



REV. PROF. JOHN HOLT RICE

UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

Vol. XLIX.

OCTOBER, 1937.

No. 1.

THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

HISTORICAL ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE OPENING OF THE
SEMINARY ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15TH, 1937

BY THE REV. BENJAMIN RICE LACY, JR., D. D., LL. D.,
*President of Union Theological Seminary,
Richmond, Virginia.*

I. THE FOUNDING OF THE SEMINARY.

The Synod of Virginia on October 24th, 1812, "unanimously resolved on the establishment of a theological seminary and unanimously concurred in the appointing of Dr. Hoge as their professor." This we take as the formal beginning of Union Theological Seminary, although Dr. Hoge had already been teaching theology at Hampden-Sydney for five years in connection with his duty as President of the College. He had written in 1810, "It was chiefly from a regard to a theological seminary lately established at this place that I was induced to accept the Presidency at Hampden-Sydney." Next year there will be celebrated the 150th anniversary of the organization of our General Assembly. When it was constituted in 1788 there were but two synods in the South, that of Virginia and of North and South Carolina. The former consisted of the Presbyteries of Hanover, Lexington and Redstone and in 1789 they inaugurated plans for the training of theological students at Liberty Hall in Lexington, Va., under the Rev. William Graham. In 1791 the Synod officially recognized a School of the Prophets, under John McMillan at Canonsburg in Western Pennsylvania, and another one under William Graham at Lexington, as the two centers for the training of their future ministers. Under

Dr. Graham studied both Archibald Alexander, the founder of Princeton Seminary, and John Holt Rice, the one most influential in establishing Union Theological Seminary. When in 1806 the Presbytery of Hanover resolved to attempt to raise funds for a theological library at Hampden-Sydney and to secure funds for the assistance of poor and pious youth for the gospel ministry, Alexander and Rice were both appointed on the committee charged with these affairs. It is doubtful if aught would have been accomplished had not Rice, the young pastor of the Cub Creek Church, been made the agent of the committee. He succeeded in securing \$2,500 and thus laid the foundation of the Seminary of which he was later to be resuscitator and builder.

During the years from 1807 to 1820, when Moses Hoge was President of the College and Professor of Theology, approximately thirty students pursued their studies in theology under his direction. Among these was Edward Baptist, the founder of Powhatan Academy which later became Richmond College. At Hoge's death the newly planted institution began to wane. Archibald Alexander, called from Princeton Seminary to be President of the College and Professor of Divinity, declined to come. The Synod of Virginia, wearied with its failures to advance the cause of theological education at Hampden-Sydney, turned the Seminary and its funds over to Hanover Presbytery. The Presbytery immediately laid the burden upon the heart of John Holt Rice, now Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Richmond. Something of the sacrifice entailed in the acceptance of this call can be seen from the fact that Rice was happily situated in a pastorate, the people of which were greatly devoted to him and to his wife. At the same time that the call came from Hampden-Sydney he received a call to be President of Nassau Hall (Princeton College). To accept the latter would have given him a place of high prominence and large emoluments. At Hampden-Sydney there was nothing except a small theological library. There was no building of any kind, no endowment and only three students waiting for the coming of a teacher and guide. Furthermore, Dr. Rice at that time was passing through a severe illness, from which it appears that he never fully recovered. So greatly, however, did he see the

need of trained ministers of the Presbyterian faith in the South country, that he turned his back upon an attractive pastorate and an attractive presidency of an outstanding college to undertake a seemingly hopeless task.

Robert Burwell, then a student at Hampden-Sydney, awaiting entrance in the theological classes, was appointed to proceed to Richmond and bring Dr. Rice and his family to Hampden-Sydney. He records that it took three days of hard work to reach Hampden-Sydney, a journey which can now be made in less than two hours. On arriving at Hampden-Sydney President Cushing very hospitably received Dr. Rice into his own home and permitted him to use a part of his kitchen, an out-house, for his first classes. Here were assembled Dr. Rice, Jesse Armistead, Robert Burwell and Thomas Hunt. The keynote of the new Seminary was struck in the opening words of its new Professor. Inaugurated on Jan. 1, 1824, he preached from the text, II Timothy 3:16, 17: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Jesse Armistead has kept a diary of surpassing human interest. His entry for Jan. 4th, the first Sunday after Rice's inauguration, is as follows: "A profitable day. Heard Dr. Rice on Psalms 119:111. After the discourse a free conversation on the means of promoting a revival of religion in the heart. Truth must be the instrument. It is this which the Holy Spirit always employs." The text is one which many of us possibly have overlooked, and reads as follows: "Thy testimonies have I taken as an heritage forever; for they are the rejoicing of my heart." We see clearly, therefore, what Dr. Rice meant when he wrote, "Our Seminary shall be based upon the Bible and we will know no *isms* here but *Bibleism*. I am sure that the Bible will afford good support to sound Presbyterianism, and if it will not, why let Presbyterianism go." We shall see later how in an age of controversy Rice made every effort to keep this Seminary free from such dissensions as have so frequently marred the Church and her institutions.

We are amazed at the success which Dr. Rice achieved in the

seven years he spent with the Seminary. His first task was to arouse the people of the South, especially Virginia and North Carolina, in the support of his institution. In 1826, with some misgivings he journeyed to Fayetteville, N. C., there to present his plans before the Synod of North Carolina. Dr. Joseph Caldwell, President of the University of North Carolina, vigorously opposed him, being desirous of establishing a Seminary within the bounds of his own Synod. But Dr. Rice in masterful debate not only persuaded the Synod to unite with the Synod of Virginia in the support of the Seminary but also won Dr. Caldwell to a position of friendliness to the new institution. So it was that formally in 1827 the Seminary was taken under the united control of the two Synods and officially became *Union Theological Seminary*. The Presbyterians of the South, however, were too few and poor properly to support a theological school. Dr. Rice therefore traveled thousands of miles by boat and stage coach to bring support to our institution from New England, New York, Philadelphia and other cities of the North. We have recently received from Hampden-Sydney College a copy of the subscription list taken in Boston, among the contributors of which were Daniel Webster and other New England Christians. One of the houses erected at the Seminary was called Boston House. Before Rice's death the student body had grown from three to thirty-nine, a number which it did not exceed until after the War Between the States.

Let us try for a moment to see something of the conditions obtaining when Hoge and Rice were founding Union Theological Seminary. In 1812 Madison was President, and the war with Great Britain, which paralyzed commerce and industry, was in progress. French infidelity was still rife among the educated people of the South. The entire population of our Nation at that time was only 7,239,881, while those residing in the South numbered only 3,003,639. Travel was accomplished with great difficulty, and communication of any kind was slow and expensive. In 1812 the Minutes of the General Assembly list 469 ministers, 789 churches and 37,699 communicants for the entire United States. The Presbyteries of the South reported 119 ministers, 241 churches and 6,027 communicants. Today in our Southland we

have 3,504 churches, 2,471 ministers and 493,311 members. Ten of our seventeen Synods have each more ministers than were in the entire South country in 1812.

To reach the rapidly growing population of this section Dr. Rice set for himself the task of recruiting and training ministers of the gospel. "For there is no part of the world," wrote he, "where men of high talents and great acquirements, of polished taste and fervent zeal are so much needed as in this country that stretches from the Potomac to the Mississippi." And he adds that in this entire territory his is the only seminary designed to train men for the ministry "*after they have gone through college.*"

II. THE SAVING OF THE SEMINARY.

With the death of Dr. Rice the Seminary went into a decline. This was not wholly due to the men who constituted her faculty but can be attributed in part to the conditions prevailing in Presbyterianism and in the country at large. Rice had set himself steadfastly against controversy. He had written Thomas Chalmers of Scotland in 1819, "Protestants of different denominations endeavored for ages to sustain and advance the Truth by controversy and they have well-nigh disputed vital religion out of the world." "It is by *zealous cooperation* that the glorious things foretold in the Bible are to be accomplished." Ten years later he wrote to Rev. Leonard Woods, D. D., "And O! that there were a spirit of union among all the followers of Christ! But I fear that the day of perfect peace is yet far distant. The spirit of controversy is like to be wakened up; and we shall see how Unitarianism and Universalism, and other heresies, will triumph on account of the quarrels of orthodox Christians!" "To my mind it seems inexpressibly important that they who hold to plain Bible truth and love the cause of vital piety, should be rallied round one standard, and united in one phalanx." He had endured criticisms because of his unwillingness to enter into violent controversy with his fellow Presbyterians, and had been termed in derision "Yankee," but he declared, "I will acknowledge as brethren those who love the Lord Jesus of all parties and I will cooperate zealously and heartily with any who aim to promote the truth as it is in Jesus."

The controversy which he so greatly feared burst upon the Church shortly after his death. By 1837 the Old School and New School split had rended the Church. Two of the professors of the Seminary had gone with the New School, one remained with the Old. The student body decreased until "the students almost unanimously determined to leave the institution unless something was done to remedy this state of things." The New School members of the faculty, Doctors Taylor and Goodrich, were requested to resign, and Doctors Samuel L. Graham and Francis S. Sampson were elected to take their places. These, with Dr. Baxter, constituted the faculty for several years. Although the decline in students was partially stayed, and the Seminary gained new life by the acquisition to its faculty of such men as Doctors Wilson, Dabney and B. M. Smith, yet at no time before the Civil War did it pass the number enrolled during the hey-day of Dr. Rice's administration. The War itself emptied our halls. Dr. Dabney, professor of theology, became Major Dabney, Chief of Staff of "Stonewall" Jackson, serving in that capacity through the memorable Valley Campaign. Dr. James P. Smith, who himself was the last surviving member of Stonewall Jackson's staff, has furnished data concerning Union Theological Seminary's record in the Confederate Army. Three of her sons were killed in battle and one died of wounds, two died in camp, fourteen were chaplains and forty-four served in the ranks. Conditions at Hampden-Sydney were such that special efforts had to be made to secure support for the aged Dr. Wilson who had passed the four score mark and for Mrs. Rice who had outlived her husband and had reached a ripe old age. The active members of the faculty were put on their own resources. The Federal troops finally visited the Seminary but did little damage to the property.

On April 9th, 1865 Lee surrendered at Appomattox. On May 9th the Rev. William H. Foote appeared at Hampden-Sydney at the hour appointed for the meeting of the Board of Trustees. Although the only member present, he conducted a service and preached a sermon on Isaiah 35:10: "And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and

sorrow and sighing shall flee away." He announced that the Seminary would open in the fall. In June a lady from Baltimore arrived with provisions for the nearly destitute members of the Faculty. She requested one of the professors to return to Baltimore to solicit gifts for the Seminary, and Dr. Benjamin M. Smith assumed the task. In that city, New York and other Northern localities he succeeded in raising nearly \$8,000 for the current needs of the Seminary, and this, together with the \$1,500 which he secured in Virginia, enabled the Seminary to open its doors in the fall to a class of twenty-four students. Most of these men had served in the Army of the Confederate States and had had a part in the great revival which had swept through the camps during the War. They and their successors for the succeeding decade or two brought into our Church a depth of experience and a maturity of thought and a resoluteness of character that have had a profound influence until this day. In 1866 the Board of Trustees, at a time when the South was prostrate and the hatreds engendered by the War still active in the hearts of men, resolved upon an effort to secure \$100,000 for the support of the Seminary. As much as \$46,000 of their previous endowment had been invested in the bonds of the Confederate Government, and their other securities were at that time yielding no income. Dr. Smith was appointed the agent of the Seminary to raise new funds. It is significant that in ten years he had secured over \$90,000 for this purpose, among his gifts being \$30,000 from Cyrus H. McCormick for the Chair that bears his name and \$30,000 from Mr. Henry T. Young of New York for the Chair which bears his name. In addition to these gifts he secured through donations and legacies many scholarships to relieve the conditions among students impoverished by the War.

Union had a small but exceedingly able faculty. Dr. Wilson, though too old to teach, still exerted a beneficent influence, and in Dabney, Peck and Smith the Seminary had professors of unusual distinction. It enjoyed for a season unparalleled prosperity and its student body reached the highest figure that it attained before its removal to Richmond, namely, seventy-seven students in 1874-75.

Something of the spirit of the time can be shown by one of the scholarships then established. The sum of \$4,000 was given to

the Seminary with the understanding that the candidate who held it "must be of birth or parentage of the State of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas or Tennessee, or of Switzerland, but in no case may he be a descendant of any person who may have taken part with the United States Government against States above named during the late War." On the other hand, the wisdom of the Board can be seen from a resolution which they sent out to the effect "That all ultraisms in doctrines and all subjects connected with political government and questions that engender strife are carefully discarded from the topics of discussions and instruction in the Seminary." Doubtless many have wondered how Dr. Dabney managed to live up to this proclamation of the Seminary authorities, but the statement gave evidence that the Seminary was striving to continue to hold to the position of its original founders, that it would know no *ism* save *Bibleism*.

On the walls of Watts Chapel are two tablets, one to John Holt Rice, the founder of the Seminary at Hampden-Sydney, and one to Walter W. Moore, the builder of the Seminary at Richmond. Should there not also be a tablet to Benjamin M. Smith who saved the Seminary in her hour of desperate need?

III. THE REMOVING OF THE SEMINARY.

As we look through the General Catalogue of Union Seminary we are impressed with the wide fluctuation in the number of students. To the high water mark of seventy-seven which were present in '74-'75, the Seminary never returned until after it was moved to Richmond. In the early decades after the War no other seminaries in the South competed seriously with this one, and the sons of our Church were loath to go to seminaries of the North. But after 1875 there was a great change. Columbia, cruelly impoverished by the War, began to take on new life, and the Presbyterians of the Mississippi Valley, especially the Southern Synods of Kentucky and Missouri, became deeply interested in a theological seminary in the thriving city of Louisville. Cyrus H. McCormick, a benefactor of this Seminary, was devoting his primary efforts along Christian benevolence to the establishing of a great

seminary in Chicago, and Princeton, which had ever been friendly toward the South, was beginning to make a decided appeal to our Southern candidates. Under such circumstances a theological seminary situated in a remote country community like Hampden-Sydney, removed from the main currents of life and affording little opportunity for practical expression of religious faith and life, made little appeal to men looking forward to active service at home or on the foreign field. The student body began to decline and it was soon seen that with the declension of students it would be more difficult to secure faculty members of genuine ability. Soon Dr. Dabney was receiving overtures from Texas, which he finally accepted, and the brilliant young professor, Walter W. Moore, who had returned to his Alma Mater from Kentucky, was being besieged by the Seminaries in Louisville and Chicago to cast his lot with them. During one year eight students turned their back upon Union because of its isolated situation. Yet new money was needed for the continuation of the Seminary at Hampden-Sydney, and Dr. Moore was directed by the Board to attempt to secure such funds. This was in the year 1891, when Virginia and North Carolina and the South were in the trough of an economic depression. By heroic efforts Dr. Moore succeeded in securing some money, but the reception which had been accorded him throughout the Church convinced him that not only would it be impossible to hold students and professors of promise at Hampden-Sydney, but it was next to impossible to interest men and women to give largely of their means to support an institution in that place. His report to the Board of Trustees, therefore, was a document of great value.

Dr. Johnson tells us of an incident that occurred in 1894. Returning from his class with an arm full of books, he met Dr. Moore on the Via Sacra burdened in like manner. Together they leaned against the plank fence in front of the library building and, planting his foot upon one of the planks of the fence, Dr. Johnson said: "Dr. Moore, you are not going to leave Union Seminary." Dr. Moore remained silent and Dr. Johnson continued, "Union Seminary must be removed to Charlottesville, Richmond or some other location more favorable to its growth. You will effect its removal with comparative ease; if you leave, those of us who are

left behind must undertake the removal; but we will have to wait twenty-five years, wait until Providence teach more plainly that necessity. Meanwhile much time will have been lost." Dr. Moore was visibly affected. He said, "Do you, a Hampden-Sydney man devoted to Dr. Vaughan and Dr. Dabney, who would oppose the removal, feel that way?" On being assured that he did, Dr. Moore said, "This will give me heart. If you will stand by me I will stay at least until I see whether the institution can be moved."

Three steps were necessary in this momentous business. First, the Board of Trustees must be convinced of the advisability of removal. How this was accomplished we do not know, but it is recorded that all but one member heartily accepted the idea. The second step was to secure offers of sites from cities in the controlling Synods. It was early resolved that unless the offer of a site was accompanied by at least \$100,000 in bona fide subscriptions the site would not be accepted. Many places bid for the Seminary, but it was finally through the generous offer of \$50,000 from Mr. George W. Watts of Durham, \$30,000 from Mr. W. W. Spence of Baltimore, and a beautiful site and over \$50,000 from the citizens of Richmond, that the success of removal was assured, provided the Synods would grant their approval. The wise and energetic assistance of Dr. Robt P. Kerr, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Richmond, was invaluable in securing the Seminary for that city. The third and last hurdle appeared to many to be the most difficult. It was in the Synod of Virginia that the real battle was fought. We cannot again rehearse the brilliant way by which Dr. Moore, at the Danville Synod in '94, kept the matter open when Dr. McIlwaine, the President of Hampden-Sydney College, brought in a resolution by which the Synod would call upon the Board to drop the whole matter of removal. Nor can we again narrate the dramatic moments during the Synod at Charleston, W. Va., when the matter was finally debated in '95. Suffice it to say that after full discussion, by a vote of 100 to 67 the motion for removal was carried. Under the able leadership of Prof. William J. Martin of Davidson and of Dr. Peyton H. Hoge of Wilmington the Synod of North Carolina, during its meeting held at the same time, resolved for removal, by the surprising vote of 110 to 3.

Preserved in copies of the Union Seminary Review and of other Bulletins of the Seminary, and soon we hope to be enshrined forever in a biography of Dr. Moore, accounts can be found of the stirring events of those days. The contract was let, the buildings were erected, the faculty of the Seminary and its library and appurtenances were removed to Richmond under the direction of Dr. Thomas Cary Johnson and Prof. W. L. Lingle.

Immediately the Seminary entered into a new era. The student body was increased by forty per cent during its first year in Richmond. But changes of even greater moment than an increase of students were soon to be made. Dr. Moore had on his shoulders both the responsibility of securing sufficient equipment for a growing institution and of providing funds to sustain it. The original twelve acres which constitute the center of our Seminary activity in Richmond were given by Major Ginter, but the Westwood property and the additional real estate and residences on Seminary Avenue and Chamberlayne were later secured. Watts Chapel was added to the original Watts Hall by Mr. Geo. W. Watts, then Richmond Hall was built as a gift of the Presbyterians of this community, and Schauffler Hall was added through the generosity of Mrs. John S. Kennedy and her sister, Mrs. A. F. Schauffler. Mission Court owes its existence to Dr. Moore's sympathetic response to the suggestion of some of our Presbyterian women that a home should be provided near the Seminary for missionary families on furlough. Only when the history of the General Assembly's Training School or when the biography of Dr. Moore is published shall we ever know fully what a great part this man played in the establishment in Richmond of the General Assembly's Training School. The seeds were sown when classes in the Seminary were opened to young women preparing for missionary fields and active Christian service in the home land. By generous advice and even more generous help Dr. Moore secured this great institution for this section of our Church.

We have, however, been thinking largely of things which can be seen and measured. Dr. Moore's great contribution was in the development of things imponderable and invisible. He was a far-seeing statesman in the field of theological education. When oth-

ers were beginning to dream of such things he was forward to establish classes in Christian Education and pioneered in our Southland in the establishment of such a department in this Seminary. He introduced into the Seminary courses in Christian sociology. Convinced that the foreign mission battle is to be fought in the pastorates of the home land, and feeling that what goes in through the Seminary will come out ultimately in the churches, he succeeded in interesting the late Mr. F. S. Royster of Norfolk in establishing the Chair of Christian Missions which bears his name. The John Q. Dickinson Chair of Church History and Church Polity was likewise founded, and by innumerable occasional addresses, by personal contacts and through campaigns which he inspired and guided he was enabled to increase the endowment of the Seminary from \$309,000 in 1898 to \$1,211,469.22 in 1926 when he died. But the mere mentioning of money does not enable us to see the broad vision of the man. Among these funds was \$50,000 which came from the late James Sprunt of Wilmington to establish one of the greatest lectureships upon this continent. The combination of this lectureship with a mid-term for ministers has given new inspiration and new life to many a minister hard pressed upon his field. Beginning with the Hoge Fellowship, established shortly after the removal of the Seminary, Dr. Moore promoted in every way the development of graduate work, which under the direction of our Dr. Edward Mack, has won great praise and grateful thanks throughout the church.

The Founding, the Saving, the Removing of the Seminary—these three stages have marked certain definite periods in the history of our Seminary and they have caused us to stress the lives of Rice and Smith and Moore. Each of these men possessed superb qualities other than the administrative gifts which have been stressed in this address, but it was largely through their executive ability that other professors were able through twelve and a half decades to devote their surpassingly fine gifts of heart and mind to the task of teaching and training young men for the gospel ministry. Time would not suffice to bring to mind Baxter, Taylor, Goodrich, Graham, Sampson, Wilson, Dabney, Peck, Smith, Hoge, Vaughan, Latimer, Alexander, Hersman, Johnson,

Strickler, English, Rice and Caldwell, who with their living successors have sent forth 2,500 ministers trained at Hampden-Sydney and at Richmond. In the Centennial Address of the Society of Missionary Inquiry, in 1918, it was stated that during the hundred years of the existence of the Society, 111 men had been sent to the foreign fields from this Seminary. The record is even more impressive today, for after 125 years in the life of the Seminary, 156 sons of this institution have gone abroad to preach the gospel of the Son of God. Over fifty per cent of the white ordained missionaries laboring under our Committee are Union Seminary men. And, in addition, many sons of other seminaries, who have gone to the foreign field have entered our Th. M. and Th. D. courses, while others have studied informally while on furlough here. These figures do not begin to tell the story, for on every foreign field, as in every theological seminary controlled by our Church in the home land, Union men have had a large part in the training of the spiritual leaders. They have also rendered valiant service in the preparing of translations, commentaries and printed matter in other forms for the native churches in foreign lands. Writing to Dr. Archibald Alexander in 1820 Dr. Rice said: "Some urge with great earnestness the giving up of our piddling little school here." Evidently the great founder later visualized the stream which would flow from such a fountain. Today the part that her sons play through various church functions, as editors, secretaries, teachers, and especially as pastors, bulks large in the life of the Church, and especially of this section of it. In the one state of North Carolina three of her sons, Frazer, Lingle and Bedinger, are directing the educational work at Queens-Chicora, Davidson and Flora Macdonald. In the entire General Assembly Union Seminary has furnished 43% of those men engaged in the active pastoral and mission work. In our controlling Synods the proportion is far greater, the figures being for the Synod of Appalachia 63%, for the Synod of North Carolina 66%, for the Synod of West Virginia 76% and for the Synod of Virginia 83%. No wonder that Mr. George N. Biggs of Huntington, W. Va., in making his contribution of \$16,000 to the Seminary, penned these words: "I feel when I am giving to Union Theological Seminary that I am getting close to the source of the stream."

We review the past that we may gain inspiration and guidance for the future. As we have hurriedly passed over the history of Union Theological Seminary in these 125 years we are impressed with the truth often emphasized by Dr. Moore in one of his favorite expressions, "When the tale of brick is doubled Moses comes." In the darkest hours of the Seminary's life God raised up Rice and Smith and Moore.

Again we are impressed with the paramount place that the Scriptures have had in the thought of our fathers who founded this institution. "Truth," said Rice in the first informal conference with his students, "is the instrument which the Holy Spirit always employs in promoting a revival of religion in the heart." And truth, for Dr. Rice, was found in the Bible. Dr. Moore has stated a like sentiment in the title and contents of his little literary gem, "The Indispensable Book." These men, however, and others who labored with them, realized the importance of aids to the understanding of the Bible, and made, from the beginning and throughout the life of the Seminary, the Library the chief object of their interest. As we have seen, the seed from which the Seminary sprang was the collection of books secured through the efforts of Rice in 1806. Regardless of the impoverishment of the Seminary, the Library was ever the chief interest of Rice and Smith and Moore. Rice's letters plead for more and better books. Smith, at a time when it would seem that bread and other bare necessities of life were the paramount needs, secured large contributions to the Library, among them a gift of \$10,000, in 1866, for the erection of a library building. Personally, he twice re-catalogued the Library, stating in his report to the Board of Trustees, in 1868, that "The preparation of the proposed catalogue would fully remunerate any enterprising students by the valuable information in bibliography which it would secure, as the undersigned knows by experience, having prepared the present catalogue." Dr. Moore, in his address celebrating the 25th anniversary of the removal of the Seminary to Richmond, spoke in most emphatic terms of the value that Spence Library had been to the Church and of the necessity of immediately securing a new building and a full time librarian. This he placed as the first and

paramount need in the growth of the institution. Many of us who are here today can remember Dr. Moore's incomparable sermon on II Timothy 4:13, "The cloak which I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments." The indispensable condition for the equipment of a minister was that he should have, first of all, the parchments, or the Word of God, and the books which would make him a full, accurate and interesting minister of the Word.

An element which stands out with great clearness throughout the history of our Seminary is its insistence upon the *proclamation* of the Word as over against the mere *defense* of the Word. Mr. John S. Munce, for several years President of our Board, tells how on one occasion he and Dr. Moore were discussing together the establishment of a Chair of Apologetics, and Dr. Moore said something like this: "I do not undervalue Apologetics, and realize the importance of our students being well furnished with defensive armor, but I have never emphasized 'defensive' preaching to the students; rather have I encouraged them to 'offensive' preaching, believing that the gospel of God's redeeming love for sinful men is God's own message to the world and should be 'proclaimed' rather than 'defended.'" That, I think, from the day of Rice to our day, has been the dominant note at Union. We are here to train men who are to go out and *proclaim* the gospel of Christ, believing with Dr. Moore the truth of Christ's words, "And I if I be lifted up will draw all men unto Myself." The emphasis therefore has been throughout upon consecrated lives of Christlike character and sacrificial zeal, combined with a knowledge of the Word of God and an intelligent apprehension of the forces at work in the world.

Conditions have changed in the South and in the Nation and in the World since 1812, but the need is just as great today as it was then for men of God, equipped in every way, to proclaim the Word, convert the world and to bring it to the feet of the Master.