



WALTER W. MOORE
June 14, 1857—June 14, 1926

u 58

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

Free
\$2.50

Vol. XXXVIII.

OCTOBER, 1926.

No. 1.

WALTER W. MOORE.

47

A Sketch of His Life and Achievements.

By REV. THOMAS CARY JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D.,
*Professor of Systematic Theology, Union Theological Seminary,
Richmond, Va.*

Walter W. Moore was born at Charlotte, N. C., June 14, 1857. He was a descendant of sterling Scotch-Irish strains. His father was Isaac Hudson Moore, a grandson of Alexander Moore, of Lincoln, who, together with three brothers, one of whom, John, attained to considerable military distinction, fought through the whole of the war for American independence. Walter W. Moore's mother was Martha Parks Moore, a woman of uncommon mentality and high moral and Christian character, eminently worthy to have such a son. She was left a widow with three children, two sons and one daughter, when her second son, Walter, was only six years of age. She struggled bravely to bring her children up to be honest, useful and honored Christian citizens. Thus we find that between 1869 and 1875 she taught a mission school at a salary of \$20.00 per month, meantime had her eldest son, Charles C., in employment in a book store at \$12.00 per month, had him and Walter serve also as carriers of the morning Charlotte Observer for three years, 1868-1871, at \$1.00 per week each, had Walter working in the afternoons three hours a day folding pages of the "Land We Love" a magazine published by General D. H. Hill, of Charlotte; and yet kept Walter in the school of the Rev. R. H. Griffith and Captain Armistead Burwell.

108826

To help replenish the family treasury, Walter, in the summer of 1872, served as errand boy in Pegram's Shoe Store at \$8.00 per month. He had already developed a taste for reading and for writing. The family was possessed of few books and had no means with which to buy others, but the proprietor of the book store in which Charles worked would permit Walter to borrow from the store any books which he wished to read. The lad, when he was only about "fourteen years of age", wrote "Wild West" stories as interesting, Mr. Charles C. Moore says, as any "dime novels of the time". When Charles asked Mr. Pegram if Walter were giving satisfaction in the shoe store, he received the reply: "Walter is the best boy we have ever had. He does his work well, but when he is wanted we find him in the cellar reading a book. I think, if your mother can do so, she should keep Walter at school." Charles talked the matter over with his mother, and they decided to send Walter in September of 1872 to the famous Finley High School in Lenoir, N. C., where he was prepared for Davidson College, which he entered in the autumn of 1874. "Here he contented himself with an average grade in some of his studies, concentrating his attention on the Classics, English Literature, Logic, Metaphysics and Moral Science, which he loved and in which he excelled", all the while reading insatiately in every department of literature. "He has more than once frankly admitted that this was a mistake on his part, and has advised many a boy just entering college to cultivate all parts of the course with equal diligence." He was a member of the Philanthropic Society, from which he received the Declaimer's Medal in 1876 and the Debater's Medal in 1877, and which he represented in the annual oratorical celebration in 1876, delivering an oration remembered by his college mates for its high excellence down to this time.

Other forces stimulating his culture had been two Presbyterian ministers. One of these was the Rev. Arnold W. Miller, D. D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Charlotte, N. C., "a man of strong personality, great learning and intense feeling", and commonly regarded in Walter Moore's youth "as the most powerful preacher in the State". Dr. Mil-

ler was a friend of the lad. Likewise a friendship with that lover of good literature, the Rev. E. H. Harding, D. D., who was Stated Supply of the Second Presbyterian Church of Charlotte, 1874-1881, and Mr. Harding's introduction of John Richard Green's Short History of the English People to the notice of Walter Moore as a youth of fifteen with a bent already to the literature of instruction when it is also a literature of power, had played a part in his mental and cultural development.

He had been received on profession of his faith into the full membership of the First Presbyterian Church in Charlotte at the age of fourteen. When he entered Davidson College he expected, it is said, to become in the course of time a physician, but in 1875 he decided to study for the ministry.

Having been graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Arts at Davidson in the summer of 1878, he entered in the following September Union Theological Seminary, then at Hampden-Sidney, where he devoted himself to his studies with an earnestness and vigor which made him *facile principem* among his classmates. His preaching while a student in the Seminary evoked extraordinary praise from his fellow-students, from the faculty, and from the people of "The Hill" who were privileged to hear him; and so great was the impression that his scholarship made upon the faculty, and in particular upon Dr. Dabney, that they marked him as soon to be recalled to the Seminary as a professor. His labors had been so severe, in the last year at the Seminary, that his health was temporarily impaired, so that he was physically unable to leave the Seminary for two weeks after the close of that term. However, he was ordained as an evangelist by the Presbytery of Mecklenburg, August 30, 1881, and served as Stated Supply to the churches of Swannanoa, Oak Forest, Red Oak, and Pleasant Hill in Buncombe County, N. C., 1881-82. He preached also in schoolhouses and other such places through out a wide district in that region—was as a "voice of one crying in the mountains", "rode hundreds of miles in the valleys and on the flanks of the greatest of the Appalachians, and had a good chance," as he afterwards said, "to learn whether
T x U

he had any of the qualifications of a minister". He "loved the people and his work", and "doubled under the good hand of God the membership of the largest of his churches". As he told the Synod of Appalachia many years later, he "tried to do his best". After one faithful year of ministry there, he was called to the pastorate of the Presbyterian Church in Millersburg, Ky.; and, in part because his physicians had told him that he could not endure the rigours of the Buncombe County winters in his state of health at the time, he accepted the call, and so preached in his new field that the whole Synod of Kentucky was filled with the fame of it.

In 1883 he was brought back to Union Theological Seminary at Hampden-Sidney, Va., to become Assistant Instructor in Hebrew. Dr. Robert L. Dabney had resigned his chair of Systematic Theology and had gone to the University of Texas. Dr. Peck had been transferred to the chair of Theology; Dr. James Fair Latimer had been chosen to the chair made vacant by the transfer of Dr. Peck, but was not to accept until after a similar election the year following. Prior to his leaving, Dr. Dabney had urged with his great strength the election of "Rev. Walter W. Moore" as assistant to Dr. Smith, who was already greatly advanced in years, and who held the Cyrus H. McCormick Chair of Oriental Literature. Dr. Peck, during the year 1883-84, had to conduct a part of the work of Church History and teach Theology. Professor Moore was asked not only to teach the Junior Class Hebrew, but during the same year also to teach exegetically the Gospel of John. It became evident at once that he was an effective teacher and destined to be a very great teacher. He came in the course of a few years to be one of the greatest teachers of modern times of the Hebrew language, investing a study usually esteemed dry with positive charm. He was elevated to the position of Adjunct Professor of Hebrew in 1884, to that of Associate Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament in 1886, to that of Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament in 1889, and to that of the President of the Seminary in 1904, and to that of Old Testament Lecturer in 1915.

The Central University of Kentucky had conferred upon

him in 1885 the degree of Doctor of Divinity. The First Presbyterian Church of Wilmington, N. C., had called him to be its pastor in 1885. This call was sprung upon him as a surprise, and it was followed by a petition from a great number of young men, some of them members of that church and some of them mere members of the congregation, begging him to heed the call. The call made a powerful appeal. The friends of the Seminary delayed not to plead its need of him. They gave express recognition to the help he had been already to the Seminary, and through it to the Church at large and his prospective enlarging usefulness in the Seminary. He was to be one of the most "called men". He did not flirt with the churches. He early gave a gentle, considerate but firm declination of the call to Wilmington.

In 1891, although only thirty-four years of age, he was already the leading man in the Seminary. Dr. Peck, an able and richly furnished teacher, from whose lips nuggets of wisdom dropped, was approaching seventy years of age and in failing health. Dr. Latimer, a man of vast moral earnestness, an excellent teacher and a preacher of power, had come to the Seminary in poor health in 1884, and was on the brink of the grave after the beginning of 1891. While Dr. Moore was not of the most robust health, he was in a condition to work effectively, and he was the logical man because of gifts and vigor to represent the Seminary before the Church Courts, and to portray its needs and prospects before the churches and before individuals.

Since, in 1891, the number of students was growing, and the dormitory space was insufficient, the Board of Trustees determined to erect two frame cottages, each of eight rooms, to give the needed dormitory space. They accordingly appointed Dr. Moore financial agent of the Seminary and asked him to raise \$10,000.00 during the summer vacation of 1891 with which to build the cottages.

The period was a difficult one in which to raise money. Virginia was in the very trough of the ruin wrought by years of booms which soon had burst, and North Carolina was suffering from a temporary paralysis of the cotton industry. Dr.

Moore found another barrier to easy success in raising the money for these buildings. That barrier was the widespread dissatisfaction with the location of the Seminary and the consequent "indisposition to contribute to the erection of any more buildings in the wrong place". Many of our private members, as well as many of our ministers and ruling elders, he reported to the next annual meeting of the Board, "seem to think that the officers of the Seminary have been blind to the changed conditions of the country since the war, and have not recognized the vital importance of planting our principal training school for ministers in some great center of population and business influence, where its needs can be seen and its work appreciated, where its property will accumulate and increase rapidly in value, where its accessibility and metropolitan advantages will command a much larger patronage, where the best methods of Christian work can be seen in actual operation, and where the contingent of picked men reinforcing the pastors in their Sunday schools and mission work will make Presbyterianism a colossus instead of a pigmy among the Christian denominations of the future. The Church cannot afford to ignore the concentration of modern life and influence in the cities. These great centers must be seized by us as they were seized by the apostles of old. They are the vital strategic points of the future. If the Seminary remains in the backwoods, it is doomed to inevitable decline. No power on earth can save it. Therefore it is unwise to throw out any more anchors in the form of buildings. Most of the persons who talked in this way had no conception of the apparently insuperable obstacles which stood in the way of removal."

He confessed that he had found no very satisfactory answers to the objections to further building at Hampden-Sidney. He suggested certain answers that could be made and proceeded to disclose the flaws in those answers. Nevertheless, he reported that he had collected \$7,530.48, had good pledges for \$220.00 unpaid, and that he had received gifts of a limited amount of furniture and bedding for the new dormitory.¹ Pos-

¹Minutes of Board of Trustees, 1892, pages 215 following.

sibly he hoped by that very report to excite the Board to attempt the "apparently impossible", namely: the removal of the Seminary. At all events, he wrote on the 26th of August next to the Rev. William T. Richardson, D. D., that it would be increasingly difficult to get money for more buildings or larger endowments at Hampden-Sidney, increasingly difficult to secure a large attendance of students or to secure suitable professors; and he indicated that he would probably leave the Seminary if it should not be removed to a better location.²

The opposition to the removal of the Seminary was up through 1893, general, strong and highly respectable. Many of the leaders of the Church held that the attractive oasis, "The Hill", was better adapted for study than the city with all its lures, they could hardly tolerate the thought of the sacrifice of the grounds and buildings at Hampden-Sidney. They did not see whence the money was to come with which to command a better location and to erect the necessary new buildings. They did not see that removal was at all practicable.

From 1891 to 1895 the brilliant young professor was continuously tempted to forsake Union Seminary, either to accept a position in some other seminary or to become a pastor of some important church. He was sounded, in February, 1892, as to whether he would accept a call to Princeton Seminary, to the late Dr. Wister Hodge's chair, or to that of Biblical Theology. McCormick Seminary called him to its Hebrew Department in 1891, to its Department of Apologetics, or to Biblical Theology in 1892; and to the Hebrew Department again in 1894.³ The Seminary established by the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri at Louisville in 1893 solicited him to accept the chairmanship of their faculty as well as the professorship of Old Testament Exegesis. The solicitation to go to Louisville was repeated over and over again in the most deferential and importunate way. The representatives of McCormick and Louisville used much the same arguments. "Louis-

²See letter of Dr. William T. Richardson to Dr. W. W. Moore, dated August 30, 1892.

³See letter of Cyrus H. McCormick to the Rev. W. W. Moore, dated April 20, 1894.

be removed to a better location. As for Dr. Dabney and Dr. Vaughan, I honor them as I do few other men on earth and I am proud of it, but in this matter I think they err. I regard Dr. Dabney's opposition to the removal of Union as inconsistent with his magnification of the location of the Austin School of Theology, 'in the culture and political center of the great State of Texas, under the eaves of the State University'. He constantly teaches that the location of that Presbyterian School of Theology in the city of Austin will give the Texas Presbyterians a great advantage over the other denominations in the Lone Star State." Dr. Moore said: "This gives me heart. If you will stand by me, I will stay at least until I see whether the institution can be moved." He went to work to endeavor the removal at once. The following resolution was adopted at the next meeting of the Board of Trustees, May, 1894:

Whereas propositions have been made offering inducements to move the Seminary to some other point in Virginia, it is agreed that the Board is willing to receive and consider such propositions, and to this end a committee of five, three from the Synod of Virginia and two from the Synod of North Carolina, is hereby appointed to take into consideration all and any propositions that may be made, and to this end they are hereby authorized to visit and inspect sites and locations that may be offered, and in case they find that offers are made worthy of consideration, they are to make reports of their investigations to a special meeting of the Board to be called by the President. Committee: J. Rumble, H. M. White, J. H. Tyler, W. J. Martin, J. P. Fitzgerald. On motion it was resolved that the Faculty be requested to designate some one of their body to cooperate with this committee.⁵

Dr. Moore was, of course, appointed as the faculty representative on this committee. He set to work in good earnest to bring about the removal. He arranged, for example, for a meeting to be held on Monday evening, July 9, 1894, in the Grace Street Presbyterian Church of this city. The question to be discussed was: Shall Union Seminary come to Richmond? Considering the season, the meeting was large and

⁵See Minutes of Board of Trustees, May 2, 1894, pages 259-260.
TxU

representative. Dr. Moore, as representative of the faculty and the committee, set forth the conditions which made removal a necessity in order to the good of the Church. He spoke in measured terms, but clearly and to the following effect: "In order to the largest usefulness of the Church the institution should be moved to some center of population and influence, where the students could have the benefit of participating during their period of training in every form of actual Christian work, and where the institution could be set in the full current of the Church's life, and where its needs could be recognized and met, and where it would be enabled to do its appointed work for the Church on a continental scale instead of a parochial scale." He said in conclusion, "I was sent by the Board to Richmond to present the matter to the people here."⁶ The assembly was highly responsive. The following gentlemen were appointed a committee to take prompt action on the subject and to report to the President of the Board of Trustees: Hon. George L. Christian, Messrs. S. H. Hawes, Howard Swineford, John A. Coke, T. William Pemberton, Charles D. Larus and A. F. Moseley.⁷

Along with the committee appointed by the Board, Dr. Moore inspected all the proffered locations and got ready for the meeting of the Synod of Virginia to be held in Danville, October, 1894. The subject of the removal came before the Synod at that meeting for the first time. It would naturally have come up in connection with the report of the Standing Committee "on Union Theological Seminary", but it was thrust on the attention of the Synod in the afternoon session of the second day of the Synod by Dr. Richard McIlwaine, President of Hampden-Sidney College, who introduced resolutions that the trustees of the Seminary should be requested to suspend the resolution to consider removal until after the next November 17th, when the people of Prince Edward County would determine whether or not they would secure the extension of the Farmville-Powhatan Railroad from Farm-

⁶See address on James Y. Fair, D. D., page 3.

⁷Central Presbyterian, July 11, 1894, page 4.

ville by Hampden-Sidney, and that the trustees of the Seminary be asked, in case the plan to secure the railroad should carry, to withdraw their action looking to its removal. Dr. McIlwaine made a long, earnest and able appeal to let the Seminary remain where it was, "on consecrated ground". Many speeches were made in behalf of, or against, removal. The third speech on the subject was made by Dr. Moore. He began by expressing a sense of timidity in the presence of so great a body. "*Rasticus*", reviewing this speech in the Central Presbyterian of November 14, 1894, says: "If Dr. Moore was frightened, it would be well for such fears to become contagious, for rarely has a stronger speech been made before the Synod. His magnetic presence, his striking appearance and benevolent cast of countenance counted for much, especially with those who are impressed with such things, but in addition, there was strong argument, uniform courtesy and a keen thrust now and then. Certain unintentional *non sequiturs* might be pointed out, but on the whole the speech was the best and strongest delivered in the Synod for many years."

"At the close of one of Dr. Moore's eloquent passages, the Synod, for the first time in the memory of many, burst into applause." There were many other speeches, some of them eloquent. Motions were made, amended, debated, lost, with the result that the whole matter of the removal was left for the time in the hands of the Board and the Board's committee. Seeds had been planted in the minds of the presbyters which would germinate prior to the Synod of 1895. The advocates of removal had not been condemned. Liberty of further agitation of the subject had been legitimated by the Synod's saying to the Board: for the present we keep hands off.

Dr. Moore returned to the Seminary encouraged to teach as well as ever, to serve the churches far and near with occasional sermons and addresses, and by letters and oral appeal to lessen the prejudices against removal, and create in every morally becoming way a more general sentiment in favor of removal, that Union Seminary might be given right of way to live a larger and more fruitful life.

Along with the committee appointed by the Board in 1894 to consider propositions offered or to be offered by localities which desired the Seminary to be removed to them, Dr. Moore went to inspect again each proposed site and to consider the proposition. This committee visited Richmond, and the plot in Ginter Park on which these buildings stand, and a plot nearly as large in Highland Park; visited the city of Lynchburg, and a plot of fifteen acres in "Miller Park", thought that each offered plot was a suitable site, received with pleasure the cordial invitation of the faculty and Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia to place the Seminary where use could be had of their library and access for our students to their class-rooms as opportunity should offer or need dictate, but, on May 1, 1895, reported to the Board that, in its judgment, no proposition for the removal of the Seminary should be considered unless, besides the offer of a site, the Board could be assured of a valid subscription of not less than \$100,000.00, either from the offerers of the site or others. The Board commended the committee for its work and continued it with the same powers and under the same conditions as before.

During July Dr. Moore supplied the Brown Memorial and First Presbyterian Churches of Baltimore, and probably talked of his efforts to remove the Seminary to Richmond to Mr. William Wallace Spence. At any rate, Mr. Spence, on the 16th of October, 1895, sent Dr. Moore his bond for \$25,000.00 to be used in the erection of Spence Library. Dr. Moore had about the same time a promise from Mr. George W. Watts, of Durham, N. C., of \$50,000.00, and through friends in this city and elsewhere was securing promises of between \$50,000.00 and \$75,000.00 more. Meantime, he was being advised from Chicago and Louisville that he would probably find it impossible to move Union Seminary and begged to remember that he could step into a more advantageous post at Louisville on the one hand or Chicago on the other. But, at a called meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Seminary on October 18, 1895, their committee to receive propositions and inspect sites, "respectfully reported that a lot containing

11 3-10 acres in the northwestern suburb of Richmond, bounded by the Brook Turnpike and Westwood, Chamberlayne and Melrose Avenues, had been offered as a site, and that in addition to this site, subscriptions aggregating \$125,000.00 had been secured for a building fund. The committee therefore recommends that in case removal is decided upon, this offer of a site and subscriptions be accepted."

The Board took favorable action and had its secretary inform the Stated Clerks of the Synods of Virginia and North Carolina that a proposition to remove the Seminary to Richmond had been accepted by them, subject to the approval of the Board: that this proposition includes the gift of 11 3-10 acres of land eligibly situated on Brook Turnpike and adjacent to the city, and a further subscription of \$125,000.00 to the building fund, and it overtured the Synods to authorize it to remove the Seminary to the proposed site as soon as it could effect the change.⁸

The Board also authorized its Executive Committee, in case the Synods should approve the proposition to remove the Seminary to Richmond, and to the square just described, to appoint a building committee of five which should receive and adopt plans for all new buildings for the Seminary in its new site, receive and accept bids, make contracts for the buildings within the limits of the available funds, give and take the necessary bonds for the erection of said contracts; receive and make payments upon the buildings according to terms of promises and contracts.⁹ Provision was also made for the exercise of other important powers by this building committee, all conditioned on the Synod's approval of the removal of the Seminary to the location described.

On the 22d of October the Synod of Virginia convened in Charleston, W. Va. Mr. Thomas J. Kirkpatrick, of Lynchburg, had been appointed by the Board to advocate and defend before the Synod the action touching the removal. Dr.

⁸Minutes of the Board of Trustees, October, 1895, pages 290-291.

⁹Minutes of the Board of Trustees, 1895, October 18.

Moore was on hand, having previously chosen certain men to speak at defined junctures. There was lively debating, Dr. Moore making a characteristically strong and eloquent speech. While the debate was on, a telegram from the Synod of North Carolina announced that that Synod had gone strongly in favor of removal. The representative of the Board stated that only one member of the Board had gone against the removal of the Seminary to Richmond. These announcements were not without effect. When the vote was taken, one hundred voted in favor of the removal and sixty-seven against removal.

In the course of the debate the Ginter Park location had been represented as wanting in healthfulness, and while counter representations had been made, something more was needed in order to give satisfaction to the whole Church. Accordingly the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, at its meeting on November 18, 1895, called to appoint the Building Committee and to do whatever, after a frank conference, should seem necessary, determined, because it was known to it "that in the minds of some members of the Board there was some question as to the healthfulness of the site offered and accepted", "not to appoint such a committee until, examining into the matter earnestly and candidly, it should become entirely satisfied as to the desirability of the proposed site." On Tuesday morning, November 19th, the committee, accompanied by Rev. W. W. Moore, D. D., and Rev. R. P. Kerr, D. D., and others, drove to the site given to the Seminary, and after examining the surface of the ground, the ditches opened for gas and water mains, the comparative elevation of the ground, under the guidance of Mr. Joseph Bryan, whose elegant home was across the Brook Turnpike from the Seminary site, inspected the surrounding country. The committee then returned to the city, and, unaccompanied by others, called in a body on Major Lewis Ginter, the donor of the site, and heard his testimony. The committee having thus heard the evidence of Mr. Joseph Bryan, who had resided at Brook Hill, the residence of his wife, and at his own home, Laburnum, in immediate proximity to the proposed site for more

than twenty years, and the evidence of Major Lewis Ginter, the generous donor, whose country seat was in view, heard also Dr. Hunter McGuire, the distinguished surgeon and President of the University College of Medicine, who had selected his country home, Westwood, as an all the year round residence, on account of the healthfulness of the locality, Dr. Paulus A. Irving, Secretary of the State Board of Health; W. C. Preston, Esq., John W. Cannon, Esq., and having read the written testimony of the Rev. J. R. Rennie, who was reared in the immediate locality and resided here the most of his life, and of others, the following action was taken:

"The Executive Committee hearing the statements in regard to the unhealthfulness of the site selected for the Seminary, have with the greatest solicitude and carefulness, investigated the matter"; and * * * * "do hereby declare that the proposed site is entirely healthful, and that in our judgment there remains no grounds whatever for suspicion on this score."¹⁰

This finding gave great relief to Dr. Moore. He did not wish the Seminary aspersed on account of the new site. The Executive Committee proceeded at once, after this investigation, to appoint a Building Committee: Messrs. S. H. Hawes, Chairman; C. D. Larus, Treasurer; John S. Munce, Drs. R. P. Kerr and L. B. Turnbull; and as an Advisory Committee: George W. Watts, Esq., and Drs. W. W. Moore and Moses D. Hoge. The Executive Committee urged the Building Committee to press the construction of the buildings as speedily as possible, so that the Board might announce the opening of the session 1896-1897 in Richmond, though the buildings were not to be ready for occupancy so soon. Dr. Moore was now assured of the removal, and though admonished by rival seminaries that, since Union's removal was now assured, he was free to be transferred to them, where they said his opportunity for wider influence would be a certainty, their admonitions fell on ears no longer keenly responsive. His preference for Union Seminary was fixed.

¹⁰Minutes of the Board of Trustees, May 5, 1896, pages 296-297.

He was to continue at Hampden-Sidney his superb work in the class-room till May, 1898. The Seminary was not to get into its new buildings in Ginter Park until October, 1898.

He had, while lamenting over the situation at Hampden-Sidney, and later wrestling over the subject of removal, been rendering a wider service. In 1892, at the Toronto meeting of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches, he had read a paper on the studies proper to a Seminarian—a paper much admired and long remembered by those who heard it. He had lectured in Chatauqua and at Lake Geneva in certain summers. He had made occasional addresses far and wide, and supplied important churches for weeks at a time. He had delivered a course of lectures at McCormick Seminary in Chicago in 1895. He had been asked repeatedly to read a paper on *Biblical Criticism* at the Glasgow meeting of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches in 1896. This he had declined on the ground that he was too much pressed with other duties, which just then had prior claim, but he attended the meeting and moved a resolution of thanks to the officials of that body for the way in which they had done their duty, and to the faculty of the University of Glasgow, and to all who had had a hand in entertaining the delegates; and thereupon paid a tribute to Glasgow which delighted the delegates, won applause after applause, and must have warmed the hearts of the whole city.

He had left America for Europe in this summer of 1896, about the middle of May, and did not set sail from Europe for his return until August 7th. He had not only attended the meeting of the Council, but had traveled through Great Britain on a bicycle, and had toured the continent, going as far south as Naples and as far north as Holland, and had written twelve news letters—some of them not only instructive but very charming, which were published in the Central Presbyterian. He had delivered the Stone Lectures at Princeton in 1897, treating of the following subjects:

Introductory, the Inspiration of the Scriptures as Affected by Oriental Archaeology;

The Babylonian Origin of the Hebrews;

The Age of Abraham;

The Connection Between Egypt and Palestine During the Sojourn;

Rameses II and the Oppression;

Manephtah and the Exodus.¹¹

He had been Reinike Lecturer in the Episcopal Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va., in December, 1897. He had incidentally done much work in this period and indeed from 1885 up to 1898, in summer schools, not only at Chatauqua, and Lake Geneva, but in other such places. Through July and August, 1898, he preached to the united congregations of the First Presbyterian and the Brown Memorial Presbyterian Churches in Baltimore. He captivated all who heard him by his talents, his learning, his eloquence, his personal attractiveness, and by his "intellectual breadth and sympathy".¹² A consequence of this summer's preaching was another informal call to the First Church, and about fourteen months later a similar call to Brown Memorial Church to succeed Dr. M. D. Babcock. The Second Presbyterian Church of Louisville, Ky., issued a similar call in 1899-1900. So also the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church of New York City.

In the midst of these great labors he had found time to compete for a prize of \$50.00 offered by the Charlotte Observer for the most suitable poem to be read May 20, 1898, at the unveiling of the monument to the signers of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. His poem, *The Vanguard of the Revolution*, was written with a swing and a vigor worthy of a grandson of a Revolutionary sire.¹³

In October, 1898, he began his rejoicing at the sight of Union Seminary in its new and commodious home, with a student body of eighty-eight, the largest in its history to that date.

He served as Moderator of the Synod of Virginia in 1899.

His most important work outside of the class-room from

¹¹See report in the Central Presbyterian, March 31, 1897.

¹²Baltimore Sun, August 22, 1898.

¹³For an interesting fact about the poem, see letters of J. P. Caldwell, dated respectively, May 18th, 21st, and 24th, 1898, to Dr. Moore.

1898 to 1904 was building up the endowment. The endowment, when the Seminary left Hampden-Sidney, was pitifully small. In 1900 he suffered himself to be made financial agent of the institution and to be asked to raise \$200,000.00 to rid the Seminary of debt and to build up the endowments.¹⁴ He did not succeed in raising the amount aimed at by a long shot, but he made a good beginning. He reported to the meeting of the Board in 1901 the gift of the Moses D. Hoge Fellowship of \$5,000.00, which has proven through many years a vast blessing to the Church. He reported the sale of the old buildings at Hampden-Sidney for \$10,000.00, with which to cut off debt on the new buildings; reported the acquisition of the Westwood property for \$16,780.00 by the Westwood Land Company, which was to be a holding company for the Seminary, and reported considerable collections, so that, in addition to securing the Hoge Fellowship and getting a sure grip on Westwood, he reduced the debt of \$59,493.00 of the year 1900 to a debt of \$15,873.00 in 1901. Mr. George W. Watts had added to the endowment about \$22,000.00 during that year.

In March, 1900, Dr. Moore had been sounded by a member of the Board of Trustees of Princeton Seminary as to whether he would be willing to become the successor of Dr. William Henry Green in that institution.

The times were not financially easy, and the efforts which he put forth to extinguish the debt and to build up the endowment told on his health. The Board became alarmed and gave him a vacation from the Seminary, 1902-1903, on full salary, and provided a substitute to carry on his work. He, with his family, spent the year for the most part in Europe. Two or three months of the year he devoted to travel in the Orient; in Egypt and in Syria. In this period he produced his widely known, instructive and entertaining book, "A Year in Europe".

Between 1900 and 1905 he served as a member of the International Sunday-School Lessons Committee.

¹⁴See Minutes of Board of Trustees, 1900, page 75.

1904—1926.

In 1904 the Board of the Seminary, having been previously empowered thereto by the controlling Synods, created and defined the office of the President, and elected Dr. Moore to that office, an office which he honored as long as he lived. His inauguration in May, 1905, was a notable occasion, because of the influence of the presidency on the future of the Seminary, because of the goodwill and fraternity shown by the presence of so many representatives from the faculties of sympathizing institutions of theology and letters at the inauguration of the first President of our Seminary.¹⁵ The Board had retained him as professor in his old chair and gave him an assistant. Thenceforth, while continuing his professorial work, and his habit of making occasional addresses and of delivering occasional courses of lectures, such as the Otts Lectures at Davidson College in 1921, he gave himself with renewed zeal to the development of the endowment and to adapting the Seminary curriculum to the needs of the age, and to working for an *esprit de corps* of our own Church and furthering the welfare of Christianity at large.

With the aid of Mr. George W. Watts, of Durham, N. C., he began to build up the endowment of the institution. Largely by Mr. Watts' aid he was able to associate with himself such effective financial agents as the Rev. A. D. P. Gilmour, now of the First Presbyterian Church of Wilmington, N. C., 1905-1908, and the Rev. W. S. Lacy, 1910-1911. About 1907 Dr. Moore had begun to inculcate the view that Presbyterians of the controlling Synods might well express their thanks to God for Union Seminary's first hundred years of service by adding at least \$300,000.00 to the Seminary's endowment. The year 1910-1911 was a year of large giving to this end. Two hundred and twenty thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven dollars and forty-six cents were subscribed in that one scholastic year. This amount, added to what had been given in the three preceding years for the same purpose, made a

¹⁵See Minutes of Board of Trustees, 1905, page 168.

total of \$322,396.48. Every year saw some increase in endowment or equipment. Mr. Watts would from time to time, to encourage some worthy development, throw a \$50,000.00 gift Seminaryward. It frequently had a string attached, that is, was conditioned on others giving in specified proportions, and when the gift of \$100,000.00 by Mrs. John S. Kennedy, of New York, was proposed in 1916-1917, it was conditioned on the Seminary's receiving as much more from other sources by December 31, 1917. This original \$100,000.00 given by Mrs. Kennedy was added to considerably in subsequent years by other gifts from her and from Mrs. Schaufler, and almost the total of these gifts was used for the construction of Schaufler Hall. This noble building was thus presented to the Seminary and to our communion by Dr. Moore, Dr. Schaufler and by Mrs. Kennedy, by the two former instrumentally, and by Mrs. Kennedy as the real donor. (Mrs. Schaufler gave several thousands, it is due her to say.)

Some idea of what Dr. Moore did in building up endowments of the Seminary and in equipping its increasingly commodious quarters can be gotten by comparing its endowment of 1904 and the estimated value of its real estate holdings and buildings at the same time with its endowment and the estimated value of its grounds and buildings in 1925. In 1904 the total endowment for library, scholarships and general support amounted to about \$219,048.15. In 1925 its scholarship endowments alone totaled \$223,714. Its lectureships, fellowships and other special endowments totaled \$148,567.00. Its general endowments amounted to \$761,126.00; its total endowments amounted to \$1,133,407.00. The value of its buildings and grounds, conservatively estimated, was \$651,554.00.

During the same period he was endeavoring to adapt the curriculum to the needs of the age. Union Seminary had begun this process of adaptation to the needs of the age before Dr. Moore's influence in the Seminary had become dominant, even before his entrance into the faculty:

(1). Thus the Board of Trustees took measures looking to the establishment of the fifth professorship—a Professorship of English Bible Study and Pastoral Theology in May, 1883.

(2). The establishment of a course of instruction in Sunday-school work was effected while the institution was still at Hampden-Sidney, but it was a most imperfect course. It was supplemented by special lectures after the removal of the Seminary; and Dr. Moore received the approval of the Board of Trustees of an endeavor in 1914-1915 to establish a special department of Religious Pedagogy and Sunday-school work with its own specially constructed administration building, a feature without a parallel in any other Seminary in that day. Dr. W. Taliaferro Thompson was elected Professor of this department in 1920 and Schauffer Hall, the building, was ready for occupancy in 1921-1922.

(3). The establishment of a special course on Christian Missions begun in answer to a petition from the student body of 1895, was fostered by Dr. Moore till the establishment of the F. S. Royster Professorship of Christian Missions, 1917.

(4). The establishment of a special course on Christian Sociology has been in process of development in more recent years.

(5). Dr. Moore fostered from the very time of the Seminary's coming to Richmond the organization of City Mission work by the students.

(6). With the acquisition of Westwood through the Westwood Land Company, he commanded spacious athletic grounds for outdoor exercise. He had a sort of gymnasium fitted up in the fifth story of the Tower of Watts Hall, which served in a way until after the building of Richmond Hall, when he had a gymnasium fitted up in the basement thereof.

(7). He labored for the establishment of Fellowships: The Moses D. Hoge Fellowship, established 1900-1901, by which the Seminary has given to each of twenty-four young men a fourth year's training, and has made only a fair beginning of its usefulness. The Charles D. Larus Fellowship was founded in 1922-1923, and has begun to run a like useful course. The Salem Fellowship is far along in the making. In his will Dr. Moore made provision for the founding of a Fellowship to be known as the Dr. and Mrs. W. W. Moore Fellowship. A fifth Fellowship was founded by Mrs. and Mrs. John Hobart Reed within six weeks after Dr. Moore's death.

(8). Dr. Moore had long talked of and prayed for a lectureship foundation, on which men eminent for distinction in specific lines might be brought here, one each year, to give a series of lectures of uncommon value to the student body. In 1911 Mr. James Sprunt, of Wilmington, North Carolina, created a foundation of \$30,000, which

in 1919 he increased to \$50,000, for the purpose of enabling the Seminary to secure year by year the services of distinguished and authoritative scholars outside the regular faculty as special lecturers on subjects connected with various aspects of Christian thought and Christian work, with the double purpose of affording means of still further training to the students for their future ministry, and of creating a powerful and permanent literature. Fourteen volumes, some of them of rare excellence, have already been produced, and this work has only begun.

(9). He recognized years ago the need for an annual mid-winter course for ministers dealing with religious questions of living interest and modern methods of practical work, and maintained such courses for years until the number of students attending the institution throughout the year became so great that there was no room for housing ministers who would have come had it been possible to invite them for this mid-winter course.

(10). Under his guidance and prompted by his suggestion, the already burdened faculty organized in 1915-1916 courses of advanced post graduate studies leading to the degree of Doctor of Divinity. courses which quite a number of earnest, younger ministers have availed themselves of to their profit and to the profit of the Church.

(11). Back in 1889-1890 he had done much to stimulate into being, and to give character to, the Union Seminary Magazine, which since 1913-1914 has been conducted under the title of Union Seminary Review, for many years now the only review of contemporary Christian thought, literature and work in our Church.

(12). Dr. Moore long had been exercised by the thought that our missionaries on furlough from their foreign fields had no home in their home land, and in October, 1912, obtained permission from the Board of Trustees to say to the Woman's Foreign Missionary Union of the Synod of Virginia that the Seminary was prepared to offer them a suitable site for a home for missionaries at a nominal cost. In 1920 the Board was reminded of this offer, and was informed that the State Corporation Commission had recently granted a charter to a corporation bearing the name of Mission Court for the purpose of establishing and maintaining such a home, whereupon the Board proceeded to lease to Mission Court Corporation a site for the ninety-nine following years for the annual rental of \$1.00. In this matter Dr. Moore has wrought quietly for years to bring to the Seminary community a succession of pious, devoted and distinguished Christian men and women, both for their good influence on the Seminary and that they might derive good from the institution and the community.

(13). About a score of years ago Dr. Moore threw open cer-

tain class-rooms to young women who wished to prepare themselves for mission work at home or abroad. The requests for the sort of fitting thus given multiplied. A separate organization developed. It grew into the General Assembly's Training School, which was located in this neighborhood largely through the exertions of Dr. Moore.

(14). He had long seen the value of a truly cultured voice. In 1913 he secured the services of Professor George M. Sleeth as instructor in public speaking, services valued so highly that he continued to secure Dr. Sleeth's services up through the year of 1926.

(15). He was chiefly instrumental in bringing it about that in 1915-1916 the Seminary could offer five distinct courses of study:

The regular course leading to the degree of Bachelor of Divinity;

A special course in English leading to the diploma without degree;

A Post-Graduate Course;

A special mid-winter Course for Pastors and Missionaries wishing to freshen up on theological questions of living interest and to learn modern methods of practical work;

And a Course of Advanced Study leading to the degree of Doctor of Divinity.¹⁶

(16). He had labored incessantly to maintain the noblest type of Christian character in the institution and to make it a great power-house for good throughout the whole Church.

In laboring for the material advancement of the Seminary, he had displayed both strategy and tactics rarely equaled in the history of institution builders, he had kept the institution before the Presbyterian public, advertising it in a great way on occasion of its centennial in 1912 by a celebration in which its services in the past and its capabilities in the present, under God's good hand, were exploited; advertising it again in celebrating the centennial of its Society of Missionary Inquiry in 1918, and making of that a great occasion; and advertising it again in celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Seminary's coming to Richmond; and in a constant stream of news notes about the Seminary to our religious newspapers through-

¹⁶See Minutes of the Board 4, Page 402.

out the years. He loved the Seminary for what it had been and was. He was bent on making others know and love it. He labored with wonderful wisdom to broaden and make more practical its teaching while preserving the purity of the faith. He grew with years in loyalty to his Church, the Southern Presbyterian Church. He laid himself out to build up for his Church and for his Lord this school in which so large a part of his life was spent. He wrought for more students, for teaching of increasing practical efficiency, for more professors to teach, for better equipment. Every advance in the numbers of students he used as a lever to raise the power of the Seminary to take care of them. Every increase of equipment and endowment he used as a lever to get more students.

It is not generally known how he poured himself out in labor. Let one incident indicate. In the spring of 1925 the increasing number of students made increase of dormitory space imperative. He was sick—ill—very ill. He went to Washington, D. C., to see if he could not get Mr. E. D. Latta to build a dormitory. He came back, not knowing that he had moved Mr. Latta at all. He went to Wilmington, N. C., to see friends of the Seminary and to see whether he could get help towards the dormitory. When he got off the train at Wilmington he had to sit for one hour and a half in the station before he felt able to go to a telephone booth to call up those friends. He was on the business of the Seminary, his part of God's business in His Church.

He had great plans in mind for the future of the Seminary. The next twenty years he hoped would show as much expansion in every useful direction as the last twenty.

He was interested in everything that pertained to the welfare of the Presbyterian Church, South. Within six weeks of his death, lying on the bed from which he was never to arise, he drew up a brief of reasons why the Presbyterian Church, South, should establish a Historical Society in this city which should preserve the history of our whole Church.

He served for years as a ministerial bureau, happily suggesting to vacant churches which had consulted him suitable men to be their pastors. A distinguished minister of one of

our largest Presbyterian churches has written: "He placed more men in suitable positions than any other man who ever lived or labored in the Southern Church."

He was interested in and at work for the Reformed Churches throughout the world. His last great discourse was in behalf of Protestant Relief in Europe. He was the instigator years ago of the annual observance of "Reformation Day".

In addition to his services as a preacher and teacher and President of the Seminary, and creator of sympathy in our Church for the Reformed Churches everywhere, he had published many lectures, sermons, biographical sketches, expository articles, especially in the UNION SEMINARY REVIEW. He had published three books:

A Year in Europe. 1904.

The Indispensable Book. 1910.

Appreciations and Biographical Sketches. 1914,
and a few booklets, each one characterized by a style suggestive of Macaulay and Addison. To sum up in part:

He served Union Seminary from 1883 to 1915 as a professor, and from 1915 to 1926 as a lecturer, a total of forty-three years as a teacher of extraordinary efficiency, and brilliance and popularity. In the eighties and nineties of that last century he made the study of the Hebrew language, of Oriental Archaeology, and of the Old Testament each a delight. His accurate scholarship, his searching analysis of the subjects with which he dealt, his seizing upon their important and salient features, his command of the fitting words to set forth his thoughts, his bearing, tone and delivery engaged and held the attention of every student. He came near to being idolized by his students. He was to them the incomparable teacher.

His power in descriptive preaching was in like manner unrivaled. Had he been an Englishman and a Church of England preacher, he would have stood in the company of Dean Stanley, Canon Liddon and Archdeacon Farrar for eloquence, but, I think, with more heart grasp of the truth than any of them except Liddon.

He was early turned by the call of Providence to move and

rebuild the Seminary and develop it in its new location. In this work of institution builder he became not less distinguished. He took hold of this noble old institution when it was poorly equipped and kept her going, handling an ever-increasing number of students, and left her with an endowment of \$1,218,672.00 over against her endowment of \$262,000.00 as late as 1896, and an equipment worth more than eight times as much as her equipment in 1896. Grant that her material equipment at Hampden-Sidney was worth as much as \$80,000.00; her present equipment cost \$651,781.00, more than eight times as much. In adding to her equipment and in multiplying the number of her students by two and a half, in enlarging her curriculum by the addition of developed courses on Sunday-School Work, Religious Pedagogy, Christian Missions, Christian Sociology, in establishing fellowships and post-graduate work, mid-winter courses for ministers, in his favoring the organization of advanced graduate work leading to the degree of Doctor of Divinity, in his securing the establishment of the James Sprunt Lectures, which brings to the institution every year distinguished lecturers, who usually publish within six months after their delivery their lectures in book form, in his combination of his endeavor to bring about improved methods in theological teaching and at the same time to maintain the truth against all forms of error, he showed himself to be a great administrator. He has had helpers, a faculty characterized by intelligent loyalty in a large degree. He has had wonderful helpers in the Board of Trustees and friends far and near, but what great builder, where everything must be done by persuasion of man and prayer to God and consecrated planning, has not had such helpers? Dr. Moore's ability to keep not a servile faculty but a loyal faculty, and to win and keep great-hearted friends like Mr. Watts, Mr. William Wallace Spence, and Dr. Schauffler, and Colonel Dickinson, and Mr. S. H. Hawes and Mr. C. D. Larus and Mr. Royster, and Mr. John S. Munce, and Mr. Webster Rhoads, and others, who loved him and admired him and had confidence in the propriety of his aims and in his practical ability to carry

on nobly toward their realization, is part proof that he was a great building and administrative genius.

Admired as an inspiring and incomparable teacher, as a most instructive and delightful preacher, as a great administrative genius, he was equally admirable as an exemplar of right living. Thinking royal thoughts, expressing them in royal words, doing royal deeds, moving among men with singular physical beauty of head and face, receiving plaudits which would have turned any ordinary head, he bore himself with splendid humility. He was considerate of all who crossed his path, and most considerate of God and His rights. Naturally, in his own denomination he was the man of most influence in his later years, the best beloved, the most honored. We make these words of Dr. Charles R. Hemphill our own:

“To few men has it been given to live a life so beautiful and beneficent, to reach an eminence so undisputed and unenvied, and to win an admiration and affection of so many hearts; and of few could it be said so truthfully as of him that he had finished the work God gave him to do.”¹⁷

A prince and a great man, an humble follower of the Lord Jesus Christ, he fell asleep on June 14, 1926, when he had just rounded out sixty-nine years of life full of notable labor and achievements.

Davidson College had honored itself in conferring upon him the degree of Doctor of Laws in 1892, and Austin College in 1924.

Dr. Moore had married Miss Loula S. Fries, of Winston-Salem, N. C., in 1886, than whom no man has ever had a more faithful and devoted helpmate. He is survived by her and by his two daughters, Mrs. Andrew Reid Bird, of Washington, D. C., and Miss Mary Louise Moore; by his two sons, Messrs. Walter Vogler Moore and Francis Hudson Moore, of Richmond, Va.; by a brother and sister, Mr. Charles C. Moore

¹⁷So wrote the Rev. Professor Charles R. Hemphill, D. D., in a letter to Mrs. W. W. Moore, dated July 12, 1926.

and Miss Ida H. Moore, of Charlotte, N. C., and by the following grandchildren, children of Mrs. Bird, and Andrew Reid Bird, Jr., Walter Moore Bird and Imogene Bird.

The burial service was conducted in Schauffler Hall at eight o'clock on the evening of June 15th. The interment took place at seven-thirty o'clock on the morning of June 16th at Winston-Salem, N. C.

A LOOK BACKWARD AND FORWARD.

BY REV. BENJAMIN RICE LACY, JR., D. D.,
President Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.

The First Vision.

Union Theological Seminary was built and rebuilt by men who, lifting up their eyes and looking on the harvest, have prayed that God would send forth laborers into his harvest.

The year 1926 marks the one hundredth anniversary of the union of the Synods of Virginia and North Carolina in the control of the Seminary, which they then christened *Union Theological Seminary*. A century ago Dr. John Holt Rice and his colleagues were impressed by the fact "that the state of things in the Southern country most imperiously requires that the Presbyterian Church should furnish to the candidates for the ministry ample means for a thorough theological education". As early as 1810 Dr. Rice, writing to Dr. Archibald Alexander, said, "We want preachers, we want a great many more preachers, preachers of zeal and of talents, who will give themselves up with unreserved devotion to the great work of preaching salvation". Dr. Rice's eyes were ever on the Southern country. In 1825 he wrote to one of his dear friends, "I have lately been making a calculation for the purpose of showing the destitute state of this region. The result is that, take our population from the Potomac to the Mississippi, not more than one-fifth part acknowledges a connection with the Church of Christ in any form. And of this fifth, more than three-