winkleman, Gerald G. "Polemics, Prayers, and Professionalism: The American Protestant Theological Seminaries from 1784 to 1920." Ph.D., State University of New York at Buffalo, 1975.  
<http://search.proquest.com/pqdtglobal/docview/302794349/citation/ACF5964DE0C44F4FPQ/1>.
- Woods, Leonard. *The Works*. Vol. 4-5. Andover, Mass.: Warren F. Draper, 1863.  
<http://catalog.hathitrust.org/api/volumes/oclc/9391684.html>.
- Worcester, Samuel. *True Liberality: A Sermon, Preached in Boston on the First Anniversary of the American Society for Educating Pious Youth for the Gospel Ministry, October 23, 1816*. Andover, MA: Flagg and Gould, 1816.
- Yarema, Allan E. *The American Colonization Society: An Avenue to Freedom?* Lanham, Md: University Press of America, 2006.
- Zunz, Olivier. *Philanthropy in America: A History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.  
<http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://site.ebrary.com/lib/baylor/docDetail.action?docID=10499001>.