BROTHER McGARVEY

"BROTHER McGARVEY"

THE LIFE OF PRESIDENT J. W. McGARVEY OF THE COLLEGE OF THE BIBLE LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

A Publication for the Seventy-fifth Anniversary Celebration of The College of the Bible, June, 1940

W. C. MORRO, Ph.D.

Professor of New Testament, Brite College of the Bible, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas

THE BETHANY PRESS
ST. LOUIS

Printed in the United States of America
By the Bethany Press

TO THE HUNDREDS OF STUDENTS OF

McGARVEY

WHO RECEIVED FROM HIS INSTRUCTION IN

THE COLLEGE OF THE BIBLE

KNOWLEDGE OF THE BIBLE'S CONTENTS

AND

A HIGH VALUATION OF ITS MESSAGE

THIS VOLUME IS

DEDICATED

CONTENTS

PREFACE

President McGarvey had purposed that the story of his life should be written by his son, John William McGarvey, Jr., and to aid him had collected considerable material and had written some portions, particularly sketches concerning associates of his early life. This son died, however, in April prior to his father's death in October and the responsibility for producing the biography was assumed by a younger son, James Thomson McGarvey. He gathered additional material and wrote some early chapters but did not complete the work. Death came to him in December of 1938, and the surviving members of the family made request of the present author to carry on the undertaking to completion.

He has used the manuscript mentioned above as a source and occasionally has quoted entire paragraphs from it, but the present work is in no sense a collaboration. The author assumes sole responsibility for selection of the material and for its arrangement. In the Foreword he gives his reasons for feeling that he has some qualification for undertaking this task. He regrets that he could not use more of the sketches of the friends which President McGarvey himself wrote. Limits of space made this impossible.

He wishes to express his thanks to many for the assistance they have given him. First to the members of McGarvey's family, especially his daughters Miss Sarah, Mrs. Higginbotham, and his grandson Davis, the son of J. T. McGarvey; and to the faculty of the College of the Bible and in particular Dean Charles Lynn Pyatt, who from the first has given encouragement and assistance.

A number of former students of President McGarvey wrote in response to a request, giving their estimate of his character and of his influence upon them. It is a matter of deep regret that all of these letters cannot be used, but space does not permit and there is necessarily considerable repetition. All, however, have helped the author to see McGarvey through their many eyes and have aided him to create the composite picture of President McGarvey which he has attempted to present. Those who responded so generously were W. H. Allen, C. J. Armstrong, W. D. Bartle, S. M. Bernard, R. B. Briney, W. N. Briney, W. S. Buchanan, R. Lee Bussabarger, Homer W. Carpenter, B. F. Cato, M. D. Clubb, Graham Frank, C. M. Gordon, Colby D. Hall, M. A. Hart, Horace Kingsbury, Edgar DeWitt Jones, E. B. Motley, F. W. O'Malley, Roger T. Nooe, H. B. Robison, Harvey B. Smith, O. P. Spiegel, W. E. Sweeney and E. M. Waits. Mrs. George A. Klingman, whose husband was then seriously ill and has since died, supplied information concerning her father, Professor I. B. Grubbs. In addition a few other friends aided with helpful information. Among these should be mentioned Dr. Herbert L. Willett, Dean E. S. Ames, Dr. W. E. Garrison and Professor W. C. Bower.

Ten friends have read the manuscript and have aided with helpful suggestions. They are President Stephen J. Corey, Dean Charles Lynn Pyatt, Professor A. W. Fortune, all of the faculty of The College of the Bible; President E. M. Waits, Dean Colby D. Hall and Professor Perry E. Gresham of the faculty of Brite College of the Bible; Dr. Graham Frank of Central Christian Church, Dallas, Dr. L. D. Anderson of First Christian Church, Fort Worth, Dr. M. D. Clubb, Stillwater, Oklahoma, and Miss Sarah McGarvey.

Appreciation is also expressed to the administration of Brite College of the Bible for excusing the author from a number of routine matters that he might have time to do this writing and for generous provision of secretarial help.

A word remains to be said about the title. To students, faculty and friends generally President McGarvey was known by the simple title *Brother* McGarvey. This described their feeling towards him. No better title suggests itself to designate the character that is here portrayed.

In what spirit should the biography of President McGarvey be written? In the past his friends have almost invariably written of him in unqualified praise; but his opponents and critics have found little good to say concerning him. Somewhere between these two extremes lies the true word that should be written. The author has attempted to find this golden mean. Dr. M. D. Clubb has supplied an excellent phrase in describing Robert Graham's attitude towards McGarvey. He wrote, "Graham loved McGarvey but he could see his weaknesses." The author has attempted to be at all times open-minded and honest. He has discovered that McGarvey's weaknesses were largely the product of the time in which he lived and has been confirmed in his judgment that his excellent, commendable qualities outweighed by far any deficiencies that he may have had.

The aim has been throughout to introduce President McGarvey to the present generation and to commend and to interpret him to its consideration and esteem.

W. C. Morro.

Fort Worth, Texas
February, 1940.

THE AUTHOR'S RELATIONS WITH McGARVEY[1]

I had a personal acquaintance with McGarvey during the last nineteen years of his life. I met him first in May, 1893. I was a freshman in the University of Missouri and he came to Columbia to deliver, on the Sunday afternoon of commencement week, the Y.M.C.A. address. His subject was "Inspiration of the Scriptures." This address may be read in his volume of sermons. It was not technical as its title may suggest, but practical and designed to produce reverence for, and a high evaluation of, the Bible. The address was, as I came later to know, characteristic of the man. It was simple, direct in its appeal, logical and convincing.

There had been something of a contest as to whom the Christian Association would invite to deliver this address and there was a measure of disappointment on the part of some of the university authorities that a certain man, prominent in educational and religious circles, had been passed by in favor of McGarvey. Some spoke in disparagement of the simplicity of the address but on the whole it was well received by the audience. The profound impression which it made upon one member of that audience still remains with him after the passing of years. The forceful appeal of the arguments, the transparent simplicity of the language and the deep sincerity of the speaker combined to create the impression that McGarvey spoke with authority.

The following autumn I entered The College of the Bible and continued as a student in that institution during the next five years till graduation in June, 1898. Most of

those years I had at least one class each session under Professor McGarvey, and his influence upon my life and my ideals was probably deeper than I realize and than any words of mine can disclose. Other teachers made important contributions to my life, but no one of them can equal that made by Professor McGarvey. He was not only teacher but personal advisor on many matters and it was he who confirmed my decision to become a teacher of the Bible.

What was the nature of the influence which his teaching and his positive views concerning the Bible exerted upon the minds of young and impressionable youths? Much must be said in future chapters that will bear on this subject. The present one is attempting to unfold the personal relations that existed between Professor McGarvey and the author and so it is appropriate that I give my impressions of his influence upon my own life and that I endeavor to make an appraisal of its character. As the result of home training I had a deep reverence and a glowing enthusiasm for the Bible and I had a respectable acquaintance with its contents. All of these were enlarged and improved by my experience in The College of the Bible. Every student who was ordinarily alert and of studious habits went out from his classroom having a mind stored with a systematic knowledge of the contents and language of the Bible. First of all, then, the instruction of Professor McGarvey did this for me: it gave me a familiar acquaintance with the finest classic of the English language. The benefit of this is almost incalculable. But this benefit was not merely in a linguistic equipment but also in a moral and spiritual view of life, which after all is the greatest treasure the Bible has to bestow.

But did not McGarvey's method and system of teaching bind the student to his own rigid views and deprive him of independent thinking? I am aware that many said that it did, but I am not one of this number. Every teacher believes that his teaching is correct and under normal conditions he expects his students to accept it. Certainly McGarvey was no exception to this rule. He had unwavering faith in the truthfulness of what he taught. It was a rare occasion when he left any question open. He did not believe in that type of teaching which leaves the student in doubt as to what he should believe. He thought that it was his function as a teacher to reach a decision on any debatable question and to announce that decision to his class, but he always *gave to the class the reasons for his decision.* During my student days, I was not critically minded. The instruction that I received I accepted, and yet I can recall an almost continuous experience of filing away in my mind questions which I hoped later to investigate more fully and decide whether the conclusions that I had tentatively accepted were to be my permanent beliefs. I think that this was in accord with the spirit of McGarvey. He had no doubt as to the correctness of the conclusions that he had reached, but he encouraged a continuous search. He knew the conclusion that the student should attain, but he encouraged him to arrive at it by his own investigation.

During the eight years that followed my graduation from The College of the Bible, I preached and attended universities in the East. During much of this period I saw McGarvey infrequently and only after long intervals. Our contacts were mainly through an occasional interchange of letters.

In 1906 I returned to the College as a member of its faculty and was thus placed in an intimate association with him that continued almost without interruption till his death. In the summer of 1911 I resigned from the faculty, but President McGarvey died in October and thus the interval during which I was not associated with him was very brief.

McGarvey's conception of the function of a college president was that he was a senior among equals. Practically no affair or policy of the College was decided by his authority alone. He presided over the meetings of the faculty and all questions of policy were settled in these meetings. If the president was in the minority, he used no other influence to carry his point than argument. When once a decision of the faculty was expressed by a vote, he accepted it as final though it might be contrary to his judgment. I have seen him yield a settled conviction of years and change the policy of the College because a majority of his faculty expressed by vote a judgment that differed from his. The faculty on at least one occasion asked the privilege of reversing its vote that it might not seem to stand in opposition to him, but he declined to accept such a reversal. The relation between a president and his faculty could not possibly be more cordial and harmonious than that which existed between President McGarvey and the faculty of The College of the Bible. This was because of his attitude and his spirit. He was the very soul of courtesy. Even the junior member of the faculty could express his views as freely as the senior member.

The faculty meetings were pleasant gatherings. President McGarvey was always fun-loving and if nothing of a serious nature was engaging the faculty's attention the

time was not infrequently passed very pleasantly. My memory retains a number of delightful hours spent in these meetings.

President McGarvey had through the years built up his courses in Sacred History. He had prepared his own textbooks for these courses and they were of such a nature that use of them required that the one who taught must also employ McGarvey's method of teaching. These methods were peculiarly his own and there is no doubt but that McGarvey made a success of them. They fitted him as the glove fits the hand, but they fitted no one else. They were so completely an expression of his own individuality that for another to use them was equivalent to attempting to become another McGarvey, and this no one could do successfully. He believed so thoroughly in these courses that he did not expect them ever to be changed either as to content or as to method. On one occasion when the faculty was trying to find a way to fit a new course into the curriculum, I made a proposal that would have required a shortening of the time devoted to one of these courses. In his most impressive manner he said to me, "As long as you teach in The College of the Bible, never change in the least respect, nor be a party to changing, these courses in Sacred History."

One course that I taught was in Christian Doctrine and for many years a certain textbook had been used. I considered it to be no longer satisfactory and in the faculty meeting I recommended a change in the character of the course and suggested a new text. President McGarvey rejected my proposal because of suspicion of the book that I recommended. Later two of the older members of the faculty, Professors B. C. Deweese and S. M. Jefferson, of their own accord, talked it over with the

President and gave to him their approval of the text that I had recommended. He then authorized me to make the change. The next year a group of students, disposed by inclination to cause trouble, carried the book to President McGarvey with some marked sentences that they regarded as objectionable. He himself told me the answer that he gave them. It was crisp and to the point. "The faculty," he said, "has approved of the textbook. Any sentence or detail about it that is objectionable will be taken care of by the teacher of the course. I wish to hear nothing further about the matter."

I was thrown into close and intimate relations with him. I was given desk space in his office; we jointly shared the same classroom. The first year I was elected secretary of the faculty and served in this capacity for four years. During my fourth year the secretary of the College Board notified me that I had been elected dean of the College. I asked him to tell me something of what the Board understood to be the duties of the office. His answer was, "We do not know the difference between dean and bean but we do know that President McGarvey is growing old and we are asking you to do everything you can to assist him and to lighten his load."

This then became my special task during the last year and a half of my membership in the faculty of the College. An exceedingly pleasant task it turned out to be. It brought me into very close touch with him. His genial nature, his kindliness of heart, his zest for life made such a relationship a thing of joy. Across the chasm of years there comes to me now the memory and the fragrance of this companionship. It is not always easy for age to offer to youth a comradeship that is free from restraint and embarrassment. But President McGarvey did and it is

this memory that constitutes the closing chapter of my experience with him. One in whose heart there was no bitterness, whatever might be the sentences that his pen wrote for the papers, who cherished no suspicions, who had no jealousies, who loved life with a zest that made it good to the last drop, whose outlook never became soured but who hoped for the good and believed in the best to the very end—this was the McGarvey of my intimate acquaintance.

One incident seems to be an exception to this uniformity of friendship but I have always regarded it as more apparent than real. I assisted I. J. Spencer in preparing for the Christian Board of Publication the commentary on the Sunday School lessons for 1911. One lesson was on the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. It was interpreted as a description of the ideals and character of anyone who is a Servant of the Lord. Jesus only has perfectly embodied this ideal in his life and, therefore, he fulfilled the prophecy in spirit not in letter. The Hebrews thought that a Servant of the Lord would be prosperous, happy and in good health, but the prophet did not hold this view. The Servant would be—might be—stricken with some terrible disease, even something like leprosy. "His visage was marred more than any man." "He was as one from whom men hide their face." A man from Oklahoma, misunderstanding the interpretation, wrote to ask whether the interpreter was crazy. McGarvey, in the Christian Standard of September 9, 1911, replied that he was and called it a disgusting explanation. Both seem to have understood the interpretation as referring to Jesus in a literal way. He certainly did not verify the questioner's interpretation and I prefer to think that he did not trouble

to identify the writer. No name is mentioned. Had he known, however, he would probably have condemned the explanation and perhaps in the very language that he did use.

In June, 1911, I resigned from the faculty of The College of the Bible and in July I left Lexington. In October President McGarvey died, so a period of only about a dozen weeks intervened between my departure from the College and his end. Certain incidents, one of which will be mentioned later, show that the friendship did not end with my departure. Once a friend always a friend was a constant element of McGarvey's character. As he had been in life so was he when death approached—a friend, staunch, unwavering and true.

Shortly after his death I wrote a brief note of appreciation of President McGarvey for the *Christian Standard*.[2] After mentioning certain qualities of his character I added: "To the above mentioned qualities I learned to add one other. This was kindliness, sympathy, companionship: in short, that quality of mind and heart which constitutes the very essence of true friendship. It was especially during the time that I was a member of his faculty that I came to know of this quality of his nature. The fact of his seniority in position to me was never by any act of his impressed upon me. His presence was a constant reminder of the fact that he was my friend and brother. It was this quality of the man which led the College circle to select the title by which he was usually addressed. He was rarely spoken of as *Professor* McGarvey, less seldom as *President* McGarvey, and almost never as *Doctor* McGarvey. He was to students, faculty and friends alike, *Brother* McGarvey.

"His firmness of conviction and frankness of expression, his long training from youth in the militant school of Christianity, his devotion to what he held to be the truth, and the directness of his character, led him to express himself in his writings in ways which created the impression that he was dictatorial and censorious. Such an impression was, however, wholly erroneous. Never have I known a man less arbitrary than he. But I did not fully realize this till I had sat with him in faculty meetings. It was inevitable that we should differ on some matters, and I had looked forward with apprehension to the hour when he should come to know that I adhered to some interpretations of the Bible which differed from those that he held. But I came to have no fear in telling him that such was the case. I think that both enjoyed the discussions which followed. He did not hesitate to pronounce me in error, but in his words there was no trace of censoriousness, and our attachment for each other was never marred by such discussions.

"Last year, when I was considering the invitation to come to Butler College, I went to him for advice. He frankly told me that he had looked forward to my continuing in life-long connection with The College of the Bible, and that my going would be a deep and bitter disappointment to him, yet I must decide the matter for myself. Later, when I laid all of the facts before him and told him that my decision was to leave Lexington, his answer was to encourage me. He said that he would miss me, but that he did not see how I could have decided otherwise. So was his friendship always genuine and free from bias. Shortly before his death a rumor concerning my attitude towards certain fundamental ques-

tions that he knew to be false reached him. During the afternoon of his last day he talked of this with regret, and expressed to the members of his family the hope that it would not retard the achievement of the task that I had undertaken in Butler College. This incident was characteristic of him.

"I share with every alumnus of The College of the Bible, with every friend of his, the deep sense of loss in which his death has involved us. To him as my teacher and co-worker, I owe much. He aided me to become a lover of the truth and a searcher for it. The memory of his friendship, his unfailing courtesy and his sweet kindliness will be in the future one of my highly prized possessions."

McGarvey was five feet, seven inches in height and of medium weight. His head was round. In posture he was erect except that age tended to make him round-shouldered. His eye was clear and penetrating, blue gray in color. His hair in early life varied from a dark brown to black but most men now living remember him as decidedly gray. He wore a beard practically all of his adult life, shaving his cheeks and upper lip till middle age and after that he wore a full beard.

McGarvey was never careless about his appearance, but was uniformly neat and gave the impression that his person had been well cared for. His clothes were always immaculate and well brushed. His hair and beard were neatly trimmed and his linen was in appearance fresh and spotless. His clothing was always dignified, usually black in color, and his coat was prevailingly of the frock-coat type. This was the sort of garment at that time fancied by older men of the faculty.

His facial expression was normally kind, usually smiling, with a decided humorous twinkle about his eyes. On occasions his countenance could become serious or even stern. At such times his face assumed a warrior cast that revealed the fighting spirit within. One year the senior class of the college asked approval of their plan to inaugurate wearing academic costume at commencement. McGarvey disapproved but asked the faculty to decide the matter and tell him its decision. Its vote was favorable and in making the anouncement to him through his ear trumpet the secretary added, "The faculty has decided that the President also should wear cap and gown."

He replied emphatically, "I shall do no such thing. You can't make a monkey out of me." A glance at the expressions of the faculty revealed to him that it was a joke and he joined them in the laugh. On commencement day, however, the seniors were the only ones who wore academic dress.

A cultured woman heard him speak one Sunday night. She evidently spent the time in forming a judgment, in fact, in making a sort of spiritual analysis, of the man. She gave her judgment to her friends. She was impressed with the sincerity and the singleness of his nature; with the intelligence and comprehension displayed in his reading; with the kindness of his heart; and with the sympathy and understanding which she concluded were the fundamental elements of his character. "If I were in great trouble," she said, "and were in need of a counsellor, he is the one to whom I would go."

This is the impression that he made upon all who came to know him intimately. The remarkable fact is that this impression deepened with a long-continued or close personal acquaintance. A former student of his confessed that he acquired a positive distaste for McGarvey as the result of his classroom experience. Such a result was exceptional. Many say that they came to have a dislike for his unyielding and literalistic interpretations but almost universally they were captivated by his personality. This man says that he turned from an almost worshipful reverence to one of positive dislike. But after graduating he received from McGarvey so many spontaneous and unsolicited expressions of kindness and graciousness that he passed through another complete change in attitude. He

came almost to wish that his relations with McGarvey had been solely social and not that of student and teacher.

Kindness was the predominant element in his character One of his daughters says that she never saw him display irritation or fretfulness towards any member of his family. The faculty of the College in resolutions passed on the occasion of his eightieth birthday made virtually the same statement concerning his relations to them. This too was the experience of students in their contact with him. He was not an easy mark for student pranks or foolishness. He could be a stern disciplinarian when occasion required, but his justice was always tempered with kindness.

There were some varieties of misconduct that he could scarcely overlook or condone. These were especially offenses against truth, honor or integrity. McGarvey would class with these rejection of the truth. That was one reason why he was so severe with those who he believed were in doctrinal error, yet the instances are many of persons who came under his condemnation for this sort of error but who later received from him kindness. Disapproval of one's doctrine did not dry up the fountain of his sympathy and graciousness.

Whatever form his disapproval or his punishment for misconduct might take, there was a studied effort to avoid anything that would humiliate and an equally studied effort to appeal to all that was best in the nature of the one that was under discipline. This was the fact about his parental discipline that impressed itself upon his family. One daughter says that when he punished, she was always aware that he was not angry. Another daughter when away from home at the age of sixteen attended a ball and danced, of which her father did not approve.

She remembers the talk that he made to her about the kind of young woman he would like his daughter to be. A son said that the most agonizing quarter of an hour that he ever spent was one Sunday night when he slipped away from home while his father was at church. He went downtown to play pool and while playing glanced towards the door and beheld his father enter in search of him. He dropped cue and balls to hurry out and take his seat in the waiting buggy. His father drove home and neither then nor afterwards did he utter a word upon the subject.

There was an innate and noble chivalry about McGarvey's nature. He was gallant in his bearing towards women and they in turn admired and respected him. The women of the country churches for which he preached were his devoted admirers. A farmer's wife told of an occasion when he came to her home unexpectedly in the late evening after the family had eaten and the servant had gone. She fell back upon a Kentucky woman's standby on such occasions and served him for his supper broiled ham. He skillfully turned her embarrassment and sense of flustration into a feeling of triumph by telling her how fond he was of ham and "red gravy." An old man who was a neighbor of his but recently remarked, "My wife loved Brother McGarvey."

At the beginning of his third year as a student in Bethany College his mother asked him to send her an original poem. Gallantly he responded by telling her that he could find no subject more appropriate than herself. Its title was "A Mother's Smiles and a Mother's Tears." He was then just twenty years old. He was too unimaginative, and too methodical to be classed as an inspired

offspring of the Muse. His production does not betray high poetic genius but it does speak a son's deep devotion and love for his mother. The closing verses of the poem are:

"My mother's smiles and my mother's tears
Thus lend me aid through all my pilgrim years,
Her tears to dry, and her smile to know,
Shall be my greatest honor here below.

"And when to heaven she is borne away,
O, may I meet her smile in endless day;
O, may we there in our smiles unite,
And join in smiles with all the 'Sons of Light.' "

"Trusting firmly in the hope with which these verses close, I remain,

July 4, 1849. Your ever affectionate son,

Jno. W. McGarvey."

In the wide circle of his friendship there were always a few women who were devotedly attached to him, and he was fond of them. It was a mark of honor for any woman to be enrolled in this inner circle. Mrs. Bourne, teacher of history in Transylvania and later of Bethany, was one of this number. The two had a common bond in their affection for Bethany College. At the Golden Wedding of the McGarveys, Mrs. Bourne expressed her tribute in a poem. She speaks of McGarvey in these words:

"Gentle leader, friend and father,
We would honor now,
Genial, kind and faithful ever,
Here all hearts can bow;
Thou hast lingered round our altars,
Laid thy offering there,
Led our souls in paths of beauty,
Chanted graver calls to duty,
Knelt with us in prayer."

Mrs. Eudora Lindsay South, who is described as "a friend for years of the McGarvey family," also paid her tribute to McGarvey in an original poem. She had been a student in Hamilton College in the days, evidently, when McGarvey was the preacher at Broadway. She makes a joyful acknowledgment to those who had enriched her life.

"But one among them held a cup abrim
With Sunday's nectar all prepared, and we
Had naught to do but drink and drink, each draught,
Like honey-dew of Jonathan; to souls
Aweary, new enlightment brought, and made
Us see anew that God would have us love
Our fellow-men; would punish evil; good
Requite; and daily strength provide for lives
Replete with useful deeds. If aught of love
Fraternal, patience under wrong, of hope
For need as yet withheld; of doing good
And fainting not—my life since then has shown,
To him who held this quickening potion much
Is due, and, friends, though years and years have passed,
He holds it yet and many still shall rise
To call him blest. To him, this golden eve,
. . . you bring your gifts—and this is mine—
A fitting one; for every word herein
Of reverence, Christian love, and gratitude
Is coined of Truth's rare gold."

The admission of women to The College of the Bible is an interesting story. During forty years of its history none were admitted. McGarvey shared with Dr. Johnson the feeling that, while a dog may be taught to walk on two legs and a woman may preach, either action is painfully contrary to nature. Besides, the Apostle Paul had clearly disapproved of women preaching. Hence no woman had been admitted, but in 1904, Professor Jefferson moved in the faculty meeting that it be recommended

to the trustees that women be enrolled on the same conditions as men. McGarvey opposed because he feared that this would result in some of them preaching. As an abstract principle he was opposed to women enrolling in the College, but Jefferson's motion prevailed, and a few women, at first the wives of married students and later others who were preparing for religious education or some other specialized activity, entered its classes. In time there was a sufficiently large number to justify the organization of a literary society for women exclusively.

When it became a concrete matter McGarvey's opposition to women as students faded like mist before the rising sun. The women students always found McGarvey to be their devoted friend and champion. It was seldom that any girl, asking for a favor or a special concession, did not have McGarvey favoring her request. Such girls as Ruby Huffman, Kate Galt Miller and Mrs. Meade Dutt became to McGarvey objects of great pride and paternal interest.

The kindliness of McGarvey's nature was manifested towards the lowly. He was no social crusader seeking to change human society. It is doubtful whether the name of Walter Rauschenbusch ever came to his attention. Yet his heart was filled with the Christian grace of sympathy toward the poor and unfortunate. He was always a friend to Negroes and on numerous occasions was present and assisted at the funeral services of those that he knew and esteemed. The wife of the Negro janitor of the Broadway Church was stricken with paralysis and he often went to see her and to offer her Christian comfort. At her request he preached her funeral sermon and commended her highly for her Christian patience and faith.

In the country churches for which he preached the families of the poor found him no less devoted than did the wealthier ones.

His movements were graceful, his step animated though never nervous nor rapid. One morning, probably during his eightieth year, as he came into the chapel, Professor Jefferson's ear detected a slight drag in his footstep. He privately mentioned it to the faculty and predicted that it was an early token of decline. About the same time a woman in his neighborhood likewise observed that the elasticity had gone from his step. From that time on walking became increasingly difficult for him, and in time even painful. Sometimes on his way to or from college he would be forced to pause for rest.

In these years a collie dog that bore the proud name of Robert E. Lee became his constant companion. He accompanied his master to college and when the weather was unfavorable was admitted to the building; otherwise he waited faithfully without. The family was accustomed to say that Lee was attending college, but at the end of the year when an ordination service was held, he attended that also. He slipped into the church in an unguarded moment and took up his position at the side of the platform. After a time he began to show signs of restlessness and to reassure and keep him quiet, at a suitable moment in the service, McGarvey walked over and patted him on the head. The family said that Lee had climaxed his college course by having hands laid on his head in ordination!

By natural instinct and endowment McGarvey was a man of great social charm and grace. This applies alike to his contact with individuals and to groups whether

large or small. He loved men and human associations and it was not difficult for him to find some common interest with those he met, no matter how far in outward circumstance they might be removed from each other. A young man was accompanying McGarvey along the streets of Lexington and was surprised to have him leave his side and approach, ear trumpet in hand, a well-known Jewish citizen of the city. The two spent a few moments in jest and repartee. There was between them no common bond of attachment except a mutual love of life. This same Jew went some distance into the country to the Macedonia church one Sunday to hear McGarvey preach on the divine mission of the Jews. He requested McGarvey to repeat it in Lexington and so the sermon was preached in the Broadway Church that it might be heard by other Jews.

On one occasion in approaching St. Louis on a train McGarvey by chance shared a seat with a Roman Catholic priest. The average Protestant minister has a feeling of restraint in the presence of a Catholic priest, but not McGarvey. This particular priest happened to be Irish and the two of them had a delightful time together.

This delight on the part of McGarvey in the association with all kinds and conditions of men is a factor in that greatest of all puzzles in his character. Many a man had the experience of being in controversy with him and of being referred to by him in sharp and bitter terms. Later the two would meet and McGarvey was found to be genial, kind and delightful. This was an amazing fact and, with a request for an explanation, has been stated dozens of times. Dean Ames of Chicago states it thus: "I had very little contact with Professor McGarvey. My most vivid memory of him was during a visit which he

made to Chicago when he was a guest in the home of Dr. Herbert L. Willett. I remember him there in the family circle as a venerable and genial man. I have never gotten over the difficulty of trying to reconcile his gracious social bearing in Dr. Willett's home with the criticisms of Dr. Willett which he wrote for publication at various times."

Dr. Willett himself faced the same perplexity. He says, "My relations with President McGarvey were personally of the friendliest character, but when he dealt with me and my work in the columns of the *Christian Standard* he always dipped his pen in vitriol and did himself, as it seemed to me and many others, a good deal of discredit by his attitude and strictures. He told Mrs. Willett, on one of the occasions when we were enjoying a friendly and informing interview with him, that he loved us both but he was compelled to correct my errors."

Peter Ainslie tells of stating the perplexity to McGarvey himself on the occasion of a visit to his home in Lexington. "It was," he says, "in 1886, and I was nineteen years old, when I first came in personal touch with Professor McGarvey and from that time till this, I have always regarded him as one of the most gracious souls that I ever knew. I truly loved him. Once, however, while calling at his home, I had occasion to refer to his lucid and dignified style of writing and then I asked him why he undid all of that by his fierce assaults on style and courtesy in his weekly contributions in the *Christian Standard*. Before he could speak, Mrs. McGarvey said, 'I am glad you asked him that, for we all think that he ought not to write in that style.' But she had hardly

finished her remarks before he, with that familiar and innocent laugh of his, said, 'My subjects deserve it.' "

In another place it has been stated that his faculty felt the difficulty and on a number of occasions discussed it with him. Practically everybody from the members of his family to the one who had but occasional contact with him felt the contrast between the two aspects of his personality. How are they to be explained? Can they be reconciled?

The first step in answering these questions is the recognition that there were in McGarvey's personality two dominant attitudes. First was his love of men and his enjoyment of their companionship. No man could be very long in his company without discovering this. It was one of the delightful aspects of his character. His second attitude was an intense devotion to the truth. This assumed the form of a deep-seated conviction that one and only one system of doctrine could be regarded as the truth. To him the Bible was an inerrant revelation of God to man, plain, simple and complete. Rejection of it, or any part of it, was rejection of God. Such was more than an error in judgment; it was a moral delinquency. The disbeliever was spiritually akin to the one perverting the truth. McGarvey identified his interpretation of the Bible with this perfect system. To him it seemed transparently simple and no man need miss it. Any one who had been instructed in Bible truth and did not discover this revelation of God rested under a heavy guilt. Such was McGarvey's belief and it must be understood in order to comprehend his attitude toward those he thought to be in error.

These two attitudes, love of mankind and devotion to the truth, ought not to be antagonistic but as a matter of fact they frequently are. One ordinarily predominates over and crowds out the other. If the former becomes the master passion the person becomes urbane, genial, a lover of men and attaches little importance to any fixed form of theological belief. If the second predominates, he becomes a theological zealot and nothing counts but loyalty to the accepted doctrinal system. The legendary Apostle John who fled from a public bath when the Gnostic Cerinthus entered, lest God should destroy the place, is an extreme example of this type. Usually a religious man has one or the other of these attitudes but not both. Not only did McGarvey retain both, but each was fully developed. He had a deep capacity for friendship and an intense loyalty to what he regarded as the truth of God.

To an observer it seemed as though McGarvey had assumed two conflicting attitudes but this he never would have admitted. He would have said that the two elements of the dilemma in the mind of Dean Ames were not due to any conflict in his own attitude, but were to be found in the character of Dr. Willett. On the one hand he was a delightful man and in his company the social nature of McGarvey found delight. On the other hand he rejected McGarvey's system of truth and of this the latter could not do otherwise than disapprove.

Now this will seem fantastic to one who has a conception that truth is relative and that therefore no man can claim that he has perfect truth and that all of his system must be true. McGarvey made just such a claim concerning his system. His truth came from God and therefore

must be perfect. One who rejected it rejected God and in this respect was beyond defence.

Why, it will be asked, need he be so sharp and so lacking in courtesy? Two things may be said to soften the offense and if these are not satisfactory there is nothing more to be added. First, it was characteristic of the men of his generation to use language of this type and they did not expect their opponents to take offense. McGarvey was scarcely more than extreme in this respect. Dr. Fortune tells of protesting in a meeting at the language which J. B. Briney had used concerning him. The man in the meeting that was most surprised that Fortune found it offensive was Briney himself. J. H. Garrison and McGarvey wrote of each other like Dutch uncles, yet this did not mean lack of esteem. W. E. Garrison writes, "I have a letter from my father, written to me at the time of Professor McGarvey's death, speaking of his high regard for him and the effort he was making under considerable difficulty and inconvenience, to go from St. Louis to Lexington to attend the funeral." He made the journey and was present at the funeral though at the time he was far from well. The men of that day would have said that the sensibilities of the second generation were too much like a hot-house plant and too tender.

The second point is that McGarvey deliberately made choice of this manner of speech because, as he said, "it lent piquancy and interest to the discussion." The language of McGarvey was not the gauge of his kindly heart.

McGarvey's interest in men showed itself in courtesy toward his friends. He was ever thoughtful of them.

Any friend in trouble might expect from McGarvey some response and he could be assured that when it did come it would be practical and helpful. A preacher in Lexington had his house destroyed by fire. Many friends came to express sympathy. He wondered that McGarvey was not among these first. When he did come, late by a few hours, the delay was fully explained by his bringing with him, collected from friends, several hundred dollars. Any person sick, or in the hospital, might expect from him diligent and careful attention. His calls were always a source of comfort and a benediction. One of his students writes, "I spent four weeks in the Good Samaritan Hospital, at Lexington. I shall never forget the visits which President McGarvey made to my bedside during those trying days. Another very happy memory is that my wife and I never made a visit to Lexington that he did not come to call upon us. We thoroughly enjoyed his thoughtfulness, his courtesy, and his humor."

His interest in his friends extended to their homes, their families and their domestic situations. As long as his strength permitted he was accustomed to take afternoon walks. It was then that he would drop in for brief calls on his friends. A case of illness, trouble or other unusual circumstances was certain to bring him on one of these visits. He called to pay his compliments to young babies. One young mother had a story of his visit so timed that he arrived when the baby was suffering from a severe attack of colic. In spite of this she could add that his call was a benediction. Another mother had a baby that was downright perverse and was at its worst when he called. He was solicitous for its well-being and assured the mother that no baby should act that way if

it were well-nourished. In spite of the confusion this mother also remembers his visit with pleasure.

Friendship and especially Christian friendship was a precious thing to McGarvey. He loved his friends; he esteemed their friendship; he allowed no ordinary occurrence to affect his friendship. It is true that he kept his friendships and his theology in different compartments of his mind and did not permit one to interfere greatly with the other. His sharp language used against an opponent was not intended to destroy friendship and so far as he was concerned it did not. When he became involved in controversy with one who was or had been his friend he softened his language and manifested a concern lest it might affect this friendship. R. C. Cave had been associated with McGarvey in editorship of the *Apostolic Times*. In the nineties Cave left a pulpit of the Christian church in St. Louis to become pastor of a liberal church. McGarvey in the *Standard* commented upon his defection and a discussion between the two followed. For years afterwards there would occasionally be an interchange of letters between them. Edgar Dewitt Jones writes concerning one of these discussions, "Some years after I left The College of the Bible and was minister of the First Christian Church of Bloomington, Illinois, I followed closely an exchange of letters between President McGarvey and R. C. Cave, then of St. Louis. The letters involved certain questions of theology, and the two men did not see alike on the issues at stake. I observed, however, that President McGarvey began his letters with the salutation, 'Dear Brother Cave,' and that on the whole, he conducted the correspondence much more graciously than he did in similar cases where his critics were in-

clined to be brash or captious. I especially liked his use of the word 'Brother' in relation to Dr. Cave and wrote him a little note expressing my gratification at his use of that word in the McGarvey-Cave controversy.

"He made a prompt reply, and his answer was in a single paragraph, without one unnecessary word. He thanked me for my letter and explained that because of the one-time close friendship that existed between R. C. Cave and himself, he could scarcely address him otherwise. Then he went on to say, 'Yes, I addressed him as *Brother* for I knew that if I missed him in Christ, I'd hit him in Adam.' Now, that was lovely; it pleased me immensely at the time, and I still chuckle over it when I recall the correspondence."

In his recent autobiography, *Where My Caravan Has Rested,* Burris Jenkins has sought to show that McGarvey acted toward him in a manner that was contrary to true friendship. He says that for five years McGarvey caused him no trouble. "For five years I had gone conscientiously to McGarvey's home to talk with him about the welfare of the allied institutions, and had never found him other than kindly and friendly. Then it came, a bolt from the blue . . . ." In this last sentence he refers to a series of articles in the *Standard* provoked by a letter written by Jenkins in which McGarvey felt Jenkins was taking an erroneous position. It is possible to put another construction on McGarvey's action, than the one Jenkins does and this is the interpretation which his family thinks is the correct one. The fact that for five years McGarvey had been kindly and friendly might be taken as an indication that this was the relation which he wished to continue. McGarvey himself says that this letter of Jenkins' was

the first intimation that had come to his knowledge that Jenkins held views contrary to his own. McGarvey was restrained in his treatment of Jenkins. His severest stricture was that he was young and inexperienced. This is not an unfriendly gesture but is frequently the way that Seventy-five addresses Thirty-five.

McGarvey solved for himself the problem of "redeeming the time." He did not waste it. He began his day early. S. M. Bernard tells of being a guest in his home and of McGarvey beginning work on the book he was then writing in the morning at five o'clock. He would drink a cup of coffee and write or study till breakfast. He guarded his health carefully. He took plenty of time for exercise and for sleep. In his later years he always took time off immediately after lunch for a nap. He slept soundly and arose refreshed to resume his work. He was able to concentrate and work rapidly. In this way he achieved much. Yet no one could have less of the attitude of nervousness or of haste. In the company of others he was never hurried. Nothing seemed to be pressing. There was plenty of time for conversation and the social amenities. No time, however, was wasted. None of it was spent in idle, purposeless talk. There was always about him an attitude of urgency. The students felt this. When they came to see him on college matters there was something that made them dispatch their business and go their way. They did not always understand just why. Some of them, after the lapse of years, refer to it in vague terms, yet there was no rudeness; no disposition to hurry the student away; merely an atmosphere that suggested urgent matters were demanding attention.

He had a happy way of putting students at their ease. Most new ones felt confused in attempting to recite to, or even hold conversation with, him. His ear trumpet added to their sense of discomfort, but usually McGarvey was able to remove their embarrassment. W. R. Holder entered college two weeks late and on his second day was invited by McGarvey to recite. Naturally he was embarrassed, but a few skillfully directed questions discovered a subject upon which he could talk and soon his confusion passed. Not all students were so fortunate but McGarvey was able to put most of them at ease. The majority felt the charm of his personality. They recognized more than one element in him as an individual. They describe their feelings when first they met him by such phrases as "benign serenity"; "he had a genuine and sincere interest in the personal lives of his boys"; "an impression of patriarchal dignity and a certain austereness, tempered by a kindly smile and a gentleness in his heart that was to all appearances more restrained than expressed"; "a twinkling eye, a beaming smile, a ready wit and a wholesome personality."

It has been almost universally recognized that McGarvey had a keen sense of humor. A granddaughter who was young when he died says that this is the one thing about him that she remembers, the spirit of fun that she could discover in his eye. Very little time was wasted in his classroom in fun. Almost never did he tell jokes in either class or pulpit. He had no collection of set stories, but the fun was spontaneous growing out of some incident of the moment, as in this story told by Homer W. Carpenter. One morning McGarvey's ear trumpet was absent from his desk. A student was called on to recite and supposing that McGarvey had not yet taken notice

that his ear trumpet had been forgotten marched boldly to the front and saluted McGarvey with the words, "Good morning, John; how are you?" Imagine his confusion and the hilarity of the class when instantly the response came, "Very well, Hiram; how are you?" He had failed to notice that McGarvey was trying out an acousticon that was less conspicuous than his trumpet.

He was fond of telling jokes on himself and especially stories concerning the awkward mistakes that his deafness caused. He was not the least bit sensitive over this infirmity but would often entertain his friends by telling amusing stories of the blunders that deaf persons, himself included, often made. In 1902 he made a trip to California to attend the state convention and brought back this story on himself. At the session of the last night a collection was being taken. The balcony had been overlooked and some persons were dropping money over the railing to the ushers in the aisles below. McGarvey touched the arm of the chairman and said, "Tell those men in the balcony to throw down some of that yellow money you use out here." The chairman made the announcement and the audience roared with laughter. McGarvey later asked the reason for the laughter and was informed that the collection was being taken for himself.

Graham Frank relates this story: A certain candidate was conducting a warmly contested campaign for reelection to Congress. On the Sunday night before the election McGarvey spoke in the Broadway Church on the moral issues of the campaign. The next morning at the chapel service of The College of the Bible, he told that on his way to the college that morning a newsboy was very

insistent on selling him a paper. Finally he cupped his hand behind his ear and said to the boy, "Son, is there anything unusual in the paper this morning?" The boy's answer was, "An old geezer over at the Broadway Church last night was raising hell." McGarvey's comment was, "I bought a paper from him."

One Sunday morning he and Professor Grubbs were homeward bound from the Chestnut Street Church. The latter asked McGarvey, "Did you hear Brother Allen's sermon this morning?" The answer was, "No, but I watched his movements and he made the motions all right." The same W. H. Allen also relates this: At a meeting in Newtown he was leading the singing and C. A. Thomas was preaching. One day for a special service they invited McGarvey and in preparation for his coming they covered the organ and pushed it to one side. McGarvey took in the situation and with a smile said to them, "You boys had better move that organ out of here or some day you will forget yourselves and use it." Allen contrasts this incident with one at Chestnut Street. An organ had been brought from a neighboring home to train the Sunday school for a Children's Day service. It had been inadvertently forgotten and Professor Grubbs on entering the church discovered it. His objection was so vehement that the preacher had to come down from the pulpit to apologize and some of the young men had to carry the offending instrument into a back room before the worship could be resumed.

The final test of a man's personality and character is his relation to his home and his family. McGarvey loved his home and in all his relations to his family maintained a high standard of social and Christian excellence. He

was a devoted husband and his daughter says he remained a lover till the end. The evening before his death not supecting that his end was near, Mrs. McGarvey left home to receive treatment for rheumatism from which she was suffering severely. He bade her good-bye with tears in his eyes and with regret that for the first time since they were married he had been unable to accompany and care for her. He was also a loving father. His sons and daughters bear witness to the unfailing kindness with which he treated them. He was firm and from all of them he insisted upon right conduct but he did not display irritation and his spirit was not a fault-finding one. One daughter says that when any of them had an ambition that seemed impossible of attainment, a talk with him usually opened up a way. One of Miss Sarah's was to study music in Europe. It would require sacrifice on the part of all, but the self-denial was made and a way was provided, not only for her but for the younger sister as well.

His home received many guests. He was a delightful host and to many visitors to Lexington the warmth and genuineness of his hospitality became known. When callers came it was a delight to see him lay aside whatever was the task of the hour and enter with zest into fellowship with his visitors. There were many that came, from many lands and renewed friendships of many years. It was remarkable that he was able to recall so distinctly and vividly the circumstances of those friendships. He seemingly could call the roll of his former students and remember something about each of them. In bidding him good-bye after a social call, Thomas C. Howe of Indianapolis said to him, "When I came, Professor McGarvey,

I expected that you would tell me something that I did not know, but I never dreamed that it would be something about my own father."

It is a delightful picture which his daughter, Miss Sarah, presents in an article that appeared in *The Christian-Evangelist* of December 27, 1923, of the family prayers in the home of her childhood. She relates that "Father, mother and the older children would read two verses from the Bible in turn, and my brother Tom and I, who could not read to edification at that time, would recite two verses which our mother had taught us in the afternoon. Then the hymn books were brought out and, as my parents both had excellent voices and handed down to all of their children a wondrous love of music, we would join in singing one or two—sometimes more—songs we loved best, then we would kneel while father would pray for the advancement of the Kingdom on earth, strength for the daily task and for the forgiveness of our sins—usually ending with this petition: 'And when Thou hast worn us out in Thy service, give us a peaceful hour in which to die.'

"Sometimes the *littlest* would be left on her knees fast asleep when the rest of us would rise—then with what wonderful tenderness, he would pick her up, undress her before the big fire, and carry her upstairs, put her to bed still sound asleep."

McGarvey had a zest for life and he carried this enthusiasm into his home. He loved singing; he loved to play the flute; he loved to join with his family in producing music either vocal or instrumental. Mark Collis tells that, when McGarvey was far advanced in years, after he had withdrawn from the Broadway Church,

when he no longer attempted to go out to night services, Collis stopped at his home one Sunday night on his way to church to consult him on some matter and found the family gathered about the piano, which his daughter was playing. He himself was playing his flute and his grandchildren were playing various other instruments. They had formed a family orchestra and in the language of the Psalmist were making "a joyful noise unto the Lord." To such use of instruments by individuals, families, or similar groups McGarvey was not opposed. His objection, as will be explained later, was solely to their use in the worship of the church.

McGarvey's readiness of wit enabled him many times to meet a situation with an apt phrase that illuminated every dark corner. Horace Kingsbury tells of an answer which McGarvey made to him. He had been preaching but a short time and had become somewhat discouraged as to the progress he was making. Another student, crude and uncultured, held a meeting and had fifty additions. In something of a despondent mood, Horace went to McGarvey for counsel. His comment was, "Horace, that young brother just blundered into a ripe peach orchard."

Another story illustrating the same point comes from Dallas, Texas. Graham Frank was present in Lexington and heard McGarvey make this reply. A son of Mrs. G. W. Yancey had been suddenly killed in an accident. McGarvey called to express his sympathy. She met him and heartbroken with grief exclaimed, "Oh, Brother McGarvey, where was God when my son was killed?" The answer of McGarvey was immediate: "Sister Yancey, he was just where he was when His own Son was killed."[3]

McGarvey was always careful and exact in money matters. The records of the executive committee of the Col-

lege of the Bible contain a number of items dealing with the financial transactions of McGarvey. He often borrowed money and gave his note, but these notes were always paid punctually. Sometimes the College fell behind in his salary and gave him notes which were also paid, but not so promptly. Collis says that McGarvey would have been a successful business man if he had given his attention to business, but that he had no love for money. He successfully accumulated during the years, though he never became rich. He was the administrator of his stepfather's estate and received a small inheritance from this source which he invested in a home in Dover. When this was sold, he reinvested the sum he received in fourteen acres of land that was then on the outskirts of Lexington. In 1887 his home on this tract was destroyed by fire. The loss was complete and at first he felt that he could never own another home. A group of ten of his friends headed by Professor A. R. Milligan offered to give him $10,000 toward replacing the destroyed house. He thanked them for their thoughtfulness and kindness, but declined their offer on the grounds that he was still young and strong. He was then fifty-eight. Later he divided this tract of land into city lots and sold them to an advantage. With the proceeds he built a brick house which still stands. As years passed it began to be difficult for him to travel the mile and a half to and from the College and domestic arrangements became also difficult. One night at the supper table, Mrs. McGarvey proposed that they sell the house and move into the city, and he consented. A grandchild was present and carried the news to his parents. They at once proposed to purchase the house and it became the home of the Stuckey

family and McGarvey built in Fayette Park off North Broadway. This was the home of McGarvey for the rest of his life.

Mention has been made of the poise and self-control of McGarvey, of his freedom from irritation and fretfulness. This was not a natural endowment of his but acquired. One of his sons had a fiery temper and was quick to anger. The father urged him one day to attempt better self-control and told him something of his own experience. In his youth he too had a violent temper and had frequent fights with other boys. One day his mother expressed to him her fear that his temper would lead him into trouble and that in extreme anger he might some day kill a man. This aroused the young lad's attention and started him on a course of self-discipline that changed the turbulent, undisciplined youth into the calm, self-controlled man of saintly character.

This chapter has not discussed McGarvey the Bible teacher, the preacher, the defender of the faith, but McGarvey as a man. The effort has been to see him through many eyes. A number of his students and others were asked to give their impression of him. The statements of a few have been selected out of many because they are representative. W. N. Briney of Louisville writes, "McGarvey, as a man, made a strong appeal to me. Those unacquainted with his lovable personality, and judging the man by the severe and sometimes caustic criticism that characterized some of his writing, pictured him as a blunt and austere man. But this is far from the truth. I found him in his personal attitudes always quite kind, patient, gentle, and forbearing. His face was usually illuminated with a smile that disarmed personal

hostility. He combined firm and unshakable convictions with a generous and tolerant spirit. This is the picture that was impressed upon me as a student in his classes and that has remained unchanged through all the years."

Edgar DeWitt Jones of Detroit expresses his judgment in these words, "I was a student in President McGarvey's classes for two years, and was a guest in his home occasionally and once he honored me signally by having me supply his pulpit at old Bethlehem Church in Clark County, Kentucky. After I left Lexington and took the pastorate of a church, I met President McGarvey at our conventions and several times I exchanged letters with him.

"My impression of this distinguished servant of Christ and teacher of the Word is distinct and rewarding to this day. In the classroom he was direct, often laconic in speech; and even when he was severe, a lovely smile played over his countenance. Occasionally, his sense of humor bubbled forth; and when that happened, we laughed immoderately, he joining with us. In personal contact I never thought of this noble Christian as other than a kindly-dispositioned gentleman. But when I read some of his articles, involving controversial questions, I could scarcely believe it was the same man. I can readily understand that those who never had the privilege of knowing President McGarvey personally, but were acquainted with his writings of a polemical character, never quite appreciated the gentleness of the man and the sometime exquisite courtesy that was in evidence in his personal contacts."

President E. M. Waits of Texas Christian University grows eloquent in praise of McGarvey. It is a pity that

only a single paragraph can be selected from his paper. "In fulfilling the request that I write a few lines setting forth my impression of this distinguished leader and teacher, I find that my pen falters somewhat, not from a lack of willingness, but because of the many years that separate me from the scenes and character to whom I pay tribute. More than forty crowded years have elapsed, and in that time the mists have gathered and the visibility has become low . . . Yet Professor McGarvey with his quiet dignity and simplicity, his benign countenance, his indefatigable industry, was a memorable and unforgettable personality on the campus. . . . The members of Professor McGarvey's classes admired him, respected him, emulated him, but they did not fraternize overmuch with him. But what his teaching may have lacked in the warm-hearted personal touch was more than atoned for by its inspirational quality. For half a century, from the throne of the professorial chair he poured forth into the hearts and lives of thousands of young men a love of truth and a respect for learning, a desire to serve that sent them forth as burning evangels to the ends of the earth. By precept and example he taught not only the Bible but the supreme value of those homely virtues—honesty, industry, faith, courage and sincerity. Inflexibly and uncompromisingly he demanded the best that his students could give, and in return he gave unsparingly his best."

Professor W. C. Bower of the University of Chicago met McGarvey but once. He came to the faculty of The College of the Bible after the latter's death. He taught for thirteen years in that institution and for four years was its dean. Of the memory and the influence of McGarvey

that rested upon the College, he writes, "I wish to express my profound appreciation of the influence of President McGarvey, not only upon The College of the Bible but upon the thought and life of the Disciples of Christ. To any objective observer the figure of President McGarvey looms large in the development of Disciple education and Disciple thought . . . No one could come into the heritage which President McGarvey and his colleagues left at The College of the Bible and not be impressed with the importance of his contributions and with the geniality of his spirit, which has lived on in the institution as one of its permanent spiritual traditions. I count myself very fortunate to have been among those who have entered into the spiritual heritage which he bequeathed to his successors."

This sketch would not be complete without a word concerning the personal religious life of McGarvey. Much has been written concerning his doctrinal position and his loyalty to the Bible, but little has been said about his own inner religious life. Many, following the fashion of today, would be inclined to speak of him as having an other-worldly religion. This is a certainty: Heaven, the home of the redeemed, was very real to him. He had a living hope in the promise of deliverance from the sorrows and pains of earth. The hymns that voiced this hope were exceedingly precious to him. He loved the older hymns, not the newer ones of the Moody-Sankey type. The hymns and Psalms meant more to the religious people of McGarvey's age than to those of today. In 1809 when Jane Crawford in Danville, Kentucky, underwent the first successful abdominal operation in all history, her only anesthetic was the Psalms of David.[4]

McGarvey quoted the hymns frequently. The Psalms seem not to have been so important a factor in his religious life. A funeral service conducted by him in his old age would have many hymns quoted. In his centennial address at Pittsburgh in 1909 to the group of elderly people he quoted many hymns. They were often the substance of his meditations. Occasionally he would struggle to recall the words of an old hymn that was no longer in print. In 1909 he asked through his page in the *Christian Standard* that someone send him a copy of the hymn that began:

> "Oh, Thou in Whose presence my soul takes delight,
> On Whom in affliction I call"

Something more than 540 copies were mailed to him. At one delivery the postman groaned under a load of seventy answers of which a few were the entire hymn book. On his dying bed he sang softly a hymn unfamiliar to the family but which spoke of a land free from parting, tears, and sorrow.

Near the beginning of the present century a student, who prefers that his name be not mentioned, had the experience, by no means unprecedented, of exhausting his available money. He planned to leave the College and called to bid McGarvey farewell. They discussed the matter thoroughly. McGarvey was just then advertising his house for sale. If a purchaser was found he would supply the money to keep the student in college. He was urged not to leave at once. McGarvey counselled prayer. At a set hour that night they were both to pray for help and guidance. McGarvey advised that their prayers be definite. They calculated that sixty-five dollars would

be needed. Hence they were to pray for that amount. A few days later McGarvey received from J. F. Davis of Portsmouth, Ohio, a check for this amount which was used to keep the student in college. McGarvey did not believe that this could be explained away as a coincidence. He accepted it as an answer to prayer. Such was his faith and by it he daily lived in intimate communion with the God Whose he was and Whom also he served.

THE DAYS OF HIS YOUTH

John William McGarvey was born near Hopkinsville, Kentucky, March 1, 1829. Three streams of human life united in forming the family of which he was a member. The paternal line had its origin in northern Ireland. From Tawney, Donegal County, while they were still young, his father, John, and his uncle, Alexander, came to America, and, for reasons not known, settled in Hopkinsville, Kentucky. John early united with the Christian church.

The second stream was the maternal line. Its family name was Thomson and it originated in Scotland. It came first to Virginia and from that state six brothers and two sisters migrated to Kentucky. They settled near Georgetown and here Sarah Ann Thomson was born. Her father John Thomson also moved his family to Hopkinsville and this brought together John McGarvey and Sarah Ann Thomson and in time they were married. Six years later McGarvey died, leaving three daughters and one son, ranging in age from five years to twelve months, of whom the second was the son, John William, aged four years.

Some years before a lad of eighteen, Gurdon F. Saltonstall by name, prompted by the spirit of wanderlust, fled from the home of his uncle in Connecticut, his father having died, and made his way to Georgetown, Kentucky, where he arrived penniless. He secured work from John Thomson, and learned the manufacture of hemp into rope and twine. Later he studied medicine, and married Polly, the oldest daughter of his employer, and in time he too moved to Hopkinsville. His wife died, leaving him with a family of nine children. He and Sarah Ann Thomson

McGarvey were married and thus united their thirteen children into one family. Six children were born to them and so in this family of nineteen children John William McGarvey was reared. Of his stepfather, McGarvey wrote, "He was an eminently just man, making no distinction among the children, distributing his estate among them equally." In his will Bethany College was named his twentieth child and shared equally with them in the division of his estate.

In 1839, when John William was ten years old, Dr. Saltonstall, on account of the social conditions that were created by slavery, moved from Kentucky to Tremont, Tazewell County, Illinois. Here young McGarvey spent the next eight years of his life, working on the farm and learning in turn the manufacture of hemp. The settlers of this Illinois community were from New England and something of the thrift, industry and independence which characterized them was imparted to the Saltonstall-McGarvey family. The mother developed rare wisdom and skill in management and the large household became highly organized to carry on without friction the work of the home and the farm. Another benefit which came to young McGarvey in this new community was access to a superior school. It was conducted by James K. Kellogg who had received his A.B. degree in Connecticut and had developed skill in school management. McGarvey says that "his attainment and methods were far in advance of the average teacher in the new country." When he was eighteen, young McGarvey was well prepared to enter the freshman class in college. He himself named as the subjects in which he received training, spelling, reading, geography, arithmetic, English and Latin grammar.

Bethany was the college of his choice. This institution had been founded by Alexander Campbell seven years before in 1840. The stepfather, Dr. Saltonstall, was a trustee and had already given $2500 to Bethany with the sole stipulation that the income from it should be placed to the credit of any son or sons that he might send to college. An older son, James R. Saltonstall, had graduated with honors at the previous commencement and now the traditions of the family were to be carried on by young John.

Sufficient time had not yet passed for traditions and customs to become fixed. For example, McGarvey entered in April, 1847, and remained till he had completed his course and graduated on July 4, 1850. Evidently the college year had not yet been stabilized. The endowment of the College in cash and unpaid pledges did not quite equal $40,000. The student body numbered one hundred and twenty-eight, and there were twelve in McGarvey's graduating class.

Traveling in the central United States was not easy in 1847. There were no railroads west of the Allegheny Mountains so the traveler was dependent upon stage coaches and steamboats. McGarvey, accompanied by his stepfather, went first to St. Louis by steamer on the Illinois River. From here it was a seven days' journey by steamboat down the Mississippi and up the Ohio to Wellsburg, Virginia, which was but seven miles from Bethany. At Cincinnati his stepfather purchased for young McGarvey books and other supplies such as was anticipated he would need during his college years. Among these was a silk hat. He wore it seldom and finally gave it to his college friend, John H. Neville, for his graduation and this is the full history of McGarvey's first silk hat. There was no second.

The prominent personalities of Bethany when McGarvey was a student were Thomas and Alexander Campbell, W. K. Pendleton and Robert Richardson. Thomas Campbell was an old man practically blind and had no part in the life of the college. McGarvey had a number of stories to tell of him. He liked to be asked to preach on Sundays but his sermons were usually two hours in length and naturally the choice went usually to his son Alexander. He was accustomed to relieve the tedium of his old age and blindness by reciting to himself hymns and psalms that he had memorized in youth. To keep his recollection of them exact he made use of young people who happened to have a few minutes of idle time to follow his recitation in the hymn book or the Psalter and to correct any mistakes he might make. Young McGarvey served his turn in prompting the memory of the venerable saint. In the home and in the college he was known as Grandfather Campbell.

Alexander Campbell was the outstanding man of the college community. In the following words McGarvey tells of the impression which Campbell made upon him. "In face and form Mr. Campbell had a most impressive appearance, so much so that one instinctively thought him a taller and larger man than he was. He had a clear, sonorous voice, enriched by a decided Scotch brogue, and his hearers, whether in a large or small auditorium, never failed to catch every word that he uttered. He never moved about in the pulpit. His gestures were few, but every one had a meaning and added vividness to the remark which he emphasized, or the emotion by which it was prompted. His style was always elevated, never descending to the trivial or commonplace, and the hearer

felt constantly borne along as upon the wings of a great bird. He never descended below a lofty conversational tone of voice and never rose into a strain of his vocal organs. His gray eyes flashed out from beneath heavy eyebrows, and he always stood erect, except at the opening of his remarks, when he would sometimes lean for a few moments on his right arm resting on the desk. So concentrated was the attention which he elicited that no auditor grew weary, however long his discourse might be, and every one drew a long breath when he concluded. He seldom spoke less than an hour."

Dr. Robert Richardson is known as the biographer of Alexander Campbell. He was the teacher of natural sciences. Of him McGarvey writes, "Dr. Richardson was also a large man, a little taller than Mr. Campbell, but not so impressive in appearance and manner. In his demeanor he was a model of meekness, and his courtesy to all persons was marked and unfailing. As a speaker he always delighted his audience by his excellent taste in the choice of words and the delicate beauty of the illustrations with which his discourses abounded. His voice was thin and naturally pitched on a high key, but he maintained a conversational tone, though it often deepened into intense emotion. He was always brief and never wearisome. As a teacher he was as clear as the ringing of a silver bell, and he often indulged in exquisite flashes of humor. If the students were impressed by Mr. Campbell they were charmed by Dr. Richardson. The doctor owned a little farm about two miles from the college, and he cultivated it so successfully that it was regarded as a model farm, and in the agricultural shows of Brooke County he took many premiums."

The third man of prominence in Bethany was W. K. Pendleton. He was the son-in-law of Mr. Campbell, and was the bursar and vice-president of the college. Of him McGarvey wrote, "Professor Pendleton was the old Virginia gentleman of the faculty. Always neatly and tastefully dressed, and never in a hurry, he maintained constantly a dignified demeanor. His manner as a speaker was always calmer and less impassioned than that of either of his colleagues, but he was always instructive. He was more argumentative than the others, and was always convincing. He was so thoroughly versed in logic that no one ever suspected him of a fallacious argument, and in the exegesis of obscure passages of scripture he was pre-eminent. Any thoughtful student would go to him rather than to any other professor for help in untangling a knotty question, and his kindly manner in dealing with all persons made every one free to approach him, while his unaffected dignity was a bar to undue familiarity. He built and occupied an elegant home on the slope of the mountain a few rods above the college. It afterwards became the property of the college, and is known as 'Pendleton Heights.' "

These three men were the permanent teaching staff of Bethany College and McGarvey says that they "constituted the power of the college at this time. Their personal influence contributed a very large part of the superior training for which the institution was noted." There were others, younger men, who were instructors in the college that had a profound influence upon McGarvey's later life. His instructor in Latin was A. R. Benton, who was later the head of the Biblical Department of Butler College, Indianapolis. McGarvey evidently had profound respect for

him. His instructor in Greek was Robert Graham, with whom he was later associated in the faculty of The College of the Bible.

Among the friends of his college days were a number that were the friends of his old age. Mention has already been made of John H. Neville. A striking parallel unites their lives. Both were born in Hopkinsville, Kentucky. Both were boys together in Tremont, Illinois. Both attended Bethany College. Both made the confession at the same meeting and were baptized together. After a period of sixteen years both became members of the faculty of Kentucky University and both taught in Lexington till the end of their lives. Neville died at the age of 81 years and ten months and McGarvey at the age of 82 years and seven months. Once in a public meeting Neville said that wherever he went McGarvey followed him. McGarvey's rejoinder was, "John, the next move you make will last a long time. Be sure you go to the right place, if you expect me to follow you."

Another friendship of those college days that continued throughout life was between McGarvey and Charles Louis Loos. He was older than McGarvey, graduating from Bethany in 1848, but he continued there for a number of years as tutor. In this way there was an opportunity for this early friendship. After the death of McGarvey, Loos said that he had met no one who was a higher embodiment of the religious life than McGarvey.

Other names that occur among the students with whom McGarvey was associated were Jesse W. Carter, Thomas Munnell, and Alexander Procter. Both McGarvey and Carter became flutists and this common interest brought them together. Munnell and McGarvey divided the first

honors of their graduating class, McGarvey delivering the Greek address and Munnell the valedictory. They were later brought into close touch with each other in the work of Kentucky, Munnell serving as State Secretary. Procter and McGarvey, in early life at least, were devoted friends. The former aided in McGarvey's ordination, performed the marriage service at his wedding, and the two evangelized together. In later life they seem to have drifted apart, Procter becoming liberal in his thinking and McGarvey conservative. Sometime during the eighties, at the Missouri Lectureship held at Paris, Missouri, they debated the historical accuracy of the Old Testament. In a subject of this sort McGarvey was in his native element and Procter was out of his. The latter attempted to show that there was a disagreement between the chronology of the historical books of the Old Testament and the Book of Daniel. McGarvey quickly exposed his error by pointing out that he had confused Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin.

When McGarvey came to Bethany he was not a Christian, but in 1848 in his twentieth year he made the confession and was baptized. He had deliberately made the decision that at the first opportunity that presented itself he would make the confession. It was not Mr. Campbell's custom to extend the invitation at every service and so McGarvey had to wait two weeks before an opportunity came. At a regular Sunday morning service, at the close of a discourse which he himself says was of "no unusual character" he made the confession and the same day was baptized by Professor Pendleton in Buffalo Creek near the church. Two other students, one of whom was John H. Neville, made the confession and were baptized on the same day.

He made steady progress in his religious development. The biblical instruction of the college consisted of morning lectures by Alexander Campbell. Some of these have been preserved in the volume of Campbell's, entitled *Popular Addresses.* They imposed no very exacting demands upon the students. No examinations were required but once a week an oral quiz was conducted reviewing the lectures of the past week. Poor students displayed little knowledge, but good ones were able to respond intelligently. McGarvey frequently told the story of a student who was asked to name some of the remarkable events that occurred in the land of Mesopotamia. His reply was, "I believe that is the place where God made the world."

McGarvey evidently profited by these lectures, for Mrs. Campbell presented him with a New Testament bearing an inscription certifying that it was presented to him for proficiency in knowledge of the Scriptures. It was one of his treasured books till it was destroyed in 1887 in a fire that consumed his home.

The services of the college church were stimulating and educational. McGarvey had not been accustomed to preaching of a high order. The college church at this time was small, built of undressed stone and simply furnished. The audiences were small but Alexander Campbell was the preacher and some of his greatest preaching was done to this audience consisting mainly of students, the faculty and a few from the village and its vicinity. Dr. Richardson and Professor Pendleton also at times took part in the service. McGarvey wrote, "The richest service of all was when they had a sermon by Mr. Campbell followed by Dr. Richardson in a five- or ten-minute talk at the Lord's Table." These talks, said he, were gems of beauty, and

they were afterwards published in the *Millennial Harbinger* and at McGarvey's own request were later issued in book form under the title, *Communings in the Sanctuary*. Not only was McGarvey's devotional life thus enriched but his understanding was also clarified. The preaching of Alexander Campbell and others in the college church removed from his mind anything which tended towards confusion.

He felt an impulse to preach but was in doubt whether he could develop the ability to become a successful public speaker. In manner he was diffident and his vocal powers were undeveloped. He formed the resolution to preach in case he had, by the time of his graduation, developed some skill in public speaking. It was characteristic of his practical nature not to leave the outcome to chance or even to divine action alone. He began to make diligent use of the Neotropian literary society as a means of developing skill in speaking. Every assignment that was made to him was carefully prepared and as carefully executed. The college in its instruction gave the student little exercise in the arts of composition and public speaking. The literary society supplied this need to McGarvey and at a later stage of life his skill and exactness in both were in a large measure due to the influence of the literary society. To the end of his life he was a diligent champion of the literary society and as president of The College of the Bible he constantly urged attendance and participation in their programs. They were maintained throughout his lifetime but disappeared soon after his death, as they did about this time in other colleges.

Not many incidents of his college days have been remembered. The social life of the community was neces-

sarily quite limited. There were few young ladies and most of these had some connection with the Campbell household. Young McGarvey spoke of frequent calls made during his leisure hours. He wrote, "Twilight and moonlight walks along the romantic banks of the Buffalo, with the singing of songs remembered in old age relieved the tedium of study and gave freshness to life." He sang well and was expert upon the flute. He and his roommate used their flutes to give occasional serenades.

A family named Murphy had moved from Illinois to Bethany to obtain an education for the youths of the household. A daughter contracted tuberculosis and died. By her request she was buried on top of a high hill back of her home. Her grave was unmarked and in time her name and the reason for her grave being located in this spot were forgotten. Fancy and legend wove stories of disappointment and frustrated love and gave poetic explanations of this lonely grave. In 1903 when McGarvey visited Bethany he was asked whether he could give any account of the grave and did so with many details. He was one who aided in the burial; he could recall the girl's name; he could remember January, 1850, as the date of her death, and many circumstances of the funeral. McGarvey was never sympathetic towards efforts to turn history into myth and legend.

During McGarvey's first year in college Alexander Campbell visited Scotland. Here he was arrested and imprisoned for some trivial reason because he was believed to be sympathetic towards American slavery. When news of his imprisonment reached Bethany the student body adopted resolutions in an effort to stir the entire nation with a sense of indignation at the act of injustice. Mc-

Garvey was sent to Wheeling to have the resolutions printed and every student was to mail them to family and friends. There is in existence a letter which McGarvey on this occasion wrote to his aunt in Hopkinsville. It is a singular letter. It champions the cause of Mr. Campbell and gives a circumstantially detailed account of the events which led to his imprisonment but it lacks the art of the special pleader. As always McGarvey sought to win his cause by a statement of facts. If the letters of the other students were similar to McGarvey's, their families and their communities were well informed concerning Mr. Campbell's arrest but it is doubtful whether they were as stirred and as indignant as the students desired them to be.

On July 4, 1850, McGarvey completed his college course. He was chosen to deliver the Greek address. Much was made of this feature of the commencement. Mr. Campbell complimented McGarvey by saying that one could almost follow his thought by observing his action and his accent. After the commencement were the leave-takings. McGarvey himself says, "At no college known to me has it been usual for students to become so fondly attached to one another and to their professors as at Bethany."

His journey home was a memorable one. His family had removed from Illinois to Fayette, Missouri. The scourge of cholera threatened travelers along the Ohio and young McGarvey was advised by his family to come home by way of the Great Lakes. That their fear was not without reason is proven by the fact that two years later his stepfather and mother started out to visit Bethany and made the trip this time by way of the Ohio. At Maysville, Kentucky, Dr. Saltonstall contracted cholera and at Marietta,

Ohio, was put ashore to die. McGarvey's journey to Fayette, Missouri, is described by his son as follows: "The homeward journey was made by steamboat from Wellsburg, Virginia, to Beaver, Pennsylvania; thence by canal boat to Erie; thence by one of the lake steamers to Chicago; thence by canal boat to La Salle; thence by steamboat down the Illinois river to Peoria; thence by stagecoach to Springfield; thence by railway, the only one in the state and the first he had ever seen, to Naples; thence by stagecoach to Quincy; thence by row boat down the Mississippi ten miles to Hannibal, Missouri, and thence by stage-coach to Fayette. The most delightful part of his journey was the long boat ride from Erie around to Chicago, and he often spoke of it to his latest days as one of the most enjoyable trips of his life." Most of the way he was accompanied by four fellow-graduates from Bethany and their friendship, zest and buoyant spirits, no doubt, added to the pleasure of the journey.

College days were over and he now entered upon the practical preparation of himself for his life vocation.

Following his graduation from Bethany College the next twelve years of McGarvey's life were spent in Missouri. He graduated July 4, 1850, and removed to Kentucky in 1862.[5] These Missouri years were not productive in the sense that he wrote books or engaged in great public enterprises, but they were very important years for him in that during this period he made the plans for his life, and prepared himself to carry out these plans. During them his ideals took shape and his character developed.

Let us realize clearly his situation. His college course had lasted a little more than three years. No ministerial training had been included. The influence of Bethany College had awakened in his mind the impulse to preach but it had given him no special equipment for the task. His special training had to be acquired in some other way. His situation was not unique. Not only was this usual with young men who planned to preach but similar conditions faced young lawyers and doctors. How did McGarvey solve his problem?

The answer is found in a manuscript[6] left by his sons, one paragraph of which describes his situation in the following language:

"John McGarvey had now fully determined to be a preacher, but he felt unprepared for the work, for he realized that his knowledge of the Scripture was insufficient; that he was deficient in general knowledge; and that he lacked experience in public speaking. He was solicited by a popular and successful evangelist to travel with him and to learn to preach by hearing and observing

him. Many had learned to preach in this way, but McGarvey believed that this would make him a mere imitator, and would afford him no opportunity for real study. Many years afterwards he was accustomed to remark that if he had received at Bethany the courses of instruction given by him and others in The College of the Bible he would have been prepared to take the field at once. Instead of going with the evangelist, therefore, he reached a decision to teach a private school and to spend the hours that he could spare from it for private study. Accordingly he opened a school for boys in Fayette, Missouri, and during his leisure hours reviewed much of his Latin courses, carefully studied the Greek New Testament, the entire Bible with the aid of commentaries, and in addition did some general reading. Whenever the opportunity came to him he took part in the meetings of the church and thus gradually acquired experience as a public speaker. This continued for two years, from the autumn of 1850 to September, 1852, at which time he was formally called by the church to become its minister and hands were laid upon him in ordination by Alexander Procter and Thomas M. Allen."

These two were McGarvey's close friends and they gave him such aid as friends can give in shaping ideals and in solving his life problem.

McGarvey held Allen in the highest esteem and has left a glowing account of his personality and his preaching. "His sermons always closed with a thrilling exhortation to sinners, and in this kind of oratory he had no peer within my acquaintance, unless it was John Allen Gano, a boon companion and fellow-laborer with him when they were both young men in Kentucky. Brother Allen knew

me to be deficient in this power, and his anxiety for me to cultivate it was expressed one day in terms which he had caught from turfmen in his early life. He had preached in the forenoon at a protracted meeting and I was to speak in the afternoon. Just before I arose to begin he nudged me and said, 'Now John, come out under whip and spur, head and tail up.' I did my best."

McGarvey devoted two Sundays each month to the church at Fayette and the other Sundays were spent at Ashland and Mount Pleasant, country churches of the same county. His first sermon following his ordination was given at Mount Pleasant. It was on the "Temptation of Jesus" and he stated towards the close of his life that it was the one sermon that he was never able to improve.

During these Missouri days McGarvey, as related above, divided his time among different churches and spent part of it either in teaching or in evangelistic work. In part this was probably due to the meager salary paid, but in part it was because of the conception of the minister's function held by both preacher and churches. He was not primarily a pastor but an evangelist. This division of time offered him some distinct advantages in the experience acquired. It widened his field of activity and offered him a greater opportunity for development. He became acquainted with a variety of church problems and extended his acquaintance throughout the churches of west central Missouri. His career as an evangelist was therefore an unplanned preparation for his work in later days in The College of the Bible.

McGarvey has left an account of the way in which he prepared his sermons and selected his themes. "I adopted at the beginning of my ministry," he says, "a systematic

preparation of sermons, by studying the subject carefully till it took shape in my mind, and then by making brief notes of its divisions and subdivisions which I committed to memory. But I left these written notes at home when I started to church to preach the sermon. These skeletons, each of which filled a single page of note paper, I preserved till they were burned in the fire that destroyed my home in 1887. I made it a rule to repeat several times, as opportunity offered, every sermon that I considered good, but restudying and often reconstructing it before repeating it. I seldom repeated one before the same audience, and never till after a considerable length of time, and usually when I did so it was recognized by some of my hearers who often complimented it on the improvement made. It is a fact that people like to hear a sermon repeated when they can see marked improvement in it, and they delight in hearing several times a really good one.

"I once heard Moses E. Lard announce before a Lexington audience a sermon which he had delivered in the same house four times within about two years. . . . I watched that audience, and they listened with a profound attention and as much delight as if they were hearing it for the first time. I never had confidence enough in one of my own to venture that far; but once, after preaching at a place which I visited only occasionally, a sister said to me, 'Brother McGarvey, that's the third time you have given us that sermon, and I think we could enjoy hearing it again.' Of course, I was somewhat confused, for I was not aware of repeating it there even once. For many years my preaching fell so far below my ideal that many times, after what I considered a failure, I felt that I had missed my calling. But sometimes, after such a

failure, some brother would, to my surprise, compliment the sermon and put me in a better humor with myself. My sermons were always made of scriptural material, and the most effective of them were either historical or biographical, though I was personally inclined strongly to the argumentative.''

In the autumn of 1852 McGarvey in company with Alexander Procter held a meeting at Dover, La Fayette County, the two speaking alternately. Sometime later McGarvey was invited to become the minister of the Dover church. He accepted and in January, 1853, he gave up his school at Fayette and for the remainder of his Missouri days, Dover was his home. It is a short distance south of the Missouri River almost exactly fifty miles due east from Kansas City. It was in one of the richest agricultural sections of the state and the citizens were mainly from Virginia and Kentucky. They were possessed of unusual culture and intelligence. The church at Dover was one of the oldest of the state and from first to last, McGarvey's relation with the church was most delightful. During his ministry there it grew in numbers and in spiritual power and the minister in both efficiency and in reputation. Again he divided his time among other churches and in evangelistic activity.

Shortly after moving to Dover, McGarvey was married. The bride was Miss Otwayana Frances Hix, the daughter of Mr. Otway Bird Hix, a prominent citizen of Fayette. Of her the son writes, ''Miss Hix was a girl of eighteen, with a bright face, a perfect form, a high school education and was also a sweet singer.'' Mrs. McGarvey's appearance when she was well past sixty suggests that the son had not overdone the praise of his mother. The date of

the wedding, March 23, 1853, was selected because towards the end of March a convention was to be held in Louisville, Kentucky, and the newly-wedded couple, accompanied by their friend Alexander Procter, who had officiated at the wedding, made the trip by steamboat, first to St. Louis and thence to Louisville.

This gathering was a convention of the American Bible Union and was held to promote popular interest in a new translation of the Bible. The new translation became an accomplished fact in the Revised Version of 1881 and there is no longer any deep concern about the subject. It seems to us remarkable that it should attract such attention that men from all over the nation should attend a convention held to promote it. McGarvey's interest in the subject is expressed in his introduction to his *Commentary on Acts* and is a forerunner of his later studies on the text, credibility and inspiration of the Scriptures. It shows him to be a young man alert and open minded to all of the important questions of his day. The convention was held in the Christian Church which was then located at the corner of Fourth and Walnut Streets, and many preachers attended it, especially from the Baptists and Disciples.

This fact made the convention significant in the life of McGarvey. Now for the first time he met many of the preachers of Kentucky with whom he was later to be closely associated. Among these may be mentioned particularly John T. Johnson, Tolbert Fanning and Henry T. Anderson. The last named was the minister of the Louisville church where the convention was held and was himself a translator of the New Testament. McGarvey used this translation in his pulpit and private work till the Revised Version was issued in 1881. McGarvey paid

a glowing tribute to John T. Johnson and he held Tolbert Fanning in scarcely less esteem.

During this trip McGarvey purchased many books and a buggy. His previous travel had been by horseback but now he must have a conveyance built for two. On his return he took up his life with the Dover church but did not at once begin housekeeping. For three years he and his wife boarded in the family of one of the elders of the church whose farm was three miles from the village. A strong attachment developed between the two families. McGarvey says, "I never had a warmer friend than Robert Campbell." During their stay in the Campbell household their first child was born in April, 1854. It was named Loulie. After the coming of this child they rented a house and began housekeeping. The Hix family presented them with two slaves, a boy and a girl. Dr. Saltonstall's attitude toward slavery had evidently not permanently impressed his stepson.

There was need of a school in the Dover community and McGarvey in cooperation with E. C. White formed a stock company and erected a building to serve as a boarding school for young ladies. It seems that Mr. White furnished the money but since he was unmarried, McGarvey was essential to the management of the boarding department. After two years White married and assumed full control of the school. This left McGarvey free to devote all of his energies to his preaching.

His evangelistic work and his preaching for other churches required him to make long and often difficult journeys. This was especially true when the weather became severe in winter. He has left an account of one journey of twenty miles which he took on a Saturday

with the thermometer registering twenty below zero. He tells us how thoroughly he was wrapped and that he did not at the time suffer from the cold but for several days he felt a sensation of chill and with that common sense which characterized all of his actions he decided that in the future he would not risk such exposure. Apparently this did not cause him to hesitate at baptisms. He tells of baptizing in the Missouri river when the ice was a foot thick. He mentions baptizing delicate ladies in wintry streams but never heard of one suffering injury from it. He describes the glow of warmth and of renewed energy which followed and compensated for the momentary chill. He ends his narrative by adding: "Our Lord knew what he was doing when he appointed this ordinance to be observed in every clime and country where sinful men reside."

In addition to acquiring for himself a reputation of being an able, conscientious and worthy preacher, he took considerable interest in debating. We have outlived the age of religious debates but at that time they were not infrequent and were often attended by enormous crowds. It was a much discussed question then as to the nature of the influence which they exerted. Probably their influence was deeper and more wholesome than the present age is disposed to admit and their power for good would have been even greater had it not been the tendency for some debaters to become rough, coarse, and determined on gaining victory at any price. They constantly belittled their opponents and heaped ridicule upon them and the doctrines they espoused. This was not true of McGarvey. By nature he was an educator and his method of conducting a debate would impart insight and information to any man that gave heed to it.

He possessed a number of native talents that admirably fitted him to be a skillful debater. In the first place, his Irish inheritance gave him a love for argument and controversy, and in his preaching his preference, he tells us, was always for the argumentative. At this stage of his life there were probably few things in which McGarvey would have taken more delight than a good stiff debate with a well-informed opponent.

Another natural equipment for debating which he possessed was a sense of humor. This would never on his part become loud and boistrous. It would be spontaneous and natural, flowing easily out of the circumstances of the moment. McGarvey would always be courteous and gentlemanly but this does not mean that his replies would lack point. Often they probably would fairly blister and his opponent would be disposed to feel that he had departed from the standard of kindliness.

A third endowment as a debater was that he never lost control of himself. He was always calm, in perfect mastery of his feelings, never excited, always well-balanced. He would never, like some debaters, shout and cover his confusion by mere noise. It was characteristic of him whatever he was doing, to be quiet, reserved, and yet wonderfully direct and pointed. He usually created the impression that he could far surpass what he was doing if he cared to make the effort.

During these Dover years McGarvey attended at least two debates carried on by others. He and T. P. Haley rode seventy-five miles to Trenton, Missouri, to hear a debate between Benjamin Franklin and a Methodist preacher. It was his first meeting with Franklin and McGarvey was greatly impressed with him. McGarvey also attended a

debate held at Brunswick, Missouri, between another Methodist preacher named Caples and Moses E. Lard.

McGarvey himself during these Dover years conducted three debates, one with a Methodist, one with a Presbyterian, and one with a Universalist. His most impressive appearance in this line of activity, however, was at Paducah, Kentucky. Briefly the circumstances were these: In 1859 Dr. J. F. Hendrick, a Presbyterian preacher of great ability and of considerable reputation, accepted the pastorate of the church in Paducah and early in his ministry gave a series of discourses on baptism in which he took issue with both the Baptists and the Disciples and publicly arraigned both of them. The two churches united in a plan to have someone reply to these addresses and the Disciples were to select the man to make the reply. Dr. Hendrick had published a book on the subject and a young preacher living in Paducah had taken careful notes of his addresses. These were to be supplied to the invited speaker and were to be the material upon which he was to base his replies.

This young preacher was I. B. Grubbs and he has left a detailed account[7] of the impression created by Dr. Hendrick's addresses and of McGarvey's reply. The preacher for the Paducah Christian Church was John C. Walden. The Baptists had made a very liberal offer to provide the building for the meeting and to bear the major part of the expenses. Mr. Walden was to find the speaker. The General Missionary Convention of the Disciples was to be held in St. Louis and there he went in search of the man. Grubbs told him to secure, if possible, either Moses E. Lard or John W. McGarvey. They were rising men who had made considerable reputations for themselves. On

arriving in St. Louis, Walden met Dr. W. H. Hopson, a man of known ability, and invited him to attempt the task. Hopson declined but urged Walden to secure McGarvey. Walden accordingly sought out McGarvey and had a conversation with him but was so little impressed by his appearance that he did not offer the invitation, in fact never mentioned the subject to him. He returned to Hopson and told him of his failure to act, giving as his reason that there must be no mistake in selecting the man for Paducah. Hopson again urged him to secure McGarvey and gave his personal assurance that there would be no failure. Walden acted on this advice and arranged a date when McGarvey was to deliver some three or four addresses in reply to Dr. Hendrick. On McGarvey's arrival by steamboat a number of interested people met him at the wharf but they too were so unimpressed by this man of unimposing stature and round head that some of them did not even greet him and one Baptist offered to pay his return expenses to Missouri if it could be arranged. But that night the large Baptist Church was packed to the doors. The opening prayer impressed the audience with its simplicity and its humility. Dr. Hendrick's points were presented one by one and answered with such ease and clearness that soon the audience was won to McGarvey's side. At the close of the meeting one man exclaimed, "Stock has advanced one hundred per cent." The sentiment of the entire community was revolutionized. The Christian church before had been small and its building unpretentious. It began to grow. Successful meetings were held and in an incredibly short time it became one of the strong churches of the city. The McGarvey addresses had no inconsiderable part in producing this result.

During these Dover days McGarvey also began to write for the papers, and his articles were received with favor. He wrote occasionally for the *Millennial Harbinger* and contributed more frequently for the *American Christian Review* which was the most widely read paper of the Christian church at this time.

As the political strife that culminated in the Civil War became intense McGarvey took a stand against secession and held that it was against the teaching of Christ and his apostles for Christians to take up arms. This he preached and advocated in his articles published in the papers. He and thirteen other preachers of Missouri appealed to Christians not to participate in the war.[8] They made five points against such a course. (1) Christians could not participate in a fraternal strife; (2) The unity of the church must be maintained; (3) War destroys the Christian characters of those who participate in it; (4) A united course of action would give the brotherhood great power when the war closed; (5) Non-participation would harmonize with the policy of early Christianity. Hence Christians were urged to promote peace. The fact that he was secretary of the association of ministers and the style and manner of treatment suggest that McGarvey was the author of the appeal.

At first they were encouraged to believe that a majority of the church accepted their sentiments, but as the conflict began such views were regarded as treason in the North and as disloyalty to the cause of the South. Few papers would any longer publish articles advocating such a policy. McGarvey continued to preach it to the end but he exerted little influence except over the select few. Even his own church in Dover was divided and some hot-heads began

to find fault with certain actions of his. He had been accustomed to hold meetings once a month for negroes only. Objections were urged against negroes meeting in large numbers. The war brought many other annoyances and after about a year his work began to be hampered. Attendance fell off; people were little interested in preaching; support of the preacher began to be neglected. In this situation he was seeking some secular occupation that would provide support for his family, which now consisted of the parents and three children, when his perplexity was dissolved by an invitation to become the minister of the church in Lexington, Kentucky.

The circumstances which brought about the invitation for McGarvey to come to Lexington were as follows: The preacher for the Main Street Christian Church of that city had been Dr. Winthrop H. Hopson. He was a man of strong southern inclination and in his preaching had alienated the northern sympathizers who constituted a considerable section of the church. This brought about his resignation and he recommended McGarvey as his successor. He had a profound respect for McGarvey's ability, and the latter's attitude toward the war fitted him admirably for a church that was endeavoring to maintain unity in spite of two divergent and irreconcilable political factions within its membership. Hopson was wise in recognizing the needs of the church and generous in recommending a man who would follow a different policy from his own.

The elders of the church gave McGarvey assurance that his position with reference to the war would be acceptable to both factions. Further, the legislature of the state of Kentucky was then attempting to do in a political way exactly what McGarvey was advising the churches to do. It was endeavoring to enforce a policy of strict neutrality. It was attempting to enact legislation—though the measures never became laws—forbidding the armies of both the North and the South to make use of Kentucky territory. All of these factors combined to induce McGarvey to accept the call and so he and his family prepared for the journey to their new home.

The family has retained memories of that journey. It was not undertaken without grief. It meant the abandon-

ment of their home, separation from friends, and leaving a church to which for nine years McGarvey had given the best of mind and heart. Reasons for going, however, were stronger than those for staying, and so they prepared for the separation.

At Fayette, Missouri, Mrs. McGarvey bade farewell to her family and he, to his aging mother. The second stage of their journey was by steamboat to St. Louis, but from that point the trip was by train over the Ohio and Mississippi Railway which is now the Baltimore and Ohio. Great alarm was felt by Charity, the cook, and Cynthia, the nurse, lest the Abolitionists should get them as they crossed the states of Illinois and Indiana.

They were warmly welcomed in Lexington by all of the church but two men showed them especial favors. One was James K. Thomson, a wealthy farmer and cousin of McGarvey's mother. He took them to his home till a house could be selected and furnished. Dr. J. G. Chinn, one of the elders of the church, aided them in securing and equipping the new house and introduced them to the membership of the congregation.

The church of which McGarvey became the minister was originally organized in 1831 with but nine members. Later there was a union with the followers of Stone and in 1840 a very successful meeting was held that led to the erection of a new building. It was completed in 1843 and was located on Main Street and was the home of the congregation to which McGarvey became minister in 1862. Something more than a dozen ministers had served the church before his coming but few for any extended period.

Before going into the history of this ministry it is desirable to pause and consider the significance of McGarvey's coming to Kentucky both for himself and for the brotherhood. It aided in making Lexington for a full half century the center of the brotherhood life. While Alexander Campbell lived and was active Bethany held this distinction. It was too remote, however, to maintain this position after his death. No city was in so favorable a position to succeed it as Lexington. The Disciples then, and for a considerable period after, were essentially a rural people. No metropolis could be the center of their life. That center must be in some place that had an active connection with an aggressive rural society. Lexington met this condition. It was the capital of the Blue Grass region of Kentucky, a section of the state that was beautiful, fertile, wealthy and progressive. Its citizens were of a high order of intelligence, were politically and socially aggressive and from the economic point of view were lifted above a complete absorption in the struggle for existence by the favored environment in which they lived.

Until a half century before, the type of religion that flourished in this neighborhood was prevailingly Calvinistic. There had been a popular revolt from the rigors of this system and the Disciples had profited by the reaction. Their churches throughout the Blue Grass had become numerous and strong. Within the region adjacent to Lexington were a number of cities, including Cincinnati, Louisville, and Indianapolis, in no one of which was the church strong enough to be the center and yet each could supplement Lexington. Finally, this city was not far removed from the geographical center of the

Disciple brotherhood. It was sufficiently southern to be acceptable to the South and yet it was not antagonistic to the North.

The removal of Kentucky University from Harrodsburg was a decided factor in giving Lexington the supremacy in the life of the Disciples. The colleges of the brotherhood at this time were Bethany, Hiram, Eureka, and Kentucky University. Alexander Campbell was in his senility and the supremacy of Bethany in the intellectual and spiritual life of the brotherhood was waning. The college no longer drew students from every quarter. Some of its most active faculty members, including Charles Louis Loos, Robert Richardson and Robert Milligan, were induced to come to Kentucky University. The *Millennial Harbinger* ceased to appear in 1870. Unquestionably Bethany was offering its scepter to another. With all of their merits neither Hiram nor Eureka made a strong bid to become the center of the brotherhood. The road to this attainment lay open to Kentucky University and Lexington.

There had been many strong men among the preachers of Kentucky but at no time had any one held a commanding position among them. Barton W. Stone for a time approximated such a distinction but he departed for the West and his day had passed a generation before. In the seventh decade of the nineteenth century there were such men as W. H. Hopson, Moses E. Lard, Robert Graham, I. B. Grubbs, L. B. Wilkes, great preachers all of them, but no one had shown or did show the ability to assume a commanding leadership.

The call to McGarvey offered him the opportunity. Did he avail himself of it? Professor B. C. Deweese in

his Memorial Address delivered in the college chapel on McGarvey's birthday following his death, March 1, 1912, says he came to Lexington well fitted for his career by natural gifts, good college training and years of special study. Then he adds, "Here he met his opportunity. He found his orbit." This means that a rare opportunity was presented to McGarvey and that he fully met its requirements. He supplanted no one else. In his ministry of the church and in his teaching in The College of the Bible he did a type of work and showed a consecration of spirit that elevated the work of the ministry throughout all the adjacent region. His church grew in numbers and influence. When he came to Lexington it ranked fourth among the churches of the city; soon it was first. After a few years a daughter church, the Broadway congregation, ranked with the mother church in membership, strength and efficiency. In his teaching he planned a type of instruction that had not been attempted in other colleges. The College of the Bible sent out preachers equipped with a knowledge of the Bible and inspired them and others with confidence that they could correctly interpret the Scriptures. In his dealing with men and public affairs McGarvey showed tact and wisdom. His integrity was beyond question. His sincerity was manifest to all. The purity of his motives and his thorough consecration stood in no need of proof. He was democratic in his dealings with all men and never displayed a sense of superiority over other preachers or aroused their jealousy. He began to write for the papers and his articles commended themselves to the common man and so in all of these ways he added to the prestige of Lexington.

There are two ways of explaining any event, the divine and the human. The Bible and the ancients generally explained every happening from the divine point of view. It was wrought of God. God did it. He established nations. He sent armies across the face of the earth. He anointed and called men to achieve. Without necessarily rejecting the truth of the ancient point of view the modern method is to put the emphasis upon the human part in any transaction. God has given man power to achieve and so God works through man. Hence the human part is brought to the front. Paul says, "The powers that be are ordained of God." The Preamble of the Constitution of the United States says, "We the people of the United States . . . do ordain and establish." When James and John asked for the first and the second places in the Kingdom, Jesus told them that these places were for those for whom they were prepared. William Newton Clarke says this is equivalent to saying they are for those who are prepared for them. In these two statements we have the ancient and the modern points of view in explaining human achievement. The ancients would have said concerning McGarvey, He was called of God. The situation demanded certain talents and powers, which he possessed and supplied. The modern says, He fitted himself for his task. Of this fact there can be no doubt. Had he not consecrated himself fully to the work of the ministry, and had he not put himself through rigid discipline and training through the Missouri years, he could never have met so fully and adequately the opportunity which Lexington offered him. His talents, natural and acquired, he brought to a high point of efficiency and thus he was enabled to assume

the leadership in Kentucky and, to the extent that Lexington became a center of the brotherhood life, to assume a leadership that was intrastate and intranational. The material point just now is that McGarvey became, and, for at least four decades, held the place of leader of the life and thought of the brotherhood. Of course there was no coronation. No blast of trumpet proclaimed him king. Like the leadership of Samuel it was natural, spontaneous and accepted by the consent of those who followed. No one was demoted to create a place for the new leader. The liberty of no man to do the work for which he was fitted, or which he desired to do, was restricted. Probably the man who thought least of the fact of his leadership was McGarvey himself. He was conscious that he possessed the ability to do certain things and he proceeded to do them. He presumed to do the work of the leader, but he never laid claim to the title.

As in every movement that is endowed with life there were among the Disciples differences in attitude and differing schools of thought. Some differed radically from McGarvey, and as time passed the number of these increased and dissent became more outspoken. All of this must be dealt with later. Our present task is to study the ways in which McGarvey acquired this leadership and the extent to which it became his.

McGarvey came to Kentucky in 1862 and died in 1911. All of these years, just short of a half century, were spent in Lexington. This was the period when he did his life work. All before was the period of preparation. His activity continued till the end. He came first as the minister of the Main Street Christian Church and for approximately three years this was his one and only task.

As might be expected he was greeted by large audiences though the task that confronted him was not an easy one.

It must be kept in mind that this was in the midst of the War Between the States, and the sentiment of the membership was divided between North and South. Members and sons of members were enlisted in the armies on both sides. Every other Protestant church of Lexington had already divided, and there was a natural tendency for this one too to break apart. The minister and the officers held the opinion that their supreme task was to hold it together and all their energies were directed to this end. Fortunately they succeeded. The credit for this must go largely to the preacher who labored tirelessly to achieve it. His son well says, "Never was the New Testament teaching against divisions more earnestly preached, and perhaps its principles were never so strained without breaking. Their reward came when the war was ended, by such a rapid increase in membership that an overflow meeting place had to be provided."

The years of the war were not a favorable time for the growth of the church. It was a sufficient achievement to hold it together and to prevent disintegration. The autumn and winter of 1862 were particularly trying. A battle was fought near Richmond, twenty-six miles from Lexington. The church building on Main Street was used for a military hospital. The congregation met for three months in the Odd Fellows' Hall at the southeast corner of Main and Broadway, but the audiences were diminished in number. The Confederates were successful at Richmond, but were defeated at Perryville in October and as a result withdrew from this section of the state. The

conflicts and the strife, brought so near their doors, were ruinous of all spiritual life.

Little more is known of the fortunes of the church during the years of the war. It naturally could make no remarkable advance but at least it held its own. As soon as the war was over it entered upon a period of rapid advance. It quickly became the strongest church of the city.

In the second year of his residence in Lexington, McGarvey sustained the first loss by death of any member of his family. His oldest daughter, Loulie, now a girl of ten years and eight months, died of inflammation of the brain brought on by fever. A short time later his mother died. She had come from Missouri, to visit him in Lexington. After her visit she returned to her home but she was already suffering from slow paralysis and during her stay in Lexington had grown worse. Her son accompanied her but came back to Lexington under the impression that she was not in immediate danger. It was not long, however, before he was summoned to her bedside but arrived a few hours too late. Her death meant the breaking up of the large family. All were married except the three youngest daughters and these made their homes with brothers and sisters. The home passed into the hands of strangers. Rapid changes also took place in the family circle of Mrs. McGarvey and soon it ceased to exist as a family.

To counterbalance these losses by death there were also additions to his family by birth. When he came to Lexington he had three children. A son was born in 1864, a daughter in 1865 and another son in 1868.

In the summer of 1866 he was invited to return to Dover, Missouri, and conduct their August revival meeting. This he did and was accompanied by his oldest son, a lad of seven years. He gives an account of this journey in *Lard's Quarterly* for October, 1866. He had a successful meeting and a pleasant visit with his friends, but on his return the stagecoach in which he was traveling from Warrensburg, Missouri, was held up by highwaymen. In anticipation of just such an event McGarvey had left his watch at home and before starting on the journey had sent his available money on by draft. The only passengers were McGarvey, his child and a middle-aged woman. She had concealed her money, except some small change as a blind, about her person. The robbers profited very little from the holdup, but took one of the horses from the stage and departed. The McGarvey family tells the story of the circumstances under which the journey was resumed. The driver had to have another horse, and was confident he could secure one from a farmer who lived about a mile distant. He was so badly shaken, however, that he declared he could not go unaccompanied. McGarvey offered to go with him but that would leave the woman and child alone. Finally the woman accompanied the driver as guard, a horse was secured and the journey was resumed.

This same year McGarvey sold his house in Dover and with the proceeds of the sale purchased fourteen acres of land about a mile and a half east of Lexington. Here he built a commodious house which served as his home till it was destroyed by fire in 1887. His increased family needed the fruit, vegetables and chickens which could be produced on this land and it gave employment to his boys when they were not in school. It also provided him exer-

cise, which came at first in the form of work in his garden and later in the mile-and-a-half walks between his home and the College. He was accustomed to credit his good health and long life to the regularity of exercise which these walks afforded him.

During these years McGarvey had contact with a number of prominent preachers of the brotherhood, with some of whom he maintained intimate relations through life. In March, 1868, he conducted the funeral in Lexington of Raccoon John Smith. Another man whose funeral McGarvey conducted was W. H. Hopson. It has already been related that he recommended McGarvey as his successor to the pulpit in Lexington. L. B. Wilkes, famous as a debater and so eminently the logician, was another frequent companion of his. Others were Robert Milligan, Robert Graham and I. B. Grubbs; and in another connection something must be said of each of them.

McGarvey was closely associated in these years with Moses E. Lard. He wrote to McGarvey from Missouri during the war telling him of the constant danger to which he was exposed and that it was difficult for him to secure adequate food for his family. In reply McGarvey urged him to come to Kentucky, which he did and here he remained till his death.

In September, 1863, Lard began the publication of a quarterly magazine which he called *Lard's Quarterly*. It continued till April, 1868, when publication was suspended because of lack of financial support. In a leading article of the first issue he tells of the alignment of leading brethren on important questions. There was a liberal and a conservative faction. On the more liberal side were W. K. Pendleton and Isaac Errett. Benjamin Franklin with

his *American Christian Review* was on the conservative side and now Lard, with his *Quarterly,* throws his weight on this side. The particular question at issue then was whether the unimmersed may be invited to partake of the Lord's Supper. Lard takes a rigid, inflexible, unyielding, legalistic attitude. A thing was so and it could not be otherwise. The Scriptures said thus and so. They could mean but one thing. There was no ground for difference of views. Lard, it must be confessed, was an extremist. He makes immersion the sole test of one's Christianity. He cites Luther as an example. Luther had not been immersed. Therefore, he was not a Christian. He might have a good, pious, Christ-like character. This did not make him a Christian. God might welcome him to heaven among the saved. That did not mean that he was a Christian. One act, and that alone, was the test of one's right to be called a Christian. That act is immersion. Neither a Christian character, nor the smile of God's welcome among the redeemed could be substituted for it. Hence Lard affirmed that he would not commune with, nor recognize as Christian, any one who had not been immersed.

In his first issue he announced that "A strong body of able brethren, in the early prime of life, has been engaged to furnish regular contributions to its pages." McGarvey was among this number. The identity of the writers, other than Lard, at first was concealed by the designations of each by some letter of the Greek alphabet. Facts about his articles, which McGarvey mentions later, reveal that his designation was the letter Kappa. He wrote twelve articles for the eighteen numbers printed. Some of his subjects were: "Repentance," "Hymns and Hymn Books," "Immersion in the Holy Spirit," "The Bible

Union—Its Works Criticized," "Ministerial Education," "Destiny of the Wicked," "Justification by Faith," and "Jewish Wars as Precedents for Modern Wars."

Already within the ranks of the brotherhood there were developing two divergent types of interpretation. One was static, inflexible, legalistic. The other was more elastic, permitting a larger liberty and variety of attitudes. *Lard's Quarterly,* during its lifetime, and the *American Christian Review* were the organs of the former group. McGarvey aligned himself with this party and became one of its leaders, though he never took such extreme grounds as did Lard. The list of his articles given above shows that his interests were wider, but the facts indicate the party to which he yielded allegiance.

At this time McGarvey identified himself with another publication. In 1869, he and four associates, Robert Graham, Moses E. Lard, W. H. Hopson and L. B. Wilkes, became the editorial staff of the *Apostolic Times,* a weekly religious paper which was published for some years in Lexington and then was removed to Louisville. It became the organ of the more conservative group within the church while the *Christian Standard* under the editorship of Isaac Errett was the mouthpiece of the more progressive element. McGarvey's connection with the *Apostolic Times* continued for seven years. During these years there were frequent changes in the editorial management. After three years, Lard, Hopson and Wilkes were compelled by circumstances to withdraw, leaving the management of the paper in the hands of Graham and McGarvey. They associated with them as office editor Robert C. Cave who continued in this capacity till September 30, 1875. In 1876, I. B. Grubbs and Samuel Kelley assumed responsibility for the paper and McGarvey and Graham retired.

The progress of the church of which McGarvey was the minister has been traced up to the period of its rapid expansion following the close of the war. Shortly after Kentucky University was removed to Lexington in 1865, McGarvey was invited to become the Professor of Sacred History in the College of the Bible of Kentucky University. This was the work for which he had been unconsciously preparing and consciously yearning and so he accepted. At first it required but two hours a day of his time and so did not interfere with his ministry to the church. After a time, however, the curriculum was extended and more of his time was demanded, so in 1867 he resigned from the ministry of the Main Street Church and began to serve country churches. L. B. Wilkes was called as his successor and under his leadership the church continued to grow.

This brings us in the study of the life of McGarvey to the year 1869. Two important circumstances of his life during this period have not been discussed. They are his *Commentary on Acts* and the founding of The College of the Bible. They are reserved for separate chapters.

In 1860, while still in Missouri, McGarvey began to write a commentary on Acts of Apostles. It was completed in the autumn of 1863, so something like three and one-half years were devoted to the production of the manuscript, but for many years previous this Book of Acts had been with him the subject of special study. Many of his sermons were expositions of its important passages. At any time during his life if he had been asked what was the most important book of the Bible, he would probably have answered, without a moment's hesitation, Acts of Apostles. It was fitting therefore that his first literary effort of any considerable magnitude should be a commentary on this book.

This commentary was begun and finished during the Civil War. The normal writer suspends all efforts to produce books of this sort during such a period. It is a striking revelation of the type of mind and the perfect mental poise of McGarvey that he should plan and execute such a work while the minds of those about him were absorbed and distracted by military affairs. Twice in the act of writing he was interrupted by military operations; first, in Missouri when a Federal camp twelve miles from McGarvey's home was attacked by a Confederate force under General Sterling Price. The cannonading could be heard distinctly and the writer's desk was abandoned till the battle was over. The second interruption was in Kentucky. A battle had been fought in Richmond, on August 30, 1862, and again McGarvey writing at his desk was distracted, this time by the roll of drums heralding the approach of the Confederate

army of General Kirby Smith. Work on the commentary was again suspended while he and the family went out to stand on the side of the street and watch the victorious army march by. His son aptly says, "Most men then read nothing but newspapers, and when not thus engaged they were discussing the incidents and prospects of the great struggle." Consider then the self-control of the man who could weigh, ponder and write on, intricate problems of exegesis undisturbed by anything less than the cannonading of a battle or the drum-beats of a victorious army.

In this book McGarvey approaches his problem from an angle different from that of his later writings. There he is a conservative, seeking to preserve; here he is discarding the usual interpretations on the ground that they are wrong. Here he is attempting to show that the central theme of the Book of Acts needs to be understood in an entirely different manner from that which has prevailed in the past. Usually he looks upon the past with respect; here he is rejecting the past that he may build a new present furnished with new ideas.

It may be satisfactorily maintained that McGarvey's *Commentary on Acts*[9] is his most original and constructive work. In it he is doing something which no one else had done before—discovering the central theme of Acts and giving to it a fresh, reasonable and harmonious interpretation. For this reason it may be regarded as his most original production.

Two inferences have been deduced concerning this commentary. First, it is a liberal, forward-looking work. Second, it is McGarvey's most constructive, most original and most characteristic production. It is necessary to justify these statements.

It has been difficult to determine the exact motive that prompted the author to write the Book of Acts. It is the archives from which we derive most of the known facts concerning the church of the first century. Hence, it is popularly assumed that the book was written to give the historical information that we derive from it, but there are weighty reasons for thinking that it was not primarily history. The next plausible assumption is that it was apologetics, a defence before the Roman authorities of the Christian religion. Every few years some book or article appears advocating that it was the defence which Paul was to present, or did present, at Rome. The theory sounds plausible and attractive, but it will not stand the test of facts. The Book of Acts could not have been written this early. A number of other theories have been advanced as to the character of the book. McGarvey had his own. He regarded it as a book of conversions. The primary purpose of the author, he held, was to tell how conversion took place and to cite typical instances of it in practical operation.

He considered the theory that the Book of Acts was primarily the history of the Christian movement and cites Hackett, Alexander and others as favoring it. Though he concedes that this is what the author has accomplished for us, he rejects the theory that this was his original purpose. That original purpose of the writer is stated by McGarvey in these words, "The greater part of Acts may be resolved into a detailed history of cases of conversion, and of unsuccessful attempts at the conversion, of sinners. If we extract from it all cases of this kind, with the facts and incidents preparatory to each and immediately consequent upon it, we will have exhausted

almost the entire contents of the narrative. All other matters are merely incidental.''[10]

McGarvey explains his purpose in writing the commentary in these words, ''In the following pages it is made a leading object to ascertain the exact terms of pardon as taught by the apostles, and the precise elements which constitute real conversion to Christ.''[11] The major practical question before the Protestant world at that time was, What is the exact nature of conversion? Churches might differ as to the extent of man's depravity; the strict Calvinist said that he was ''wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body''; the Articles of Religion of the Methodist Church said that he was ''far gone from righteousness,'' but all agreed that man's depravity was such that he was incapable of attaining peace with God without the helping action of the Spirit of God. This action of the Holy Spirit was the absolute prerequisite of any instance of conversion. This had been the dominant view since the days of Augustine, and the religious workers of the middle nineteenth century from Peter Cartwright, the backwoods Methodist preacher, to Charles G. Finney, the New School Presbyterian President of Oberlin College, all preached its necessity in every case of conversion.

The theory was stated in perfectly logical terms in the theological works of that day, but in practice it did not yield either to explanation or to logic. The crux of the difficulty lay right here: No intelligent statement could be made as to when, upon what person or in what way the Spirit would act. There was equal uncertainty as to how the Spirit would complete the process. Peter Cartwright was convicted of sin at home, at midnight, after he

had returned from a dance, but it was three months before his conversion came. Finney was converted at a meeting by what he later described as a baptism of the Holy Spirit, but at the time he was not at all certain whether he had been converted or whether the Holy Spirit had abandoned him as reprobate. No one would attempt to give intelligent directions as to how a sinner should proceed to attain peace with God. The answer in general would be, Have faith in Jesus Christ and you will be saved. But faith was itself an act of God wrought by the Holy Spirit and so this answer brought one no nearer an understanding of the process of conversion. McGarvey himself tells us that when he was a boy in Illinois he heard preachers proclaim, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," and he would comment to himself, "I believe in Jesus Christ just as much as that preacher does, and I need further direction." In a world that is regulated by law and where uniformity and certainty of results prevail, religion, in this most important of all transactions, could discover no uniformity and no law.

In reality the God of the then current religion was not a rational, reasonable, intelligent Deity. There was no system, no orderliness in His actions. Elsewhere than in religion it was beginning to be discovered that certain agencies produced always the same results. In all nature God is the same always, yesterday, today, and forever. The one exception according to the then current belief was in the sphere of man's fellowship with God. Here it was still true that, "God moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform." No saint, no experienced preacher, could give to a sinner a clear, intelligent answer to the

question, "What shall I do to be saved?" Peter Cartwright railed against a New School preacher (by this term he meant a college trained preacher) because he was attempting to give sinners at the mourners' bench some direction as to what they should do to be saved. Cartwright called him away and sent him into the congregation to induce more people to come to the mourners' bench.

There was beginning to be a popular reaction against this vagueness and indefiniteness as to the way in which a man should come to God. The Disciples rode the tide of this popular reaction and came forth with an answer clear-cut and definite. It has been perhaps their most distinctive and most valuable contribution to religious thinking. It can not be said that it is their exclusive attainment or their exclusive possession. They did attain it, however, and did so somewhat in advance of the rest of the religious world. No man can gainsay their right to this distinction. It must be conceded, however, that in stating their doctrine they sometimes expressed it in mechanical, legalistic phraseology, but underneath these rigid, legalistic terms there was a substratum of spiritual reality that was like a vein of pure gold.

This truth had been coming slowly. The Campbells had vaguely but no less certainly reached out for it. Their vagueness was translated into certainty by Walter Scott in 1828, in his preaching in the Mahoning Association in eastern Ohio.[12] From this time on the Disciples had an answer to the question, "What shall I do to be saved?" Thirty years, however, were to pass before any one attempted on the basis of a thorough exposition of Scripture to define and elucidate the factors that constitute conversion. That was the contribution of McGarvey.

His work bears the title, *A Commentary on Acts of Apostles.* More exactly it is an exposition of the teaching of this book on the subject of conversion, and this McGarvey conceded. He believed that conversion was the dominant interest of the author of Acts. The portions that are not narrating cases of conversion are either preparing the way for some new case or are relating the consequences of one previously described. This view controls the entire structure of the commentary. Some chapters of Acts, the third, for example, that may seem to the casual reader to be of minor importance, are given relatively much space; while others that are of as great importance are given little. The fifteenth chapter is scarcely inferior in importance to the second, yet McGarvey devotes almost ten per cent of the original edition to the second chapter and not quite four to the fifteenth. This is because the second is a chapter of conversions but the fifteenth is not. Eight per cent is given to the eighth chapter and but five to the thirteenth. Forty per cent of the book is devoted to the six chapters that contain accounts of conversion, namely the second, third, eighth, ninth, tenth and sixteenth; only fourteen per cent is given to the last eight chapters.

In developing the doctrine of conversion as presented in the Book of Acts, the first point which McGarvey makes is that no preceding action of the Holy Spirit, other than that which took place through the Word as preached by inspired men, was deemed necessary or was even contemplated in the New Testament cases of conversion. This was a clear-cut statement of the issue between him and the current teaching on the subject. It was the doctrine of the Disciples clearly stated and supported by careful and lucid exposition of the related passages of

Scripture. McGarvey examines and finds substantiation of this position in almost every instance of conversion mentioned in the Book of Acts.

He begins with the account of the Day of Pentecost. The miraculous action of the Spirit had produced upon the minds of Peter's hearers no other effect than confusion and uncertainty. It brought to their hearts neither conviction nor assurance of pardon. "All the power which belonged to this event must have come short of the desired effect, but for a medium distinct from the Spirit, through which it reached the minds and hearts of the people. That medium was the word of Peter. . . . Not a word is said of any influence at work upon them, except that of the words spoken by Peter; hence we conclude that the change in their minds and hearts has been effected through those words."[13] Luke could not have used the language which he does, McGarvey says, if the current belief that conversion is due to a direct action of the Holy Spirit is correct.

He touches upon this topic in the discussion of almost every instance of conversion but it is considered fully in the account of the conversion of Cornelius in the tenth chapter. He brings out this truth in his discussion of the singular nature of the bestowment of the Spirit upon Cornelius. It was not at all a part of the conversion process. Here conversion proceeded as in other cases. It was solely for the purpose of giving proof that Cornelius a Gentile was acceptable as a Christian. McGarvey concludes his argument, therefore, with the words, "It is, therefore, a very gross deception to urge upon the people that they should receive the Spirit, after the precedent of Cornelius, before they are immersed."[14]

In a summary at the end of the chapter he further urges that Cornelius was baptized in the Spirit but Saul and the eunuch were not; therefore, baptism in the Spirit is not an essential, but a circumstance arising from the peculiarity of a single case.[15]

In the account of Lydia's conversion, the phrase, "whose heart the Lord opened, so that she gave heed to the things spoken by Paul,"[16] is given careful exposition. By a detailed analysis of the language and of the circumstances McGarvey shows that this does not mean that her heart was opened by the direct action of the Spirit but through careful heed on her part to the words spoken by Paul. God opened her heart in that it was God through his Spirit who was speaking through Paul.[17]

Another topic that McGarvey presents with great clearness is the nature of the process of conversion. It is not something which is done to man but something which, in response to the influences which God directs, the man himself does. This he brings out in his exposition of Acts 3:19. Here only in the Authorized Translation of Acts is the term "be converted" used. It naturally creates the impression that it is something which is done to man. This is not correct, for a Greek verb in the active voice is translated in the English by a passive. McGarvey says, "In a correct version of the New Testament, the expression *be converted* could not possibly occur; for there is nothing in the original to justify it."[18] His position has been vindicated by the translation of the Revised Version which here and throughout the entire New Testament has always substituted for it the active verb *turn*.

On the basis of this unquestionably correct definition of the term McGarvey proceeds to explain just what is

meant by conversion. It is a turning that involves a change of conduct. There is always a first act in the turning and this first act is not one which a man may himself choose but is one which God himself has designated. That is baptism. Conversion is truly a reformation of life but a reformation that is summed up and epitomized in the act of baptism.[19]

In the discussion of the same passage, Acts 3:19, McGarvey brings out his understanding of the meaning of repentance. It is not sorrow for sins as is popularly supposed, for "Godly sorrow works repentance unto salvation."[20] Etymologically the Greek work means a change of mind. But what part of the mind is changed? McGarvey says the will, for it is such a change of the mind as leads to a reformation of life. In the main this is correct, though it may be criticized as too narrow. The will is the part of the mind that must be changed in order that the repentance be complete, but it is not the only part which is changed. The change of the will carries with it a change in every other part of the mind. In this case the etymological meaning is the correct one. Repentance is a change of the mind, the whole mind—will, emotions, judgment, affections, conscience—all is changed.

If some one should object that this is more the consequence of faith the answer is that it is a mistake to attempt to distinguish between faith and repentance so clearly as to make them entirely distinct. McGarvey's type of mind was of that logical, exact, rigid sort which would not be content to leave any term with a vague, uncertain area. His definitions marked distinctly the limits of any term and he was not content till each term

was differentiated in meaning from every other one. Hence he seizes upon the narrowest possible meaning of repentance and makes it the complete definition. In doing this he has so distinguished between faith and repentance that they do not overlap.

McGarvey had little to say about faith. In common with all of the early Disciples he made it comparatively simple. Alexander Campbell began the chapter on "Faith" in his *Christian System* with the statement, "Faith is only the belief of testimony." It is not that this definition is wrong but faith is far more than this. If it had been this merely Paul could scarcely have written, "That life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself up for me."[21] Many others of Paul's great statements about faith could scarcely have been uttered.

Recent study has traced the ancestry of this narrow definition of faith which prevailed among the Disciples back to John Locke of the seventeenth century. McGarvey in common with the men of his day inherited and accepted this definition. His fullest discussion of faith is in the treatment of the Philippian jailer.[22] He here argues against the doctrine of justification by faith only. He says that faith is used in two senses: First, abstractly, that is, of faith alone. In this sense it cannot justify. Many who thus believe are not saved. The second meaning of faith includes repentance and obedience which properly result from faith. It is not the faith alone which justifies but the faith and the obedience.[23] That is, the element of the faith which justifies is the obedient spirit. It would not be untrue to McGarvey's position to say that he believed a man is justified by

obedience. This attitude toward faith shows that faith did not have to him the significance which it had to Paul. More even than to Campbell[24] faith was to him purely an intellectual process and the element which gave it value is the obedient spirit.

His discussion of confession is based on Acts 8:37. He is aware that this verse is an interpolation, but claims that this fact modifies but does not invalidate the argument for requiring of a candidate for baptism a confession of faith in Jesus Christ. Insertion of the verse is evidence that confession was the universal practice of the church. He supports this by citing certain passages of Scripture which speak of the confession, such as John 9:22; I Timothy 6:13; Romans 10:8, 9. He alleges that confession today is imperative not because it is expressly commanded, but because it rests upon an apostolic precedent. No one should be admitted to baptism without a confession of faith in the lordship of Jesus and nothing more should be required in the confession of a candidate.

Baptism was a subject of keen and ardent controversy in the days when McGarvey wrote, and this caused him to have much to say on this subject. The form of baptism is by immersion. His principal argument in favor of this position is to be found in his comments on Acts 8:38, 39. So confident is he that immersion and immersion only is baptism that he discards altogether in his commentary, in accord with the example of Alexander Campbell, the words "baptize," "baptism," and "baptist" and in their stead uses respectively, "immerse," "immersion" and "immerser."

To him baptism is primarily an act of obedience that completes faith. Without obedience faith is incomplete, is dead. Sometimes the word faith is used in a com-

prehensive sense to include repentance and obedience,[25] but at other times it is used exclusive of them and means merely the belief of testimony. The process of turning from the old life to the new or of reformation is introduced by baptism. It is the initial act, but it is more than this: it is the whole process of turning. He thinks of baptism as a sort of symbol of one's entire reformation. He says, "The commands 'turn' and 'be immersed,' are equivalent, not because the words have the same meaning, but because the command, 'Turn to the Lord,' was uniformly obeyed by the specific act of being immersed. Previous to immersion, men 'repented' but did not 'turn'; after immersion, they had turned, and immersion was the 'turning act.' "[26] He reaches the same conclusion by a comparison of Acts 2:38 and 3:19. In each passage between repentance and forgiveness of sins there stands a command. In one it is "be baptized" and in the other it is "turn." By an argument based upon the theory that since they occupy the same place in the logical sequence they must be exact equivalents, McGarvey reached the conclusion that baptism and turning must, therefore, be regarded as identical. "A penitent sinner turns to God by being 'immersed.' "[27]

It is a legitimate question whether such a conclusion necessarily follows. McGarvey based his argument upon the inference that baptism is the first act on the part of those who turn. It was so on the Day of Pentecost, he argues, hence it must be so in other cases.[28] The command then should have been to be baptized at once. Like the Philippian jailer everyone should be baptized the same hour of the night that he makes his decision. No doubt in McGarvey's ministry there were many who for

perfectly legitimate reasons postponed their baptism for days, weeks, possibly a month or more after their confession. Yet they had turned. In McGarvey's own case, he made the decision that on the first opportunity he would make the confession. Two weeks passed before an opportunity came, yet he had turned. The fact is that baptism and turning are two different concepts. The latter expresses a change in conduct; the former is a symbol of personal surrender to Christ. Both come between repentance and formal forgiveness. Yet they are different. The difficulty lies in the impossibility of breaking up a spiritual process into definite steps or stages, each one wholly distinct from the other.

Baptism is for the remission of sins. McGarvey subjects the language of Acts 2:38 to a searching analysis and shows that it can mean this and nothing else.[29] This truth assumes a large place in his teaching. Time and time again he brings it to the front. He is quite explicit in the statement, however, that baptism is not to be isolated from the other elements of the process. Baptism alone is not for the remission of sins, but faith, repentance, confession and baptism are all for this purpose. They, when combined into a unit, are for the remission of sins, but he does say that the remission of sins is consummated in the act of baptism. In what sense baptism is for the remission of sins, McGarvey never attempted to explain. It is probable that he would have refused to attempt any explanation. To him it would have been sufficient to say that God in the Scriptures so enjoined it.

This is McGarvey's interpretation of the doctrine of conversion as he sees it taught in the Book of Acts. This

was what the Disciples offered to take the place of the vague and mysterious doctrine of conversion that was current in Protestantism. It is rational and is founded upon an exact and impartial exposition of the scriptural teaching. It unquestionably corresponds to the preaching of the Apostolic Church. It assumes that God is a reasonable being Who has provided a definable way by which man may enter into harmony with Him. It provides a fixed answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" The answer is precise and yet is sufficiently elastic to meet the needs of various types of human personalities. It was an enriching and a constructive contribution to religious thinking. McGarvey's part was to formulate it into a systematic statement. All of it had been preached before but his task was to define each part, to relate one part to another, and to construct all parts into a unifiable whole. It may be said—though he would have repudiated the statement since he abhorred the term theology—that he constructed into a systematic statement the Disciples' theory of conversion.

How well did he do this task? What part of the statement may be regarded as his own personal contribution? His searching analyses of the statements of Scripture are almost beyond improvement. His discussions are always clear, lucid and convincing. It is difficult to think of any one reading it with an open mind who would not be swayed by his logical clearness. It was always true that when one heard or read McGarvey's exposition of a scriptural passage there was a difficulty in evading the force of his argument. Hundreds must have read his commentary in the early days and have been convinced that his explanation of the nature and process of conversion could be none other than the true way.

Mention has been made in the previous chapter of the two factions into which the brotherhood was dividing and that McGarvey aligned himself with the one that was more rigid and inflexible. Does this fact manifest itself in his commentary on Acts?

The process of conversion consists in part of certain spiritual attitudes. These are faith and repentance. There are also certain acts. These are confession and baptism. The legalist interprets the process from the point of view of the deeds. Dr. Hopson is quoted as having said, "Repentance and prayer are not worth the snap of my finger without immersion."[30] This is a legalistic approach. No one can question the truthfulness of the opposite statement that immersion is worthless without repentance and prayer. This would be a spiritual attitude. To the legalist the ultimate and final test of any man's conversion is the completeness of his obedience to the acts, not his character, nor the motive of his spirit. Such an attitude can be maintained only by ignoring certain fundamental elements of the teaching of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount. Here Jesus teaches that the one thing that is important is the motive. These acts—any acts—cannot be evaluated apart from the spirit that prompts them. It is the motive that gives value to the act, not the act to the motive.

McGarvey did not go to the extreme of his associates, Lard and Hopson, but statements can be found in his commentary that seem to imply that the test of conversion in any instance is a question of acts, not of spiritual attitudes. Such is his identification of baptism and turning and his position that confession in the precise words of the eunuch is imposed by apostolic precedent upon

every one who today turns to God. Again his reduction of the justifying power of faith to obedience is a nearer approach to the position of the Judaizers than to Paul's.

Such a view will affect one's attitude on every question, even his conception of God. If the ultimate test is an act then God becomes a fact-finding, bookkeeping sort of God and not one Who judges by the attitude and motives of the heart. The key to all of this lies in the conception of the relationship of the gospel to law; not the Law of Moses for McGarvey never hesitated in affirming that the Law of Moses had been abolished in Christ, but, What has taken its place? What is the nature of the Gospel? McGarvey thought that the Gospel was another law. In commenting on John 1: 17[31] he said that the Law was not without grace and the Gospel was not without law. He quotes a paragraph from *The Christian*[32] which he says he believed was intended to be a description of his position. He will tell whether it accurately describes him, if his opponent will answer a certain question. The opponent did not answer and so we cannot say that it was McGarvey's position. In substance it was that Christ is now the law-giver and that the Christian is as much under statutes as was the Jew. As the article cited shows, some form of this position was widely accepted. McGarvey was a man of his time and his thinking was in harmony with the thought of his time.

A certain rigidity of view may be observed in his commentary in his discussion of the reason why Paul circumcised Timothy.[33] The reader usually gets the impression that since Timothy was half Jew, Paul circumcised him on grounds of expediency. Circumcised, Timothy could meet Jews as a fellow-Jew; uncircumcised he could have no

contact with them. Further, Paul in Galatians seems to connect circumcision with the Law,[34] and to teach that the abrogation of the Law carries with it the abolishing of circumcision. Hence Paul settled the question by the Christian principle of freedom. This, however, is not the view of McGarvey. He approaches it from the point of view of a rigid system and decides every point in accord with this fixed system. Circumcision was given to Abraham, hence it antedates the Law. The setting aside of the Law did not affect circumcision. Hence Paul circumcised Timothy because the latter was a Jew. The rite is permanently binding upon Jews and hence every Christian Jew is under as much obligation to be circumcised as he is to be baptized. Gentile Christians are free from it, consequently Paul's language about the freedom of Christians from the rite of circumcision applies to Gentile Christians only.

McGarvey does not see that this position is a practical negation of the fundamental thesis of his commentary: God has one definite way in which mankind may find peace with Him. This position would result in two kinds of Christians with a different sort of requirement for each. There would have been two churches, not one, with two different conditions of admission. It is a virtual denial of Paul's great doctrine that in Christ there can be neither Jew nor Gentile. Paul sees the distinction abolished; McGarvey sees it persisting to the end of time. These conclusions which may be regarded as defects of his presentation came from McGarvey's adhesion to a legalistic or fixed theological system. This was partly due to the thinking of the age and partly due to Mc-

Garvey's own type of mind. He was a true child of his time. They are blots that mar, but do not destroy the value of, his discussion.

This commentary is an extraordinary book to be written by a man just past thirty. To some extent the problem has changed and a modern commentary on Acts will deal with a different set of questions. It is still, however, a book of solid worth and offers wholesome sustenance to the man of today who reads it.

Sixteen hundred copies were ordered in advance, which is remarkable in view of the fact that the year 1863 was in the midst of the Civil War. It was issued first by Franklin and Rice and has been reprinted a number of times. A revised edition in two volumes was issued by the Standard Publishing Company in 1892. The type was larger; it was more handsomely bound. The Introduction was enlarged by the addition of a number of items that were not in the original. In form it is more like a commentary than the original edition. The spirit and the doctrinal positions are virtually unchanged.

By temperament and by developed interests McGarvey became a teacher. A teacher is one who imparts information and develops attitudes toward life. He depends upon facts in the main and so makes his approach primarily to the intellect. All of this was true of McGarvey. He sought to persuade men by telling them what were the facts and what was the true interpretation of these facts. Though himself a man of deep and tender emotions and capable of arousing in others those feelings that are noblest and most enduring, yet he never sought to do this by the art of the orator or by appeal to mere sentiment. He greatly admired oratorical skill in others, and the power to sway the feelings, but he seemingly did not cultivate this talent in himself. Much of his preaching from early life onward was expository. In this he was essentially the teacher. He was always a teacher and teaching was native to him.

In his early days he taught schools in Missouri. In part he taught because the salary paid a preacher in those days was inadequate. Since McGarvey was young and inexperienced he almost certainly needed the earnings of a teacher to supplement his income. But there were other reasons for his teaching. It was a service which he could render his community that was in line with his preaching, and it gave expression to a natural inclination to teach.

Those who knew him well recognized that he possessed by nature the qualifications for a teacher. The year fol-

lowing his graduation Alexander Campbell offered McGarvey a position in the faculty of Bethany College as a teacher of Mathematics but he declined. A number of years later he was again invited to accept the place, and again he declined. Still later he was offered the chair of ancient languages in Bethany College, but he recommended in his stead Charles Louis Loos, then president of Eureka College, and he accepted. In 1857 Robert Milligan, the President of Kentucky University at Harrodsburg, invited McGarvey to become a member of its faculty, but the temptation was not strong enough to induce him to leave his work in Missouri. After he removed to Lexington he was asked to become the teacher of English Literature, in this institution, but once more he said, "No," and, in declining, stated that the only teaching position that would tempt him to leave the pulpit would be that of a teacher of the English Bible. At last he had discovered the object of his ambition.

Kentucky University was not, as its name may suggest, a state-supported institution, but a privately endowed college, under the auspices of the Christian church. Its name was selected without sufficient consideration on the impulse of the moment at the time of its incorporation and, as later history made evident, was unfortunate. In 1864, its buildings in Harrodsburg were destroyed by fire. Instead of rebuilding on the spot it was deemed wise to seek a new location. Harrodsburg was not situated centrally and at that time was twenty miles from any railroad. Several places, among them Louisville and Covington, were considered but Lexington was favored as the new location. In addition to being central for both

church and state, Lexington contained the unoccupied buildings of Transylvania University.

This, the first institution of higher learning west of the Allegheny Mountains, had been successively under the control of the Presbyterians, the Episcopalians, the Baptists and the Methodists. Under each it had flourished and then had declined, and at this time it was practically closed. Its trustees offered to donate to Kentucky University its grounds, buildings, libraries and all other equipment on the one condition that it remove to Lexington with its active endowment of $200,000. The offer was accepted and the session of 1865 began in September in the new location.

One of its constituent units was The College of the Bible of Kentucky University. It was for the training of preachers, but was not a theological seminary and did not conform in its educational standards to this type of institution. It represented a new and distinctly different educational ideal. A committee of the curators of the University said, "It is a new and peculiar institution, unknown in the history of our colleges."[35] This was one of the peculiarities of the Disciples. They did not conform to the recognized standards in theology and church organization and it is not remarkable that they dissented also in education. In the former fields they cherished the theory that they were restoring New Testament practices but they could not make this claim in education. Here they were confessedly mapping out a new scheme of their own devising. Who was the author of this new plan?

Robert Milligan was the president of the new College of the Bible and McGarvey was the professor of Sacred History. There are a number of reasons for believing

that it was McGarvey who planned the name, the ideals and the curriculum of the new institution. They bear the earmarks of his thinking. He tells that the curators named him as a member of a committee to plan the instruction of the college and it was probably he that supplied to the committee the new curriculum. This is further evidence of his leadership.

This conjecture is made more probable by an article from his pen in *Lard's Quarterly* of April, 1865, on the subject of "Ministerial Education." It appeared but five months before the opening of the College of the Bible and in a sense is a blue print of this institution. It names as the first requisite in the education of a minister, *knowledge of the Bible.* The second is *knowledge of the needs of his people,* and how these needs may be supplied. There is a third, a *general education in literature and the sciences,* but he repeatedly says that this is less important than the others. Equipped with the other two, a preacher may forgo this third and yet be educated for his task. These were the ideals of The College of the Bible and so its plan of education was the child of McGarvey's brain.

The central principle of this new educational scheme was that the Bible itself should be the principal subject in which the preacher should be trained. In the seminaries, the principal subjects taught were theology, church polity, and the administration of the work of the parish. The Bible was used as proof of the correctness of the theories advanced. It was not taught for its own sake but was assigned a place of secondary significance. Now McGarvey proposed to change all this. The Bible was to be taught for its own sake. Its value was not in that it supplied the evidence of some theological system but that it itself offered a way of salvation.

The student was to be given a knowledge of all parts of the Bible on the theory that it was to equip him thoroughly for his work as a preacher. When he preached, he was to preach the Bible. When he taught in the Sunday School, he was to teach the Bible. In his work among the people of his church he was to apply the Bible to their problems. He was himself to be a constant student of the Bible for in it were to be found wisdom and guidance for every situation of life. Instruction in the Bible therefore was to be the central and the principal part of a preacher's training in the College.

The basic biblical courses were called Sacred History. This was McGarvey's own title. He treated the Bible as history, a continuous history from creation till the death of the last apostle.

At first McGarvey devoted but two hours a day to teaching and it did not interrupt his work as a minister. This continued for two years and then the course was expanded and more of his time was demanded. He resigned his city church and became a teacher of the Bible.

McGarvey's associate in the work of the College was Robert Milligan. He was originally a Presbyterian but while teaching in Bourbon County was baptized at the noted Cane Ridge Church. He taught in Washington College, Pennsylvania, in Indiana State University, in Bethany College, and in 1857 accepted the presidency of Kentucky University in Harrodsburg. In 1865, he became the president of The College of the Bible. This work was most congenial to him. Like McGarvey, he had found at last his heart's desire.

He was an older man than McGarvey by some fifteen years and had enjoyed the experience of important teach-

ing and executive positions. He was in poor health and this no doubt limited his activity, but he met his classes in his room when he was unable to go to the College. He was a man of great piety, of genuine devotion to ideals and of consecration of life. He was the author of seven books including a *Commentary on Hebrews, The Scheme of Redemption,* and *Reason and Revelation.* He held premillennial views and attempted to forecast the future course of world history from certain prophetic passages. His success as a prognosticator of coming events was no greater than that of others who have attempted the same role. Milligan died in March, 1875, while his *Commentary on Hebrews* was going through the press and the publishers asked McGarvey to write a sketch of his life, which he did, and it may be found in that volume.

The organizing genius of Kentucky University was John B. Bowman, a graduate of Bacon College which was organized in Georgetown in 1836 and was removed to Harrodsburg in 1840. It closed its doors in 1850 but through the efforts of Bowman was reopened in 1857 under the name of Kentucky University. Possessed with the ambition to revive his alma mater and to convert it into a university, he undertook the task of raising by his own personal efforts an ample endowment. He was remarkably successful and within a very short time he brought its endowment to $200,000.

When the institution was removed to Lexington, this sum was increased from the funds of Transylvania University by $65,000 in addition to the buildings and grounds valued at an excess of $100,000. Bowman then attempted to create a university in fact as well as in name. There was already in existence the College of Liberal Arts and

Robert Graham became its president. Mention has already been made of the organization of The College of the Bible with Robert Milligan as president. There was a College of Law and in 1873 Transylvania Medical College was organized.

In addition to these which were actual colleges of Kentucky University, the state legislature in 1865 created the Agricultural and Mechanical College and, for the time being, placed it under the direction of Kentucky University. The state had received from an appropriation made by Congress for this purpose the sum of $165,000 and the legislature guaranteed to Kentucky University the interest from this sum, amounting to $9900 per annum. In return, Kentucky University was to provide buildings for the College, purchase an experimental farm and receive free of charge for tuition three hundred students per annum to whom were to be granted the benefits of "any instruction given in any of the colleges or classes of the University except those of Law or Medicine." It is a certainty that Kentucky University was not to receive excessive compensation for its undertaking. Bowman in his annual report says, "Surely the state was the obliged party."[36]

The initial success of Bowman in raising the endowment and the magnificence of his plans inspired confidence in him and led to his appointment as regent. He was also the treasurer of the University and the chairman of its Executive Committee. This gave to him almost complete and unrestricted control over its affairs. Any experienced person, however, will know that the funds, ample though they may have seemed to many, were inadequate for plans of such magnitude. Financial diffi-

culties began to develop and to undermine confidence in Bowman's ability to handle the situation.

There was an even more serious reason for uneasiness. How were these ambitious plans to affect the interests and the rights which the church had in the University? This question was beginning to agitate the minds of many in the church and McGarvey was among this number. As in so many other matters of public interest he became the leader and, though others shared in his uneasiness, he had to bear the onus of the controversy.[37]

There are two widely different points of view from which any such question may be considered. When the church creates a hospital, an orphans' home or an educational institution, for whose benefit does it plan it? Every important college or university that was founded under the auspices of a church has had to face this alternative: Is the institution created for the needs of the church itself or is it the gift of the church to the world? Many an institution can tell the story of conflict over this question and in a number the controversy still rages.

Kentucky University faced this issue and Bowman and McGarvey became the leaders of the two factions.[32] Such ambitious plans as Bowman cherished could not be carried out within the restricted area which the Christian church of central Kentucky could supply. He wanted the institution to serve the church and at the same time it was in many ways to transcend the interests of the church. He seems to have been in advance of his time in his willingness to have students from other churches share in all that the University had to bestow equally with those from the Christian church. He proposed to ignore denominational lines in an area that was acutely conscious

of these lines. Bowman seems to have been an idealist without an actual basis in reality for his idealistic plans.

Naturally McGarvey took the other side of the alternative. He believed that the University was the creature of the church, existed for the church and should serve the church. This was its first and its predominant task. Every other service that it could render the community must be subordinated to this. From the University he expected two services in the interest of the church, namely, the training of preachers and a Christian education for other students. No other undertaking which the University might attempt in the field of education should interfere with these.

By the church McGarvey meant the Disciples of Christ. He and his brethren did not believe in denominations, they would have affirmed, yet they assumed an attitude that was in spirit thoroughly denominational. They would have defended themselves, as denominationalists always do, by the assurance that the body to which they belonged was itself the true Church of Christ. At an unknown date an organization of twelve churches was effected in Cincinnati, headed by Bishop McIlvaine of the Episcopal Church, to promote Christian union. It adopted a preamble and a constitution. McGarvey wrote and published four letters to the bishop which were afterwards issued in a tract.[38] He commended the purpose of the organization but criticized its method. He condemned it for adopting a constitution; it should have eliminated all human statements and have sought union on the basis of the New Testament alone. He commended to the bishop and his organization as a model the procedure of the Christian churches. This, in McGarvey's judgment, was

the true way of seeking Christian union. He and his associates had no place in their scheme of things for other churches or for members of other churches. They did not therefore believe in cooperation. They believed in Christian union but they expected it to come by the way of conquest and absorption, not by federation and alliance. In the year 1907, the state convention was held at Latonia. A new Roman Catholic church was being constructed near the site of the convention. One day McGarvey stood across the street watching the construction, when some one approached him and asked of what he was thinking. His answer was, "I was thinking of the day when that will be one of our churches." This was typical of the way that McGarvey thought. Consequently he would not sympathize with any plan to make the University serve a wider constituency to the neglect of his brotherhood.

Here was abundant material for a controversy, but in addition, there were two strong personalities that were mutually unacceptable to each other. The issues of the controversy developed slowly through the years. On the part of those who took the church's view, it assumed the form of a suspicion that Bowman was diverting to the support of the Agricultural College money which properly belonged to other departments of the University. The funds supplied by the state for its maintenance were pitifully inadequate and his energies were absorbed in providing for its needs. This made it inevitable that the departments of the University in which the church was interested should lag behind.

The Bowman partisans said that the purchase of lands for the Agricultural College, "compelled him (Bowman)

to defer the work of endowing (the University), until those estates were paid for.'"[39] The other side used the language, "The funds of the University have been largely applied to the use of the Agricultural College."[40] As early as June, 1871, the Board of Curators appointed a special committee to investigate the condition of the accounts and the funds of the university. Its report was that the accounts had been kept and the funds were intact.[41] The appointment of such a committee indicates a feeling that there was need of defence.

McGarvey was not inactive during this controversy. At this time he was one of the editors of the *Apostolic Times* and he made use of the columns of this paper to stress emphatically the rights of the church to the services of the University. In reply Professor Peter of the Science department of the University came to the defence of Bowman and in published articles excoriated McGarvey. He was accused of conspiracy to unseat the regent, and of falsehood. On January 11, 1872, McGarvey demanded of the curators an investigation of these charges. Such an investigation was held at the meeting of the Board in June but announcement of the decision was postponed till a year later. The reason for this delay was that a number of controversies existed within the University and a Committee on Grievances was appointed in the hope that all of them could be settled together. Bowman was a man of strong temper and was unable to brook opposition to his purposes. McGarvey had become distasteful to the regent and through the year that followed, his resentment smouldered.

The Committee on Grievances in its report to the Board in June, 1873, vindicated McGarvey completely of the

charges. The language of the report was, "We do not find from the evidence adduced that Prof. McGarvey is guilty of conspiracy against the regent; moreover, we also exonerate him under the alleged charge of falsehood."[42] It was openly stated, however, that McGarvey was unacceptable to the regent.

The curators attempted a policy that meant the hushing up of all controversial topics. Everyone was to maintain silence and thus promote peace. But McGarvey was never one who could be hushed into silence when he felt that important issues were at stake. On July 3, 1873, he published an editorial in the *Apostolic Times* reviewing the controversy and the action of the curators. With reference to this editorial the Executive Committee addressed a communication to the curators in which it says, "The article in the *Times* of July 3, of which he is the acknowledged author, destroyed all hope that we may have had, that harmony could be restored, and the interests of the University promoted, without some action on the part of the Executive Committee."[43] On the other hand McGarvey's friends speak of this editorial as a "Vindication of his character, which had been grossly assailed in the public press."[44] On June 26, the Executive Committee decided to ask McGarvey to resign, though this action seemingly was not then made public.[45] McGarvey's friends said that this action was demanded by the regent and that he offered the choice between McGarvey's resignation and his own. Following the editorial of July 3, the Executive Committee openly requested McGarvey's resignation which request he declined. The committee then removed him from his professorship.

There followed a summer of sharp controversy. The church was thoroughly aroused and rallied in large majority to the support of McGarvey. A son of one of the curators in newspaper articles renewed and reiterated the charges against McGarvey. A printed form of petition was distributed among the churches for them to use in asking for a reorganization of the University and the retention of McGarvey. On August 5 another appeal was made to the churches to "interfere for the safety of both church and University." One hundred and eighty-one churches petitioned the curators. This was a remarkable number and shows that there was a widely spread feeling aroused among the churches.

In such an atmosphere the Board of Curators met in a called session on September 16, 1873. The forces of Bowman stood firm. The dismissal of McGarvey by the Executive Committee was reaffirmed. The petitions of the churches were not considered but were referred to a committee of eight with a resolution ordering that its report or reports be printed. It met in Cincinnati one month later, promptly divided into two factions, and, after an agreement that each faction would prepare a report, adjourned. The majority report was signed by five members of the committee. It was favorable to Bowman and the Executive Committee and unfavorable to McGarvey. The minority report was signed by three members of the committee. It strongly sponsored the interests of McGarvey.

The University suffered as a result of the bitterness engendered by this controversy. The attendance fell off. The importance of McGarvey to The College of the Bible may be gauged by the fact that its number of students

dropped from the peak of one hundred twenty-two in 1870-71 to thirty-five in 1873-74. But there was a corresponding falling off in the other colleges as well. In the College of Arts, the number was reduced to eighty-eight and even in the Agricultural College the attendance was scarcely forty per cent of previous enrollments. The total student body was about thirty per cent of what it had been a few years previous.

It looked for the time being as though McGarvey's career as a teacher of the Bible had come to an abrupt end. Many of the students of The College of the Bible prepared at once to go elsewhere, the majority to Bethany. They planned a farewell prayer meeting on the evening of September 19 and invited McGarvey to be present. At first he planned to attend but reflection convinced him that the ordeal would be too great for him to endure. He wrote a letter to one of the students giving his reason for not being present. It reveals him as composed and going about his work in his usual manner. He had attended prayer meeting at the church the night before, but the expressions of sympathy from his brethren came nearer breaking down his composure than the condemnation by the Board. The letter contains no note of bitterness and no word of reproach. He was masterful in his temporary defeat and proceeded on his way as editor of the *Apostolic Times* and minister of the Broadway Church.

The agitation of the churches over his dismissal continued and at the meeting of the curators in June, 1875, as a concession toward harmony, this body asked the Kentucky Christian Education Society to nominate men for the professorships of The College of the Bible. President Milligan had died on the 20th of March previous,

and consequently both positions were vacant. The Education Society nominated Robert Graham for the presidency and McGarvey to his old position. The Board of Curators was not disposed to continue the fight longer and accepted the nominations.

The financial difficulties of the University, however, were not at an end. During the sessions of 1875-76 and 1876-77, the two professors received only about one-third of their salaries and at the close of the session in June, 1877, it was announced that Professor McGarvey only could be retained and that at half time and half salary. This virtually would have ended the work of The College of the Bible. The two professors brought the situation before the Education Society and it took steps to organize a college independent of Kentucky University. An appeal was made to the churches and a temporary board to manage the affairs of the new college was appointed. The response of the churches was evidently prompt and generous. A meeting of the Board was held on July 27, 1877, at which it was decided that sufficient pledges had been made to employ three men for its faculty. The three chosen were Robert Graham, John W. McGarvey and I. B. Grubbs. Three rooms in the basement of the Main Street Church were used for class rooms and a boarding house was rented for a dormitory. Forty-one students were enrolled and at the June Commencement there were thirteen graduates.

At the meeting of the curators of Kentucky University in June, 1878, the office of regent was abolished and Bowman's connection with the institution came to an end. The professor of Mathematics, H. H. White, was chosen as acting president. The other colleges were separated

from the University and it was reduced to the College of Arts. The new management invited The College of the Bible to occupy classrooms in its building and to take over its dormitories. A satisfactory affiliation was worked out between the two institutions and a new chapter in the history of The College of the Bible began. McGarvey recommended Charles Louis Loos for the presidency of the University and he accepted and assumed his new position in 1880. This brought together in closely associated work McGarvey and Loos, an association that continued without interruption till death ended their careers.

It is seldom that a man is involved in so sharp and heated a controversy as the one just described, and at its end comes out as completely victorious as did McGarvey. Usually there is loss on both sides and frequently the victory is more costly than it would have been to yield in the beginning. There was loss in this instance. The scheme of a great university was given up and Kentucky University became in fact only a college, but this was not a complete loss. Much bitterness was engendered and both church and University unquestionably suffered the loss of many friends.

The remarkable fact, however, is that McGarvey retained to so large a degree the esteem and the loyalty of the churches. These had been his throughout the entire affair, nor was there any later reaction from this devotion. His conduct was such as to give them the impression that his part in the controversy was not prompted by mere desire for victory nor for any other personal reason. Even his late opponents came to feel and to acknowledge that he was actuated by high motives and that his part in the conflict was not for personal advantage, and when

the advantage did come to him, he did not use it to humiliate his foes nor to exalt his friends. The outcome of the whole affair was that McGarvey was entrenched in his position as leader. From this time forth till his death the Kentucky brotherhood accepted his guidance without hesitation or misgivings.

The new organization brought together into close fellowship the three men who for the next quarter of a century were to bear the burden of The College of the Bible. Often it was actually a burden though they bore it always with joy. There were to come days of poverty, times of perplexity and always years of heavy, relentless toil. There was no break in their fellowship, they shared in each other's joys and in their sorrows they were not divided. Since they were so closely united in fellowship and service it is fitting that something should here be said about the other two members of the faculty.

Robert Graham was English born on August 14, 1822. By trade he was a carpenter. He migrated to this country and settled in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. In the pursuit of his trade he was employed to work on the new buildings of Bethany College. He repeatedly said that this experience created in him the determination to secure a college education. He entered Bethany, ranked high in scholarship, and was a senior in 1847, the year that McGarvey was a freshman. After graduating he travelled by horseback, as he delighted to tell, into the Southwest, assisted in holding a meeting at Fayetteville, Arkansas, that resulted in establishing the church there, became its preacher and later founded Arkansas College. In this he had a claim of being one of the remote founders of the University of Arkansas. He also preached in sur-

rounding communities and inasmuch as preaching was infrequent his sermons were sometimes two hours in length. It fastened on him a habit which he confessed he was never completely able to throw off. At a state convention in Lexington in the middle nineties, at an evening session, he was the first of three speakers. After he had spoken for twenty minutes which was his allotted time, the chairman rapped on his desk and announced, "Time is up." Graham turned to him and in a stern voice exclaimed, "What do you mean? Why, I haven't commenced." In utter disregard of the chairman he proceeded on his way to the end of his speech.

In 1859-60 he taught English for one year in Kentucky University at Harrodsburg but then returned to Arkansas. The outbreak of the Civil War forced him to leave and in the fall of 1862 he became minister of the Walnut Street (now Central) Church, Cincinnati. In 1864 he became minister of the church in Santa Rosa, California. From Santa Rosa he returned to Kentucky in 1866, to become the President of the College of Liberal Arts of Kentucky University. He anticipated the coming distrust of the Bowman regency and resigned to assume the presidency of Hocker Female College, the forerunner of what was later called Hamilton College. From this he passed to the presidency of The College of the Bible in 1877, which he relinquished in 1895. He continued to teach till 1898 and then retired. Death came to him on January 20, 1901, at which time he was 79. McGarvey was ill at the time and the death of his lifelong companion was kept from him for fear of a possible injurious effect. As he began to convalesce he read in a paper a statement that informed him that his friend had gone. He had

already in mind anticipated its coming and was not injuriously depressed by the news.

The teaching of President Graham was divided between the College of Arts and The College of the Bible. The first semester he gave a course in Mental Philosophy, or Psychology as it was then coming to be named, and in the second, Logic. Similarly in the first semester he gave Ethics followed by Economics in the second. A third course was Homiletics given to The College of the Bible students alone. Most living men remember him as an old man and he had the habits that go with age. His text books were scarcely up to date. His methods had become fixed. Students who repeated his courses said that he always told his jokes at the same place. Yet he was clear-minded and vigorous. He was a good counsellor. He had a kindly heart and yet could be firm. He prided himself on the control of his emotions. When a joke was told that would bring shouts of laughter from others his countenance would remain passive. He would look bored, even pained. He was accustomed to say that he laughed inwardly. He was methodical and exacting. Loose and indifferent work on the part of a student did not escape his attention. At such a time his comments to the student were apt to be sharp, even caustic. He was a man of great personal integrity and any conduct that was low or unprincipled had his disapproval and censure.

Between him and McGarvey there existed a close bond created by a common task, a common purpose and by ideals in which each shared. There is no story of disagreement or friction between them. The work of one supplemented that of the other. Graham was the admin-

istrator; McGarvey was the student, the writer, the man of wider vision. Graham wrote little. His mind turned to the past. His circle of interests was limited and his association with men was less spontaneous. McGarvey wrote many books. Though he reverenced the past he lived in the present. His circle of interest was wide. He loved especially the social contact with his fellow men. The friendship of these two was intimate and close and death alone brought it to an end.

Professor I. B. Grubbs was younger than the other two and always remained the junior member of the faculty. He was a native of Kentucky and like the other two obtained his education at Bethany. He preached in Paducah, Eminence and Louisville. He taught in Flemingsburg College. In 1873 he became, along with Samuel Kelly, editor of the *Apostolic Times* which position he gave up in 1877 to become a member of the faculty of The College of the Bible. It was his quality of mind which commended him for consideration. His specialty was exegesis of the Pauline Epistles. He loved the more abstruse, theological phases of the Apostle's thinking. His interest was in Paul, the theologian. Of the Apostle, as the great mystic, the great moralist, or even the great practical organizing genius, the missionary, he had little concern. It is doubtful whether these phases of the Apostle's life were acutely present to his mind. But for Paul's doctrines, especially that of Justification by Faith and the relation of the Law to the Gospel, he had the greatest enthusiasm. His voice was high-pitched. In moments of excitement it became almost a falsetto. There were times when his shrill tones could be heard out on the campus. At such a time some-

one was apt to remark, "Professor Grubbs must be lecturing on the seventh chapter of Romans."

His interests were not numerous and he was not widely read. In fact he depreciated wide reading. In his old age he would occasionally warn the other members of the faculty against reading too much. On one such occasion Professor Jefferson replied to him, "Professor Grubbs, if you knew the number of things of which I am ignorant you would not give me such advice." As a result of not continuing to read, his thinking and his classroom methods became somewhat stereotyped. He did not write easily. He expressed himself in complicated, philosophical phrases. His methods of exegesis were inclined to be mechanical. He had a number of rules, some of remarkable insight, that he applied to the interpretation of Paul. These tended to make the Apostle a logical process and to obscure his spontaneity and life.

Professor Grubbs was dearly beloved by the students. M. D. Clubb says that in his day the students revered Graham, admired McGarvey, but loved Grubbs. They loved him for the simplicity of his soul, the purity of his life and for his enthusiasm. He introduced them to the riches of Paul's thought. In addition to his course in exegesis, he taught Church History, Acts in the Sacred History course, and occasionally other subjects. Professor Grubbs aged early. A number of maladies sapped his vitality. His frailty became so great that students would take his courses early for fear he would not live another year. They were doing this twenty years before he retired. He was a man of beautiful and saintly character, often unworldly as is not unusual with saints. He loved the College and he was devoted to his colleague, Professor McGarvey.

In 1904 Professor Grubbs was in the hospital with what was feared might be a fatal illness. He said to Professor McGarvey, "The highest honor that I have enjoyed on earth is that of being a servant of Jesus Christ, and the next is that of being associated so many years with Robert Graham and J. W. McGarvey." Professor McGarvey responded, "One of the highest honors that I have enjoyed is my intimate association with Robert Milligan, Robert Graham and I. B. Grubbs."

McGarvey was a lover of music; he was a good singer; he understood adequately the principles of music; he was a flutist in his youth and continued to play this instrument till advanced in years; members of his family became skillful musicians and studied music abroad; yet he believed that the use of instrumental music in the worship of God was wrong because contrary to the divine will.

At times, this paradoxical, believe-it-or-not attitude, has been carried to even greater lengths. Here in Texas, there is a preacher who on Sunday morning disapproves of the use of pianos, but who spends the time from Monday till Saturday tuning and selling them. A group from the faculty, one Sunday afternoon visited Thorp Springs where Texas Christian University had its origin. The buildings there had passed into the hands of another people but were still used for college purposes. In the morning, worship had been conducted in the chapel. The table had been spread for the Lord's Supper, and the linen and emblems had not been removed. A piano that was used for musical instruction during the week was kept silent at eleven o'clock under the assumption that its use would have been sinful. At three o'clock, the time of the visit, a number of students were gathered about the piano singing hymns to its accompaniment. That was not thought to be wrong. These points of view are based upon a belief in the contrast between the sacred and the secular which is so rigid and so sharply drawn that it is difficult to adjust it to reality or to a reasonable concep-

tion of God. Can something be distasteful to Him at eleven o'clock, but the identically same thing be pleasing to Him at three?

The attitude of people towards the use of musical instruments in worship, like that towards a number of other articles, follows a somewhat fixed social pattern. At first they are regarded as luxuries and on this ground are condemned. Later more weighty reasons for condemning them must be sought, but in spite of these they are extensively used and in time they become so prevalent that they are accepted as a matter of course and become virtually a necessity. Through a cycle somewhat like this the question of the use of musical instruments in worship has passed.

In the early days organs and pianos were used scarcely at all. Life was too simple and poverty was too pressing for them to be possessed. After a time one and then another began to appear, first in homes and then in the churches. At this stage they were condemned on the ground that they were luxuries. Their position is analogous to the houses of hewn stones, the ivory couches and the silken cushions in the days of Amos. Such things are not wrong in and of themselves, but they are wrong when they are objects of luxury and are obtained by defrauding the poor. Peter Cartwright, the early Methodist preacher, condemned musical instruments in the homes and churches, but purely on the ground that they were departures from the simple life with which he was acquainted. He disapproved of them in the same tone and for the same reason that he denounced ruffled shirts on men and jewelry on women. McGarvey looked back to that departing day when he began a discussion of "In-

strumental Music in Churches" with the sentence, "In the early years of the present Reformation, there was entire unanimity in the rejection of instrumental music from our public worship."[46]

Improved economic conditions made it possible to place musical instruments in many homes and their introduction into churches was increasing. Hence it was no longer effective to denounce them as luxuries. A more potent objection had to be found. The argument was advanced that they were condemned by the Scriptures because they are contrary to the will of God.

After a time this argument with the great majority of men and women lost its force. Musical instruments had become common and were no longer luxuries. They were in practically all homes. Seldom did one hear singing unaccompanied. Singing in the churches without instruments was apt to become painful. In the face of a reality like this the argument ceased to be effective. An agitation for an organ was started; there was some opposition but in one way or another it was silenced, and the instrument was introduced. Once in, it was almost never removed.

One of the country churches for which McGarvey preached was the Bethlehem church of Clark County. From first to last his ministry to it covered a period of nineteen years and ended about the turn of the century. In 1906, he himself arranged for a new minister for this church to begin with them in the autumn of that year. The church was then agitated over the organ question and the discussion had passed through all of the various stages mentioned above. After becoming acquainted with the situation the new preacher requested the officers to decide the

matter. Reluctantly they did and their actual vote was unanimously to install an organ in the church. They were familiar with McGarvey's attitude but were no longer convinced by his arguments. They had pianos in their homes and did not find themselves able to make the nice distinctions as to when a musical instrument might or might not be used. This vote settled the controversy so far as the Bethlehem church was concerned except on the occasional Sundays when McGarvey came to visit them. Then the organ was closed and, out of deference to him, remained silent.

An article by McGarvey opposing the use of musical instruments in worship appeared in the *Millennial Harbinger* of November, 1864. This was during the third year of his residence in Lexington. He described the situation in a fairly detailed way. In the early years instruments were not used in the public worship. Occasionally there had been attempts to introduce them into some churches, but a large portion of the congregations were opposed to them and they were kept out to prevent factions. In recent times there were congregations that unanimously favored the organ and, on the theory that each church was independent to determine its own policy, musical instruments were being used in the worship of such churches. McGarvey wrote to contest the correctness of such a policy.

It is clear from this description of the situation that it is just at the time when musical instruments were ceasing to be regarded as luxuries and it was necessary to find a weightier ground for opposing them. No article against their use in worship appears in the *Christian Baptist* or the *Millennial Harbinger* prior to 1864, though there are occasional thrusts against them. For example: Alex-

ander Campbell in referring to them, speaks of instrumental devotions and of worship by proxy.[47] He is also reported to have said that an organ in a church is as inappropriate as a cow bell would be in an orchestra.

Moses E. Lard, in a brief article, bracketed together dancing and the use of organs and denounced both.[48] No one had previously attempted to formulate a statement defining the wrong that lies in the use of musical instruments. It was McGarvey who then made this opening statement but it was followed by many others. As in so many other cases McGarvey assumed the lead.

McGarvey's argument is that the use of musical instruments in worship is contrary to the teaching of the New Testament. They were used in Old Testament times as a part of the divinely-constituted worship, but are prohibited in Christian worship. They are also to be used by saints and angels in the praise of heaven. McGarvey concedes both of these points but the last with a slight misgiving. This is one time when he would prefer to interpret the language of Scripture symbolically, not literally. He says, "If the inhabitants of heaven do literally use harps of gold, which may well be doubted. . . ." His reason why they are permitted in heaven but denied in the church he derived from the analogy of childhood and maturity. "Children must be denied privileges which older persons may enjoy with impunity." The analogy breaks down, however, when applied to Israel and Christianity. The children enjoyed what the adults are denied.

McGarvey and his generation seem to have had an implicit faith in the impeccability of their logical processes. He offered his argument as an object for logical dissection. If it has errors, he would like to have them pointed

out. At the same time, he is fairly confident that no error in it can be discovered. In this confidence he builds his argument. It is a matchless piece of reasoning. Honesty and sincerity mark every stage in it. If one is willing to grant his first assumption, there will be little difficulty in following him step by step to his final conclusion.

What is this primary assumption? Upon what does he build his structure? The answer is the silence of the New Testament concerning musical instruments. It says nothing about their use in the early church. What is the inference which one is to draw from this silence? Any argument based upon silence is precarious. There may be a number of explanations as to what lies back of any silence and no one can tell which is the correct explanation. One conjecture is as plausible as another. If I speak on a certain subject there is something definite upon which to reason as to my attitude. If I maintain silence there may be a dozen conjectures, as to why I have not spoken, but my silence has closed the road to every one of them. It was maintained that the New Testament is silent on the subject of musical instruments. At least half a dozen explanations of this silence may seem possible. It might be that it was silent because nothing was changed and there was nothing to tell. When Jewish singers sang Psalms, they did so to the accompaniment of musical instruments. If any of these singers came into the church and sang a psalm in the Christian worship,[49] it is not at all improbable that he would sing it in the same way that he had in the Jewish service. This would all seem natural and there would be no feeling of need to say anything about it. In this case it would be the silence of acquiescence. But McGarvey's argument requires that this

silence must be mandatory and prohibitive. He consciously built his argument on this assumption. He supposed a peculiar situation. Ordinarily, God reveals His will by speech, but in this case it is by silence, and in McGarvey's hands, the silence is made as explicit and as definite as the speech would have been.

That the argument of McGarvey was based upon the silence of the New Testament was its vulnerable point. This was seized upon by A. S. Hayden who says that this fact makes the argument look suspicious.[50] He named what he thought are three strong points against the argument, but he does this not as a champion of the organ. McGarvey's challenge had been to the brethren who had adopted or advocated instrumental music in the church but Hayden said that he was not an advocate of such a practice and the editor of the *Harbinger* confirmed the correctness of this statement. His belief and practice agreed with that of McGarvey. His attack was prompted solely by the belief that there is a logical weakness in McGarvey's argument from silence.

McGarvey adroitly and skillfully parried the points of his critic,[51] but he could not remove the fact that his argument is all founded upon silence. He did not make the attempt. He cast his argument in the form of a syllogism and the minor premise is, "The use of instrumental music is an element of Jewish worship which was thus discontinued." How does he know it was discontinued? Only through the silence of the New Testament and thus his elaborate argument has not succeeded in protecting this vulnerable point. It remained an argument based upon a doubtful interpretation and as Hayden says this fact makes its value suspicious.

The discussion between McGarvey and Hayden trailed on and, as is usual in such cases, produced no effect upon the disputants except to confirm each in his opinion. It did, however, reveal the position and spirit of each. McGarvey could scarcely understand Hayden's position. He rejected McGarvey's argument and yet he did not approve of a musical instrument in the church! McGarvey said, "I know not whether to understand you as in *favor* of its use, or *opposed* to it." Hayden replied that he might pass this by unnoticed, but he is afraid of what McGarvey might do with his *silence!*

In an article, which Hayden said would be his last,[52] he discussed the motive which has prompted him to write. He opposed the use of musical instruments in the churches on prudential grounds and not because he believed they were divinely prohibited. Yet, he saw a danger in the conclusions which would be drawn from McGarvey's argument. It would be necessary "to condemn, reject and eject" every church and every member who uses musical instruments in the churches, for, according to McGarvey's argument, their use is a flagrant sin. The inevitable result of such a course would be "alienation, bitterness, strife, ill will, dissension and schism." To him it seemed self-evident that no divine legislation was ever made touching this subject. Its regulation, therefore, must be left to the good sense of the brethren directed by kindness and brotherly love. He therefore pleaded for tolerance and the liberty of all churches to decide this question without outside interference.

This was a prophetic note which Hayden sounded. Had McGarvey and some others seen it as he did, how much of bitterness and strife would have been spared the churches!

How different might the later history have been! But McGarvey did not see it Hayden's way. He did not shirk the responsibility that resulted from his argument.

"Why should you shrink from these consequences? If 'alienation, bitterness, strife,' are to result . . . are we for this reason, to let that (condemned) practice go unrebuked?"[53] It is always a weighty question which is the more important, men or the Sabbath? Human well-being or the temple? Law or the interest of man? Shall we stand most firmly for what we believe to be a divine regulation of religion and life, or for that which pertains to peace among men? It is not easy to give answer when concrete cases arise. To one group the answer clearly should favor divine regulation: to a second, man's interest. McGarvey was never one to hesitate long over such an alternate. He regarded all divine regulation as in the nature of law, and its authority is not to be spurned. God should be obeyed no matter what may be the consequences to man. In this spirit he approached the decision of the organ question. Though his reasons were based on nothing more than New Testament silence, yet he was convinced that the use of musical instruments in the church was prohibited by divine law as rigidly and as completely as taking human life was condemned by the sixth commandment. He could not, therefore, hesitate nor doubt as to man's duty. He never saw high worth in man in contrast to divine regulations. No one but Jesus could ever have convinced him that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath.

Three years later[54] Hayden published an article on "Expediency and Progress." One of his points is that expediency must be used in adapting ourselves to the

social conditions of the age in which we live. Under this he cites some instances of people going to unreasonable extremes in their attitude towards music both vocal and instrumental. McGarvey construed this as a challenge to his position and rushed to its defence. His attitude is now less flexible; he is no longer putting up his argument for calm and thoughtful analysis; his tone and language are more vigorous; of the rightness of his cause he entertains no doubt. The use of musical instruments in the churches is an innovation of the Mother of Harlots. Those who favor their use will no longer listen to arguments. In the New York church the use of the organ is attended by its usual accompaniments, pew renting, dancing and theater going. Many churches are permitting the use of cabinet organs in their Sunday schools and are winking at social vices. If it is wrong to use the organ in the church it is wrong to train the children to use it in the Sunday school. He no longer maintains the semblance of a calm debate to determine the truth. He is now the champion of a cause and will maintain it to the last extreme. Hayden and his party should yield. They are introducing an innovation and cannot feel in conscience bound to maintain it. Therefore the obligation to yield rests upon them and not upon him and his party. We have a conscience on the matter, he says; they cannot, since their ground is expediency only.

Hayden replied with considerable spirit.[55] "I do not know myself," he says, "in the coat Bro. McGarvey puts upon me." He protested McGarvey's language, "Bro. Hayden and all conscientious men who stand with him for the use of organs." In other ways he claims that McGarvey has misinterpreted and misrepresented him.

Once more Hayden states his position. He objects to exalting the organ question into a place where it will seem to be a major element of the Christian faith. Assigning it to such a place inevitably brings dissension and division within the churches. He sought the unity and peace of the church.

At this point, the debate between Hayden and McGarvey ended. Others carried on the discussion with reference to different points, for Hayden's article had raised a storm of protests. All legalistically minded persons felt called upon to defend their position. The discussion became so heated that the editor had to ask that it become more temperate. But McGarvey and Hayden were through.

It is evident that McGarvey felt that the drift within the churches was away from his position. In his earlier articles he had apparently hoped for a full and final settlement of the question and a church united. This was still his hope in 1865 for he knew some churches that had abandoned the use of the organ and he expected that others would. A church in St. Louis had submitted its organ controversy to a group of brethren among whom were Robert Graham and Isaac Errett. The organ was silenced and the dissenting members were restored. But this earnest yearning on McGarvey's part was not to be realized. The subject was warmly debated. Men were taking sides violently. W. K. Pendleton exhorted,[56] "We notice a growing heat under the discussion of this subject—but let us keep cool." We fear the brethren did not keep cool. Here and there in the literature of that day are references to discussions, to the attitudes of men and to decisions of churches with reference to musical instruments in worship. The tendency was not at all what

McGarvey had hoped that it would be. Our earlier study has led us not to expect this. It is no matter of surprise that the number of churches introducing the use of musical instruments was constantly increasing. Even in Kentucky, in spite of the aggressive leadership of such men as McGarvey, Grubbs, and Lard, organs are beginning to appear in the churches. McGarvey wrote, "I could once boast that there was not an organ or melodeon in a single Christian Church in Kentucky"[57] but the churches of Louisville and Covington had robbed him of that boast. Many Sunday schools were using them even when they were not employed in the worship services of the churches.

That McGarvey was disappointed in the outcome of his controversy not only seems probable, but it is seemingly confirmed by his tone and actions later. The great care and skill with which he constructed his argument indicates that he had hoped to carry the churches with him. But the movement of the church was contrary to what he had expected. Even those who were his friends and who in other matters accepted his leadership did not follow him in this. It must have been apparent to him that only a remnant would continue to oppose the use of musical instruments in worship. If he or anyone else had stopped to analyze the figures, he would have discovered that the changes were almost always from opposition to approval; rarely were they in the other direction. He could scarcely have remained ignorant that the drift was in that direction. The churches about him—even the Main Street Church of Lexington[58]— one by one dropped away and adopted the use of the organs in their worship. He faced the alternative that Hayden had placed before him and that he had then so confidently spurned. The

choice was between a softening of his antagonism to the organ or a division within the church. He had chosen the course that would result in division. Was he content with this choice?

McGarvey could not recant and retrace his steps. Some positions one can revise, but his on the organ must be maintained or abandoned entirely. There was no middle ground to which he could retire. M. D. Clubb reports Robert Graham as saying in his old age, after he had retired from the faculty, "The greatest mistake John McGarvey ever made was his opposition to the use of musical instruments in the worship of the church." It is not probable that McGarvey shared in this feeling. His intellectual integrity demanded that he hold steadfast to his original view. But should he push his demand as insistently as he had in the beginning? Was he willing to make the question of the use of the organ a major issue and so divide the church? Was the exclusion of the organ from the worship a main factor in the primitive Christianity for which the Disciples were contending? Seldom are the great issues of life put in such explicit and clear-cut terms as these. It is not probable that such clearly contrasted alternatives presented themselves to the mind of McGarvey. In actual life the lines are apt to be blurred and somewhat indistinct. Yet, there is no doubt but that this alternative as a practical issue faced him and demanded a choice. If he pushed his opposition to musical instruments to the point he once did, that is to regard their use as a flagrant sin, there can be no place where he can stop short of a complete division of the church. This would undo much of the work which he and the fathers had done. There is evidence that

McGarvey was not willing to push his opposition that far, though he never recanted his earlier position nor materially modified it.

This, then, was his practical solution of the dilemma before him. He retained his original position practically unchanged. But after the early years had passed he did not seek opportunity to state it. He would have been willing to let it lapse, had this been possible, but it was not, and whenever he did speak, it was to restate his opposition with no appreciable changing of what he had said in the first place. When he found that it was necessary to speak, he was largely content to state his position and not to press it to the point where it would become a barrier or a cause of division between him and his brethren. This much is a certainty: McGarvey never allowed his position on the organ question to become a cause of division within the church. His soul recoiled from such a step. Yet, he stood so firmly by his original position that he was willing and actually did bring upon himself discomfort, alienation from friends, and practical isolation, yet he was not willing to impose this upon others.

In the late seventies or early eighties he conducted a debate on this subject in the *Apostolic Times* with J. B. Briney. It has not been possible to discover a file of the paper that contains this discussion, and so to make a comparison between his view at this time and that of earlier days. In 1886 there was a discussion between him and A. I. Hobbs on the subject.[59] It turns on the right of each church to decide the matter for itself. McGarvey concedes that each church has the right, but Christian charity would prompt it to consider the sentiments of a minority, even of one person. This would virtually be the rule by a minority and Christian judgment has seldom,

perhaps never, conceded this. McGarvey never made the use of the organ a theme of instruction in his college classes, though Professor Grubbs occasionally did. All of the students knew McGarvey's position, and the use of the organ in worship was occasionally the theme of debate in the sessions of the literary societies, but McGarvey said little or nothing on the subject. It was not easy to possess oneself of articles that he had written on the controversy. They were not circulated. During the nineteen years of his department in the *Christian Standard* the subject was seldom mentioned and perhaps never of his own volition. Occasionally someone with whom he was engaged in controversy would twit him with his opposition to musical instruments. Then he spoke out. He offered no apology for his position. He made it clear that he had not changed from his earlier view, but he never lingered long upon the subject. He never stated his argument in full.

McGarvey never made silence of the organ a condition of his participating in any service. Fifty years before when this same controversy had raged in the Presbyterian church, Dr. R. T. Breckinridge refused to preach in a Presbyterian church that used musical instruments unless it was silenced while he was officiating. McGarvey would speak or worship in any church or assembly where a musical instrument was used, but if conditions made it possible, he preferred the singing be without the instrument. The president of our United Society, Robert M. Hopkins, tells this story: His father, Alexander C. Hopkins, was leading the singing at a Kentucky state convention. It was an evening session and McGarvey was on the program to speak. The organ was being used.

McGarvey came in and took his seat on the platform behind Hopkins. As a hymn ended, McGarvey said to Hopkins, "Alec, stop that thing," and that "thing" was stopped! Hopkins held McGarvey in high esteem and the latter's wish was law. Probably in most assemblies of the church in Kentucky the organ would have been silenced temporarily out of respect to McGarvey but his argument did not restrain them from installing organs in their churches.

It has frequently been asked whether McGarvey did not come to the point of regretting that he had taken so positive a stand with reference to the organ. There is a persistent rumor that he expressed to someone this regret. This rumor has never been run to earth and there is no evidence that he felt such a regret. It is not probable that he did. The evidence is all against it. We have probably gone as far as the facts warrant us in saying that he was not disposed to push the matter to the point of dividing the church.

It seems certain that in his later life the question of the use or non-use of the organ occupied but a minor place in his thinking. If the question had never been raised from without, it is not probable that he would have raised it himself. He always maintained such an attitude as would make it clear that he thought that one who used the organ was a Christian quite as much as one who did not. In a faculty meeting of the College of the Bible sometime in the spring, probably of the year 1909, he presented an application from a woman of one of the Southern states for a scholarship in the College for the next session. Since the woman was approaching forty the faculty was disposed to reject the petition. Mc-

Garvey pleaded her cause. She was, he said, an organizer of the Christian Woman's Board of Missions. Often she visited communities where no leadership had been developed and she had to read the Scriptures, pray and lead the singing. There were two equipments that she sorely needed, and she wished to come to The College of the Bible to acquire these. They were, a better knowledge of the Bible and greater facility in *playing the organ.* The incident shows the inner state of McGarvey's mind. In his usual thinking he accepted without question that her playing the organ for worship was not incompatible with her Christian life.

It was a near tragedy that constituted the closing chapter in McGarvey's connection with the organ question. For a dozen years he had been the minister of the Broadway Church. For twenty years more he had been its best beloved member and its most influential elder. His life was knit closely into the life of the church, but it was inevitable that the question of introducing an organ into its worship should arise. Its development had followed the same cycle as that of the Bethlehem church, mentioned earlier in this chapter. The question did not arise suddenly. Some years before it became an issue, it was discussed and a compromise was agreed to: a leader of the music was employed, who organized and trained a chorus. The improved music, however, did not satisfy. It but fed the desire for an organ. In 1902, it became an open issue. Elsewhere the story of that controversy is told and it will not be repeated here.

Does McGarvey's action then attest as correct the explanation which has been offered above? An affirmative seems to be the only possible answer to this question. On

November 2, 1902, the elders of the Broadway Church deemed it wise to submit the question to the vote of the congregation. McGarvey had been consulted on the matter and his letter of withdrawal is dated the very day that the announcement was made that a vote would be taken.[60] He evidently decided to withdraw and leave the church to decide the question as it wished. The discussion in the church occupied some weeks but McGarvey had already withdrawn his membership.

In deference to the wishes of many friends who were urging him to make known his reasons for the action he had taken, he published in the *Lexington Leader*[61] a short article of about one column's length. He restated his old arguments derived from the silence of the New Testament and early Christian literature. Since a choice was left to him it was natural that he should worship where there was no instrument. His final sentence was, "With ill-will towards no human being, and with a most earnest desire for peace in my old age, I leave the subject."

McGarvey was always a copious writer. In early life he wrote for the *Millennial Harbinger*. Even in his Missouri days he also made numerous contributions to the *American Christian Review*. In the middle sixties he wrote at least a dozen thoughtful essays for *Lard's Quarterly*, seven of them appearing within two years. From 1869 to 1875 he was an active editor of the *Apostolic Times* and continued to write for it after he gave up his editorial connection. He was editor of the *Apostolic Guide* during 1887-88. The last nineteen years of his life were given to his department of Biblical Criticism in the *Christian Standard;* at the same time, during many of these years, he aided in preparing notes for the Sunday School lessons, and wrote numerous articles for other papers. His was truly a busy and laborious life. But in addition to producing this periodic literature, he was the writer of many books and this chapter is to tell something of them.

In addition to the books reviewed here, McGarvey wrote a few that were occasional in character. One of these was *A Guide to Bible Study*, 1897.[62] The interesting thing about this little book is that Dr. Herbert L. Willett was the editor. He wrote the Introduction and here and there by means of footnotes added a faint trace of critical lore, as for example, to McGarvey's statement that the first five books of the Bible constitute the Pentateuch he added that the first six constitute the Hexateuch. *Biblical Criticism* was a reprint from the *Christian Standard* of his leading articles on this subject. Two volumes were contemplated, but only one was published.

In the main the order in which his important books are discussed is chronological. A separate chapter has been devoted to his commentary on Acts. Following this comes:

I. Commentary on Matthew and Mark

Perhaps the least satisfactory of McGarvey's major works was his commentary on the first two Gospels. Professor Deweese said, "It has not attained the great favor accorded to his work on Acts, but has been esteemed by many."[63] It was volume one of a projected commentary on the entire New Testament to consist of eleven volumes, when and if it was completed. It is a monument to the spirit and the vision of the Disciples of those early days. They did not hesitate at ambitious plans and were confident that their scholarship was competent for any undertaking. In 1865, in reviewing McGarvey's Acts the editor of *Lard's Quarterly* called the roll of his scholarly brethren and urged each of them to select a book of the New Testament and write a commentary on it as McGarvey had done. This *New Testament Commentary* was planned to be "at once popular, and to employ all the best learning that is now so abundantly accessible in this department of study."[64] Only three of the proposed eleven volumes were finished. They were McGarvey's volume on Matthew and Mark, published in 1875, Lamar's Luke, 1877, and Milligan's Hebrews, 1875.

Of his own volume, McGarvey said expressly, "The commentary is intended primarily for the people, and only secondarily for scholars."[65] He discarded the divisions into chapters and verses except as a means of citing references and in their place substituted divisions into parts, sections and paragraphs. His students will recog-

nize in this a feature of his instruction in Sacred History. Concerning the authorship, date, purpose and characteristics of the Gospels he depended almost entirely upon the statements of Fathers of the early centuries. He drew practically nothing from the internal evidence of the Gospels themselves. This is diametrically the opposite to the tendency of the scholarship of today. It was beginning then and still is devoting itself intensely to a study of the internal rather than the external evidence concerning the Gospels with the result that many of the positions of these early centuries have been materially altered. Hence when McGarvey's views as to dates, authorship and characteristics differ from those of more recent writers, the differences are to be explained by the fact that he gives the traditional positions derived from the Fathers and they deduce theirs from internal evidence.

McGarvey was not in a position to write of Jesus in such a way as to meet the standards of the present day Prior to the nineteenth century the interest in Jesus had been almost entirely theological and scarcely at all historical. The historic Jesus was of little significance; the Christ who died and made atonement for mankind was all important. Luther even goes so far as to say that there is little profit in studying the earthly life and teachings of Jesus. During the latter half of the nineteenth century there was a movement away from this theological Christ towards a new emphasis upon the personality and earthly life of Jesus. McGarvey came between the two and he yielded himself entirely to neither. He regarded the "Back-to-Jesus" movement with suspicion lest it reduce the Apostolic age to a subordinate place. While he believed fully in the atoning death of Jesus he also cher-

ished a sense of the value and importance of the example of Jesus in life and teachings. As on a number of subjects McGarvey had gone part of the way with the spirit of the new age but not far enough to reap the full harvest.

Somewhat related to his commentary on the Gospels was a book, the product of his old age. In collaboration with Philip Y. Pendleton he issued in 1905 his *The Fourfold Gospel.* It was an effort to weave the four Gospels together in such a way as to constitute a single narrative. From the days of Tatian of the middle second century this has been attempted repeatedly but these two collaborators claimed that new features made theirs essentially a unique work. Within parentheses, comments were made on the meaning of certain phrases and statements so that the work was a combined commentary and harmony of the Gospels.

Such a work is necessarily based upon a rigid theory as to the value of the very words of the Gospels. These collaborators boast that they have omitted but five minor words of the four Gospels. This high valuation of every single word is somewhat discredited by the fact that the harmony is based upon the text of the Revised Version in English and not on the original Greek.

Their view was that slightly differing statements in two or more Gospels are not to be considered as differing ways of saying the same thing but each supplies a part of the whole story. For example the language of Jairus to Jesus in Mark, "My little daughter is at the point of death" and in Matthew, "My daughter is even now dead," are not different ways of stating his fear as to his daughter's condition, but must be combined and must mean "My daughter was at the point of death when I left home

and now I fear that she is actually dead.''[66] Thus no Gospel gives us a complete story. Each is the part of a jig-saw puzzle which must be fitted together to have the whole. If this tendency were followed to its logical conclusions, the use of the separate Gospels would be dispensed with because any one gives but a part. Their place would be taken by a harmony. In the Syrian Church for a time Tatian's *Diatessaron* did supplant the individual Gospels, which finally led to the prohibition of its use. About 450 A.D., hundreds of copies of it were confiscated.[67] Goodspeed has said that our age has lost the ability to read and interpret the Gospels separately, and this work would have added to such inability. In his classes McGarvey studied each Gospel separately but he did not interpret them separately. In reviewing Burton's *Introduction to the Gospels* he depreciated the idea that any Gospel had a ''point of view.'' He held that each had only part of the truth but its conception of Jesus was identical with that of the others.

McGarvey's friends may well regret that he had a part in the production of this work, for it contributed nothing to the cause to which he devoted his life. It seems to have exerted, however, no deep or lasting influence and it was and is rarely mentioned.

II. The Lands of the Bible

In common with almost every Bible student McGarvey cherished the longing to visit Bible lands. This wish became a deep yearning after it became a probability that he would devote his life to teaching in the College of the Bible. For a time, however, the difficulties seemed insurmountable. His family was large, there being then seven

living children, and his income could not be stretched to include such an extra expense. But in 1879 a way was opened by which this long cherished dream could become a reality. A group of his former students headed by C. C. Cline of Louisville proposed to advance him a sum of money sufficient to defray the expenses of the trip and to provide a support for his family during his absence. On his return he was to write a book about the lands he visited and they were to be reimbursed from the sale of this book. McGarvey accepted the proposal and made most careful preparations for the journey. He left Lexington on Monday, March 3, 1879, and returned to that city on September 2. Almost exactly six months were consumed by the trip. He then proceeded to write, and the following year published, his *Lands of the Bible.* It sold extensively. In 1893, the sale had reached the seventeenth thousand. It seems probable, therefore, that the generosity of his friends was not wholly without recompense.

In recent times the study of the geography, the topography, the history and the archeology of Palestine has passed through three distinct stages. The first period ended approximately in 1850. It was marked by unscientific methods and imperfect knowledge. Legend and improbable stories played a large part in the information that was imparted concerning the land. The stories told concerning the Dead Sea, the supposed figure of Lot's wife, the city of Jerusalem and other places were fanciful and incredible. In 1838, Dr. Edward Robinson made his first visit to this land and with the publication of his *Biblical Researches in Palestine* in 1856 introduced the second stage of this study. His investigations were followed by the labors of a number of others including

Lynch, Barclay, Thomson and the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund carried on by such competent men as Anderson, Wilson, Warren and Conder. The study of the land during this period was accurate and thoroughly scientific. The information compiled made knowledge of the Bible more living and exact. The investigations of the period, however, were subject to one limitation. They were restricted to surface observation. About the beginning of the Twentieth Century there was introduced the unearthing of buried cities and the investigation became mainly archeological.

McGarvey's study and writings lie entirely within the second period and were restricted as were other works of this time to surface facts. That archeology might at a later time throw additional light upon the subject was scarcely present to his mind. In his enumeration of the benefits of the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund he credits it with giving "an accurate account of the archeology . . . of the country."[68] As a matter of fact the a-b-c's of Palestinian archeology were scarcely known at that time. Later information has led to such a revision, for example, of the opinions held concerning Jerusalem that it has rendered McGarvey's view of the topography of the Holy City obsolete. This is not because of any neglect of facts on his part, but is due to the limitations of knowledge of his age.

McGarvey was always methodical and painstaking in his preparation for any undertaking and those for this trip were no exception. He read all available books on biblical geography and thus stored his mind with all knowable facts. Many travellers expect to acquire their knowledge on the spot. McGarvey knew that this meth-

od was unreliable so he used the better one of learning all that he could in advance. In a blank book he made a list of all the places he proposed to visit, noted under each the facts concerning it which he felt needed to be verified and left a blank space for the enumeration of new discoveries. His information was secured from the books of Robinson, Barclay, Thomson, and from the reports of Lynch, the Palestine Exploration Fund of Great Britain, and the American Palestine Exploration Society. He also made extensive use of the translation of Baedeker's *Handbook for Travellers* in Palestine and Syria. He depended upon it rather than living guides for his information as to details.

His companions on the journey were a cousin, Frank Thomson, from near Lexington and W. B. Taylor of Elizabethtown, Kentucky, a former student of the College of the Bible. In England they were joined by H. S. Earl, an American who had preached in Australia and at that time was located in Southampton, England. They made their way from England to Egypt through France and Italy. March 29 to April 12 was devoted to Egypt. They landed in Palestine at Joppa whence they travelled to Jerusalem. On April 21, they left Jerusalem for Jericho and devoted seventeen days to the region east of the Jordan. The next twelve days were given up to the country south of Jerusalem. On May 26, they left Jerusalem on the trip to the north and on June 13, left Palestine and entered Syria at the White Promontory.

The next day they experienced the one near tragedy of the trip. Two miles from Sidon they paused for a bath in the sea. They were soon beyond their depth and were caught by a strong current off shore. McGarvey was soon

exhausted, sank twice, and lost consciousness. It was only through almost superhuman efforts on the part of the others, especially of H. S. Earl, that he was rescued. This was on Saturday afternoon and they remained in camp till Monday morning when he had gained sufficient strength to resume his journey.

McGarvey was of deep religious nature and a firm believer in God's providential care over the affairs of earth. Before his departure from Kentucky many friends, including members of the Broadway Church, had assured him that his well-being would be the constant subject of their prayers. He had the strongest conviction that his deliverance was an answer to their intercession. It was natural for him to ask, For what purpose? To this question he could find no certain answer, but he called upon family and friends to bear witness that he, in gratitude for his deliverance, pledged to God for all his future life, undivided love and toil to the utmost of his strength. In a very solemn manner he enjoined his children to watch his conduct and after his death to give their testimony whether or not he had kept his vow. Those who knew him intimately can feel assured of no other response than an unqualified assent. He kept the faith.

As was characteristic of him he found both a passage of Scripture and the verse of a hymn to express the sentiments of his soul. The Scripture is:

"We would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life: but we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God who raises the dead: who delivered us from so great a death, and does deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us: you also helping together by prayer for us, that for the gift bestowed upon us by the means of many persons thanks may be given by many on our behalf."[69]

The words of the hymn were:

> "Here at Thy feet I leave my vow,
> And Thy rich grace record;
> Witness, you saints who hear me now,
> If I forsake the Lord."

After departing from Sidon he visited Mount Hermon, Dan, Cesaerea-Philippi, Damascus, Baalbec and on July 7 sailed from Beirut for Asia Minor. His principal interest there was to visit the sites of the seven churches of Asia.[70] Laodicea only was omitted. After this came visits to Constantinople and Athens. He sailed from the latter city on August 1, reckoning from that point that his journeying in the lands of the Bible was over. He contracted fever in Athens which led him by the advice of his physician to forego visiting other places in Greece. The next month was devoted to Italy, France and London. To him the most interesting object in the British Museum, in fact in all London, was the Alexandrian Manuscript of the Greek Bible.

The Lands of the Bible is divided into three parts. Most books on Palestine were devoted to the travel experiences of the tourists. McGarvey did not neglect this, for Part Three of his book is the account of his travels. It is the personal portion of the work. Part One is given up to the geography of Palestine and Part Two to its topography. By the term geography he means more than is usually included in that term. It covers for him not only a general description of the features of the land, but also its climate, soil, vegetation, animal life, its agriculture, the social and home life of its people, the state of religion and education and the different races of people to be found within the country.

A little more than one-third of the book is devoted to a description of the topography of the land. He studies the great centers like Jerusalem, Hebron, Shechem, the Maritime Plain, the Plain of Esdraelon, Galilee and the Trans-Jordanic region and describes them from the point of view of Bible times and then does the same for the smaller centers that were associated with them.

Take for example his treatment of Jerusalem. First, he discusses the original city, its history, its location, its interesting features and its surrounding terrain. He bases his discussion upon the theory that the eastern ridge of the city was Mount Moriah and the western was Mount Zion. This is according to the description of the city given by Josephus. Modern archeology has led to a restudy of the biblical references with the result that scholars of today almost universally hold that the original city was on the eastern ridge only and that this was Mount Zion. As the city grew, the name Zion was extended so that in time it designated the city covering both ridges and then Josephus or his predecessors made the mistake of limiting it to the western ridge alone. McGarvey was aware that such a theory had been advanced but considered that it had been proven false.[71] So far from this being true, it is now generally recognized that it is the only theory that will satisfactorily account for all of the biblical facts. To the general reader of the Bible this may seem to be unimportant, but it calls for a rearrangement of much that McGarvey wrote concerning Jerusalem. Next he describes the hills, valleys, walls, streets and buildings of Jerusalem as they exist at present. This is followed by an extended description of the site of the ancient temple and the chapter is

brought to a close by sections describing the pools and the environs of the city.

To McGarvey the first authority in deciding any question of geography was the Bible itself. When any spot was pointed out to him by his living guide or by some book, as the site of a biblical incident his invariable question was, Do its situation and topography harmonize with the Bible statements? If they did he was apt to decide in favor of the location. But local tradition may have hit upon the place for the very reason that it met the requirements of the biblical statements. Archeology may later find reasons for rejecting the identification and for locating it in another spot that meets the biblical conditions equally well or better. An example of this is the location of Lachish. McGarvey was satisfied with the usual identification about a dozen miles east of Gaza. Recent excavations have made some remarkable discoveries at Tell-ed-Duweir farther south and have proven beyond doubt that this was the site of Lachish. Only archeological examination could correct the error of centuries. In the location of Ai he was more fortunate. Two passages in the Old Testament mention its topography.[72] Guided by these descriptions he selected the spot where he believed Ai was located, and his identification has been confirmed by recent excavations.

McGarvey's common sense and methodical habits are revealed by his careful and precise examination in all details of the spots and objects of Palestine. For years following his visit to the Holy Land tourists to Palestine would bring back the story of some guide who remembered him as the man who measured everything with a rule or a tape line. He gives the dimensions of stones, buildings and ruins. He corrects Baedeker and other

books of description. He brought away from Palestine a mental photograph of its hills, valleys, streams and settlements, their relationship to one another and their union together to form the whole. This became a favorite theme in his teaching in The College of the Bible. The Bible lands were as an open book to him and through this intimate knowledge he was able to make their geography vivid and real to his classes. Frequently through the year he would give illustrated lectures to the students and he always had a good hearing though attendance was voluntary.

He treasured the memory of his trip to the Holy Land and was always delighted to share it with others. A former student told this story. He and McGarvey were attending a convention at which the student was to give an illustrated lecture on the Holy Land. His lantern was of the old-fashioned, gas-tank type. He asked McGarvey to take his place and give the lecture. The very first picture aroused in his mind a number of suggestions which he proceeded to develop. The better part of an hour passed without a call for another picture. At last the operator of the lantern was compelled to send to him a message that *at his end* the gas was about to give out.

The Lands of the Bible was well received. It was commended by those who were sufficiently informed to make their judgments of value. John A. Broadus of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary pronounced it the best one-volume work on the Bible lands in existence. Time has revised and corrected some of its judgments. George Adam Smith's great work on *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* by its matchless style, its fresher knowledge of archeology and its thorough mastery of historical

as well as biblical facts has largely supplanted earlier works on biblical geography, yet McGarvey's work stands out as a worthy contribution within the field and a noble memorial of the labor and pains which he was willing to devote to such a subject.

III. Evidences of Christianity

His book which required the longest period of time for preparation was *Evidences of Christianity*. He needed much time to gather the material and then, due to serious interruptions, further time to cast it into written form. He had projected the work and had commenced to write it before his trip to Palestine. That and the writing of *The Lands of the Bible,* made a postponement necessary. At last he returned to this task and the first volume was printed in 1886 but much of the material of the second volume was destroyed by the fire which consumed his home in 1887 and so this second volume did not appear till 1891.

The work is divided into four parts. The first part discussed the "Integrity of the New Testament Text"; the second part, the "Genuineness"; the third part, the "Credibility"; and the fourth, the "Inspiration," of the New Testament books. Observe the scope of the discussion and then connect it with the title of the work. The *Evidences of Christianity,* and yet a work that dealt with four aspects of the New Testament books! Are the evidences of Christianity to be found exclusively in the New Testament? Are there not other evidences on behalf of the Christian religion than those found there? McGarvey would have answered, "None of any significance." The Christian religion stands or falls with its sacred writings. It is the religion of a book. McGarvey did not hesitate to

avow this and he never allowed to pass unchallenged any one's denial that this was so. To him it was and could be nothing other than the religion of a book. This was the reason that he attached such importance to the Bible and why so much of his time and energy were spent in defending it against hostile criticism. Any question then of the integrity, the historicity or the inerrancy of the New Testament was an impeachment of the Christian religion.

The Christian scholar today does not think of the discussion of the text and canon of the New Testament as lying within the sphere of Apologetics but McGarvey did. When he had occasion to refer to the curriculum of Union Theological Seminary, McGarvey speaks of its course in Apologetics and adds, "In its related course in New Testament Introduction."[73] This point of view colored all that he had to say upon the subject. His whole-hearted devotion to textual criticism has always seemed remarkable in view of his violent reaction against Historical Criticism. The reason for this is apparent. The defence of the Christian religion will always be weak if there is any doubt with respect to the text of the New Testament. His interest was not to trace a remarkable human achievement and to show how there has been preserved a wealth of material so that the original text of the New Testament can be restored with a high degree of confidence. It is not probability which McGarvey desired but certainty. "If we have in the Christian Scriptures," he says, "nothing more than an authentic account, such as wise and good but fallible men could give, we . . . will not reach the result that is desirable. We must find proof that the Scriptures are infallible."[74] He attains assurance "that the text is virtually unaffected." He writes of a demonstration that the text of the New Testament has been so well preserved

that only in one place in a thousand, . . . is there any doubt as to the original reading.[75] Again he says that "all the authority and value possessed by these books when they were first written belong to them still."[76]

Again, McGarvey was not satisfied with a stage in the discussion brought to a successful termination. He wanted finality. The closing words of Part One are, "The materials for criticism which have been collected by the diligence of the noble men whom we have mentioned are now so ample and the number of thoroughly accomplished critics yet engaged in the work so great, that we have every reason to expect a speedy consummation of their hopes in a restoration of the original text which shall approach very nearly to perfection. Then the science of biblical criticism having finished her task, may lay aside the implements of her toil and rest under the benediction, well done!"[77]

But these desired goals of McGarvey—certainty, a perfect text and finality—were not attained. Scholarship of today asserts instead, probability, a text that approximates the original, but no end of the investigation. More scholars are working in the field of textual criticism today than in the year McGarvey wrote and the problems they are trying to solve are becoming more perplexing. They have to a high degree the assurance which McGarvey desired but it is based upon different grounds. It rests upon the wealth of material, the inflexible methods and the perfectability of the science and not upon any assurance of infallibility.

The greatest contribution which Westcott and Hort made to the solution of the problem was their division of the authorities for the text into three great families.

They rejected the testimony of two and relied almost exclusively upon that of the third. McGarvey never refers to this, seemingly because he assumed the correctness of their solution. But this is the very point on which textual critics today question the finality of Westcott and Hort's decision. It is becoming evident that one family of the authorities has greater value than they conceded to it. Just how much is the value that should be attached to this family is a moot question. A few would go so far as to accord it a value superior to the one upon which Westcott and Hort relied. Not yet, and perhaps never, can the textual critics of the New Testament have the assurance that their work is done.

In the second part of his work McGarvey's interest is not in tracing the growth of the New Testament canon but in discovering all possible reasons for attributing each book of the New Testament to its reputed date and to an apostolic author. Without this he did not feel that he would have an infallible New Testament. There is a marked difference between what McGarvey regarded as the meaning of canonical and the meaning which the present age attaches to it. To McGarvey it meant that a book came from the hand of an apostle or an apostolic man; to modern scholarship it is not a matter of authorship at all but the question, Did the church recognize it as belonging to its list of sacred books? Though the word "canon" appears in the title of McGarvey's book, it scarcely is to be found in the body of the text. This is because the word had for him no meaning independent of the authorship and was consequently of minor importance. He wrote, "If Matthew is the author of this narrative (the first Gospel), as we have proved above, its canonicity is necessarily implied in this fact."[78] Hence

McGarvey sought evidence that a book was of apostolic origin. This proved it to be inspired. Canonicity or the belief of the church that it constituted one of the units that made up the New Testament would to his mind add nothing to the value of the book, and so, into that question, McGarvey never enters.

The third part of the work deals with the general credibility of the New Testament historical narratives. He explains that this does not mean for these narratives an infallibly perfect character since that is dealt with in Part Four, but it means rather such a "degree of reliability as belongs to historical works of the better class."[79] His first argument is based on the canons of historical criticism as stated by Rawlinson in the Bampton Lectures of 1859. He has already argued that the books of the New Testament were written either by apostles or by apostolic men. They are, therefore, the work of contemporaries and their testimony possesses the highest degree of probability.

He carries his investigation through eight chapters, covering a little more than a hundred pages, to show agreement on the part of the New Testament books with other writings. He then carries on the process by harmonizing the statements of the Gospels; also those between Acts and other books; and closes this discussion by showing that there are many undesigned coincidences between the Gospels, and between Acts and Paul's epistles. In this section of his treatment McGarvey is combating the positions of the Tübingen school, of Renan, and of Strauss. But no one today accepts the position of these schools of thought. Pfleiderer is sometimes reckoned to be the last of the Tübingen school and he died in 1908.

They were of great historical importance in their day in that they profoundly stimulated thought and investigation but they set on foot the movements that led to their own undoing. To combat such positions today is but to fight men of straw, and it was almost so in McGarvey's day. Because of the shifting of the attitude of religious thinking this portion of his argument is now wholly out of date.

The fourth part of his work treats of the inspiration of the New Testament. He discussed the different theories of inspiration but in turn rejected each. Not that they are untrue but each has some limitation or defect. Adopting a theory of inspiration, he holds, is the wrong way to proceed in studying this subject. One should turn rather to the New Testament and find what it teaches on the subject. This McGarvey did and there is no sounder method of studying this subject. McGarvey presses each passage to the utmost of its language and extracts from it the fulness of what the passage can be construed to yield. From 1 Corinthians 2:13 he concludes that the apostles "were guided or taught by the Holy Spirit, as to the very words which they employed."[80]

In short, McGarvey's explanation of inspiration leaves little room for the individuality of the inspired man to assert itself, though he does say that in respect to style the New Testament writers "do not differ from writers without inspiration," and "The Holy Spirit did not to any perceptible degree change their natural modes of expression."[81] Yet when he draws his conclusions as to what inspiration did for the inspired men, such for example as the statements that their recollection of past events was "precisely such as God willed"; that the Spirit taught "to the full extent needed the words in

which to express" the things revealed; that they were enabled "to speak with consummate wisdom, yet without premeditation"; it is difficult to conceive of their personalities and individual powers as untouched. In his desire to make the inspiration as complete as possible he seemingly makes the subjects of inspiration virtual automatons, though he expressly disavows intention to do so.

This then is a brief summary of the work on the evidences of Christianity. What can be said as to its value for today? In the first place, it is a voice from the past speaking on phases of the topics that are no longer living questions. Perhaps this is felt more deeply concerning this work than any other that McGarvey wrote. In the entire range of the Christian religion, the four topics of the text, canon, credibility and inspiration of the New Testament can be reckoned as second to no other four in significance. The fact is that McGarvey's treatment of them is quite remote from the interest and feeling which our day has for them. It is not merely that his treatment is out of date. No writer can be reproached because fifty years have made his discussion obsolete, but he subordinated all four of them to another question that he deemed more important. He made the discussion of the text and the canon a means to an end rather than regarding them as worthy of treatment for their own merits. The fact that he thought of the discussion of the text as a link in the chain of evidences for Christianity so colored and influenced his discussion that he discussed phases of the subject which bear upon this and passed others by. This all goes back to his primary conception that the Christian religion is a religion of a book and that the evidence on its behalf is inseparable from the infallible character of that book.

This work was the product of much toil on the part of McGarvey. It was furthermore in a very real sense original and pioneer research on his part. It would have been easy for him to have followed the conventional course in his teaching of the Bible and to have left this phase of the subject unconsidered. Few of his friends or his students would have been aware of any neglect on his part. This he did not do. That his theory got in his way and prevented him from writing the book that he might have written is scarcely to be held as a reproach against him. The remarkable fact is that he, a self-trained man, should have mastered this difficult subject so thoroughly and have brought it in a practical way to the attention of his brotherhood. So important did he deem the subject of the text of the New Testament that in the nineties when the national convention was held in Nashville, Tennessee, he made this the subject of his address. The newspapers of the time made his address quite a feature.

IV. The Authorship of Deuternomy

Professor Deweese in his memorial address told that McGarvey believed that his greatest work was done in the field of biblical criticism. When asked what he considered his greatest intellectual achievement McGarvey's answer was, "The mastery of the critical attacks on the truthfulness of the Old Testament."[82] He further said that *The Authorship of Deuteronomy* was "the book that cost me the severest and maturest efforts of a laborious life."[83] He therefore considered it to be his *magnum opus*. This is because of the important place which the book of Deuteronomy held, in his opinion, in the critical scheme of things.

He believed that every major position of Old Testament historical criticism is dependent upon the date and authorship of the Book of Deuteronomy. Disprove the correctness of the date which critics are accustomed to assign to it and, he believed, the entire fabric of the critical position would fall. This was the situation that McGarvey consciously faced in writing on the authorship of this book. The circumstances inspired him to do on this task his best work.

Was Deuteronomy written by Moses? McGarvey so held and this was the fundamental position of those who constituted his party. On the other hand, was it written sometime in the seventh century? Was it the book which Hilkiah the priest found in the temple in the reign of King Josiah?[84] These questions the critics answered in the affirmative. The book then could not have been written by Moses. It was produced several centuries subsequent to his death though it consists of legislation that by a sort of legal fiction was attributed to him. Here then the basic line of difference between the two was drawn, but the differences were many and separated them at every point along the line.

McGarvey believed that the entire Law of the Old Testament was given through Moses; that it was the basis of Israel's religion at all stages of their history; that their idolatry and immorality were lapses from its standard; that the task of the prophets was to call the nation back to obedience to this law. This is the interpretation which had been put upon the Old Testament throughout Christian history. The theory had been formulated before Christ was born. It had the strength and sanction of time in its favor. Its weakness was that

it lacked the element of growth. The religion was as perfectly developed in the beginning as it ever became. It was in accordance with the static philosophy that had ruled the ages. Its adherents did not feel that this was a weakness but the new age so appraises it.

On the other hand, the position of the critics was that Moses was a great, gifted and inspired leader. He organized Israel and changed them from a mob of slaves into a compact, disciplined nation. He gave to them such laws, government and religion as suited their needs and fitted the life they were then living. The agricultural laws, for example, and the regulations concerning the kingdom were not given in the time of Moses but came as social and political conditions demanded them. Changes for the better came, though slowly and painfully. One of the leading factors in bringing about the moral and social improvements in Israel's life was the prophets. In a very real sense they created the highly spiritual religion of Israel. Along with the prophetic development, though slightly later, was the development of law through different stages. It cannot be determined exactly what were the laws given by Moses, but they must have been such as suited the needs of the time. A body of laws found in Exodus 20:22 to 23:33 and called "The Book of the Covenant,"[85] was codified in the early agricultural days of Israel. Some of these laws were ancient and some were recent. In the seventh century these laws were expanded and became our Book of Deuteronomy. This body of laws was found in the temple and brought to public notice in 621 B.C., in the reign of Josiah and became the basis of all subsequent legislation. This development of law continued through at least two later stages and assumed the form which we now find in our Old Testament

a century or more after the Babylonian exile. This in brief is the development as advocated by the critics.

McGarvey had in support of his position the tacit approval of the Old Testament writers, practically all external evidence, and the tradition of Mosaic authorship throughout the centuries of Jewish and Christian history. The critics rested their case upon two main facts gathered from the interpretation of the books of the Bible themselves. First, the book found by Hilkiah was Deuteronomy and no other book. Second, the legislative and religous conditions of Deuteronomy are earlier and in some cases countradictory to those of the other books of the Pentateuch. These were the positions which McGarvey challenged and sought to disprove. His *Authorship of Deuteronomy* was a major assault upon the entire position of the critics. He conceded that the book found by Hilkiah included Deuteronomy, but it must have included the other books of the Pentateuch. He further conceded that most of the reform measures carried out by Josiah were those advocated by Deuteronomy but denied that all were from this source. He also denied that this book represented an earlier and a contradictory stratum of legislation. The evaluation that is put upon his argument then and even now will depend upon the critical attitude of the man who passes judgment. Members of his party hailed it as a masterly argument; those on the other side did not find themselves convinced. Thus the situation stood then and now.

It was recognized generally as a thorough and painstaking survey of the entire field. It was as complete an argument on behalf of the traditional view as might be expected from any source. *The Expository Times* of London said that the critical view could not lay claim to

general acceptance till it had refuted McGarvey's arguments. It then added that most of its readers had already settled this question for themselves and it meant by this adversely to McGarvey.[86]

In 1906 the New England convention of the Disciples was held at the St. James Street Church in Boston. There was present at one of the evening sessions the venerable Dr. Plum, pastor of the Second Congregational Church of Boston, who through the convention committee invited one of the speakers to occupy his pulpit on the following Sunday morning. His presence and his invitation were due to an interest that he had in McGarvey. In introducing the speaker on Sunday morning he mentioned that he was professor-elect of the chair of New Testament in the College of the Bible and then he exhibited a well-thumbed copy of McGarvey's *Deuteronomy* and told the audience that it had been to him a constant source of inspiration and help. To many other conservatives it was a support and a stay.

Each competent reader must be for himself the judge as to the merits and the abiding quality of this major work of McGarvey. There is no doubt but that the drift in scholarship has been away from his position and toward that of the critics. The unfortunate part of the discussion is that the controversy was never brought to a clear issue. It could not be so long as it was confined to the realm of biblical interpretation. The interpretation of each side is very largely conditioned by its primary assumptions. The actual differences between the two are to be found in the rival philosophies with which each approaches the Bible. Reference is made elsewhere to the fact that Professor George Foote Moore of Harvard declined to review McGarvey's *Deuteronomy* because such a

review would yield no good results. The two of them, he said, would need to go back of the arguments of the book and find an agreement on certain fundamental principles. Without this a discussion between them would be beating the air. If one accepts the fixed, static philosophy of the ancient world, he will follow McGarvey. But if he adheres to the fluid, progressive philosophy which postulates change, growth and development he will give his approval to the position of the critics. After all, then the controversy was inconclusive.

V. Jesus and Jonah

In the months of August, September and October, 1895, McGarvey carried on a study of Jonah in his department of Biblical Criticism in the *Christian Standard.* The following year it was issued as a small book bearing the title given above. To this material was added a chapter on "The Three Days and Three Nights" of Matthew 12:40. The occasion that prompted McGarvey to write on this subject was a symposium in the *Biblical World* in which eight prominent men in the religious and educational life of America discussed the question whether the book of Jonah was to be construed as history.

Professor Thayer said it is a religious novel. Professor Ropes said the authority of Jesus is in the sphere of religion and morality; not in that of literature and history. Hence Jesus cannot be quoted as an authority to prove that the story of Jonah is history. The others, among whom were Franklin Johnson, University of Chicago, Wm. DeWitt Hyde of Bowdoin, and Rush Rhees of Newton, though not so explicit, took similar grounds. These were the positions that McGarvey discussed. To his way of thinking the story of Jonah to be of value

must be accepted as authentic history and the story of the fish swallowing Jonah must be accepted as an actual miracle.

McGarvey devotes a third of his book to the question: Is the story of Jonah incredible? His answer is negative. No statement in the Bible could be to McGarvey incredible. The language of Jesus attests the historicity of this story. He emphatically declared that he accepted without question the authority of Jesus on every subject on which he spoke. McGarvey wrote for those who have no difficulties about miracles, and who do not believe the Bible uses fiction as a teaching medium.

VI. McGarvey's Sermons

During the summer of 1893 McGarvey occupied the pulpit of the Broadway Christian Church, Louisville, Kentucky. The Guide Publishing Company of that city had his sermons taken down stenographically and after the correction of mistakes they were printed as reported. To these were added two sermons which, contrary to his usual custom, he had written out with his own hand. The collection consisted of twenty-four sermons and they constituted his one volume of published addresses. He doubted the value of printed sermons. He had made little use of them. Many preachers, however, after their death fade almost from the memory of living men. He offered these sermons as a means by which he might be recalled, when his voice should be heard no more.

He dedicated the volume to his beloved Broadway Church, Lexington, where most of the sermons had previously been preached and where he had spent the most useful years of his life. These sermons then were the selected material from McGarvey's preaching experience

and may be accepted as representative of what he regarded as his best preaching. They are a summary of his gospel.

An examination of the titles will indicate his interests, and what according to his judgment constitutes the essence of the gospel message. Two sermons deal with the punishment to be inflicted upon sin. Twelve treat of the related topics of Redemption, Forgiveness and Conversion. Three discuss God's relationship to human life. Three are concerned with aspects of the church's life. The remaining four deal with such special topics as Inspiration, the Efficacy of Prayer, the River Jordan and the Consequences of Believing a Lie. The list among other things is notable for topics that are absent. There is no sermon on the love of God, the lordship of Jesus, Christian duties, or the social gospel. With the exception of the last, the absence of these topics is not to be taken as a lack of interest in them. He had probably not attempted to cover the full range of the gospel. Yet the list does indicate McGarvey's interest. He was a practical preacher. He was evangelistic in his attitude. Conversion and related topics constituted a large element of the message that he always preached.

The book was successful. It sold largely. From a financial point of view it is said to have been the most remunerative of his books. He is supposed to have told his friends that it was the only one of his books that paid him any considerable sum in royalties.

McGARVEY'S DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN THE *CHRISTIAN STANDARD*

In 1893 McGarvey began a department in the *Christian Standard* of Cincinnati that bore the title, "Biblical Criticism." He had previously, as he tells us, sought the cooperation of a number of conservative scholars of various denominations in founding a magazine devoted to this subject. Most of them expressed sympathy with his purpose but a number feared that it would turn out to be a financial failure and they were apprehensive that such an outcome to the undertaking would do more harm to the cause than good. Hence the enterprise was abandoned. McGarvey then offered his services to the *Christian Standard* to supervise and edit a department devoted to this subject. His offer was accepted and the department was opened on January 7, 1893. At first it was announced that two or three columns would be used each week but later it was enlarged to a full page, and at times occupied even more space.

With a few minor exceptions his contributions appeared with great regularity. It was at times temporarily suspended, once on account of illness, again during a trip to the West when he substituted articles on his travels, and occasionally for other reasons, but with these exceptions his writings for this department continued for a period lacking but a few weeks of nineteen years.

Biblical criticism as it is generally understood is a technical subject and is a theme for scholars and those specially interested. It does not ordinarily seek expression in a popular religious weekly and, as such a department would usually be conducted, would not be attractive to the typical

layman and untrained reader. It would be filled with technical terms and strange names that would repel such a person. Furthermore the average reader, even many preachers, would find its discussions dry and unhelpful. Many of its questions would seem to them to be unimportant. What does it matter whether a certain book of the Bible was written in the fifth or the third century before Christ? Whether this same book was written by a certain man known to us by name or by someone unknown? Of course, a skilful advocate can build up a case and make it appear that much will be lost by departing from the usually accepted position. Without such a build-up, however, the average man can live in a world of critical controversy and be untouched by it.

For these and other obvious reasons such a department as that conducted by McGarvey would not usually be popular. An editor would, under ordinary circumstances and with the usual type of scholar conducting it, hesitate to introduce it. But McGarvey's department in the *Standard* was not a journalistic mistake. It succeeded. Tested by all of the usual criteria for success McGarvey's achievement was remarkable. It continued for a long time with undiminished popularity. It was often mentioned by other journals, and articles from it were frequently copied. It had a wide circle of readers. Many subscribers to the *Standard* turned first of all to this page. It was the subject of frequent comment both in praise and in condemnation. It made thousands of average church members at least conscious of a subject concerning which they might otherwise have been wholly unaware. How did McGarvey succeed in turning this potential failure into so conspicuous a success?

He wrote for the people and not for the scholar. He not only wrote for the average mind but succeeded thoroughly in attracting its attention. This fact influenced profoundly what McGarvey had to say. He brought his arguments down to the level of the general mind, but not in such a way as to leave it with a sense of inferiority. It was assured that it was competent to render a decision on the questions at issue. He did not limit himself to the actual questions of biblical criticism but his page became a medium for the discussion of all questions in which people were interested. Finally McGarvey could and did bring to the discussion certain personal elements that greatly enhanced the popularity of his page. He spoke with authority. His readers came to his department with the conviction that important questions would be settled for them definitely and finally. They were not left in a state of suspense. Those who advocated critical views at variance with the ones held by McGarvey were treated by him in such a way as to discredit them and to envelop their views in an atmosphere of suspicion. These were some of the factors that caused McGarvey's page to be widely read and its decisions to be accepted by many. Some of these points need to be somewhat amplified.

First, he wrote for the generality of men and not for the scholar. In his opening announcement he avows an intention to do this. "It may appear strange to many," he says, "that such a department should be opened in a weekly religious journal, which goes freely into the family circles of the people . . . . but the questions to be discussed are obtruding themselves into all circles of thinking people, and it is wiser that they shall reach the people through the friends of the Bible than through its foes."[87]

McGarvey succeeded in accomplishing what he here avows was his purpose. He wrote for the people and the people read what he wrote. There are facts which attest the truth of this statement.

The nature of his audience influenced profoundly the character of what McGarvey wrote. Some people, he says, will deem his attempt injudicious and he concedes that this would be true of certain phases of the controversy. He will devote his attention to other phases of the subject, such as will require nothing more than good common sense and the learning which is within the reach of those of modest attainments. "It is by the discussions," he says, "which lie within this range of thought that all the issues raised are to be ultimately settled in the public mind."[88] In short he was not seeking to convince scholars but to prepare the minds of the untrained people so that scholars could not unfavorably influence them. The ultimate decision would lie with the people and not with the scholars. This should be carefully noted for it indicates the understanding which McGarvey had of the subject.

It still remains a fact, however, that biblical criticism is a technical subject and an adequate treatment of it requires the discussion of technical questions. Both writer and reader must, of necessity, have a knowledge of the intricate and technical angles of the question and must possess sufficient training to follow through the complicated phases of the discussion. But McGarvey's readers did not possess this training and he avowedly brought the discussion down to their level. He made the subject easy by leaving the hard parts out.

He closed his eyes to, and thus ignored, many essential elements of the principles of biblical criticism. There can

be no criticism of him for bringing his discussion to the level of his readers, but he never said to them, "There are some phases of this subject which lie beyond your present knowledge and in which you are consequently not interested." Instead he constantly sought to create the impression that they, the people, were the ultimate judges of the question and that they were competent to render a final decision. He frequently flattered his readers by assuring them that there was no question but what they were competent to answer and no decision to render but what would be made by them. Here was a reason then why this page was popular. It gave the average man the comforting assurance that he was inferior to no one on earth. McGarvey believed that the honesty, integrity, and clearness of insight of such a one were unspoiled by contact with corrupting influences, and he accepted implicitly the moral and intellectual integrity of the generality of people.

Another reason why his page was popular was that he did not limit himself to critical questions. His department became a forum for the discussion of every conceivable sort of moral and religious theme. In his opening article he defined biblical criticism very exactly as including within "its scope all inquiries in regard to the original text of the books which make up the Bible, their authors, the dates of their composition, their historical reliability and their literary characteristics."[89] He further pointed out that it includes textual criticism which determines the original text; historical criticism which has to do with questions of credibility, authorship and dates; and finally literary criticism which is concerned with matters of style and diction.

If he had adhered strictly to this definition, he would have excluded from his discussions all questions of interpretation and the meaning of certain passages. He had no intention, however, of imposing such a limitation upon himself. In another place he says that the range of discussion will extend to all questions of biblical criticism and in his enumeration of the different varieties in this passage includes exegetical criticism, probably coining the phrase in order to increase the range of subjects that he will discuss. At first he confined himself fairly closely to biblical questions but as the years passed he introduced other topics, some of them not related at all to biblical criticism, until at last his page became McGarvey's forum for the discussion of any topic that he or his readers might fancy. He received many letters asking him about the meaning of certain passages of the Bible, about questions of doctrine and the practices of the church and even about current topics.

Anyone who conducts a query department in any religious paper must expect many times to be called upon to define the unpardonable sin, to explain the riddle of Cain's wife, and to state the sense in which the bishop must be the husband of one wife. McGarvey had all of these and similar questions to answer. On one occasion he says that he received, on an average, one letter each week asking about the remarriage of divorced persons. One question that came to him frequently was concerning the meaning of Paul's statement that women were to keep silent in the churches. His readers came to expect that sooner or later any topic in which they were interested would be elucidated, and if any one of them grew tired of waiting he could hurry matters up by writing a letter.

Another factor that contributed to the satisfaction which people found in McGarvey's department was the authoritative tone in which he wrote. He was a man of great natural humility and modesty but these were laid aside when he wrote his column for the *Standard*. There was, of course, no boasting and no pedantry, but always a quiet assumption that the question under discussion would be settled at last and would be settled right. He wrote with authority and this pleased the people. They prefer always to have questions settled definitely and positively. McGarvey gratified this desire.

This assumption on his part of the authority and the knowledge to settle all questions is indicated in a number of ways. For example, someone made the request to McGarvey, "Will you kindly give . . . . what you understand to be the general belief of the Christian church on the nature of Christ and his relation to the Father?" "I prefer," he answered, "in all such matters, to tell what the general belief of the Christian church *ought* to be, rather than what it is. It ought to be what the Scriptures teach, and I aim to give this."[90] Here is his position pointedly stated. He believed that the one source of authority and knowledge is the Bible, and he discredited all other sources.

Another way in which McGarvey shows this authoritative spirit is in his attitude towards prominent men. It fell to his lot to criticise men who were college presidents, professors and editors. Usually in a case like this a distinction is made between a man and his teaching. One may disapprove of a man's teaching and yet hold him personally in high regard. McGarvey made no such distinction. "A man's personality, and his teaching," he

said, "are so identified that it is next to an impossibility to keep them separate in thought."[91] Consequently when he condemned a man's teaching he not infrequently spoke of the man himself in a sharp, sarcastic, accusing manner. His readers were given to understand that these men were either misled, made the dupes of designing critics; or were themselves deceivers, purposely contributing to the overthrow of the Christian faith. Against both he stood as the champion of the truth of God. He might hold them personally in high esteem but as long as they held the position that they did they are enemies of the gospel. Their error was more than a mistake in judgment. To him the truth concerning God's revelation in the Bible was so clear and unmistakable that for anyone to reject it, especially if he were well read in the Bible, could arise from nothing less than moral perversity.

There was a succession of these leaders with whom McGarvey had controversies. On one occasion he named them in the order seemingly of their chronological appearance as the objects of his criticism. They were Professor Briggs, President Harper, Lyman Abbott and Washington Gladden. He writes in a similar tone of each of them. Take for example his statements about President Harper. "Has he," he asks, "forgotten to be candid?" He believed that President Harper had acquired his views from men who are enemies of the cross of Christ and who had adopted theories for the express purpose of overthrowing the Christian faith.[92] "President Harper is either a back number in his study of criticism, or his recent article was intended for a coating of whitewash."[93] He calls him, "This famous professor." "Wellhausen is not a trimmer like President Harper."[94] "He blows hot and cold with the same

breath.'"[95] These are but a few of the terms of reproach and censure that he hurls at him. He certainly leaves the President without much character or even respectability. He speaks of the others similarly.

This method of handling the motives and the characters of those he criticized was at the same time both McGarvey's advantage and his weakness. It gave satisfaction to his readers. There was nothing subtle about it. It was the rough and tumble sort of warfare that they could understand and appreciate yet it gave offense to the associates and admirers of those he held up to ridicule and it caused grief to his own friends. The most mystifying fact about it all was that it did not represent the McGarvey that they knew. One of the most frequently heard comments on his department was in substance that it was surpassingly strange that a man of such kindly heart should, whenever he began to write, dip his pen in gall and vitriol.

He was not ignorant of this feeling of his friends but he preferred to pursue his own course. On one occasion the faculty of The College of the Bible attempted to induce him to change his manner of writing. The faculty consisted at that time of Messrs. Deweese, Jefferson, Calhoun, W. F. Smith and Morro. They were agreed in their desire that he should change his tone and this was clearly stated to him. He was deeply moved but gave them clearly to understand that his decision was to continue without change.

Later Professor Deweese tells that in a private conversation he suggested that in exposing errors all names should be omitted, for, Professor Deweese explains, "his critics and some of his friends thought his method was

often most exasperating." This would have removed entirely the ground of offense but McGarvey's answer was, "It is the personal feature which lends piquancy and interest to a discussion." This reveals his reason for choosing the course that he did and it further shows that he believed that it did add popularity to his writings. There is no doubt, however, that it beclouded the actual generous character of the man. Professor Deweese adds that this peculiarity of his style "sometimes so belies President McGarvey's real feeling that he was unjustly accused of personal bitterness. Antagonists who heard him speak, or met him socially and in his home . . . came to esteem him highly."[96]

He wrote with the settled conviction that criticism of the type usually spoken of as higher criticism was always harmful. In theory he approved of higher criticism and repeatedly stated that it was ancient and legitimate, but his approval extended only to the science as it was practiced in earlier times. The modern higher criticism was employing a different method and of this he disapproved completely. The work which he approved and regarded as almost a model was *Horne's Introduction,* published in 1818. The new method which is based upon the so-called historical system was in his judgment without merit and was actually pernicious. He constantly called the critics destructive and at times used such a stronger term as crooked. He also compared them to rattlesnakes, to burglars, to men spreading the contagion of smallpox, and evil workers in general. Their motive was not good. They were enemies of the right. They were seeking to undermine the Christian faith. In all that they did they were destructive; he would never admit that the modern variety of criticism was constructive.

All of this was because he did not admit the legitimacy of the newer method of study. He could not see that the modern method of approach is just as much a science, is just as much controlled and regulated by the rules of evidence, requires just as much care in sifting out the truth and rejecting the error as the older method. As in all other processes where evidence is to be considered and weighed there were men here who took extravagant positions. Sometimes their conclusions were wild and grotesque and were drawn from personal prejudices and not from the evidence. Paul Elmer More, in a Foreword to Fosdick's *A Guide to Understanding the Bible,* says, "There are heavy sins of commission to be charged against the so-called higher criticism that, from its lair in Germany, raged over the world during the nineteenth century—many extravagances of conjecture and not a few absurdities." But of what human discipline may the same statements not be made? McGarvey formed his estimate of the character of higher criticism from these illogical and reckless workers. From their extravagant and absurd conclusions he judged the entire science.

Why did a man of such clear judgment and so skilful in weighing evidence arrive at a decision that was wholly unfavorable? Since he saw the merits of textual why did he not also see those of historical criticism? Because, in the case of the former, the church was regaining something that it had lost. There had been a pure text of the Bible but it had become corrupted. Textual criticism is the method by which it is to be regained. Historical criticism, however, is revolutionary. It is giving the church something that it had never possessed before. McGarvey could show that within the historical period of the church the

view which he advocated had always been held. Therefore it seemed evident to him that it must be the truth. Further the masters of textual criticism were churchmen. The higher critics were men trained in historical methods and were not always religious. Some of them were actually irreverent. From this fact the inference was drawn that it was a movement hostile to religion. He could see the irreverence; he did not see a possible good.

It must be kept in mind that when McGarvey conducted this department he was an old man. He was sixty-four when it began. His mind was as open and clear as at earlier periods of life but at this age one's mind loses something of its elasticity and its ability to adapt itself to new points of view. He continued to do real and original work in familiar fields and in the direction that was familiar to him, but it was not easy for him to adopt a new point of view. From the start he was a conscious and avowed advocate. He was seeking to rescue the church from a danger. As time passed he obtained great publicity for this very undertaking, and was hailed as a champion of orthodoxy.

He lived through an age when the world was undergoing a transition in its mode of thinking. This great revolutionary change took place between the time of his birth and his death. Some men changed as the world changed; others, McGarvey among them, did not. His point of view and his modes of thought at eighty were substantially the same as those he held at thirty. Any new fact coming to his attention was at once adjusted to his body of knowledge according to the pattern of thinking that had been usual with him. In discoveries in any field of human knowledge, archeology, for example, he could see readily

the points that favored his manner of interpreting the Bible; other points he did not see or he found a way, satisfactory to himself, of explaining them into harmony with his view.

This is a common procedure of the human mind and in using it he differed not at all from other men. The higher critics did the same thing and when he caught them at it he denounced them unsparingly. Their interpretation and his of the Code of Hammurabi; the identification of Amraphel of Genesis 14 with this same Hammurabi; the Oxyrhynchus sayings of Jesus; the Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions concerning Belshazzar; and some dozen other equally important discoveries in the field of archeology were by either party made to harmonize with their attitude previously taken. In each case the facts were the same; they differed from each other in their interpretation of the facts. The newer points of view, which the critics were bringing to the front, he could never see. He denied them to the bitter end, and to both himself and the critics, the amazing fact was that neither could see what seemed to the other so self-evident.

A new system of thought was coming to light and consequently a new manner of interpreting the Bible. It was not a difference on a few points but the old and the new diverged radically from each other all along the line. The two for example had differing conceptions of God's manner of revealing himself to the world. According to the older view the Bible represents the completeness of God's revelation of himself. When it was finished no further revelation was to be expected or was needed. Hence the Bible becomes the criterion by which all religious truth is to be tested. Any statement claiming to be a religious

truth should be rejected if it is not supported by the Bible. This in substance was McGarvey's position.

The newer view on the other hand thinks of God's revelation as continuous. The Bible record is not the only revelation which God has made though it is the highest and the most perfect. Hence man may know truths about God which are not mentioned in the Bible. Man in this day or in any day may seek for, and may hope to acquire, new truth about God. This in substance was the position of the higher critics against which he protested. The difference on this subject is but typical of the differences that may be found between them on scores of other subjects. It was two thought systems that were in conflict.

The newer point of view was claiming that it was discovering new light. It was constantly citing the information of new sciences. Among these was Comparative Religion. A comparison of the religious beliefs and practices of men at similar stages of culture shows that men act and believe similarly whether they be in Asia, America or the islands of the Pacific, whether the date be the twelfth century before Christ or the eighteenth century of the Christian era. Since this is true the study of other religions will be of help in understanding the Bible. McGarvey did not believe this. It was reversing what he thought was the order of nature. Instead of understanding the Bible through the practices and experiences of other religions, we should test them by the statements of the Bible.

He had occasion often in his department to review books and articles dealing with topics related to Comparative Religion. He discussed Menzies' *History of Religion;*[97] Lyman Abbott on the evolutionary development of sacrifice;[98] Tiele on *The Science of Religion;*[99] President Harper

on "Sacrifice";[100] *Myth and Fiction in the Bible.*[101] In these reviews he states his attitude toward Comparative Religion. It is a usurper in the field, claiming an authority to which it is not entitled. It does not classify heathen religions as false or superstitious. Its historian (Menzies) holds a view concerning the origin and growth of religion that is at variance with that taken by all writers of the Bible. The same historian sets aside the testimony of the Bible on sacrifice as he does on everything else when it suits his purpose. Because the language of Genesis so implies, McGarvey conceded that a stone age preceded one of metal. To Lyman Abbott's statement that "Sacrifice had a pagan origin," he replied that the Bible gives the only account of the origin of sacrifice. There is only one genuine history of religion and that is found in the Bible. There is no such thing as a science of religion. It is not a matter of development but of revelation.

Another science with which McGarvey and the critics had trouble was the historical method of studying or interpreting the Bible. He confused it with the study of history. In reviewing an article in the *Biblical World* on the subject, he comments, "As the greater part of the Bible is history, one is led to ask, What is the historical method of studying history? Is there a mathematical method of studying mathematics?" He asks why they speak only of the historical method of studying the Bible. "Why do they not speak of the historical method of studying American history?" By the historical method is meant the recognition of a principle of growth or development whether it be in Roman, American or biblical history. Hence each book of the Bible or passage within the Bible, or the account of any event in any history is to be interpreted in the light of its time and its cultural environment.

This is the distinction between the modern and the ancient method of studying and interpreting the history of any age or of any land. There is an historical method of studying history and it applies to American history quite as much as to Hebrew history. If the principle had been clearly stated to McGarvey he would have agreed with the critics as to the fundamental correctness of that which they called the historical method, though he might have differed from them as to the dates and circumstances of some of the passages.

The germ of this principle had been taught by Alexander Campbell, in his *Tracts for the People* printed in 1846,[102] and McGarvey, as every student of his will recognize, approved of these rules of Mr. Campbell's. He asserted that the historical study of the Bible is as old as the Bible itself, but by this he meant the study of it as history. His statement was based upon a misunderstanding of what is meant by the historical study of the Bible. Had he understood the term, it would not have removed the differences between him and the critics, but at least it would have softened somewhat the clash and antagonism between them.

In 1895 he reviewed some lectures by President Harper of The University of Chicago. At the close of the series he asserted that the lectures were not by Harper, but were of composite authorship.[103] He then proceeded to parody the supposed arguments of the critics. He did this at other times using many documents as illustrative material. Of course he did not intend that his arguments should be taken seriously. Composite authorship can be proven only by unmistakable evidence that there are in a document conflicting points of view, ideas and ways of stating conceptions. This his treatment did not show. The whole sub-

ject might be dismissed as an instance of his bringing his argument down to the level of his readers, the people, were it not for the fact that he was constantly asserting that the most scholarly critics were blindly and unthinkingly following the lead of German critical teachers. "In nothing perhaps, does he [President Harper] follow so unquestioningly his German teachers as in his account of animal sacrifice."[104] In reviewing George Foote Moore's *Commentary on Judges* he writes, "Criticism more arbitrary, more antagonistic to right reason, can scarcely be imagined; yet in it Professor Moore is but blindly following his German teachers."[105] If he does this in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry? If he comments thus concerning George Foote Moore, what would he say concerning some younger man or university student?

One field of criticism that obviously he did not master was the synoptic problem. He predicted for many years that the day would come when the critics would treat the Gospels as they had the Pentateuch and he hailed Bacon's work on the Fourth Gospel as a fulfilment of his prediction.[106] As a matter of fact the process of Gospel criticism was by that time far advanced but his writings gave little evidence that he fully grasped the critical position. He did not read widely here as he had on the subject of the Mosaic books.

His method of meeting the argument was not to weigh the argument itself but to ask the question, Do the Gospels themselves recognize the possibility of such an origin as the critics attributed to them? He could easily find texts that led him to give a negative answer to this question. When the critical view as to the Gospels was first arresting his attention, he dismissed the subject by saying, "I think that

I can discover passages that will show that such an explanation is impossible.''[107] This kind of argument was convincing to him. When asked why he believed in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, his answer was that it was because of the statements to that effect made by Jesus and his apostles and then he added, ''Their words I accept as absolute authority on any subjects on which they speak.''[108]

For the most part those he criticized ignored his comments. In many cases his department probably escaped their attention. In other cases they chose to disregard what he wrote. There were a few notable exceptions to this rule of silence. Washington Gladden in a series on *Some Puzzling Bible Books* preached a sermon on Esther. In replying McGarvey not only published his criticisms in the *Christian Standard* but they were also sent to the Columbus, Ohio, *Evening Press*. He defended the historical character of the book, justified the slaughter of the Persians and accused Gladden of ''inexcusable ignorance.''[109] Gladden replied to McGarvey and reduced the differences between them to two questions: (1) Is the book history or the product of imagination? (2) Are its moral teachings sound? He accused McGarvey of careless reading of the book. To this the latter again replied. Finally the controversy was reduced to three questions on which the two took opposite sides: Did the Jews slay the Persians wantonly or in self-defense? Were women and children involved in the slaughter? Did the author of the book approve of the wholesale killing? Each wrote another article in which he announced that this would be his last word. They ended the controversy with each insisting upon the correctness of his position. As a matter of fact

they never came to a clear issue. Each minimized the scholarship of the other.

Occasionally one of his brethren would take issue with McGarvey on some question and a prolonged discussion would follow. This was particularly true in the instance of E. B. Cake, preacher at Maysville, Kentucky.[110] He had published some articles in the *Public Ledger* of that city on critical questions. He was seemingly not well informed and McGarvey disposed of him rather effectively. McGarvey confessed that the articles were prolonged beyond their importance. He compared Cake to a man with the smallpox.

R. C. Cave had been associated with McGarvey for four years as the office editor of the *Apostolic Times*. He was a brilliant preacher and was led to adopt liberal views with reference to the Divinity of Christ. He withdrew from the church for which he was preaching in St. Louis and became the preacher for a liberal church. At intervals during 1908 and 1909 he wrote to McGarvey in defense of his position and the latter replied.[111] In position they were far apart but in the main their discussion was more irenic than in some cases where the opponents were nearer together. Cave asked, "Will heretical views in respect to the Bible, miracles, the Virgin Birth, etc., exclude from heaven?" McGarvey thought that in many cases they will.

An intermittent warfare was carried on between McGarvey's department and the *Christian Century* of Chicago and *The Christian-Evangelist* of St. Louis. Such men as Willett, Ames, Morrison, Faris, W. E. Garrison, Gates, etc., all of them more or less closely connected with Yale or Chicago Universities, were contributors to the *Christian Century*. They were advocates of the theories of the critics

and the clashes between them and McGarvey were frequent. He treated them as though they were young and inexperienced men, and that was probably his belief concerning them.

He speaks of W. E. Garrison as young and as following blindly his teacher.[112] H. L. Willett is "the ill-informed writer";[113] the *Christian Century* characterized McGarvey as holding, "A man is a fool, a scoundrel, an infidel or a traitor because he does not hold my opinion."[114] He charges the *Christian Century* with unfairness in its criticism of him.[115] The *Century* asserted that he believed that his opponents lacked honesty, reverence and intelligence.[116] This of course he denied.

Between him and J. H. Garrison, the editor of the *Christian-Evangelist,* there was a pronounced difference in attitude. Garrison, though not a technically trained critic, ably espoused their cause. McGarvey regarded Garrison as lacking in firmness. Garrison in turn criticized McGarvey for constituting himself the mentor of the brotherhood and for continual faultfinding. Sharp words flew back and forth. Garrison called McGarvey, "Our astute critic and the universal regulator of the brotherhood."[117] He described McGarvey as, "The man whose specialty is to point out flaws in the literary products of others."[118]

In 1903, Hall L. Calhoun was a graduate student in Harvard University. Through him, McGarvey sent a copy of his *Authorship of Deuteronomy* to Professor George Foote Moore with a request that he read and review it. Moore read the book through and in a very courteous manner by means of a letter to Calhoun pointed out five errors of statement into which McGarvey had fallen. McGarvey published the letter in the *Standard* and claimed that some

of the errors did not affect his argument.[119] It must have been something of an experience for McGarvey to have his method so completely reversed and turned back on himself, though in a gentler manner than he was accustomed to use. It was, however, no less effective as the reply of McGarvey shows. In a quiet, dignified, and humble manner he commented upon the letter of Professor Moore and acknowledged his errors. There was nothing in the circumstances that demanded that the letter be printed. A man of less sincerity and humility than McGarvey would not have printed it. A more self-centered man would have reflected that for years he had posed as an authoritative oracle and had freely pointed out to his readers the mistakes of editors, college professors and presidents, and now to have his own errors exposed could scarcely have been palatable. He would have suppressed the letter since it was so easy and so natural a thing to do. But McGarvey did not suppress it. He published it and in the spirit of Christian meekness accepted whatever of humiliation it brought to him.

One of the most interesting phases of this interchange of comments did not come out into the open and it is probable that McGarvey never knew of it. When Professor Moore gave the letter to Calhoun, he added the comment, "My letter will show your friend, President McGarvey, that I have read his book in its entirety. I have not attempted to review his arguments. Such a step would produce no good results. Before anything of this sort could be done it would be necessary for President McGarvey and me to go far back of his arguments and discuss and agree upon certain fundamental principles." This was the pith of the whole matter. McGarvey was ad-

vocating a metaphysics that belonged to a former age. The fundamental question was not, Are his interpretations sound? but, Are his fundamental assumptions true? Moore on the other hand was interested in a system of thought that would fit into the intellectual world of the present day.

These two men may be regarded as typical and representative of the two thought systems that were contending for supremacy. Such a controversy goes on continually. Each generation passes under review and often revises the judgments of its predecessor. The age of McGarvey saw the criticisms of the past assume an importance and an insistence beyond the usual. McGarvey stood for the past; Moore for the new. They were both clear thinkers. In any situation they would agree as to what were the facts, but their interpretation of these facts would differ. That was because their primary assumptions differed. During the thirty years that have passed since the death of McGarvey the religious thinking of the world seems to have receded from his attitude. Many of the positions which he deemed fundamentally wrong have apparently attained general acceptance. Later thought may in turn revise them, but at present each year seems to accord them a surer standing.

Paul Elmer Moore has already been quoted with reference to the extravagances and absurdities of the critics. But not all of their achievements he thinks were of this character. He goes on to add, "Some results have come out of it that may be accepted as permanent and salutary; and among these must be reckoned the discovery of the evolutionary character of the Bible. . . . We have learned a great deal of the history of Israel; in its larger outline we know how their sacred books were finally put together

from successive strata and how these strata represent the developing religious sense of the people. This change of attitude towards the sacred Scripture of the Jews, I hold to be of almost incalculable importance for the future of religion: it takes the ground from under the older criticism of the book from the angle of fact and ethics; it supports and clarifies the teleological relation between the two Testaments, and it puts the claims of revelation in a new and thoroughly consistent light.''[120]

Our object has been to determine the spirit and the manner in which McGarvey conducted his part of the controversy. His ideals and his purposes were high. His methods and the manner in which he conducted the controversy were scholarly, though with a keen insight into the character of the audience he was addressing he adapted his message to them. He wrote for the generality of men, not the scholarly mind. He was passionately and wholeheartedly devoted to the truth as he understood it and believed that he was defending that truth against men who were anxious to destroy it or who were misled into following evil leaders.

By nature McGarvey was a man of positive convictions. He did not advocate views concerning which he held doubt. When he adopted any conclusion he was assured in his own mind that it was correct. His attitude towards his opponents caused pain to his friends and yet the evidence is cumulative that this was not an indication of his spirit. It was a deliberately chosen method of his to give life and spirit to his discussions. He was not embittered and he felt no personal antagonism towards those whom he criticized. Social contact with him convinced many of them that this was true. He read widely and did not attempt

to discuss any subject unless he was convinced that he understood it. Advancing years and the fixedness of mind which it involves nullified this somewhat, but did not destroy the studious habits and method of a lifetime. He was a conscious and avowed advocate. He came to the task with fixed convictions and he sought to convince his readers of the truth of his decisions. In this spirit and in accord with these methods he conducted his department for almost nineteen years.

What were the final results of this department? What impression did it have upon him, upon the College, and upon the brotherhood as a whole? There is no doubt but that it stamped him as ultra-conservative. This was not in one respect only but in every detail. His mind was compact, and decisions reached in one field would strongly influence his thinking in related ones. He accepted and rejoiced in this reputation which his department imposed upon him. His department won for him many friends and admirers; it also disposed many to disapproval of his spirit and method. It seems fairly certain that he would have closed his career with more universal commendation if he had not conducted this department. He would probably have conceded that this is true but he counted his victories for the truth, as he interpreted them, as more important than personal approbation.

His department also stamped The College of the Bible as being for the time also ultra-conservative. Testimony has been given that there were freedom and opportunity to seek the truth. Yet it cannot be questioned that the general impression was that the College followed in the course he mapped out for it. That was the impression McGarvey sought to create. It was to continue, he hoped, as it had

been during his lifetime. All know its later history. It broke with the traditions of the past and proceeded along new lines. So the department did not affect the College permanently.

It is difficult to estimate what was the effect of the department upon the life of the brotherhood. That it was a dividing factor there can be no doubt, but in all probability the tendency to divide would have been occasioned by some other factor if not by this department. The seed of division was in the thought of the time. It certainly did not seriously check development, for his readers were persons whose minds were already made up. Few scholars and few students were permanently influenced by the department. Its influence therefore was most deeply felt on McGarvey's own reputation.

In 1867, after serving the Main Street Church for five years, McGarvey resigned as its minister and began to serve country churches. L. B. Wilkes succeeded him at Main Street and after a time increased attendance made a second place of meeting imperative. During the war, when the church building was used as a military hospital, the services had been held for three months in the Odd Fellows' Hall at the southeast corner of Main and Broadway. In October, 1869, a decision was reached to hold overflow meetings in the same place and they began the first of January, 1870.

A church was not organized at once, but for a time the officers of the Main Street Church assumed the oversight of both congregations. It was regarded as one church with a common treasury, but holding meetings in two places. A number of elders and deacons were designated to attend and to officiate at the new meeting place. The following arrangements were made for preaching: Graham, McGarvey, Lard and Professor J. D. Pickett of the English department of the university were each asked to supply one Sunday a month. Lard found it impossible to comply with the request so Wilkes was substituted in his stead and Pickett was to occupy his pulpit at Main Street on the Sundays when he had to be absent. McGarvey's turn came on the first Sunday of each month.

Search began at once for a more permanent place of meeting. Due to a division that had taken place in the Presbyterian church during the war a building of theirs located at the corner of Second and Broadway was of-

fered for sale at the price of $15,000. On April 10 it was decided to purchase it and that day pledges were taken to the amount of $7,000. By the 14th this sum was increased to $12,000. The purchase was made on April 30, and on May 1, which happened to be McGarvey's Sunday, the actual history of the Broadway Christian Church began. McGarvey aroused some resentment among the members of other churches by announcing that he would on this day preach the gospel in that building for the first time. Perhaps nine out of ten of the preachers of the Disciples at this time and under these circumstances would have made a similar announcement.

The arrangement of four preachers supplying the pulpit continued during the year 1870, but on September 4 the officers submitted to a vote of the congregation the question, Shall the church continue the existing plan or have one preacher? The official recommendation was to have only one and such was the decision of the church in a vote taken September 11. Without nominations each member was then asked to express his preference for minister. Seven were named in the ballots but McGarvey had a majority and his election was made unanimous. He resigned his country churches and on January 1, 1871, he entered upon the ministry that, second only to his teaching in The College of the Bible, became the major interest of his life. From this time forth his classroom in the College, the pulpit of the Broadway Church, and the study where he wrote his books and articles, became the three centers of his activity and influence. He served as preacher of this church till 1882 when he again resigned to serve country churches. He continued as one of its elders, however, and often supplied its pulpit in emergencies and

when the preacher was absent. He always had an influential voice in the affairs of the church and it engaged in no activity in which he did not have a directing hand. This happy relationship continued till 1902 when, for reasons that are explained elsewhere, he resigned his eldership and asked for a letter from the church.

The organization of the Broadway Church aroused some disturbance though it seems not to have been due directly to opposition to the new church. Sometime during 1870 something like a dozen members asked for letters from the Main Street Church, for the purpose of organizing a second church. These letters were granted as is shown by the records now in the possession of the Central Christian Church. Later a controversy arose between this group and the officers of the Main Street Church and six months after the letters were granted the church withdrew fellowship from them apparently on the grounds that they were creating a schism. The nature of their schismatic action was seemingly a disregard of the policy of the Main Street Church which held the theory of a metropolitan church, that is, one church for the city with one governing board and one treasury, but different groups within the church meeting for worship at different places. The dissenting group held that each congregation was a separate church independent in its government from the others. This theory accounts for the singular action of the Main Street Church in withdrawing fellowship from members to whom it had already granted letters. The views of this dissenting group are stated in a letter addressed to the elders of the Main Street Church under date of April 13, 1871. The two groups had held conferences on March 28 and on April 1, and this letter is a statement of the decision of

the dissenters after these conferences. "We are entirely opposed," they say, "to a longer continuance of two congregations under one eldership. . . . We are convinced that the tendency of such a system is to metropolitan centralization and consequently, to the destruction of congregational independence and responsibility. . . . When a second congregation was formed out of the church in this city, in order to worship at Odd Fellows' Hall (January 1, 1870) under a common eldership, we had reason to believe the arrangement was only temporary, and that when the movement proved a success, an independent organization would take place in the second congregation. We see no prospect for such a consummation."[121] Yet ten weeks later this is exactly what did take place. On June 25, 1871, the entire membership of the Main Street Church was called together to receive a report of the elders concerning the proposed "Second Christian Church." The church then adopted resolutions offered by President Robert Milligan to the effect that, in order to remove all obstacles, every connection between the Main Street and the Broadway congregations be dissolved without delay, and that those who wished to do so, including the dissenting group, be invited to constitute a separate church on the second and third Sundays in July.[122]

The dissenting group that signed the letter quoted above were G. W. Elley, D. S. Goodlow, J. D. Pickett, J. B. Bowman, A. M. Barnes and E. D. Luxton. The influence of the controversy upon the life of the Broadway Church was to cause it to become an independent church though as a factor in the Bowman-McGarvey incident it dragged out an existence for a few years longer. Efforts were made by outside parties to bring about a reconciliation

between the dissenting group and the officers of the Main Street Church, but they were not successful. An agreement to arbitrate was reached on almost all points except the exact wording of the basis of arbitration. Here, so far as the records go, the matter rested. The proposed "Second Church of Christ" was organized, a building was constructed, but later it disbanded. By an irony of history the contention of Bowman for a congregationally governed church was achieved for him by McGarvey, his opponent, in the latter's ministry in the Broadway Church. The theory of one church in the city with different places of meeting was not found to be workable. Such an arrangement can succeed only when there is a strongly centralized government vested in the hands of one man, the bishop.

July 9 and 16 were the Sundays on which members of the mother church were permitted to declare their wish to become affiliated with the new Broadway organization. One hundred and twenty-two members and six students constituted the charter membership of this church. On August 27 six elders and seven deacons were elected. Some of those chosen, however, declined to serve and balloting continued till September 20. On the second Sunday in October the officers were ordained by Graham and Milligan. Towards the close of each year the church by vote confirmed its choice of McGarvey as its minister and so he continued to serve it year after year. At first his salary was set at $1200 per annum. In 1873 when he was dropped from the teaching staff of the College it was increased to $2000 and he was permitted to be absent one Sunday each month for evangelistic work. When he resumed teaching in the autumn of 1875, he asked that his salary be restored to $1200 but the church insisted unanimously on paying him $1500. Later at some undetermined

date it was reduced to $1200. He was to do the preaching but did not assume responsibility for the visiting.[123]

On two occasions during these years McGarvey offered the church his resignation. One was in 1875 when he resumed teaching in The College of the Bible and the other was in 1879 when he asked for leave of absence to visit Palestine. On each occasion the church declined to accept his resignation but in September, 1881, he gave notice that at the end of the year he would discontinue his ministry with the church and this time it had no other choice than to accept his decision. John S. Shouse was called from Midway to succeed him. While this was the end of McGarvey's ministry for the Broadway Church it did not terminate his connection with it nor his labors on its behalf. He continued as one of its elders and was active in all of its affairs. The average preacher dreads to assume the ministry of a church when its former minister remains in connection with it. Both of McGarvey's successors in the pulpit, John S. Shouse and Mark Collis, bore willing witness to his unfailing helpfulness and that no action of his was the cause of embarrassment to them. McGarvey was the soul of honor and of Christian courtesy.

McGarvey's relation to the church as a member and an elder was equally as devoted as when he served as its minister. He faithfully attended its services. Willingly and cheerfully he rendered it any aid which the circumstances of the hour demanded. Shouse told the story that on one occasion when a revival meeting was in progress something happened at the very last hour that prevented the evangelist from being present. In a hurried consultation it was decided to ask McGarvey to preach in his place. The people were assembling and there was no opportunity to get word to him in advance. As he entered the door

an officer took him to one side and explained to him the situation and told him that he would have to preach. Without hesitation he accepted the assignment and few in the audience knew that his previous notice had been so brief. His service as an elder was not perfunctory. Meetings of the elders were held each week just before the prayer service. McGarvey was diligent in his attendance at these meetings. Mark Collis says that he cannot recall that McGarvey ever asked to be excused from any duty or assignment that he was asked to assume.

There was no organ in the Broadway Church at this time and for years afterwards, and consequently the services were very simple. There would be congregational singing of such hymns as McGarvey would himself select. He always made these selections with great care, seeing to it that there was a harmonizing idea running through all parts of the service that bound it into a unity. This desire for unity in the worship would also control the selection of the passage of scripture that would be read, and if McGarvey himself offered the morning prayer it too would give voice to this common thought. The services were democratic, however, and often an elder or some suitable visitor would be invited to lead the congregation in its morning prayer.

These would be followed by the sermon and it was the leading feature of the service, though the congregation would be told many times that the purpose of their meeting was to break bread.[124] But whatever might be said about worship as the ideal that brought them together, actually most of them came to hear the sermon. Kentuckians love oral discourse whether in their churches or their political arenas. McGarvey loved preaching whether he was

himself the speaker or in the audience. He once said that there is no intellectual enjoyment to be compared to that which comes from hearing a good discourse. His son has preserved a saying of his to the effect that the highest personal satisfaction that can come to anyone is that consciousness of power which a speaker has over his audience. Many preachers had the experience of finding McGarvey one of the most attentive and the most inspiring of listeners. His face would glow with the enthusiasm which cheered and inspired the speaker.

Between the preacher and the audience at Broadway there was a bond of sympathy and expectation that prompted both to give their best. With his idea of the dignity and importance of preaching it would not be natural for him to neglect his sermon. His audience expected him to exalt life and its obligations and he felt a divine imperative resting upon him not to disappoint it. He did not preach merely to please but solely to do his hearers good. There was not such emphasis then upon the brevity of the sermon, and with a shortened service before, he was left with more time to devote to the discourse. Its usual length was not less than thirty-five minutes and it might exceed by a few moments this allotted time.

An important feature of the Sunday morning service would be the observance of the Lord's Supper. The elders, not the ministers, took the lead in conducting it. The information concerning this feature of the service came from John S. Shouse, McGarvey's successor in the ministry of the Broadway Church. Among the elders were such experienced preachers as Robert Graham, I. B. Grubbs and others and it was usual for one of these, preceding the Lord's Supper, to make a talk of from five to ten minutes

in length. It was expected that this talk would emphasize the leading lesson of the morning's sermon and then work around to some thought suitable to the Lord's Supper. McGarvey's ministry was before the days of individual communion cups, an innovation to which, when it did come, McGarvey was sharply opposed.

In those days the financial program of the church would be directed largely by its officers, though by influence and sermon, McGarvey would have a shaping hand in directing its policy. Both by example and precept he built within the church a generous spirit. Under his ministry the Broadway Church acquired a reputation for bountiful liberality. It has been said that McGarvey was disposed to be legalistically minded, but there was an exception to this in his attitude towards Christian benevolence. He was opposed to tithing or other schemes that set up an external standard for giving. He thought they would kill the spirit of Christian generosity. "The tithing system of the Law of Moses," he says, "was a compulsory tax, while all contributions for the support of the Christian ministry are voluntary."[125]

The themes of McGarvey's sermons would usually be biblical. Often theme, subject matter, and illustrations would all be taken from the Bible. When questions of public interest arose they would be selected as the theme of the sermon but yet the basic instruction would be taken from the Bible. It was a dictum with him which he often handed on to his students, that when people were talking about any subject then was the time to preach on it. At a time when murders were frequent he preached on the danger in going about armed. He says that most of his sermons were expository or on historical passages. He was fond of repeating Bible stories and then of developing

the lessons they taught. Various phases of biblical truth such as constituted the background of the historical portions of the Bible would often be the theme of his preaching. This served as his systematic theology. It was not within the range of his thinking to consider any other. From the Bible came his doctrine, the theme of his preaching and his ideals of life.

What specifically would be the subjects of his sermons and what would be the goal of his preaching? No list of his sermon topics used in the Broadway Church exists. If there ever was one, it along with his sermon notes was destroyed by the fire that in 1887 consumed his home. Yet it is not difficult to form a general impression of the subjects on which he preached. There is, first of all, his volume of sermons, all of which he tells us were preached in the Broadway Church; then there are occasional sermons printed in tracts or in papers; convention addresses and sermons which were also frequently printed; and finally the memory of those who can recall his sermons.

First of all, he would preach often on conversion and related themes. McGarvey was always strongly evangelistic. He did not believe that salvation is the result of a developed and matured Christian character, but that it is the consequence of a definite decision brought about by faith in Christ. The main task of the preacher then is always to bring men to the point of making this decision. The Book of Acts would supply him much of his material for preaching on this subject. Its examples of conversion would be often retold and their lessons enforced. He believed whole-heartedly that the Disciples had rescued the entire doctrine of conversion from much confusion and perversion and had restored the New Testament teaching. In his preaching then, he would often recount the mistakes

which Protestant theology had made in its treatment of conversion. Probably every sermon that McGarvey ever preached in the Broadway Church had as its ultimate purpose the deepening in the minds of men the importance of making the decision to accept Christ and, if they had not done so already, of taking this step at once.

The second group of subjects on which he would often preach would be the obligations and duties which are imperative upon the members of the church that they might perfect their Christian characters. These would not refer primarily to the virtues and responsibilities of the individual life. Teaching with reference to these would be reserved especially for the mid-week prayer meeting. The moral life was not disregarded. McGarvey would repeatedly stress its importance, but it is rather singular that it was usually taken for granted that, the Christian decision once having been made, moral development would follow as a matter of course.

The specific obligations that would be emphasized were the duties which the members owe to the church and its organized social life. The ordinances, as they were called, baptism and the Lord's Supper, would often be interpreted, and the duty of observing them enjoined. Regular attendance upon the services of the church, the duty of worship and prayer, the grace of liberality, the obligation to refrain from slander and scandal, sobriety and conduct in general such as would be recognized by the world as fitting the Christian character, would be a partial list of the Christian graces which would constitute the theme of the preaching. It was a wholesome, upright, vigorous Christian life which was taught.

How is McGarvey to be ranked as a preacher? Was his influence exerted by his position and by his life, or by

ability in the pulpit? Up to a late period of his life the announcement that he would preach would usually draw a large audience. His preaching was quiet but none the less effective. At one of the national conventions of the Disciples, F. M. Rains said that in the days of his vigor there were few preachers that were the peers of J. W. McGarvey. M. D. Clubb writes with reference to Robert Graham, "His estimate of McGarvey as a preacher was high. I have heard him say, in talking of preachers and preaching, that he had heard men who could preach greater sermons than he, but taking him Sunday after Sunday, week in and week out, he was the best preacher he had ever heard."

As a minister he was interested in all public questions, especially such as affected the moral life of the community. In social problems, as the phrase is used today, he did not concern himself. At a preachers' meeting, that was held when he was an old man, a paper had been read on the social teachings of the Bible. Due to deafness he had not heard the paper nor even the subject. When he was invited to speak he asked what had been the topic discussed. On being told that it was the social teachings of the Bible, he abruptly dismissed the matter by saying, "I know nothing about that." When, however, there arose any question that affected the moral life of the community, McGarvey considered that it was the minister's duty to speak out. He came in this way to exert a significant influence in the community. He was recognized as a moral force in Lexington and whenever any question arose that affected the standing or the moral character of the city it was expected that he would not remain silent.

The most notable instance of this came some years after he had ceased to be the minister of the Broadway Church

but while he was one of its active elders. In 1894, the congressman from the Lexington district, a brilliant orator of an influential family, became involved in a notorious scandal. He was accused of having lived a double life and he made no effort to deny the alleged facts. He boldly announced himself as a candidate for re-election to congress, depending upon his brilliant record, his oratorical skill and his popularity to carry the district. He acknowledged his immoral past but asserted that he had repented and that it was the Christian duty of every man to forgive him. The people were swept by what amounted to a hysteria and his re-election seemed not at all improbable. McGarvey took a part in the campaign and made what at the time was felt to be an important contribution to his ultimate defeat. Before an audience that packed the opera house he made what he said was the first political speech of his life. He conceded that it was the Christian duty of every man to forgive the erring congressman upon his repentance, but that did not mean that he was under obligation to return him to congress.

The inner history of the incident was supplied by John S. Shouse. Strong pressure was brought to bear upon McGarvey to induce him not to make this speech. He was threatened, if he persisted, with dire consequences that would befall him. Some things concerning his family would be made known which it was presumed he would wish not to be made public. McGarvey was unmoved by the threats and went his way unterrified. The consequences did not follow.

McGarvey's moral integrity was a factor that gave his ministry great power. In connection with the incident mentioned in the preceding paragraph, when John H.

Neville was told that a threat had been made that, if McGarvey insisted on speaking in the opera house, some unpleasant exposures would be made to his discredit, his comment was, "If it is a matter of morality it is a base insinuation. I have known John McGarvey from his boyhood and his character is absolutely spotless." Full knowledge of the circumstances reveals the fact that he was right and Lexington confirmed his judgment.

McGarvey did not derive prestige from his position as head of the College but the character of his life dignified that position. The community recognized him as worthy of the place that he occupied. This was the reputation that McGarvey bore among all classes of men. He lived in harmony with the ideals of the ministry he professed. Men might not approve of his doctrine, but they could not dissent from the life that he lived.

In the parlor of his home on East Main Street in the middle nineties was an artistic white wax cross under a glass dome. A group of students had been invited to his home for dinner during the Christmas week and to one of them whom he observed inspecting it he told its story. When he was minister at Broadway he received a letter from a woman who told him that she had been attending his services. At one time she had conducted one of the most notorious houses of ill-fame in Lexington. She had abandoned this way of life and had married. Her soul was perplexed over the question whether such a woman could obtain forgiveness and salvation. She would be at church on the following Sunday night and she asked McGarvey to answer her question. He did and a short time afterwards she made the confession. She continued for some considerable time a member of the Broadway Church, retiring, ask-

ing little, seeking earnestly the better life. A woman now advanced in years remembers her as attending the Woman's Bible class and describes her as beautiful physically and as appreciative of any kindness shown her.

She had presented to McGarvey this white cross and it possessed a symbolic significance which only the initiated could understand. Like the woman in Luke's Gospel, she sought in this way to express her gratitude for her deliverance from the ways of sin. Naturally, like Luke, McGarvey offered no hint as to her name or identity. Her husband died, she left Lexington and in another state she conducted a private orphanage and in time died, having lived a worthy Christian life.

McGarvey was always a loyal and thoroughly convinced supporter of the organized missionary work of the church. His opposition to the use in the worship of the church of musical instruments might lead one to expect opposition to missionary organizations also. A negative attitude in respect to one is usually followed by a similar attitude in respect to the other. This was not true of McGarvey. In his mind there was no connecting link between the two. His attitude on each question was attained on independent grounds and represented in each case his honest convictions. In his attitude toward missionary organization he carried his associates with him and how fortunate for the church that he did. Otherwise Lexington would have anticipated Nashville in becoming the center of opposition to the organization of the church for missionary service. Under his leadership the Broadway Church became a great missionary church and had fellowship in all of the cooperative enterprises of the brotherhood. On the first Sunday in October, 1872, which happened to be near the end of

the first year of its independent church life, the records of the Broadway Church show that a missionary offering was taken which amounted to $420. Another offering for the work of the state was taken the following April.[126]

On February 11, 1891, McGarvey contributed to the *Gospel Advocate* of Nashville an article on "Mission Work: a Word of Peace." It was a thoughtful article designed to meet the objections to missionary cooperation of those who opposed it. It was printed on the editorial page of the *Advocate.* It states clearly and convincingly the underlying philosophy of the missionary organizations, but in such a manner as, if possible, to disarm criticism. The later history of the church will tell how effective it was.

McGarvey participated in another form of activity closely related to that discussed in the preceding paragraphs. He served on a number of boards and through them rendered useful service. In 1869 he assisted in raising funds for the establishment of Hocker, later Hamilton, College. McGarvey became the chairman of the Advisory Board of the Trustees and continued in that capacity for many years. For about forty years he was a member of the board of the Kentucky Female Orphan School. He became a member in 1863 and the following year was elected chairman which position he retained till 1892. He gave his services to this institution with great pleasure. On one occasion he said, "It is a badge of honor in Kentucky to be known as a graduate of that school."

Dr. Hopson, McGarvey's predecessor as the minister of the Main Street Church, was chairman of the state meeting, as the state convention was then called. When a vacancy occurred owing to the resignation of Dr. Hopson, McGarvey was chosen to succeed him and was either chair-

man or secretary of this state gathering till increasing deafness made it difficult for him to serve. The Kentucky Christian Education Society was another organization to which he gave practically forty years of service as a member of its board. It had been created and endowed in the early days by such pioneers as John T. Johnson, John Smith and others. An endowment fund of $30,000 was raised from the income of which provision was made for the education of young men for the ministry. Year after year McGarvey rendered valuable service in the administration of the fund and in selecting the young men who were to be its beneficiaries. He withdrew from it only when the infirmities of age rendered such a step necessary. McGarvey also served for a number of years as chairman of the Garth Educational Society.

He had been ordained to the ministry on the third Sunday in September, 1852. The fiftieth anniversary of this event was celebrated in the Broadway Church on the same Sunday in September, 1902. A large audience was present and McGarvey delivered the address. He had been an elder of the church continuously since its organization in 1870 and at the close of this meeting tendered his resignation as elder. His reason was that deafness made it difficult for him to participate in the meetings and to render the service which the office required. The church requested him to retain the office for advisory purposes but informed him that he was released from all other duties and responsibilities. It seems not to have been then anticipated by either the church or himself that circumstances would soon bring about a more complete release not only from the eldership but from his membership as well.

His opposition to the use of instrumental music in worship has been discussed in another chapter. Because of this opposition an organ had never been used in the Broadway Church. As was to be expected, there had been some agitation and a few years earlier a compromise had been adopted. The church engaged a leader of singing who in turn trained a choir. The quality of the singing was noticeably improved, but this did not silence the agitation. If it had any effect it stimulated it. One of the superintendents of the Sunday School insisted that she must have an instrument for her department. The situation was submitted to McGarvey and inasmuch as this was the Sunday School, not the worship of the church, he consented. A second department also asked and received. Further agitation followed and at length the elders decided that the question must be submitted to the congregation for decision. Friends of McGarvey tried to induce him to accept the organ under protest and to take the attitude that it was the action of the church, not his. He considered it with some care and there was hope that this would be his decision. Had there been no church in the city without an organ, this would have been his course of action, but Chestnut Street offered to him a haven and he asked for letters for himself and Mrs. McGarvey.[127]

On November 2 announcement was made that a vote would be taken on the following Sunday, and on this day, November 2, his letters were written. He told his daughter that he would withdraw from Broadway so that the congregation could have what it wanted without opposition from him. He indulged in no threatenings; in asking for his letter he merely stated that it was against his conscience to remain in a church that used an organ in its worship.

At the meeting on November 9, there was a brief service and the sermon was short. A resolution to postpone action indefinitely out of consideration to McGarvey was introduced but it was lost by a vote of 112 for the resolution to 140 against, with a number not voting. Then a resolution postponing action for two weeks was passed.

During the interval the matter was widely discussed, was given publicity in the papers and McGarvey was induced by the urging of friends to publish his reasons for opposing the organ. This he did in a brief article in the *Evening Leader*. His objection was due to his belief that the New Testament's silence concerning musical instruments in the worship should be taken as a prohibition of their use. He would have retained his membership in the Broadway Church, though under protest, if there had been no church in the city without an organ. Since there was such a church, no reason existed for his remaining in the Broadway Church against his conscience. On November 23 the vote was taken. The majority in favor of the organ numbered 149. Many of those voting in the negative favored the organ, but voted as they did out of regard to McGarvey. The organ was installed in the Broadway Church and its use there began with the year 1903.

The letters granted him and Mrs. McGarvey were of the usual form but they were accompanied by a letter from the minister of the church, Mark Collis. Its date shows that McGarvey was out of the church long before the vote was taken. Collis wrote: "Lexington, Ky., Nov. 4th, 1902. Dear Brother McGarvey: Herewith I send church letters for yourself and Sister McGarvey as your request. I need not tell you that it is with very deep regret that we give you up as members of the Broadway congregation. You

take with you the warmest affection of the whole church, and we all hope that we shall often have the pleasure of your presence with us. Yours very truly and fraternally, Mark Collis."

The letters were presented to the Chestnut Street Church along with those of about a dozen other members of the Broadway Church who accompanied him. Here his membership remained till his death. The preacher at Chestnut Street Church was W. H. Allen. He asked Professor Grubbs, who had removed his membership from Broadway some years before, to receive McGarvey into the church. Allen recalls that he said, "Brother McGarvey, we would rather have you than ten thousand aids to worship." Each year on the third Sunday in September, the anniversary of his ordination, he was asked to preach and his friends came not only from Lexington but from all over the county. On that day the church was always crowded.

His withdrawal from the Broadway Church did not end McGarvey's interest in, nor his services to, this church. He often preached there and whenever called upon for some special service he readily responded. Collis says that he continued to consult him on matters concerning the welfare of the church. When he attended the meetings of the church, the organ was not silenced because it was not his wish that it should be. It was his settled policy never to have a church alter its usual manner of conducting its worship to accommodate him. On the occasion of his funeral the Chestnut Street Church was too small, and the Broadway building was undergoing repairs. It was held therefore in the Central Church and in accord with his usual policy the organ was used.

The story has already been told of how in 1877 the College of the Bible of Kentucky University was unable to continue its work. Its faculty had consisted of McGarvey and Robert Graham. Only the former could be retained and he for but half time. This would have meant virtually the end in Lexington of ministerial training. Through the Kentucky Christian Education Society, McGarvey and Graham brought the situation to the attention of the churches of Kentucky. The response was prompt and generous and on July 27, 1877, the new College of the Bible was organized and incorporated. The appeal to the churches had been to pledge themselves for a period of five years to annual payments. This was a precarious basis for the continued existence of a college. Most experiments of this sort have proven that after a few years payments fail and the institution is forced to close. In the present case, however, the response was sufficiently liberal to justify a beginning; the future was trusted to solve its own problems. The newly constituted board chose for the faculty Robert Graham, J. W. McGarvey and I. B. Grubbs.

For its first session, that of 1877-1878, classes met in basement rooms of the Main Street Church and a boarding house was rented for a dormitory. Forty-one students attended and in June there was a graduating class of thirteen. During the year 1878 the ambitious plans of Kentucky University were abandoned and it was reorganized on a more modest basis. The office of regent was abolished and the various colleges that had constituted units of the university were discontinued. The university was reduced to the

Preparatory Department and the College of Arts. The old College of the Bible was to all intents and purposes abandoned and the new institution was invited to take its place. It was offered free use of the classrooms and dormitories of the university. This offer was accepted and until its own home was built in 1895 the work of The College of the Bible was carried on under the conditions of this invitation. The classes, chapel exercises and other meetings of the college were held in the three rooms on the first and second floors of the east wing of Morrison Chapel, the principal building of Kentucky University. Two small dormitories were already in existence and in time The College of the Bible added to these a third, Craig Hall. These were the physical facilities of The College of the Bible through the first seventeen years of its history.

Under the new arrangement the relations between Kentucky University and The College of the Bible were cordial and mutually helpful. To any classes of the other, for which they were prepared, the students of either institution had free access. This was of great assistance to The College of the Bible. Instead of having to supply instruction for its students in a number of departments it had to provide teachers only in the Bible and related subjects. In 1879 Charles Louis Loos upon the recommendation of McGarvey was chosen president of Kentucky University. He succeeded Professor H. H. White, who, since the resignation of Professor Graham, had served as president in addition to being teacher of Mathematics. President Loos taught Greek and administered the affairs of the university. He became a great asset to The College of the Bible and was virtually a fourth member of its faculty. These four were all graduates of Bethany College and came together not as strangers but as tested friends.

For a number of years the leaders among the Disciples had felt the need of an institution to train men for the ministry. In 1865, the very year of the founding of The College of the Bible, a number of articles on the subject appeared. Benjamin Franklin in the *American Christian Review* admitted that many were desiring such an institution but he had for it no favorable word. It would be but a fifth wheel. In his judgment the only way for a man to become a preacher was, by means of observation and study, to train himself to preach. W. K. Pendleton in the *Millennial Harbinger* refused to accept Franklin's plan as the solution and called upon the brethren for cooperation and careful thinking as to the institution that would supply their need. Isaac Errett complied with the suggestion and attempted a description of the college that would meet the requirements of the Disciples. It is remarkable that there was such a close correspondence between his ideal and the actual organization of The College of the Bible. McGarvey and Errett on this subject were in practical agreement. Most significant is the fact that the type of institution met the approval of the brotherhood generally and it is probable that no other would have been acceptable. One thing is certain: a theological seminary would have died stillborn. The Disciples eschewed the thought of theology and an institution that suggested such a term could never have survived. The most telling argument against any institution was to attach to it the labels "Theological" or "Seminary." Either was equivalent to a death sentence.

The name, College of the Bible, suggested an ideal that harmonized closely with the thinking of the average Disciple. When McGarvey in *Lard's Quarterly* said that the two indispensables of a preacher's training were a knowl-

edge of the Bible and an ability to preach it effectively, he had said the one thing to which most Disciples would give their assent. There was probably no other statement, except the most obvious commonplace, that would have received so nearly unanimous approval. McGarvey's good common sense and his fitness to be the leader are shown by the fact that he seized upon this common denominator of the Disciples' mind and around it organized not only his own institution but through it supplied the name and the ideal to nearly all of the institutions for ministerial training that came into existence among the Disciples during the next fifty years. It is a great achievement when a common yearning of a group of people can be embodied in an institution that adequately expresses that yearning. This The College of the Bible did.

An institution that would train men for the ministry of the Disciples was a recognized necessity; to have attempted more than was expressed in the ideal of The College of the Bible would have been to court failure. This type of institution conformed to the ideals or standards of no other people, but neither did the Disciples. They were a peculiar people and it followed that their educational institution would partake of their peculiarity. Today they are conforming. Their Colleges of the Bible are consequently hastening to outstrip one another in an effort to comply with the requirements of the Association of Seminaries. McGarvey's College of the Bible was the first to attain this distinction. The prophets or time will have to tell whether this is a sign of wholesome progress or decay.

There was no distinction made in The College of the Bible between graduate and undergraduate students. Both groups would meet in the same classes and receive exactly

the same instruction. In one of its classes it once had a student from the mountains of eastern Kentucky who had not completed his high school work and a Master of Arts from one of the best colleges of the East. Such a lack of proper grading was one of the weaknesses of the plan of The College of the Bible. It was not desired that there should be such results but it was inevitable that they should happen under the educational plans and ideals that controlled the college. The unprepared student was always a source of perplexity but every student was expected to take a course in Sacred History, no matter what had been his previous educational experience. It was a fixed point in the planning of the curriculum that an indispensable for every man who expected to preach was a knowledge of the English Bible. McGarvey's courses were to supply this need. They were that-without-which The College of the Bible could not be. It existed for them. Other courses could be added or omitted without impairing the work of the College. These were essential. It is remarkable how completely this point of view seemed to have taken possession of the minds of all connected with the institution, whether instructors or students. McGarvey had done his ground work thoroughly.

These basic courses, called Sacred History, consisted of a study of the Bible historically. They covered three and a half of the four years of the college course. The first unit studied the period from creation to the end of the Judges. Included in this was the study of the contents—the only instruction on this subject that the curriculum provided—of the Mosaic Law. Those taking this course were freshmen and were not prepared for any critical investigations of the problems of the Mosaic period. Hence they were

not introduced to the critical discussion of these questions. That was reserved till the senior year. The course was a paragraph-by-paragraph study of the books from Genesis to Ruth, governed by the assumption that they give an accurate, literal and adequate history of the period. The history of other countries, such as Egypt and Babylon, might supply confirmatory material but could scarcely be said to supplement it.

The majority of those taking this course were young, inexperienced, with a limited education and a decidedly limited knowledge of the history of the ancient world. This course gave to them a compact, easily grasped, simple outline knowledge of the period, based, of course, upon Bible statements alone, and it supplied to them a theory of the period which was readily adapted to their stage of development. Many of these students had not yet completed their high school courses. The freshman class of any college today includes students who are farther advanced in knowledge of history and sciences and are acquainted with problems that were unknown then to the students of the College of the Bible.

The second course in Sacred History covered the period from Samuel to the close of the Old Testament era. A very brief historical study of each of the prophets was introduced at his supposed date and this was the only contact which the student ordinarily had with the prophets. McGarvey readily admitted that this was a deficiency of the college curriculum. It should have a course in the prophets, but neither teachers nor students could find time for it. McGarvey made tentative attempts to provide such a course but he never succeeded in working it out. The fact is that his interest in the prophets was limited. To him their

major value was in the predictions which they made, particularly concerning the Messiah. As a great social and religious force which transformed the moral and spiritual outlook of Israel and rescued its religion from Baalim and idolatry in general, he was scarcely aware. Such a conception of the prophets did not exactly fit into his mental picture of the religious history of Israel.

The period covered by this course abounds in critical problems in the fields of history, society, and literature but they were not brought to the attention of the students except as they affected the dates and authorship of certain books. In such cases McGarvey would state briefly the critical position and then would give his reasons for rejecting it.

The third course was the four Gospels. It was neither a study of the life of Jesus nor was it a course in the harmony of the Gospels. For neither of these did McGarvey have much use. Each Gospel was studied separately, but it can scarcely be said independently. The attitude of McGarvey toward the Gospels did not entertain the thought of independence of one Gospel from the others. Each one supplemented and completed the story of the others and seemingly this would have supplied the proper mental attitude for a harmony of the Gospels but here McGarvey hesitated. It was more than a harmony that he desired. It was a continuous narrative, a part of which was supplied by each of the four Gospels. This should have constituted a life of Christ, but told, as he probably would have said, in the inspired words of the original writers. His mind was not imaginative and he found little value in modern efforts to expand this material into a biography of Jesus.

The fourth unit was the history of the Apostolic Age. The Book of Acts was the basis of the course with a historical study of each of the epistles fitted into its proper place. The historical and critical problems of the New Testament were later in making an appearance than those of the Old Testament and scarcely penetrated the presentation of the history of this period.

Later McGarvey developed his course in criticism and wrote his books on the evidences of Christianity. Earlier he had given a half-year course on this subject but in 1893 it was expanded into a full year's course with his books as texts. He regarded this course as the crowning achievement of his teaching career, and it constituted the final touch which each student needed to prepare him for his work as a minister. It was usually taken in the senior year.

As long as his strength lasted McGarvey taught four hours each day, five days in the week. When his course in criticism was added, one of those in Sacred History had to be given to another teacher. Professor Grubbs took the course in Apostolic History. Then advancing years and increasing deafness made it necessary that McGarvey lighten his load and one by one these courses were yielded to Professors Deweese, Calhoun or Morro. He retained his course in criticism longest, but finally it was entrusted to Professor Deweese.

McGarvey's teaching methods were uniquely his own. He borrowed little from the principles of the science of pedagogy. He knew what he wished to accomplish and he knew the method that he would use in accomplishing it. Memorization had a large place in his plan both for teacher and student. Many people believed, and it was frequently re-

ported that he had so thoroughly committed the Bible to memory that he could restore it if every copy were lost. In reply to a question printed in the *Christian Standard*[128] just a month before his death he says that this ability of his had been greatly exaggerated. For the purpose of his class work he had memorized the Bible but not exactly and not fixedly. A part of each teaching day had to be given up to refreshing his memory. In his writing, memory of the text saved him much time, but he did not rely upon it.

He described his method thus: "When it became my daily work to teach the scripture narrative to classes of college students, I adopted a method by which I recited to them the scripture lesson, paragraph by paragraph, announcing questions on each paragraph for the class to study, answering for them such as they could not be expected to answer without help. This required me to memorize daily one chapter or more and occupied the chief portion of my time for preparation." The next day the process was repeated except that now the student did the reciting. Most of his students now living remember him as quite deaf and it was his custom to request the student reciting to come to his desk and speak into his ear trumpet.

McGarvey's notes for his class work were kept in little Morocco-bound blank books. In these each book of the Bible was divided into its parts, sections and paragraphs. Under each paragraph were noted the questions which he would ask of the class with such references to passages of scripture as would aid them in answering. Each year he would take one of the four courses for revision so that within four years he had revised the series. In 1893 these notes were printed and this ended further revision, but

before this there had been seven complete revisions of each of the four courses. Whatever McGarvey did he did thoroughly.

To form a proper estimate of the value of McGarvey's teaching one must take into consideration the class of students he addressed and the purposes he had in mind. They were not scholars and he did not think of making them into scholars except in one subject, that is, a practical knowledge of the English Bible. His objective was to have a vigorous, evangelistic church, its ministry acquainted with the Bible and preaching it; and thus carrying the gospel to the ends of the earth. It was a restoration of the Apostolic church with its zeal and fervor. Such a task did not require scholars. It needed men of zeal grounded in the knowledge of the scriptures. There was a place in his vision for men who were intellectually of one talent as well as for those of many talents.

In the early days, especially, the majority of the students of The College of the Bible came from rural communities with an inadequate high school training. They were good stuff but undeveloped. They knew little of methods of study. McGarvey's instruction fitted them better than one more pedagogically correct. Many of them became preachers of great power and their debt to McGarvey was incalculable. The occasional student with a better educational preparation fitted as best he could into the college plan and it is surprising that so few complained that they were undergraded. Toward the turn of the century a few that had the benefit of university training expressed their disappointment and one or two were quite vociferous. This means that McGarvey's method fitted his day. It was not adaptable to times of better educational preparation.

The attendance of the new College of the Bible during 1877-78 has already been mentioned as forty-one. From this time on the attendance increased. Its average was above one hundred. Its highest was 187 which came in 1892-93. The lowest enrollment of the College during McGarvey's lifetime was 78 in the year 1902-03.[129] In comparing this record with that of the present enrollment of the College or of any other of our institutions it must be kept in mind that at this time The College of the Bible had few competitors. It was the only institution of the Disciples up to the year 1881 that offered a special course of training for preachers. In this year the College of the Bible of Drake University was organized. Most of the colleges had a biblical department and young men who were planning to preach could get part of their training in it and could complete it elsewhere. But The College of the Bible asked no help from other institutions. It resented the implication that it needed help in its task of training preachers. Its students were not encouraged to go elsewhere, and for a number of years none did. Later McGarvey himself advised a selected few to pursue graduate work in Eastern universities. The Disciples were a self-contained people and The College of the Bible partook of this spirit.

It drew its student body from a wide field. Practically every state that had any considerable number of Disciples would send its quota. Kentucky would naturally supply a number larger than that from any other state. Tennessee would send a considerable number. There would be a smaller group from Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. Other southern states did not have many because in them the Disciple membership was not large. A few came from

Arkansas and the Texas delegation was usually considerable. Few were from Ohio because Hiram College drew strongly from its own state. The group from Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri was usually large. Not infrequently the number from some of these states would exceed a dozen. Kansas sent fewer. After the Drake College of the Bible was established in 1881, the number coming from Iowa and the Northwest was inconsiderable. From remoter regions there was a small but dependable trickle. Students came from Pennsylvania, New York, and even from New England. Most years saw a few from Canada; one or two might come from England, and Australia and New Zealand supplied a goodly number. Some years the Australasian Club would approximate a score. Continental European countries and Armenia sent an occasional student. These were usually hospitably cared for at first in the McGarvey home. The family tells of the occasion when it was the task of the mother to convince a European that God was not deaf and that he could be heard if he prayed less loudly.

The student group was thus from widely distributed sections and every year stories were told of students having new experiences. The number who had never before seen a tobacco field was considerable. A few had their first introduction to long-eared mules in Kentucky. Occasionally a student on his first visit to the country had to ask about a most remarkable sound that he heard which usually or supposedly turned out to be the braying of a Blue Grass donkey. A New York student's money gave out and he left college to work on a farm. He returned on a visit and described his employment as "pitching rails." It remained a mystery as to just what farm operation he described by

this phrase. Usually the experiences of a new Australian student with American food, especially fried chicken, yielded a few laughs. Any one of these students, whether from near or far, could have told you that it was McGarvey's name which drew him to The College of the Bible. Many of them had carried on preliminary correspondence with him rather than with the college office. On the campus, it was discovered with some degree of surprise that there were other men in the faculty and other courses than those given by McGarvey, but the number who were drawn to Lexington by the name and reputation of McGarvey was surprisingly large.

The problem of providing financial support for the college was one that obtruded itself upon the attention of the faculty year after year. Annual subscriptions from the churches of Kentucky as a source of income might justify a start but it was too unreliable for permanent dependence. The three men chosen for the faculty continued the quest for funds during 1877-78 and they were assisted by S. H. King of Stanford. In 1879 a permanent endowment was started. In the spring of 1881 McGarvey was asked to entrust temporarily his classes to other members of the faculty and to devote his time to the solicitation of funds for the college. He spent the six months from March to September on this task and secured in cash and pledges $30,000. B. F. Clay, a graduate of The College of the Bible, continued and took pledges subject to the condition that the total endowment should reach $50,000. In 1884 the amount was $48,240 and the following year the required $1,760 was voted from the current fund. In 1893 McGarvey speaks of the endowment as only a little above $50,000.[130]

After a few years there was a new solicitation of funds with a different objective. The quarters in Morrison Chapel were too cramped and The College of the Bible sorely felt the need of a building of its own. Mention of a proposed building appears first in the transactions of the executive committee in 1890. In 1892 a committee was appointed to select a site on the campus and to negotiate with the curators of Kentucky University for permission to erect a building on this site. This privilege was granted in 1893. The same year G. L. Surber, another graduate of the College, was appointed financial agent to raise money for the building. On July 5 McGarvey, Mark Collis and J. G. Allen were appointed a committee to plan the building and on December 8 their plans were approved and at the suggestion of McGarvey the fund was named in honor of President Robert Milligan, *The Milligan Memorial Fund.* The architect estimated the cost of the building at $24,000. Solicitation of funds continued through 1894 and in 1895 it was constructed and in the autumn was dedicated.

The interior of the building was planned by McGarvey. The first floor was given over to classrooms; the second contained the chapel and the library; the third was occupied by the halls of the literary societies and extra classrooms. Utility rather than aesthetics guided the planning, but a number of colleges have used it as a model in constructing buildings of their own. The cost of the building was $26,012.13. There seems to have been a small debt on the building but by 1900 it was reduced to $125.92.

When McGarvey became President of The College of the Bible, its assets were: endowment, slightly more than $75,000 and a building valued at $26,000.[181] As its permanent fund began in 1879, these sums were the accumulation

of the last sixteen years of the presidency of Graham. By chance McGarvey's presidency also lasted sixteen years and at its close the College had the same building, slightly improved, and an endowment, on June 1, 1911, of $175,804.48. During McGarvey's presidency, therefore, the funds of the College increased approximately $100,000, but that is not the whole story; there was carried on during his incumbency, and under his direction, a campaign not only to secure funds but to win and indoctrinate friends so that following his death the resources of the College continued steadily to increase. This was in spite of the fact that there was a period of disturbance following his death which must temporarily at least have checked the inflow. McGarvey built wisely and he built enduringly.

From his inauguration till his death there was an almost continuous solicitation of funds for the College but it never became an intense campaign. No comprehensive goal or objective was set and no pressure was applied to bring the College assets to any fixed amount. In 1896 McGarvey and Surber acted as a committee to report to the trustees the needs of the College. In 1900 the endowment aggregated $73,087. For a time during this year and the following, J. T. Hawkins served as financial agent. From January, 1901, to October, 1903, M. D. Clubb held this position, soliciting funds to endow chairs in honor of McGarvey and Graham. In 1903 McGarvey addressed a circular letter to the former students urging them to lay a "solid and sufficient financial basis" for the College. In October, 1903, W. T. Donaldson became financial secretary for the College and held this position till after McGarvey's death.[132]

In 1905 the curators of Kentucky University requested The College of the Bible to desist from an active campaign and to leave the field entirely to the former institution. The College was just at the point of attaining an endowment of $100,000 the consummation of which was announced in 1906 but it was felt that the time was not auspicious for it to withdraw completely. Hence it asked instead that there be cooperation between the two and among several reasons emphasized the fact that the prestige and influence of the older men of the faculty, McGarvey and Grubbs, were valuable assets of the College and that it should avail itself of this benefit while they lived. J. W. Hardy became the agent of Kentucky University and till Donaldson's resignation the two worked in cooperation. Between 1906 and 1910, under the leadership of Robert M. Hopkins, then Secretary of the Kentucky Religious Education Society, a campaign was successfully carried on to endow a chair of Religious Education. This brought to the College $25,000 and in honor of Hopkins' father it was named, *The Alexander C. Hopkins Chair of Religious Education.*

The original faculty continued without change till 1894 when Benjamin C. Deweese was added. He had been a professor in Eureka College, Illinois, and his coming to The College of the Bible had been long desired by McGarvey. It seemingly had been frankly discussed between McGarvey and Deweese so that when the invitation came to him Deweese's acceptance was sent by return mail. His especial task was to lighten the load of the aging members of the faculty. His coming added no new courses, but he took some of those previously given by each of the three. He fitted excellently into the plan of the College and proved himself to be an admirable helper of the faculty. He was

a man of high character, genial and companionable. He was a good counsellor. His scholarship was thorough, and of the very type which The College of the Bible sought to develop. He rendered high service for many years as a teacher in the college.

In March, 1895, Graham resigned as President. At the dedicatory services of the new College of the Bible building in the autumn he surrendered the president's office into the hands of McGarvey. The latter was no novice. He had been a member of its faculty from the beginning and to a considerable degree its guiding spirit. He continued as its president till his death in 1911. Graham taught for two years longer but at the commencement of 1898, after half a century of teaching, he closed his active career. He died in January, 1901, and the long and intimate friendship between Graham and McGarvey, which began in 1847, came to an end.

James C. Keith of Bethany College was called to take the place of Professor Graham. His class, that of 1866, was the first to graduate from The College of the Bible. His stay was brief for at the end of the first session he resigned and returned to Bethany. The place vacated by the resignation of Keith was filled by the call of Samuel M. Jefferson. He came from California where he had served as Dean of the Berkeley Bible Seminary. He was a most satisfactory teacher and was highly esteemed by the students. He remained a member of the faculty till his death in 1914.

In the spring of 1904 announcement was made that at the opening of the fall session Hall L. Calhoun would be added to the faculty. He had been a brilliant student, graduating in 1892. He taught and preached in Tennessee till 1901 when at McGarvey's suggestion he entered Yale Divinity School. There was an understanding with the board

that when he had completed his university course he would be invited to join the faculty of The College of the Bible. In 1902 he received from Yale the B.D. degree and two years later the Ph.D. from Harvard. He began teaching in the College of the Bible in the autumn and continued till his resignation in 1917. He was diligent, painstaking, a master of details. He was closely associated with McGarvey, and rendered him every assistance in his power in his teaching and his administrative work. In temperament and type of mind they were very congenial to one another. In September, 1905, Professor Grubbs on account of failing health was granted an indefinite leave of absence on salary. He was never able to resume his teaching but lived on till September 20, 1912, when he died at the age of 79. In the fall of 1906 W. C. Morro became a member of the faculty. In 1909 he was chosen dean of the College. The purpose of the board in creating this office was to give assistance to President McGarvey in his growing frailty. Morro resigned from the faculty in the spring of 1911 and left shortly before the death of McGarvey.

During the years of his presidency McGarvey had charge of the chapel service, though members of the faculty assisted him in turn. This service was quiet, dignified, uplifting. The talks were wholesome. His prayers were models of devotion and reverence. W. E. Crabtree wrote to ask that he publish a small volume of his chapel prayers. Since they were not written, McGarvey could not comply with the request. In the year that McGarvey was eighty Professor Jefferson requested him to make a talk each week on the foundations of his religious life. It was the hope that he would talk intimately on those subjects that were near to his heart and would reveal some of the richness on which his soul had fed. He returned to an early love and

gave expositions of certain passages in Acts somewhat after the example of his commentary on that book. The series was somewhat disappointing; Professor Jefferson thought his request probably came too late in McGarvey's life.

On March 1, 1909, the eightieth anniversary of his birth was celebrated. It was fittingly commemorated in the chapel service of The College of the Bible. Speeches were made by representatives of the faculty, the College board and the students. The faculty presented him with a handsomely bound, large type copy of the Bible. On receiving it, he said, "If it were not that it would be wasting a beautiful copy of the Word of God, I should ask that it be placed in my coffin with me." At a suitable moment in the service the negro janitor came down the aisle to present on behalf of the faculty of the University a cake with eighty candles.

The secretary read the resolutions that had been adopted by the faculty for the occasion. In part they were as follows, "We also wish to express our wonder at the extent and permanent character of the achievements which in spite of limited resources have been wrought out by him and our profound admiration for the outcome of his life's work as it is today exhibited especially in the buildings, endowment, influence and future prospects of The College of the Bible. He had worthy co-laborers in this great task, yet no one will gainsay the statement that a very large measure of the success is due to his tireless activity, patience and preseverance.

"We deem it no less worthy of mention that, though older by more than a score of years than the oldest of us, we have always found him delightfully companionable, considerate of our feelings, appreciative of our efforts, and tolerant toward our individual preferences and opinions.

On questions concerning the policy and administration of the College we and he have occasionally differed. Such a fact is too insignificant to be worthy of record, were it not that we have always found him so ready to yield to the judgment and wishes of others. No single instance upon his part of irritation, mere faultfinding or insistence upon having his own way has ever marked his attitude towards any one of us or our predecessors during the time since our senior member became connected with the faculty. Neither the age, the longer experience, nor the well-known strength of convictions of our President has ever made him arbitrary or dictatorial towards the other members of his faculty. Each of us feels the freedom and exercises the right to develop his courses of instruction as he understands his duty towards the God of truth and the young men that compose his classes. Our usual title is not a mere form. He is in reality what our speech declares him to be, honored and dearly beloved, our Brother McGarvey."

On this his eightieth birthday he offered his resignation as president. Every member of the board of trustees felt satisfied with his achievement during the past fourteen years that he had served and requested him to continue as long as health and strength permitted. Two more years was the time allotted him.

What was McGarvey's conception of the future and destiny of The College of the Bible? He has not left us in doubt as to the answer to this question. In his annual report in 1908 he said that it was his hope and expectation that it should become the greatest seat of biblical learning in the world. To this end he charged the members of his faculty to become specialists in chosen fields of biblical knowledge and to watch for young men who would carry on toward this goal. He further planned for the Board

and the Kentucky brotherhood as to the part they should have in this enterprise. It was a great ideal and the plan for it was not lacking in penetrating wisdom.

The attainment of such an ideal would mean different things to different men. To many it would mean a great university, not restricted in its scope to the Bible alone nor even to the Bible and closely related subjects. It would be a seat of learning where there would be a great library and where different and conflicting views concerning the Bible might be presented. It did not mean this to McGarvey. It meant an institution with a single point of view, actuated by one motive and that the proclamation of the biblical doctrine of salvation. He was always practical. Knowledge on no subject, certainly not knowledge of the Bible, was for its own sake alone. It was to inspire faith in Jesus. His College of the Bible had separated knowledge of the Bible from other branches of knowledge, and this would also be true of his ideal College of the Bible. It would always exist as an institution isolating biblical knowledge from other useful fields of human learning.

McGarvey never had the experience that comes from contact with other scholars in a great university, but was practically self-taught. Such a person knows his own field but is frequently hostile to other points of view than the one he has mastered. This was true of McGarvey. He knew his own point of view but had not learned from contact with them that others who had a different approach might be equally as loyal as himself. There were fields of research within biblical subjects which his planned curriculum for The College of the Bible had not and could not enter. This is manifest in an article originally published in *The Christian-Evangelist* and later issued as a pamphlet.

It bore the title, *How Far Behind Are We?*[133] It was a comparison between the curriculum and the instruction of Union Theological Seminary and The College of the Bible. He equates hours of one against hours in the other. Such a comparison ignores the fact that there may be great, wide chasms of difference in courses that have the same or similar titles; and that the objects of a course may profoundly influence its quality.

The environment and the background of The College of the Bible, therefore, prevent it from becoming "the greatest seat of biblical learning in the world" in any sense that will be generally accepted. In the sense that McGarvey used the phrase that may still be the goal of its endeavoring. In loyalty to McGarvey does this involve a complete acceptance of his points of view? Unquestionably McGarvey hoped that these would remain unchanged, yet he never attempted by means of creedal statements or legal measures, to bind the future to the past. According to its own sense of the right, he left the college free to develop its responsibility to God and the young men who attend its classes. Its future was to be shaped by the ideals and not by the letter of McGarvey's teaching.

It is easy to express the wish that on certain details McGarvey's position had been different. There has been no effort in these pages to maintain that he was always right. Errors of judgment and mistaken assumptions have been fully conceded. Alongside of these concessions there stands the reiterated assertion that his ideals and the intentions of his heart were about as perfect as one may hope to find in mortal flesh.

To pass a proper judgment upon his achievements one must clearly appraise the conditions under which he

worked. It was no comfortable study, swivel-chair sort of decision that he was called upon to make. He had to arrive at it to meet hard, stern realities of life. He found himself committed to the leadership of a people in revolt against positions of the past. There is no leadership more difficult than this. If McGarvey had attempted to take the positions which our modern wisdom says he should have taken, he would have failed. As it was, he succeeded. He was the embodiment of his age; he spoke to the men of his generation in language that they understood; they sympathetized with his positions and they trusted him. Had he spoken differently he would not have succeeded in his leadership.

THE PERMANENCY OF McGARVEY'S LIFE-WORK

The story of McGarvey's life and achievements has been told, inadequately certainly, but with admiration and truthfully. This closing chapter attempts an appraisal of his accomplishments, particularly with reference to their permanency, and the value of his contributions to Protestant thought in general, and especially to the Disciples of Christ. Such an undertaking calls for the unusual combination of the talents of Seer and Interpreter and is most difficult.

His contributions may be viewed from several angles. In a number of respects he helped the Disciples formulate their ideals and their policies. He was always aggressive in advocating certain definite views, doctrinal in the early stages of his life, critical and historical later. He was a teacher, and in both his methods and the contents of his teaching, he departed from the prevailing customs and standards. He incorporated all of these ideals in an institution, The College of the Bible, which became the incarnation of every one of his aspirations and spiritual judgments. When everything else fails him The College of the Bible may be expected to perpetuate his name. Finally his life as a whole, his moral and spiritual integrity, his ideals, hopes and aspirations deserve the fullest consideration. Ultimate judgment of a man should never rest upon one section or aspect of his life but upon the completeness of his personality and the thoroughness with which he has been able to incorporate this into the pattern of life which he lives before the world. In these respects and in a spirit that is sympathetic with all that is noblest and best in his

life this chapter will attempt to make an honest evaluation of his contributions to life and to determine the way in which his ideals may be perpetuated.

No man had a greater part than McGarvey in shaping the policy of the Disciples to place the Bible at the very center of religion. They were from the beginning a people of the Bible and their preaching was the message of this book. They rejected speculative theology and proposed to substitute for it a simple application of the Bible teaching to the problems of life. This attitude of theirs toward the Bible was wholesome and invigorating, though their spirit may be criticised as too often legalistic. It enriched the religious life of those early days. Its tendency was to make religion both practical and reasonable. No voice was more influential in this than that of McGarvey and he embodied this revolutionary change in The College of the Bible. He made the Bible central in its curriculum and incorporated the fact in its name. This name gripped the imagination of the early Disciples. For fifty years numerous institutions modeled after McGarvey's were founded at home and in the mission fields and practically all of them were Colleges of the Bible. This name was not an idle gesture. The Disciples were grounded in the truths and principles of the Bible. Their preachers needed to know the Bible. It was recognized as their one indispensable equipment.

It has been conceded above that the early Disciples were legalistically inclined. Such an attitude was characteristic of the mid-nineteenth century and of the American spirit of that day. McGarvey partook of this spirit. He belonged to his generation. He thought its thoughts and spoke its language. His success in winning the confidence of the people of his day and in attaining leadership over them

was due in no small measure to this fact. Had he assumed a different attitude or spoken a different language, he could not have been the leader of that people. McGarvey fitted his day as Andrew Jackson fitted the democracy of the Middle West.

Our present age is in revolt against many of the beliefs of that day and in nothing more definitely so than against the legalism that seemed at that time to be so logically invincible. Thinking people among the Disciples today are suspicious of legalistic attitudes and explanations. McGarvey is involved in this reaction. The most frequently expressed judgment concerning him is a dissent from what is spoken of as his rigid and legalistic attitude. The majority of even his former students agree in this judgment.

How far will this reaction go? Reactions like pendulums tend to go to extremes. There is danger that in correcting mistakes such a reaction will also destroy values. This risk faces the Disciples. Such a reaction cannot go beyond a certain limit without imperiling their very existence. If it advances so far as to remove all distinctions between them and other religious groups no place will remain for them. Their very distinctions give them a warrant to exist and to plead for Christian union. Without these their witness would become ineffective and they would pass into nonexistence. Some features of their fathers' plea they will do well to retain and this high appreciation of the Bible should be one of them.

It must be conceded that there is need of revision in their conception of the place of the Bible. Life is far more complicated than it was in the days of McGarvey and the most pressing question before our generation is whether the principles of the Christian religion are adequate to the

solution of its problems. This requires as never before that the Bible be studied and its teachings be thoroughly understood. McGarvey's ideals with reference to the Bible are a priceless inheritance of the Disciples and need a new application to the problems of today.

The viewpoint and the motive in studying the Bible today differ from those of McGarvey's time. Hence this age can profit from McGarvey, not by literally doing and teaching as he did, but by meeting the problems that confront it in the spirit and with the ideals of McGarvey. In this way only can any person of the past be of value to a later generation. A granddaughter today cannot literally follow in the steps of her pioneer grandmother who wrought with a spinning wheel on a puncheon floor and cooked in a Dutch oven, yet this granddaughter can acquire inspiration and help to live her life, from the pioneer spirit of the older woman. So may the Disciples of the mid-twentieth century follow in the steps of McGarvey and others of his day. Other ways of imitating the past with profit there are not.

McGarvey made many other contributions to the doctrine of the Disciples. One of these, as noted in an earlier chapter, was his interpretation of conversion. Protestant theology had turned aside too far and had arrived at a conception of God's dealings with man in accord with which the Spirit of God acts irrationally and unpredictably. In their efforts to correct this many Disciples, McGarvey one of the number, went too far in constructing an explanation of conversion that was mechanical and unyielding. For example, what faith was required of a man before baptism? In his *Commentary on Acts* he gives the usual answer of the Disciples: "Faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God."

This is a sufficient confession. With it the church should be satisfied and should require no other. Later, however, he extended this so as to include orthodoxy, according to his standard, on practically all matters of belief including even critical questions concerning the Old Testament. He further affirmed that hesitancy to believe certain doctrines, even certain critical theories, may deprive one of heaven.

The reaction against this extreme position today is decided. There are few that would impose as a prerequisite to baptism that a man should be correct in his dating of the Book of Daniel; that he accept as literal history the stories of Genesis or that he have no misgiving as to the virgin birth of Jesus. To insist upon following McGarvey literally in all of these matters would be to invite disaster. It would be the most effective way of defeating the very purpose of McGarvey's whole life. It is the spirit of McGarvey, freed from the rigorous attitude which the circumstances of the time imposed upon him, that should guide the Disciples and not a literal dependence upon his very words. Like David each group and each individual must serve his own day and generation.

McGarvey was a superior teacher, particularly for such youths as in his day made up the student body of The College of the Bible. The number of those who were profoundly influenced by his presentation of Bible facts was exceedingly large. His teaching not only presented the facts but also supplied the student with an interpretation of these facts. In a quiet and most effective manner, with a touch of evangelistic fervor which was always a strong element in his nature, he disposed his students to accept the program of life which the Bible presents.

His method of teaching was peculiarly his own. Not only had he wrought out for himself the substance of what he taught, but he had also developed the method by which it was presented. It was not shaped by a desire to conform to the best pedagogical methods but by the practical design of giving the student such knowledge as he required. It was a method that might easily become mechanical, and in the hands of a less dynamic teacher than he, did actually become so, yet few would say that it was mechanical in the hands of McGarvey. He kept it living and vital.

Professor H. B. Robison of Culver-Stockton College in the following paragraph has well described McGarvey's ideals and objectives in teaching. "His ideas of teaching the Bible," he says, "were definite and precise. He thought of parts of the Bible as history, and parts of it as prophecy, and prophecy was prediction. Prophecy he did not attempt to teach in class except a little in his later years. To him the historical parts of the Bible were factual and simple, and he had the facts well in mind. He succeeded in imparting this body of Biblical knowledge to the minds of his students with remarkable rapidity. There was not much discussion, there was straight learning; and if a student did not know the answer, the class was invited to tell him. In a short time he sent young preachers out with a definite body of information and point of view who filled the pulpits of the brotherhood far and wide. He advised his students to stay out of the cities and away from theological and philosophical discussions and preach the Bible and convert people to Jesus Christ. There is no doubt that he put more preachers into our pulpits than did any other teacher among us and that his influence had much to do with the rapid growth of our membership in

those years. It was comforting and encouraging to receive his approval. If a student dissented strongly and persistently from his conclusions, it was difficult for the two to get along together successfully. At that time the majority and the philosophy of teaching supported the teacher."

In spite of his excellence as a teacher there were defects in his methods. Dean Colby D. Hall of Texas Christian University, who was a student under McGarvey and found him inspiring and helpful, speaks from the point of view of an experienced administrator who is thoroughly acquainted with the best educational methods that are in present use. He comments concerning McGarvey's methods in teaching as follows: "As viewed by teaching methods of today, McGarvey's had distinct limitations. He did more telling than teaching. The student was given the answer; he was not taught to search for it. I never heard him refer a student to any book other than the Bible and the *Lands of the Bible*. This was a limitation, partly of his day, and partly of his point of view. No teacher could succeed with that method today."

A number of his other students express similar judgments. Among them Madison A. Hart says, "President McGarvey had a more complete knowledge of the actual words of the Bible than any man that I have ever known. He was clear in presenting his thesis but honesty compels me to say that he lacked several of the elements of a great teacher. He was a bit too legalistic in his interpretations. He always impressed me with the feeling that he was more interested in having his own conceptions of truth accepted than in opening the minds of his students out upon the public square of truth and reality. He lacked the ability

to inspire his students with the great passion to seek truth from whatever source it might come."

There are justice and correctness in these criticisms and yet one significant phase of the truth has not been taken into account. There are two ways by which a teacher may impart to his students enthusiasm for knowledge. One is by a teaching method and the other is by his own example. The very thoroughness of McGarvey's knowledge of the facts of the Bible became a stimulant to many students to emulate his example. McGarvey did not cite his students to the library; he did not teach them the independent use of books, yet his life and his knowledge inspired some to acquire that which they recognized was the source of his own power. He failed to work out and to impart to them a method of study, but he did fill their minds with a passion to know. Such a passion is more important than the method. Given the passion, a method will be found.

McGarvey's contribution, therefore, in the field of teaching was not in the method that he used. Perhaps no living teacher is attempting to use it today. McGarvey made it a success, but a change in the circumstances and the time has rendered it ineffective. Once more therefore the inference is inevitable that he is not to be followed literally but in spirit. Here again the letter kills but the spirit gives life.

McGarvey's most distinctive contribution was in his devotion to certain doctrinal positions. These were definite and fixed, and there were a number of reasons for their assuming this form. In the first place, he believed that he derived them directly from the Bible and they were thus a revelation from God. He further assumed that they were so clear that on matters of fundamental faith there was little chance or probability of differences. A departure

from a faith so evident could be accounted for only by an assumption that the person differing was perverse. McGarvey and other members of the faculty were usually in agreement. Any difference between two of their teachers was to the students a matter of surprise and to some extent of perplexity. There was a standing disagreement between McGarvey and Grubbs as to the state of the dead. McGarvey believed in an intermediate state; Grubbs, that the righteous dead pass immediately to their inheritance. In 1860 these two debated in the *American Christian Review* the meaning of repentance, but this seemingly did not come to the attention of students of later days. To the modern student it will seem a small matter that they disagreed; he is trained to expect this of his teachers. The students of The College of the Bible were not. Disagreement seemed to imply that someone was failing to follow the lead of the Spirit of God. The result was a doctrinal system that was fixed and from which few dissented.

It was because historical criticism threatened the solidarity of this rigid system that McGarvey in his later years devoted so large a part of his time and energy to a tireless resistance to this type of criticism. During the forty years that have passed since he wrote upon this subject the steady drift of unbiased scholarship has been toward the judgment that he was in error. This is not the place to enter into the discussion as to whether he or present-day scholarship was right. Each competent person must decide this for himself. The task confronting us is to determine the value which remains of McGarvey's part in the controversy.

In spite of the fact that the past settled many of its questions on purely traditional grounds, it nevertheless possessed a rich deposit of truth. His efforts were to pre-

serve, unconsciously perhaps, this valuable inheritance. He did not see, as few of his generations saw, that there were equally precious truths to be acquired by the new method and by it alone. Some portions of this new truth he accepted but others he did not. The critics in many cases fell into a similar error. In their eagerness to establish the new, they were disposed to minimize the value of the old.

It is usual in such controversies to correct the excess of one side by the moderation of the other. In such a way as this one is to seek the truth in the present controversy. A passion on the part of both sides for the truth gave value to the controversy. The radicalism of one side is corrected by the conservatism of the other. McGarvey, therefore, in his extreme conservatism, even when he is judged to be in error, is not without value.

To a zealous champion of his side, one who glories that he "holds to the things for which McGarvey stood," this will seem but a scant tribute of praise. If anyone in his quest for truth has been honest and truth-loving, his errors are but errors of judgment. His sincerity has imparted value to his efforts even when they were wrong. This is a just basis for passing judgment upon any controversy and its disputants. So must we judge McGarvey. Of his sincerity there was no doubt and where his judgment was at fault there remains for him the meed of praise that he did in all honesty what he believed was right.

No man can doubt the sincerity and the nobility of McGarvey's life. Whatever estimate one may place upon the correctness of his doctrines, his fidelity and devotion to truth, as he understood it, lie above question. Such a life is immortal. In this perishable world the one thing that endures is a noble life. The name of the man who lived it

may be forgotten. The record of his deeds and the very deeds themselves may fade from the memory of men, yet the nobility of his life is built enduringly into the fabric of other lives and in them it continues and achieves. McGarvey's name and life are slowly but with increasing speed traveling the road whither soon he will be "as though he had not been." In the Preface to his volume of Sermons he expressed the hope that this collection of his addresses might postpone the coming of that certain hour.

Death came to him nearly thirty years ago. Hence every man who graduated under him is well past fifty and many of them are retiring into the inactivity of old age. It is no longer true as it was forty years ago that the leading pulpits of the Disciples are filled by McGarvey's students. It was a serious question in the minds of the group that planned the writing of this biography whether sufficient interest could be aroused to justify the effort. Recently an aged friend of McGarvey's made the comment, "There are men in Lexington that do not know that such a man as McGarvey ever lived." All of this is true but it does not end in futility. In spite of the fact that men are forgetting the name of McGarvey, and will continue to forget it, his fidelity and integrity have passed to multitudes of men through the channel of the lives, achievements and preaching of his students. The fact that he lived has added greatly to the nobility of life. Like slowly falling snow that obliterates all of the outlines of the landscape, so time is thrusting his name into the ranks of the forgotten, yet he lives and will live on. In the sense that the poet meant, he has joined the "Choir Invisible"

> "Of those immortal dead who live again
> In minds made better by their presence."

The College of the Bible is the great monument to McGarvey's life and leadership. His other achievements were subsidiary to it. In it he embodied the noblest ideals and aspirations of the Disciples of his time and in this tangible, workable form handed them on to the Future. Through this institution the name and influence of McGarvey will have their largest measure of power in succeeding generations.

Should his teaching and his point of view be carried on unchanged? McGarvey hoped that they would be unaltered, though he took no steps to bind them legally, nor to impose upon them a creedal statement. He left the college free for each generation in accord with its own sense of responsibility to its students and the truth to develop its future. As all know the present policy of the College has been not to continue the methods and ideals of McGarvey unchanged. His own special courses have been altered; his textbooks are no longer used; his theories have been revised; and certain doctrines taught by him, which he regarded as almost identical with the gospel, are no longer taught. He left it so that those in charge of the College had the legal right to make these changes, but did they have the moral right? Two answers have been given to this question and two groups have formed around them. One group holds that loyalty to his name and the rights in the matter demand that his ideals and doctrines should be taught unchanged. The other, holding a view that truth is always progressive and that each generation must settle its own problems in accord with the eternal principles of the gospel, holds that new conditions and new light demand a fresh adaptation of the truth. On general principles the latter position seems undoubtedly to be correct. All other

men and institutions are subject to this rule of change; McGarvey alone cannot be exempted.

Both of these groups will agree that there should be a loyalty on the part of the College to McGarvey, but in what does this loyalty consist? Reduce each position to its fundamental principle and the difference is found to be exactly that which has been mentioned on previous topics. Is this loyalty to consist in a literal following of him in all matters or in an interpretation of his spirit? The College must adapt itself to changed conditions; it was doing that very thing in the days of McGarvey and it must continue to do it now. This again calls for a determining of what the spirit of his life and teaching is and an application of it to the future of the College.

The permanent value of McGarvey is not to be determined by a slavishly literal devotion to his positions, but by a reasonable interpretation of the spirit and purpose of his whole life. McGarvey believed in the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. Some of his friends insist that loyalty to him requires acceptance of the same belief. His opponents say that in this he was in error and therefore reject him completely. Both sides go to extremes. McGarvey is to be evaluated by his life as a whole and not by one feature of it. The same reasoning will also apply to other critical positions. It is a reasonable principle that McGarvey is to be judged, not by incidents or sections of his taken singly, but by his life as a whole.

One who adopts this point of view may claim to be a true son of McGarvey. Kinship in spirit, not literal acceptance of his views, is the test of loyalty to him. This is the test that is applied to all others of the past. On the part of those who are competent to pass judgment it would

be affirmed that Francis of Assisi is perhaps the most perfect realization of the ideals of Jesus that the church can supply. Such a conclusion is arrived at by the spirit of his life in its entirety, not by his attitude towards property or towards monasticism. Luther can be convicted of many errors, yet a fair appraisal of his life is that he was one of Christianity's great heroes and a foremost contributor to Christian life and truth. Albert Schweitzer is the embodiment of a Christian life of devotion, consecration and sacrifice. Thousands find in him an inspiration to the highest ideals of life, yet his application of the doctrine of eschatology to Jesus is repellant to a majority. Paul holds that the true sons of Abraham are those who share in his spirit, not those who trace descent from him. Similarly the sons of McGarvey are those who in his spirit follow truth whithersoever it leads.

McGarvey's life was open and could be read by all men. That for which he lived was no secret either to friend or foe. Men in Lexington who were unsympathetic with his ideals of life have testified that he lived loyally to his principles. His fidelity to these ideals was constant throughout life. While yet in college, in his teens, he formed the purpose to preach and industriously employed his time in fitting himself for this calling. As a young man in Missouri he subordinated everything to the major task of acquiring knowledge of the Bible. He did this so thoroughly that his brotherhood found him fitted for its supreme task. Or would it be more suitable to say that he made his task, that of teaching the Bible in a small, struggling college, the major task of the brotherhood? As Moses was faithful in all of God's house so was McGarvey faithful in all of the enterprises of the church. The College of the Bible

served the brotherhood. It is easy to criticise the principles by which it was operated, but it is very doubtful whether anything very different would have survived and served the needs of that hour. McGarvey wrote prolifically and every page that he wrote was prompted by the supreme desire to point out the truth of God and to build His cause among men. His conception of the truth was challenged in his day and more insistently today, but none that knew his heart could doubt that he sought the truth. His methods of combat may at times seem to be somewhat ungenerous but he struggled for that which was to him more precious than life. He gave his best to the church, as minister, as officer, as adviser. No man can measure the strength and vigor which he imparted to the churches of Kentucky and indirectly to the churches of the whole world. In moral principles, he lived blamelessly. In devotion, he vowed by the Syrian Sea to give to his utmost. This he did without stint. Those who were permitted to have glimpses into his inner heart knew that it cherished only nobility and uprightness. He lived life to the full; he was never content with the superficial; in thankfulness and a joyous spirit he drank of life's cup. This is the McGarvey whose life challenges us to emulation. This can not be done by literally doing or believing as he did, but only by each one facing duty honestly, and truth candidly, and deciding each problem as it arises guided only by truth. This was McGarvey's ideal and it should be that of every man who follows in his steps.

NOTES

The following abbreviations are used:

Ch. C., *The Christian Century;* Ch. E., *The Christian-Evangelist;* Ch. S., *The Christian Standard;* A. C. R., *The American Christian Review;* A. G., *The Apostolic Guide;* A. T., *The Apostolic Times;* L. Q., *Lard's Quarterly;* M. H., *The Millennial Harbinger;* Com., *Commentary on Acts;* L. of B., *The Lands of the Bible.*

1. This *Foreword* is presented by the author as a personal narrative. He is responsible for all the statements given in it. The rest of the book is more impersonal and whenever it is possible the authority for any statement is cited.

2. Ch. S., October 28, 1911.

3. McGarvey has been credited with giving a similar answer to Mrs. Reid whose husband died in Mount Sterling under tragic circumstances. She was the daughter of McGarvey's college friend, Thomas Munnell. This was much earlier than the Yancey incident.

4. Statement of Dr. John O. McReynolds, Dallas, Texas.

5. McGarvey gives the date of his coming to Lexington as the spring of 1863 (Ch. S., April 4, 1903), but his son and others name the year as 1862. The earlier date is undoubtedly correct for he was in Lexington at the time of the battle of Richmond which was fought August 30, 1862.

6. President McGarvey in his correspondence with his oldest son makes frequent reference to the subject of his biography. It is probable that this son began to write, but he died in April, 1911, six months before his father. The task was then taken up by another son, James Thomson, who added something more to the manuscript, but it is not possible now to tell what part is the work of the older and what part is that of the younger son. It is everywhere incomplete, contains many lacunae and marginal notes suggesting the securing of additional material or revision. It is fuller in the earlier periods of McGarvey's life, but after his location in Lexington it is little more than a chronicle of events. Evidently McGarvey himself supplied the material for the earlier periods. This document is used as a source and indebtedness to it is hereby acknowledged, especially for Chapters II, III and IV. Mrs. A. R. Bourne was to have collaborated with the younger son and spent one summer in Lexington during which time she wrote a considerable part of the section which she was to contribute. Her manuscript has not been available to the author of this biography.

7. The account given by Professor Grubbs is almost contemporaneous with the event and undoubtedly gives an accurate account of what happened. The story of this debate has been told in a form that was clearly embellished by details that are legendary. One man, who was in a position to be better informed, told that McGarvey met the Presbyterian preacher in public debate, and after the second night was left to hold the platform alone.

8. A. C. R., June, 1861.

9. The original edition was published by Franklin and Rice, Cincinnati, 1863. It was many times reprinted.

10. Com., p. 4.

11. Com., p. 6.

12. Garrison's *Religion Following the Frontier,* pp. 122-123.

13. Com., p. 38.

14. Com., p. 140.

15. Com., p. 141.

16. Acts 16:14.

17. Com., pp. 210-213.

18. Com., p. 57.

19. Com., p. 56.

20. 2 Cor. 7:10.

21. Gal. 2:20.

22. Acts 16:30.

23. Com., pp. 209-210.

24. Some of my friends say that I have not done full justice to Campbell in thus limiting his conception of faith to a mere intellectual process. They base their judgment upon some sentences of his in his *Christian System,* Chapter XIV, on *Faith in Christ.* Here he admits an element of trust. He explains, however, that this is due to the figure of metonymy, the effect for the cause. When a person is the object of faith there follows an element of confidence or trust in that person, but this element is not an essential part of faith. It is due to the object of faith. He adds, "Faith is the simple belief of testimony, or of the truth, and never can be more nor less than that." He quotes 2 Thess. 2:3 to prove that Paul substitutes for faith, the belief of the truth. In an illustration of the rescue of persons from a wrecked vessel, he names faith as the formal cause, that is, consent to accept the guidance of the rescuer, *Christian System,* p. 248.

25. E.g., Acts 16:31.

26. Com., p. 56.

27. Com., p. 57.

28. Com., p. 56.

29. Com., pp. 40-41.

30. June 22, 1871.

31. Author's class notes.

32. October 5, 1871.

33. Acts 16:3.

34. Gal. 5:2-4, 11, 14.
35. Curators' Address, p. 68; cf. Note 37.
36. Curators' Address, p. 20.
37. The sources of information for this controversy are mainly three: (1) A number of contributed articles and editorials in the *Apostolic Times.* (2) A leaflet by a committee of five members of the church, issued in August, 1873, bearing the title, "An Address to the Members of the Christian Church in Kentucky." (3) A report of a special committee of eight members appointed by the Curators at its autumn meeting in 1873. Its special function was to formulate a reply to a petition addressed to the Curators by the churches in Kentucky and it was authorized by the Curators to publish its report or reports. It met and promptly divided into two factions and prepared two reports. The majority report was written by John Augustus Williams, a brother-in-law of Bowman. The minority report was written presumably by General W. T. Withers. The two reports were published in a pamphlet entitled, "Address of the Board of Curators of Kentucky University to Certain Churches and Donors, etc., 1873."
38. A copy of this tract has been supplied to the author by Enos E. Dowling, Librarian of the School of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis.
39. Curators' Address, p. 20.
40. Idem, p. 20.
41. Idem, p. 26.
42. Idem, p. 63.
43. Idem, p. 28.
44. Idem, p. 64.
45. Idem, p. 63.
46. M. H., 1864, p. 510.
47. M. H., May, 1849, p. 300.
48. L. Q., May, 1864.
49. 1 Cor. 14:26.
50. M. H., Jan., 1865.
51. M. H., Feb., 1865.
52. Idem.
53. M. H., April, 1865.
54. M. H., March, 1868.
55. M. H., June, 1868.
56. M. H., Jan., 1865.
57. M. H., April, 1868.
58. This action by the Main Street Church was in 1887.
59. June 17 and July 22.
60. The original letters from the Broadway Church to McGarvey and his wife, signed by Mark Collis the Minister, and dated Nov. 2, 1902, are in the possession of the author.
61. Nov. 16, 1902.

62. Handbook series for the Bethany Christian Endeavor Reading Course, Vol. I, 1897, Cleveland, Ohio.
63. Memorial Address, March 1, 1912.
64. *Commentary on Matthew and Mark,* Publishers' Preface p. iii.
65. Idem, p. 62.
66. *The Fourfold Gospel,* pp. IV, 352-353.
67. Krüger's *History of Early Christian Literature,* p. 120.
68. L. of B., p. 12.
69. 2 Cor. 1:8-11.
70. Rev. 1:11.
71. L. of B., p. 144.
72. Gen. 12:8 and Josh. 8:9-12.
73. Ch. E., April 20, 1893.
74. Text and Canon, p. 1.
75. Idem, p. 55.
76. Idem, p. 17.
77. Idem, p. 56.
78. *Commentary on Matthew and Mark,* p. 10.
79. *Credibility and Inspiration,* p. 1.
80. Idem, p. 183.
81. Idem, p. 190.
82. March 1, 1912.
83. Ch. S., Aug. 1, 1903.
84. 2 Kings 22:8.
85. Exodus 24:7.
86. *Expository Times,* June, 1902, p. 419.
87. *Biblical Criticism,* p. 3.
88. Idem, pp. 3-4.
89. Ch. S., Jan. 7, 1893.
90. Ch. S., Oct. 15, 1898.
91. Ch. S., Aug. 28, 1897.
92. Idem.
93. Ch. S., Sept. 11, 1897.
94. Ch. S., July 13, 1896.
95. Idem.
96. Memorial Address, March 1, 1912.
97. Ch. S., July 6, 1895.
98. Ch. S., Jan., 1897.
99. Ch. S., Sept. 24, 1898.
100. Ch. S., April 15, 1902.
101. Ch. S., March 19, 1904.
102. M. H., 1846, pp. 13-22.
103. Ch. S., March 2 and 9, 1895.
104. Ch. S., April 5, 1902.
105. Ch. S., Nov. 9, 1895.
106. Ch. S., July 16, 1910.
107. The author's personal recollections.
108. Ch. S., Jan. 26, 1895.

109. Ch. S., May 29, 1897.
110. Ch. S., Jan. 6, March 23 to May 29, 1895.
111. Ch. S., Nov. 28 and Dec. 5, 1908.
112. Ch. S., June 15, 1895.
113. Ch. S., Jan. 29, 1910.
114. Ch. C., Aug. 23, 1906.
115. Ch. S., Jan. 7, 1907.
116. Ch. C., Nov. 15, 1902.
117. Ch. E., June 5, 1897.
118. Ch. E., Jan. 6, 1906.
119. Ch. S., July 25, 1903.
120. Fosdick's *A Guide to the Understanding of the Bible,* Foreword.
121. Curators' Address. Majority Report, p. 15.
122. Minutes of the Main Street Christian Church copied into the records of the Broadway Christian Church by J. W. McGarvey; Date, June 25, 1871.
123. Curators' Address, p. 16.
124. All of these facts are taken from the minutes of the Broadway Church.
125. Acts 20:7.
126. Ch. S., Jan. 4, 1908.
127. Minutes of the Broadway Church.
128. In the accounts of this incident in the Lexington papers, the *Leader* and the *Herald,* in the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch,* and in more recent published narratives of it, the statement has often been made that McGarvey wrote a letter threatening to resign from the church if the vote was favorable to the organ. No such letter was ever written. He asked the elders to keep him informed of the course they would take in the matter and before public announcement of their decision was made he had asked for his letter. Through the kindness of W. H. Allen, who was then minister of the Chestnut Street Church, the original letter dated Nov. 2, 1902 is in possession of author together with Collis' accompanying letter, which was written Nov. 4.
129. Ch. S., Sept. 2, 1911.
130. These figures are taken from the summaries in the annual catalogues of the College. They are not as accurate as might be desired, since the systems of numbering were changed from time to time.
131. Ch. E., April 20, 1893.
132. These figures and the facts given in the following pages were taken from the minutes of the Board and the Executive Committee of the College of the Bible.
133. Ch. E., April 20, 1893.