The Beginning of Theological Education
At Andover

James W. Fraser

Edward Door Griffin, later to be Andover Seminary's first Professor of sacred rhetoric, remembered his youth in western Connecticut: "I saw a continued succession of heavenly sprinklings . . . until, in 1799, I could stand at my door in New Hartford, Litchfield County, and number fifty or sixty contiguous congregations laid down in one field of divine wonders." 1 Later Barton W. Stone, at the time pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Cane Ridge, Bourbon County, Kentucky, described the camp meeting of 1801 which would make his village forever famous in the annals of American revivalism: "Many things transpired there, which were so much like miracles, that if they were not, they had the same effects as miracles on infidels and unbelievers . . . ." 2 These "heavenly sprinklings" and "miracles" were the harbingers of what became known throughout the new nation as the Second Great Awakening.

Many New England parishes and pastors, especially among those who considered themselves heirs of the Great Awakening of the 1730s and 1740s, began to experience new revivals of religious concern and energy during the 1790s. A revival at Yale College under its influential president, Timothy Dwight, in 1801 brought further attention to the movement, while also helping to convert many who became the preachers of the Awakening as it continued to spread. Soon, revivals became expected features of much of New England congregational life, and a church which went too long without one was either to be pitied or censured. But there was more to the revival movement than just preaching and soul saving. Dwight and his successors had an agenda for New England and America, and the Awakening was the vehicle for accomplishing it. In Dwight's estimate, the Revolutionary generation had moved away from the faith of the Puritans to an Enlightenment rationalism. The genteel deism of a majority of the Yale student body when he arrived in 1797 was simply proof of the
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problem, while the results of this deism in revolutionary France, coupled with his perceptions of the barbarism of the American frontier, gave him much to fear.\textsuperscript{3} And so the Awakening was the method to return the nation to its true faith.\textsuperscript{4} In their quest to transform the land, and confound those who opposed them, especially the anti-Calvinist Unitarians, the evangelicals like Dwight relied most of all on education. In those early decades these church leaders came to trust a newly-evident cluster of educational institutions: for the masses, the church with its college-trained pastor and the public school and Sunday school; and for the leaders, the college and a new institution—the theological seminary.\textsuperscript{5}

Beginning with the founding of Andover Theological Seminary in 1808, the three-year seminary, an institution independent of colleges and designed for the post-collegiate training of clergy, became a characteristic of the evangelical crusade wherever its influence and energy was felt. In New England, across New York, and into the Mississippi Valley, theological seminaries were founded, modeled to a degree on their predecessor at Andover, to carry on the work of training new leaders for the crusade. The seminary was even adopted by others who did not share the evangelicals' enthusiasm—Unitarian Harvard itself established a Divinity School in 1815—but the institution had begun with the revivalists. The new form of schooling developed first at Andover, Massachusetts, has served many needs in the almost two centuries since its beginning. Its roots are in a very specific set of historic needs and opportunities. At that point a new institutional model was born, one significant enough to deserve more attention than it has received to date.

Leonard Woods, destined to be a major speaker for their cause, described the mood among Massachusetts' evangelicals in 1806: "This state of things in Boston and Cambridge caused deep solicitude among Orthodox ministers and Christians, and led to a general feeling that something must be done to check the prevalence of error."\textsuperscript{6} The first years of the nineteenth century were not easy ones for those who supported the revivals associated with the Second Great Awakening in New England. In the fall of 1800 their arch-enemy, the deist Thomas Jefferson, was elected President of the new nation, defeating their own almost-orthodox John Adams. Five years later they suffered through two almost equally severe defeats. Henry Ware was elected Hollis Professor of Divinity at Harvard College in the fall of 1805, and in the spring of 1806 Samuel Webber was elected Harvard’s President. Both men were well-known Unitarians. While Harvard had long been suspected of heretical leanings, nothing so ominous had happened before. David Tappan, the Hollis Professor from 1792 until his death in 1803, was a moderate Calvinist who was trusted to provide an adequate theological education for evangelical ministers. And acting president Eliphalet Pearson (1804-06) was clearly one of the evangelicals' own whom they had hoped would succeed to the presidency of the college. Now the Commonwealth’s proud old school had moved toward irremediable heresy. Clearly a crisis was at hand.

Pearson resigned in protest from the Harvard faculty and was welcomed to the village of Andover as the likely leader of a movement of resistance against the Unitarian incursion into New England’s faith. By July, Pearson, Jedidiah
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Morse of Charlestown, and Samuel French of Andover, along with several prominent lay evangelicals, were meeting to develop a new institution as a counterbalance to the wayward school in Cambridge. The plan was to graft a clergy training institution onto Phillips Academy, Andover. The planners of the new institution had much in their favor. Both Pearson and Morse were respected leaders of the Orthodox cause and could command support. The founders of Phillips Academy had considered the training of ministers important and had already included provision for such work in the charter of their academy, although it is doubtful they had ever envisioned the sort of institution now developing. The necessary funds were also available. A Boston merchant, Samuel Abbot, who had planned to leave his very sizeable fortune to Harvard for theological training, now transferred his interest and energy to the new project. It was an auspicious start for a new school.

The Andover evangelicals were not, however, the only ones responding to the crisis in this way. The Rev. Samuel Spring of Newburyport and the Rev. Leonard Woods of West Newbury had been contemplating the creation of a school of theology for their adjoining parishes since 1801, and in 1806 they began to meet with some of the wealthy laymen of their churches to develop a plan. The two schools, one at Andover and the other at West Newbury, would be only a few miles apart. Neither group had yet conceived of the sort of school which Andover would shortly become. Spring and Woods apparently foresaw a "Theological Academy" which would, in effect, continue the method of reading divinity which had been standard practice among New England clergy for more than a century, a pattern in which a college graduate spent from a few months to a couple of years studying theology in the home of a respected minister before seeking ordination. No one spoke of more than a single faculty member, and in the case of the Newbury school, Woods as professor of divinity would also continue as a pastor, not unlike all who supervised the reading of divinity in parishes before him. Perhaps the new wealth available would have been used to acquire larger libraries. Or maybe Woods could have hired an assistant for his parish or Andover, a fulltime professor of divinity, so that the students could have their teacher's undivided attention. There is no indication that in early 1806 anyone had any other perspective. New possibilities were yet to emerge.

Shortly after some of the discussions in Newburyport, Leonard Woods went to Charlestown, Massachusetts, to discuss his work on the Panoplist, an evangelical journal, with its editor, Jedidiah Morse. In the course of the meeting, he happened to mention the plans for the Newbury Seminary. "This information," Woods records, "under the circumstances, almost overwhelmed him with a deep sense of the wonderful providence of God." Morse quickly convinced the Newbury pastor of the desirability of a united institution, and the two began to work toward that end. Merger would not be easy, however. The evangelicals of Massachusetts had internal divisions of their own. The Newbury followers were largely disciples of Samuel Hopkins. They saw themselves as the true heirs of the New England Puritans, Jonathan Edwards and his student Samuel Hopkins. All others, including the Andover Calvinists, were considered to be backsliders. Meanwhile at Andover, the old Calvinists, as they were known, considered their colleagues to the east to be extremists who had carried
Calvinism to its most absurd conclusions. Both were heirs of the Great Awakening, both supported revivals, yet each side distrusted the other.\textsuperscript{10} From the spring of 1807 to the spring of 1808 Woods and Morse worked tirelessly to bring the rest of their reluctant colleagues along. Finally, working behind the scenes, Woods convinced the Newburyport lay donors that merger was desirable and presented Rev. Spring with a fait accompli.\textsuperscript{11} In May 1808 the carefully-crafted compromise was presented to the Trustees of Phillips Academy, and plans were made to open Andover Theological Seminary in September as a united institution including the endowments and faculty of each of the schools. The need to unite in the face of the larger Unitarian threat and the opportunity to build something new in American education had won out.\textsuperscript{12}
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While the delicate negotiations on the governance of the institution and the faith of the faculty moved forward, plans were also progressing on the shape of the institution. Clearly there were resources here for something new in the training of clergy. Jedidiah Morse seems to have been the first to grasp the scope of the opportunity. In response to a fear voiced by Nathaniel Emmons that ministers from a theological college would not command as much respect as those with university degrees, Morse wrote, “Call not the Institution a College but a Theological Seminary. The idea is to admit young men into this school who have received education at some one of our Colleges.”\textsuperscript{13} Andover would not compete with Harvard at the baccalaureate level—there were enough trusted colleges to do that—but would rather provide post-baccalaureate education for those entering the ministry. Morse’s letter represents the first known use of the term “theological seminary” among American Protestants to denote schooling at this level. It was also one of the first attempts to plan a truly post-graduate
professional school in the nation. Shortly thereafter Morse wrote of the second unique characteristic at Andover: "It is to be on a broad foundation, and to have three Professors at least."¹⁴ Not only would the school be a graduate institution, it would also have a faculty of more than one. No such graduate institution yet existed in the United States.

In speaking of the new institution's future, Timothy Dwight of Yale praised the donors "who have thus evangelically testified, that God has not showered wealth upon them in vain."¹⁵ Whatever the original source of the wealth, the amount was indeed unusual for the endowment of any school at the time. Three donors from Andover and three from Newburyport gave the school $57,000 before it opened, and within their lives brought the amount to a full $300,000. In addition they provided, at their own expense, new buildings on the Andover campus to house the school and new houses in the town for the faculty.¹⁶ At a time when Harvard's full endowment was about $150,000 this amount of money, twice Harvard's, meant that Andover had the potential freedom to experiment.¹⁷ It would be a long time before another seminary began with such unlimited opportunities.

To the great delight of evangelical New England, Andover Seminary opened on September 28, 1808. The patriarch of the evangelical movement, Timothy Dwight, journeyed up from New Haven to preside at the opening ceremonies. Jedidiah Morse closed the celebration announcing "A new era in our Churches now commences . . . . A new Institution . . . rises to bless our country."¹⁸ The opening of the seminary brought one more surprise to the founders. Woods wrote that "before the Seminary was organized, Dr. Spring expressed the hope that we should, in due time, have twelve or fifteen students in the Seminary at once."¹⁹ Nineteen were waiting for admission when the school opened. The following year thirty-six were admitted. Numbers of that sort continued to come with the result that the average student body in three classes was from the beginning around one hundred. Such large numbers contributed in ways unanticipated by the founders to shaping the new institution.

As it developed from the early plans of Morse, Woods, and others, and as it was reshaped through the experimentation of the early faculty, a coherent form of theological education took shape at Andover. Morse's plea for a post-college institution with at least three professors was the base. The students were also expected to stay three years to complete the curriculum. The model for theological education which would wield much influence in American Protestantism was summarized by Woods:

A variety of methods were introduced and tried by the Professors, but after a few years it was agreed that the department of Sacred Literature should occupy the substance of the first year, Christian Theology, including Natural Theology, the second year; and the departments of Sacred Rhetoric and Ecclesiastical History the third year.²⁰

What was in the minds of those who put the school together? Of course, the pattern of reading divinity had been used in New England for a century, and
the expansion of such a program into a small academy may well have been the initial goal of both groups. Spring already had been a mentor for some candidates, and the Andover Academy’s bequest had provided rooms in the academy and some support for a dozen scholars who had studied in that parish. The ideal of a thorough education for the ministry, which included a liberal arts education followed by theological study, was common among most European Protestants and Catholics and had been carried over to the new world. This ordering of studies had been practiced in continental universities since the Renaissance and in Catholic minor and major seminaries since the Council of Trent. The anti-Catholicism of the evangelicals, along with the condition of Catholic theological education in the early 1800s, probably ruled out the possibility of any Catholic influence on Andover. Also, in the early nineteenth century, the distinction between the study of the classics in the minor seminaries and the study of philosophy and theology in the major seminaries was blurred among American Catholics where the church and its institutions were yet in embryonic form. In Europe, Catholic theological education was still recovering from the effects of the French Revolution and other political upheavals. Certainly none of the Andover founders made any reference to Catholic models, either in public documents or private correspondence.

It is not clear why the Andover founders adopted a three year program or how they settled on the substance of studies. The English universities, as well as Harvard and Yale, had required three years’ study beyond a bachelor’s degree for the honor of a master’s degree. There was, however, no set curriculum for this program and some read divinity on campus or with a pastor, while others claimed that they merely had to survive for three years to collect the advanced degree. The time requirements of master’s honors may have been a factor in the decision for a three-year course of studies, but it could not have indicated the content or structure of those studies. More suggestive is the little-known experiment of the small Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, whose General Synod adopted a plan for a seminary in 1804 and opened the school in New York City in 1805. The plan called for a four-year curriculum including Biblical and theological studies. The school’s curriculum was described in glowing terms in Morse’s Panoplist in 1806. But the whole Associate Reformed curriculum was under the direction of a single professor, John Mitchell Mason, and for most of its students took the place of both college and seminary. If anything, “Mason’s Seminary,” as it was known, was probably the model for the “Theological College” which Nathaniel Emmons felt might not win sufficient respect for Andover.

While all of these factors may have had a limited influence, none of them was decisive. Rather, Andover was indeed something new. Of course, the theological education of Puritan clergy for the previous two hundred years had its impact. The assumption that a college education followed by some further study was desirable had gained considerable support in New England. Then too, Morse, Woods, and Pearson realized in the course of the two-year period of negotiations between 1806 and 1808 that they had considerable resources available to them, and the decision not to found another college freed them to consider what they might like to see happen. Finally, the Andover plan was developed through experimentation in the first few years of operation. The arrival of a much larger
student body than expected meant that the informality of the previous systems would not work. Certain teaching methods and curricular arrangements seem to have been tried and abandoned. But within a very few years, Woods and his two new colleagues Moses Stuart and Ebenezer Porter all seem to have agreed on the most desirable arrangement. The insistence on doing something, the willingness to experiment, the availability of large sums of money, and the unexpected numbers of students, all attributable in part to the energy released by the Second Great Awakening, had created something new in American education.

While they were willing to tinker with their program for ministerial education, the Andover faculty stood firm about admissions standards. Four requirements were consistently announced: piety—meaning conversion or belief in one’s preparedness for conversion, a college education or its equivalent, moral character, and membership in a Christian church. All requirements were taken seriously. Adoniram Judson, later to gain fame as a missionary to Burma, was admitted to the first class only provisionally because his piety was felt to be lacking. At the heart of the academic curriculum was the assumption that it was for college graduates, and the Andover faculty knew the sort of college curriculum they wanted. When Yale College, in 1828, adopted its famed “Yale Report” recommending the importance of a classical education as the basis for colleges, many saw it as a reactionary move. For the Andover faculty, it was confirmation of what they had long been seeking. They only pleaded that Hebrew be added to the responsibilities of the colleges so that seminary years might not be consumed by language study.

Written in response to a request that Yale drop the requirement of the “dead” languages, the “Yale Report” affirmed the need for the classical languages and literature, Latin and Greek, in a college education. “The object,” according to the Yale faculty, “is not to finish his education; but to lay the foundation, and to advance as far in rearing the superstructure, as the short period of his residence here will admit.” Then, the specific skills of a profession could be acquired in graduate work.

Although the “Yale Report” was conservative in its reaffirmation of the traditional classical curriculum as the core of the college’s program, it also represented a marked departure from the colonial college. Now college work was viewed as preparation for further studies. A college education was not necessarily complete in itself, but ideally provided the foundation for advanced work, probably in law, medicine, or theology, after which the candidate was truly prepared for life’s work. This shift was itself due, in no small part, to the emergence of the Andover model of professional school in the preceding twenty years. The requirement of a college degree was successfully maintained. Between its opening in 1808 and 1836, Andover received 693 students; only forty-two did not hold a bachelor’s degree. The Andover model called for not only the three years of seminary work, but four years of college; the same pattern in use today.

From the beginning most knowledgeable observers assumed that Leonard Woods would be the professor of theology at Andover. He served as the Abbot Professor of Christian Theology until his retirement in 1847. During his long
tenure he taught Calvinism to generations of future preachers and missionaries while also attaining the reputation as a major defender of that tradition. His debates with Henry Ware brought the differences between the orthodox and the Unitarians into focus, just as his more friendly debates with Lyman Beecher and Nathaniel William Taylor symbolized the differences emerging within the evangelical camp itself. In none of these discussions was Woods likely to compromise his own views.31

To no one’s surprise Eliphalet Pearson was appointed Professor of Sacred Literature. He served, however, for only one year, resigning to concentrate his efforts on behalf of the seminary in his office as chairman of the trustees.32 Pearson’s successor was the thirty-year old Moses Stuart, the popular pastor of New Haven’s Center Church. At the time of his appointment, Stuart knew neither Hebrew nor German, the language in which most existing Hebrew grammars were published. From most accounts of the era of Andover’s founding “the study of oriental languages and history was at a low ebb in New England. Even the study of Hebrew had fallen into almost total neglect.”33 Stuart set out to teach himself Hebrew. In the process, he realized that the best information on the subject was then available in German, and so he learned that language also. Indeed, his devotion to German scholarship and his encouraging of bright students to share this interest elicited more than a little distrust on the part of many of his supporters.34 It also began a pattern of connections between German and American higher education which was to grow in significance for the next century, introducing German research and teaching methods to the United States.

In effect, Stuart helped to create a new academic field. His first published grammar was available in 1813, and his Hebrew Grammar of 1821 became the standard seminary text.35 He not only created texts, he created a profession. After extra work at Andover, some of Stuart’s students even made the trip to Germany for further study. When the American Oriental Society was established in 1849, the roll of membership published in its first Journal numbered sixty-eight scholars, twenty-three of whom were once pupils of Stuart.36

While Stuart and Woods dominated the intellectual life of Andover during its first four decades, the curriculum was also supposed to include Sacred Rhetoric and Ecclesiastical History. A famous preacher, Edward Door Griffin of Newark, New Jersey, was persuaded to accept in 1809 the dual roles of teaching rhetoric at Andover Seminary and serving as pastor of the Park Street Church in Boston. He was well-liked by his colleagues and students, but quickly found the joint position more than he could carry. He resigned from Andover in 1811 to devote all his time to the Park Street congregation. As with Sacred Literature, the second appointment was to be more successful. Ebenezer Porter served Andover from 1812 until his death in 1834. He became as well-known for his published lectures on rhetoric as for his “Letters on Revivals.” In 1827 Porter was also made President of the Seminary. In addition to his role as presiding officer at faculty meetings, he seems to have been primarily responsible for student discipline, a matter the more scholarly Stuart and Woods were happy to leave to Porter.37
The fourth department of the seminary, Ecclesiastical History, had a more checkered development. When money became available for a fourth position, Andover appointed James Murdock in 1819 with responsibility in both the fields of rhetoric and history. It was an unhappy move. Although initially recommended by Woods, Murdock spent most of the next decade fighting with his three colleagues over his right to teach history, the place of ecclesiastical history in the seminary curriculum, and the value of the discipline for theological education. Apparently the majority of the faculty had serious reservations about the importance of historical study. Finally, in 1828 the unhappy Murdock was forced off the faculty. The trustees redefined the fourth position as the "Brown Professorship of Pastoral Theology and Ecclesiastical History." The incumbent was both to teach history and to introduce students to the more practical affairs of church life.38 These four departments, with some occasional assistants in one or another, constituted the Andover faculty until well after the Civil War. They also represent the general division of most seminary faculties to the present day.

The professors developed the methods of instruction, like the curriculum, by trial and error. Woods recorded that he began by giving all lectures in theology, but in time modified the system to allow for more class discussion. Like many of his successors, he complained about the problems of the few students who tended to dominate a discussion and the majority who "kept back by diffidence from joining in . . . ." After a forty-year struggle with the problem, "My endeavors in this respect," he remembered, "were successful only in part." Finally, in response to a student complaint that student presentations all tended to be the same, and therefore boring, Woods instituted a new exercise of having students submit written papers on which the professor commented, in writing, "The business of examining and criticizing so many dissertations proved to be very laborious; but," Woods believed "the students regarded it as promotive of their best improvement."39

The role of the trustees and visitors was limited. In a situation such as the Murdock crisis, they did indeed step in to settle the affair. The appointment of a president for the faculty in the midst of this debacle suggests, however, that the trustees did not want to become personally involved in the vicissitudes of faculty meetings.40 On the other hand, the trustees never relaxed their vigilance over the orthodoxy of the faculty. When Leonard Woods published an implied criticism of the Westminster Confession, he was taken to task and modified his views. Far from complaining about this implied threat to his academic freedom, Woods expressed his gratitude to the trustees for rescuing him from "mistakes and inconsistencies." His only complaint was that they should have acted sooner.41

John E. Todd, an Andover student in the early 1820s, described student life in the institution in a letter to a friend:

As you may suppose, I am buried up in theology. I am much driven in study. My class recites three times a week in theology, once in Hebrew, once in Greek, and attends three lectures, sometimes four. Besides this I belong to four different societies which meet even-
ings. In addition to this, I have now the appointment of writing a dissertation of one hour in length, to be delivered before the Society of Inquiry, respecting missions.42

Todd's life appears to have been fairly typical of student life as it developed at the seminary. Class work, student societies, and concerns with the state of their souls dominated the correspondence of Andover students. In addition, most were involved in some capacity with a church or a school to earn additional money, and in the early days they often worked in the seminary shop for both exercise and spending money.

Rooted in the Awakening, the early Andover kept the revival at the center of all its activity. The purpose of the faculty was to produce more successful revivalists. To this end, the faculty created the Wednesday evening prayer conference.43 Woods noted:

> Never can I forget those solemn and delightful seasons, when I went to the Conference Room with Professor Stuart, or with another of my beloved colleagues, and from the fulness of our hearts spoke to our pupils on the great principles of our holy religion, both doctrinal, experimental and practical. Many a time did Professor Stuart say to me, "If we do good in any way it is in this Conference."44

The conference was the one seminary exercise absolutely closed to outsiders. Here, with as much honesty as they could muster, students and teachers shared their concern and doubt over the state of their souls and for the evangelical movement. Often the conference centered on a topic of importance to future ministers—how they would conduct revivals, how they would govern their own lives in the pastorate, how the seminary curriculum did or did not help them.

Equally important to the students were the many student societies which they conducted with little aid from the faculty. There were many, as William A. Hallock, one member of the class of 1822 recorded:

> I am a little burdened with societies—Secretary of the Rhetorical, Secretary and Treasurer of the Lockhart Musical Society, Treasurer of the Auxiliary Corben, and Committee of Recommendation, Purchasing Committee of the Athenæum, Vice-President of the Society of Inquiry, treasurer of another society, agent also for purchasing German books. They do not all make a great demand, but they occupy some hours every week.45

Although Hallock's schedule was somewhat unusual, these societies did represent the point where the students took the most responsibility for their own theological education. In all student memoirs they represent an important part of it.

The most important organization was the Society of Inquiry for Missions, which included virtually the whole student body. Here students searched their own hearts as to their call to the mission field, either on the western frontier or in some distant land. They also worked together to learn about missions.
The societies carried on a vast correspondence with missionaries, and in time with the sister societies of other seminaries. Although faculties might fight over their theological differences, students in the Society of Inquiry kept themselves posted on developments and commitments to the mission field across the range of theological opinion.

From the outset the founding of Andover Seminary created a stir in the American Protestant religious world. Now other religious bodies seeking to define their own responses to the Second Great Awakening and to strengthen their programs for training ministers had a lead to follow. The Andover plan was adaptable, and the basic idea of a three-year, three or four professor, post-college theological seminary would indeed be used for many different ends. Certainly the founders of Andover did all in their power to make sure that their model was widely emulated. A year after giving his blessing to the original school, Yale President Timothy Dwight was in Philadelphia urging the Presbyterian General Assembly to adopt the plan, something that church did four years later—founding Princeton Theological Seminary in 1812.46

Most important to the spread of the Andover model of ministerial training was the work of the American Education Society. Established in Boston in the summer of 1815, the American Education Society (AES) along with its auxiliaries was to become the largest and most prominent organization providing scholarships for indigent ministerial students in the first half of the nineteenth century. Eliphalet Pearson, president of Andover’s board of trustees, along with two faculty members, Ebenezer Porter and Moses Stuart, drafted the Society’s constitution.47 The goal was to ensure a steady supply of ministers educated in the Andover mold. After 1828 this policy was very explicit: the Society would aid only those candidates who would promise to “pursue a regular three year course of theological study.”48

Between 1815 and 1860 the AES aided nearly five thousand candidates for the ministry, or about one-quarter of all who attended seminary during that period.49 The incentives to meet the Society’s requirements were strong. None of the successor seminaries to Andover had anything approaching its financial base, most were small, harassed by debt, and eager to receive students who were fully financed. In one case, Bangor Seminary initially had sought to model itself on the four-year English dissenting academies which combined college and seminary rather than on the Andover plan. The AES recommended that the “institution should without much delay assume the character and rank of a purely Theological Seminary, adopt a three years course of Theological study, and carry the students through it in the usual way . . . .”50 The Bangor faculty sought to defend their system, but the AES was adamant and Bangor was in desperate financial straits. Within a year the trustees announced: “This Seminary has now assumed a form corresponding with that of other Theological Seminaries of our country.”51 The Andover model and the AES had won. The same story was repeated in several other cases. A surprising variety of schools were willing to make sure that their curricula fit the ideal of the powerful Society to benefit from its considerable largesse. At a crucial time the American Educational Society wielded tremendous influence in the spread of the three-year seminary, new in 1808, yet duplicated in dozens of schools in all regions and denomina-
tions before the Civil War. Although the vast majority of Protestant clergy still engaged in other forms of education, every denomination had within half a century at least one school modeled after Andover which made the seminary an option for at least some of its candidates. A good bit of the credit for this development must go to the unique agency which self-consciously set out to project its plan for theological education originating in Massachusetts Congregationalism on all parts of Protestant America.

The Andover faculty and trustees had a clear sense of being pacesetters and took pride in their position of leadership. Looking back on his own career, Woods wrote, "It is one of the most remarkable consequences of the establishment of this Institution, and one of the clearest proofs of the great value attached to it by the community, that so many similar Institutions have in so short a time been founded."52 Speakers at Andover's Fiftieth Anniversary exercises echoed the same pride in their school as the "original type."53 Nurttured by the energy of the Awakening, supported by generous donors, and having attracted an able faculty and student body, Andover Theological Seminary emerged in the decades after 1806 as a new type of institution for theological education. Although copied by many, the original school at Andover would remain throughout the nineteenth century as a beacon, attracting some of the best students and sending forth faculty members for similar institutions and notable missionaries and ministers for the American churches. The 1806 negotiations between Leonard Woods and Jedidiah Morse had blossomed beyond anyone's wildest expectations.
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