

BULLETIN
COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Reverend
Richard Thomas Gillespie, D.D., LL.D.
1879-1930

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY AT
DECATUR, GEORGIA

VOLUME XXIV

NOVEMBER, 1930

No. 2

Entered as Second-class Matter May 9, 1928, at the Post Office
at Decatur, Georgia
Under the Act of August 24, 1912



Richard T. Gillispie

In Memoriam



RICHARD THOMAS GILLESPIE

BORN OCTOBER 23, 1879

DIED MAY 30, 1930



PRESIDENT
COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
1925-1930

MEMORIAL SERVICES OF REV. RICHARD THOMAS
GILLESPIE, D.D., LL.D., NOVEMBER 2, 1930

DR. J. SPROLE LYONS, *Presiding*

Doxology

Prayer—DR. ROBINSON

Hymn No. 19 (Tune—Azmon, No. 68)

Scripture Lesson (Psalm 90)—DR. D. P. McGEACHY

Gloria

Addresses:

DR. GILLESPIE—The Administrator and Executive

DR. E. L. HILL, Athens, Ga.

DR. GILLESPIE—The Pastor and Preacher

DR. MELTON CLARK, Columbia Seminary

DR. GILLESPIE—The Student and Man

DR. W. M. MCPHEETERS, Columbia Seminary

Hymn No. 309 (Verses 1-2-3-4-8)

Resolutions:

Faculty—DR. GREEN

Students—MR. CECIL THOMPSON

Prayer—DR. CARTLEDGE

Benediction—DR. KERR

Dr. Gillespie, the Executive and Administrator

By REV. E. L. HILL, D. D.,
Pastor of First Presbyterian Church,
Athens, Georgia

A belief in the predetermined purpose of God has shaped the course and moulded the career of the world's strongest men and women. Without such a doctrine man lives a purposeless life in a causeless world. The doctrine is rational and imperative—the only escape from intellectual despair. It rectifies the scientific idea of development. It eliminates Atheism from Evolution. It drives chance from the universe. It makes Law a servant and not a master. It gives personality to God, and breaks the paralyzing spell of fatalism. When God needs a man to fill a place in His plan, by that unchangeable law of supply and demand, commonly called Providence, the man is forthcoming. God needed a man to go as an apostle to the Gentiles, and when the clock struck the hour for such a man, Saul of Tarsus steps forth—a Jew by birth, a Greek by education, a Roman citizen by inheritance. A man was needed to lead in the solution of the problem of human rights in England, and straightway Stephen Langton stepped forth with the Magna Charta in his hand. A man was needed to vindicate the freedom of human conscience, and the door of the monastery at Wittenberg opened and Martin Luther stepped forth and began to unbind the rosary and prepare to nail the thunderbolts of the Reformation to the chapel door.

Some six years ago God needed a man to head this venerable institution, which for a hundred years had nurtured and trained a large number of the most useful and influential ministers of His Kingdom; but at that time stood in one of those great crises common to human life. Richard T. Gillespie was elected President of Columbia Seminary on November 24, 1924; stepped in his place on January 1, 1925, and was officially inaugurated on May 3, 1927. I see him now as he stood at the beginning of his Presidency—a young man with a strong, agile and alert body, and a quick and steady step; with a clear, keen and logical mind; with a vision that was brilliant with the richest hopes; and an enthusiasm that was freely fed from the exuberance of youth. He had a mission that was well defined, and strengthened by a loyalty to a sense of duty. I see him as he set himself to the task which was before him, and

like a giant he set in motion the forces which were destined to register a new era in the history of this Seminary, in the enlargement of its Faculty, in the increase of its number of students and in the realization of this magnificent plant here in Decatur. Again I see him as he called me to the rear of this chapel, just after the graduating exercises of this Seminary in 1930, and threw his head on my shoulder and poured out the inner feelings of his heart to me. His task was done and he had sacrificed all for the attainment of his ideals and he stood like a wounded veteran. Little did I think then that I would so soon receive the sad news that the pre-determined purpose of his life had been accomplished and he had been called to rest from his labors.

Dr. Gillespie, as the President of Columbia Seminary, attached no excessive significance to mere numbers in his student body; but often he expressed the earnest desire that his student body should be men properly trained in college and with a sufficient foundation upon which to build the theological education. His beautiful soul was an inspiration to his student body; and his sympathetic heart poured out its richness into the lives of the young men in this institution. In my last conversation with him his eyes were dimmed with tears and his soul burdened with sorrow because he could not secure employment for all of his students during the summer, and he said pathetically: "If I just did not love these students and did not care; but I do love them and I do care, and their problems are my problems; and I am burdened with their disappointments." I say without the slightest hesitation that of the distinguished men who have preceded and those who may follow him as the head of this institution no one has exceeded or will exceed the full measure of his devotion, and loyalty, and zeal in behalf of his students.

Perhaps, as chairman of the Building Committee in the construction of the buildings on this campus, I had more intimate association with him than any other member of the Board. He was the incarnation of action; and, though he thought through the problems concerning the buildings, his decisions were quickly made. His industry was tireless, and hard problems could not frighten, deceive nor cajole him. From his point of view there must be no useless expenditure of money, but nothing must be put on the campus which would cheapen and detract from the majesty and dignity of the "School of the Prophets." His study of the plans familiarized him with their every detail, and he kept these plans in his mind and on his heart by day and by night. He could visualize these buildings long before the first shovel of dirt was lifted from this sacred spot; and nothing afforded him more pleasure than to paint to some in-

quiring visitor the picture of this campus as it looks today with these stately buildings towering on this hillside. Were I asked to formulate an inscription suitable for a tablet to his memory on this campus, I think I should purloin the words in St. Paul's Cathedral in London, which mark the tomb of the architect of that matchless structure—"If you seek his monument, look around you."

Some years ago it was my privilege to preach the Baccalaureate Sermon for Columbia Seminary; and after the service in the First Presbyterian Church of Columbia, I was wandering around in the old cemetery connected with that church, and presently I stood fronting the grave of the Rev. Joseph R. Wilson, D. D., the father of President Woodrow Wilson and one whose name and family traditions have always been closely linked with the life of this institution, and I read the inscription on the grave, "A lover and servant of his fellowman, a man of God." Summarized in these few words is a profound and beautiful tribute to a great life; and I rejoice to believe that it would be no exaggeration, but a just and merited tribute, to apply these words to the life and service of Richard T. Gillespie.

Dr. Gillespie, the Pastor and Preacher

By MELTON CLARK

The committee on memorial exercises has invited me to speak on "Dr. Gillespie as Pastor and Preacher." It would naturally occur to any one that this task could be better performed by one who had had the privilege of sitting under Dr. Gillespie's ministry. Such a one would be able to bear personal testimony to the character and influence of Dr. Gillespie's preaching.

While it has not been my privilege to be a member of his congregation, our relations through the years have been such that I am able to speak with confidence in reference to many phases of his life as a preacher and pastor. He succeeded me in the pastorate of the Presbyterian Church in Florence, S. C. I had labored there for eight years, and therefore I knew intimately the problems, the difficulties and the opportunities presenting themselves to him when he became pastor of that church. After nine years of service in Florence, he accepted the call to the Maxwell St. Presbyterian Church in Lexington, Ky.; and after five years of service in that field, he accepted the call to the First Presbyterian Church in Louisville, Ky., where he served for about four years. In 1925 he came to the Columbia Seminary presidency, and we were intimately associated during the five years of his service here.

In order to secure first-hand information as to Dr. Gillespie as a Pastor and Preacher I have secured the testimony of officers of the three churches that he served.

Mr. J. P. McNeill, an elder in the Florence Church, writes me:

"As a pastor, Dr. Gillespie was one of the best in our Synod, and I believe that this statement would be verified by all the members of our church. His constant, personal attention to the members of the church was manifest and highly appreciated. I know that we all loved him. As a preacher, he prepared his sermons thoroughly and delivered them in an attractive manner, to the spiritual benefit of the congregation. It was heart-rending to us when his pastoral relations were dissolved."

Mr. F. L. Wilcox, also of the Florence Church, writes of Dr. Gillespie:

"As a pastor, Dr. Gillespie showed himself to be well equipped by native disposition and ability to fill the position in a most

useful way. He was a man in the prime of his young manhood, handsome, full of energy, athletic, and yet having every appearance of deep consecration to the work he had undertaken. His influence with the young people was unexcelled. Largely through his influence a young men's class was organized in the Sunday School, with an enrollment of one hundred, every one of whom was eager and alert to do any service which Dr. Gillespie suggested. From the very beginning of his services in Florence there was a gratifying increase in the membership of the church, and hardly a Sunday passed during his entire stay that from one to thirty-nine members were not received into the church on profession of their faith. The result is disclosed in the fact that when he resigned from the pastorate of this church, December 1, 1916, the total membership was more than 485.

"As a preacher, Dr. Gillespie was earnest and persuasive. His unquestioned faith, his devotion to the cause, his unbounded energy and his attractive personality made him a force for good, not only in the community as a pastor but in the pulpit as a preacher. The effect of his work in this field can be seen and the results of his preaching here are manifest in the large increase in the membership of the church and in the devotion of people of all classes to him and to his church. He was not only loved and admired by the members of his own church, but his popularity extended throughout the entire community, among all classes of people. It was with sincere regret that this church was called upon to give him up for work in a larger field. It was with the greatest pleasure that his friends here witnessed the wonderful progress which he made, and the recognition of his ability which was shown in his eventual selection for the presidency of Columbia Theological Seminary."

Mr. C. M. Marshall, of the Lexington, Ky., church, writes:

"Dr. Gillespie was my close personal friend, not only for the five years he served as pastor of the Maxwell St. Presbyterian Church of Lexington, Ky., but it continued in his pastorate at Louisville, and at Columbia Theological Seminary. To me, his most outstanding characteristic was his devotion to the high calling of his Master. Nothing was allowed to turn him aside from this one great purpose of his life. He was eminently qualified for a business or professional life; but, having once turned from such a calling, he was not one who would 'look back.' The earnestness and sincerity with which he witnessed for his Master, both in the pulpit and in his daily life, was the cord which drew and held men to him. I know of no former

pastors who won and held such a wide circle of friends, both in and out of the church, as he did in this community. I attribute this to his open, frank and generous disposition.

“Perhaps another characteristic of him as a minister was the plain, clear and unmistakable emphasis in his preaching on ‘Christ and Him Crucified.’ His sermons were scriptural, and nothing led him away from declaring the ‘whole counsel of God.’ Talented in many ways, possessing a bright mind and being a forceful speaker, he represented in a large way the ideal minister. Any estimate of his character would not be complete without reference to his manliness. The business and professional men were at perfect freedom in his presence. His manly ways, both in act and thought, commended him to his associates. He was every whit a man in his loyalty and devotion to his home, in his respect and consideration of others, and in his usefulness and devotion to his God.”

Mr. Thos. F. Gordon, of the First Church, Louisville, Ky., writes:

“As pastor of the First Church in Louisville, which he served for about three and a half years, Dr. Gillespie did a splendid piece of work in leading the congregation through the difficult period of the erection of a new church and Sunday School building. During that time his work was made difficult because of the fact that services were held in a club house several blocks away from the church location. He soon won the esteem of the people of the congregation, and his gentle ministry in cases of illness and distress made him greatly beloved. His strongest work was that of organization, and in this field his ability was certainly providentially sent, as our congregation had been much disturbed by moving into a new section, and only the most careful leadership could have kept the work in good condition. This Dr. Gillespie provided.

“Dr. Gillespie’s preaching was marked by an earnest zeal in the presentation of the simple gospel of salvation by faith. Always dignified and of a serious turn of mind, his messages were spiritual and uplifting to those who came to the church for worship and instruction. Under his direction the services of our church were attractive by virtue of his own deep sense of the presence of the Holy Spirit, which created always the atmosphere of reverence and the feeling of faith, hope and love. Those of us who sat regularly under his ministry were brought constantly to the foot of the Cross, and the influence of our pastor’s own consistent walk before us will not fade from our

minds and hearts as we continue to serve in the Kingdom of our Lord. We are grateful that our Heavenly Father gave to us for a little while this noble servant of His, to serve a very special need in a very trying time in the history of the old First Church. No one could have given himself more conscientiously, more unselfishly, nor with more devotion to his task than did Dr. Gillespie to his work as pastor and presbyter while with us. We look back to our association with him and with his delightful and beloved family as one of our happiest memories."

I think, perhaps, that these letters which have come from able and godly men, who regularly sat under the ministry of Dr. Gillespie throughout the years, would suffice. However, I will add just this testimony. Having examined the outlines of the sermons which Dr. Gillespie preached during his pastorate at Lexington, Ky., and in the First Church in Louisville, I find that his themes were taken from both the Old and the New Testaments. There are two types of sermons which predominate: first, the doctrinal; and second, the practical. The doctrinal sermons center around the life, the sacrifice and resurrection of our Lord and Saviour. The truths which seem to be emphasized in the practical sermons are loyalty to Christ's Church, effective service by the Church, and individual activity in soul-saving.

There never arose any sort of question in any mind as to the theological soundness of Dr. Gillespie. He loved the Word of God, and his mind found greatest satisfaction in the Calvinistic system of theology. He preached his convictions, and his convictions were heartily in accord with the system of theology set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith and found in the inspired Word of God.

There is just one other phase of Dr. Gillespie's ministry which I am constrained to mention, and that was his fidelity and activity as a presbyter. He took with utmost seriousness his relation to the courts of the Church—the Session, the Presbytery, the Synod, and the Assembly when he was elected as a representative to the last named. It did not seem to occur to him that attendance on the Church courts was a privilege to be used at his option. It was a privilege that he enjoyed, but it was first and foremost a duty, which he always gladly performed. He gave his earnest thought to the problems confronting the Church, and in the Church courts he became recognized as a leader whose judgment could be relied on, and whose willingness to participate in labors however arduous was unfailing.

A letter from Dr. Blakely, formerly a member of our faculty, has well expressed that which I think is the feeling and attitude of the whole faculty of the Seminary in reference to Dr. Gillespie. Dr. Blakely says:

"Dr Gillespie was one of the finest and truest friends whom I have ever known. His loyalty to those who served and worked with him was beautiful. He had the wonderful gift, as his Master had, of seeing men better than they were and, because he saw them better than they were, they in his fellowship actually became better. In the depths of his great soul Dr. Gillespie was a lover of his fellowman.

"He led Columbia Seminary through trying days. He had caught a great vision of what theological education should be. He was not able to realize all of his dreams for the ministry of our Church, but the future education of our ministry will most certainly lie in the direction of his vision. Truly his life was a grain of corn, which has fallen into the earth to die, but will live again, bringing forth much fruit. Praise God for such a life!"

Dr. R. Alexander Bate, of Louisville, Ky., has expressed himself and his relations to Dr. Gillespie in the following beautiful lines:

"A pastor, patterned like the Master, meek
Yet bold in every act of loving sacrifice,
His own requital for redeeming price
Of those who, strayed and wandering, fast grew weak;

"A shepherd, whose ideals shall ever speak
Through golden gifts of talents which suffice
To bring back those, a prey to wanton vice,
Who lose the way His love would have them seek;

"He fought armed in the armor of his Lord,
He sought to bring repentance to each soul
And rescue reprobate from certain doom.

"His life was even tone of sweet accord
With pitch of Heaven's tune, and reached the goal
Of Him who died, but left a vacant tomb."

Dr. Thomas Goulding, the first Professor of Columbia Theological Seminary, had a rule for his own guidance in preaching:

"Let every sermon preached contain so much of the plan of Salvation that, should a heathen come in who never had heard the Gospel before and who would depart, never to hear it again, he should learn enough to know what he must do to be saved."

This, I think, Dr. Gillespie endeavored to do in his preaching, and as a pastor, like Paul, he "ceased not to admonish everyone night and day with tears."

Dr. Gillespie, the Student and Man

By W. M. MCPHEETERS

Our American "naturalist of souls," Gamaliel Bradford, has said: "There are people who pretend to read souls from faces. Alas, it sometimes seems as if the more they pretended, the less they knew.

"There's no art to find the mind's construction in the face," says the great master, who perhaps found as much as any one. The cast of the features, the set of eyes and nose and mouth and chin, tell us something, but how vaguely, and how differently, according to the different observer."

What Mr. Bradford says is no doubt true; still like Samuel, when we look upon the splendid physical proportions of some Eliab, we are only too apt to say, "Surely Jehovah's anointed is before him"; and when we see Zacchaeus, because he is small of stature, we are only too apt to measure the inner by the outer man. In other words, our first impressions of one, rightly or wrongly, are apt to be based upon his physical presence and appearance. But, just as the testimony of an equivocating witness has to be corroborated before it can be safely accepted, so our first impressions have frequently not only to be modified, but to be wholly set aside in favor of others, resting upon the more solid basis of subsequent revelations of character in speech and action.

The impressions made by the outer man in the case of Richard Thomas Gillespie were altogether in his favor. He was above the average height, stood erect and firmly upon his feet, was well-proportioned, carried himself with easy, unconscious dignity. He had a finely formed head, eyes that were set sufficiently apart, a forehead that suggested a vigorous mentality, a nose that is usually associated with strength and aggressiveness, a chin and mouth that bespoke firmness and steadfastness of purpose. His voice fell distinctly and pleasantly upon the ear. His whole appearance commanded respect and invited confidence. His step was firm and usually somewhat rapid. I can see him now as he walked the paths of the Seminary campus—his quick, scrutinizing eye taking in every feature of the little landscape which he was so concerned to render attractive. All together he was a man of exceptionally fine and attractive presence.

My personal contact with Dr. Gillespie was limited to two periods in his life, namely—while he was a student at Columbia

Seminary and subsequently when he became president of the Seminary. I saw something of him before he came as a student in the Seminary, and also was in more or less touch with him during the period between his leaving the Seminary and his returning to it as president. But, during the time of his presidency, it was my valued privilege to have somewhat exceptional intimacy with him.

In his case, the outer man did not belie the characteristics of the inner man. He had not a brilliant and versatile mind, but what, for the purpose of the work-a-day world in which we live, is perhaps better, namely—an alert, vigorous, well-balanced mind.

His speech did not sparkle with wit, nor was it salted and seasoned with humor: it was, however, simple, unaffected, direct. His words were well chosen, his sentences clearcut, and both alike were suited to convey the ideas that he was seeking to express. He was never verbose or prolix, and if occasion demanded it, his speech could be both short and sharp.

His manner was usually grave, always unassuming, and courteous. And, while never gushing or effusive, he could be very cordial and gracious. Even when the occasion that called forth his speech was charged with tenseness, such was his self-control that he could speak with a perfectly level voice, and found no need either of loudness or harshness to secure the impression that he desired to make.

His activities were not determined by impulse, but by his enlightened judgment. He was in the habit of thinking before he acted. In the habit of getting the situation clearly before his mind, and deliberately shaping his conduct toward some well-defined goal that he had set before him. In one of his addresses to the student body, while president, he urged the young men at an early period in their career to select some definite goal and train themselves with that goal distinctly in view. He illustrated his precept from the case of two of his classmates and himself. It seems that, while they were yet students, they talked with each other as to their main objectives in their future ministry. One said that he wished to become an effective preacher. What the other purposed making his main objective I have been unable to recall. But he himself said that he purposed fitting himself to take an active part in the development of Columbia Seminary. This attitude was characteristic of the man. He planned his activities prior to entering upon them.

He was characterized by a high degree of self-control and a capacity for healthy self-criticism. He did not permit his ambition to outrun his judgment, or to hasten him unduly toward the attain-

ment of his goal. He had not been a great many years out of the Seminary when the faculty approached him with a proposal that they be permitted to suggest his name to the board for some position in the institution. To this proposal he listened with appreciation; but said very frankly that he did not feel himself prepared to enter upon such a responsible task, and that hence he would have to decline to permit his name to be put before the board. For a number of years after this, he continued to discharge successfully the duties of a pastor and a presbyter. When subsequently, in the year 1924, he was called by the board to the presidency of the institution, prior to making any response to the overture, he came to Columbia Seminary and talked over the whole situation very fully with the faculty, stated to them his conception of the needs of the Seminary and of the duties of the president, and talked over with them the situation that was at that time actually confronting the Seminary; namely, the question of its removal. While deeply interested in the Seminary, and while, as has already been stated, having from his student days looked forward to a time when he could serve it effectively, he still refused not merely to accept, but even to consider the call until the question of the location of the Seminary had been settled. With his usual insight and good judgment, he said that for him to take an active part in any movement, either to retain the Seminary in its then location, or to transfer it to a new location, would from the necessities of the case prove a handicap to his efficiency as president; that the question of location was one that ought to be decided by the controlling Synods and in regard to which he could not and would not express any opinion whatever. Much as the faculty and the board regretted his decision, they saw the wisdom of it, and also saw in it an indication that they had not made a mistake in calling Dr. Gillespie to be the head of the Seminary.

I mention these incidents as illustrating his fine self-control and his capacity for self-criticism. It would have been very easy for him, in the first instance, to have accepted the judgment of his older brethren as to his qualifications for a place in the faculty. Naturally their judgment flattered his proper pride. But he did not permit either his ultimate purpose or the flattering opinion of others to hide from his own eyes the fact that he was not at that time ready to enter upon what he hoped would be his life's main work. And, with a self-control that is quite exceptional under such circumstances, he kept himself in training for a number of years longer. When he did come to the Seminary, he had tested out his abilities as an organizer and an administrator in three pastorates, and had tested them perhaps more severely in leading to a successful consummation

a campaign for securing funds for the educational institutions of the Synod of Kentucky. When he put his hand to that campaign, it seemed to be a hopeless enterprise.

And this leads me to dwell upon another characteristic of the man. He had what I may call an earned self-confidence—a characteristic, I may say in passing, at the farthest remove from self-conceit, which latter is usually an evidence of self-ignorance. By an earned self-confidence I mean a self-confidence gradually established as the result of experience with himself in various connections. He was in the habit of watching and criticising both the methods of his work and its results. In consequence of this habit, he came to be aware that he could trust himself to do, and do well, certain things. It gave him the measure of his abilities and confidence in them. Accordingly, he neither “rushed in where angels fear to tread,” nor was he easily daunted by difficulties. Having formed a just estimate of the difficulties to be encountered in a given undertaking and also satisfied himself that with proper tact, enthusiasm, and energy they were not insurmountable, he did not hesitate to face them.

Having put his hand to a task, he was unsparing of himself in the energy with which he prosecuted it. Indeed, there is reason to fear that the campaign to secure funds for the educational institutions of Kentucky, that he headed and guided, made a drain upon his physical resources that opened the way for the inroads of the trouble that was finally to prove fatal. However that may be, having entered upon a task, he was, as I have said, prepared to stake everything that he had in the way of mental, moral, and physical resources and energy to bring it to a successful conclusion. I do not mean that he was foolishly wasteful of his energies. He sought to conserve them, but he conserved them merely that he might use them more effectively and for a longer period. He did not think that a man's main end in life was just to keep living. He felt that there were ends that in and of themselves were sufficiently important and worthwhile to justify a man even in sacrificing his life to attain them. He counted the cost before beginning to build and was prepared to pay it to the last farthing in order that he might complete what he had begun.

Not only was Dr. Gillespie characterized by definiteness of purpose, but he was also armed with what every true leader finds to be indispensable; namely, an indomitable patience and tenacity of purpose. If he could not attain his goal today, he could wait and expect to attain it tomorrow; and if not tomorrow, he could still keep his goal steadily before him and wait again, removing now this obstacle

out of his path, and then that. He knew that the accomplishment of any end of real magnitude and real worth was not to be effected without overcoming difficulties, and that difficulties were not to be overcome without enduring patience and resourcefulness.

Further, he was a man of vision. He saw the immense possibilities in every way of that great tier of states that Columbia Seminary was founded to serve. He saw that in the opening years of the twentieth century they stood merely at the threshold of a material development that promises to be of unprecedented magnitude. He saw the possibilities of an institution like Columbia Seminary for moulding and shaping both the present and the eternal destinies of the great population, which, in the not distant future, will fill this magnificent territory and develop its amazing material resources. He saw the strategic advantage of an institution located at a center of life like Atlanta, and so, capable of reaching out, both east and west and south and north, until it came in contact with territory in which other institutions had already found their natural spheres of service. He felt that it was worth while patiently to expend his best life energies in building up an institution that would be a mighty and a lasting influence in shaping the future of the people of this great empire. He planned for an institution that would be worthy of such a vast constituency and would be fitted to meet the needs of such a constituency. His vision was not limited merely to training men for the ministry; but it was in his mind to establish for this section of the country, when in the providence of God the time was ripe for it, a training school for what, for lack of a better name, I shall call, lay-workers; and also to link up the activities of the Seminary, not only with the home field in all of its departments, from the Sunday School to the pulpit, from the city to the village and country church, but also with the work in the foreign mission field, by establishing here a home for missionaries, who by their presence and personal contact with the students would keep alive in the hearts of the latter a sense of the duty and privilege of going out to the uttermost parts of the earth with the gospel of Christ. He thought that it was worth while, if necessary, for a man to lay down his life to lay the foundations of such an institution and start it upon its career, and he was right.

Dr. Gillespie was not only capable of a great and noble vision of service, but he also saw the relation that exists between the attainment of such a vision and many humbler and unspectacular forms of service. He never forgot that he was human himself and that the very heart and core of the great enterprise to which he had devoted himself consisted largely in developing generous,

human sympathies and worthy ideals in the lives of the young men who were to be the agents under God in accomplishing the end for which the Seminary itself exists. And he wisely sought to cultivate in the students those kindly, human sentiments and sturdy, manly qualities, which, when sanctified by the spirit of God to the service of Christ and man, make the real preacher and the real evangelist. He wisely recognized the fact that one way in which to cultivate these qualities in the students was by exhibiting them in his own intercourse with them. Had he been their father in the flesh, he could not have felt or shown a more genuine, kindly, human, personal interest in every individual student than he did. He sought in every way to provide for their comfort—for the natural and wholesome expression of their youthful physical vitality. He could not only enter into their zest for wholesome recreation, but bear with their youthful limitations. If any of them were heady, he was patient with their headiness. He sought to impress them with the fact that no form of service is beneath the dignity of a man; that instead of being beneath their dignity to provide for their own needs, as far as their circumstances permitted them to do so, it added to the measure of their true manhood to render any service that it was in their power to render, and through rendering which they would be able to cultivate and maintain a proper spirit of independence.

This leads me to notice another conspicuous characteristic of Dr. Gillespie as a man, and that was his own sturdy spirit of independence and self-dependence. From the time he was a lad of fourteen years of age, as I understand, under God, he depended upon his own personal labors to provide for his personal needs. He earned by actual work the money with which to put himself through college. When I approached him with reference to coming to Columbia Seminary, he told me frankly that he was unwilling to come unless he could be provided with some means by which he could meet his own expenses. And it was on those terms that he did come and by actual work paid his way through the Seminary, as he had paid it through college. While this is true, he was as far removed as one could be from any spirit of self-appreciation or swaggering independence. No student who has been at the Seminary within my memory has demeaned himself with more of the unpretentious, unself asserting character of a Christian gentleman than Richard Thomas Gillespie. So far as his outward actions went, nobody would ever have known that he was paying his own way.

He not only paid his own way while he was at the Seminary, but, even while still himself only a student, he felt it his duty and

privilege to do what he could actively to promote its interests. In this connection, he showed his insight into certain matters, the importance of which it is only too easy to overlook. One way in which he did this was by raising the money with which to furnish a guest room at Columbia Seminary, and by so furnishing it as to make it not only comfortable but attractive. Any of the alumni or of the ministers of the synod who were passing through Columbia found it an inviting and cheerful prophet's chamber into which to turn aside and rest awhile. It was he also who suggested and equipped a room specially fitted for the use of the Society of Missionary Inquiry, providing suitable cabinets and table and chairs. I mention these facts as showing a side of the man that fitted him for the work to which God finally called him. In connection with the new plant, he did not seek for display, nor indulge in extravagance, but he properly appreciated the importance of comfort and of a due regard for appearances. And so, in regard to everything that affected the comfort and welfare of the students, Dr. Gillespie was careful to see that in these respects they lacked for nothing that he could provide. He thought money spent in providing good food, well served, wisely spent. He thought money spent in keeping the grounds attractive and the buildings and walks clean and presentable was money spent for really educational purposes, that is, for the purpose of cultivating ideas and habits of orderliness and tidiness in the lives of men, who from their position were to be ensamples to the flock.

While he did not coddle the students, feeling that there is no greater disservice that you can render a young man than to coddle him, he did take a sympathetic interest in all of their financial and other difficulties, and was ready, as far as his judgment permitted, to assist them to meet their legitimate needs. He secured a fund to help meet the expenses of any student who had to go to the hospital, and in many other ways he was at pains to show his interest in the students as men—as human beings with bodies that had to be cared for.

Conspicuous among Dr. Gillespie's characteristics was his loyalty. When I approached him in regard to coming to the Seminary, the interests of the institution were about at their lowest ebb. The total student body numbered only sixteen—the Junior Class which he entered numbered only six. The same year there was at Union Seminary, Virginia, an enrollment of seventy, and a Junior Class of twenty-five. The buildings in which the Seminary was then housed, while not without their beauty and their attractiveness, were old. The rooms of the students were heated with grates. They

had to carry in their own coal, make their own fires, take out the ashes and cinders. They had to get their water from a spout and take it to their rooms. The refectory was a dilapidated wooden structure, the floor of which was none too solid. The chapel had been built for a stable. The grounds were limited to four acres. On the other hand, Union Seminary at that time was housed in new and modern buildings. It had an attractive chapel, library and refectory, and spacious grounds. Dr. Gillespie was a student at Davidson College at the time and his friends and classmates there, some of them from South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Florida, were all going to Union Seminary.

In talking with him, I called his attention to the fact that the Seminary had been founded by his spiritual forebears; that it had ministered to the spiritual welfare of his forebears; that it was erected to meet the spiritual needs of those of his own people who were to come after him; that it had been built up by the self-denying labors and prayers of godly men and women—men and women of vision, who had their eye, not merely upon the present, but upon the future, and who were seeking to serve, not a limited locality, but an entire section of our common country. I also made it plain to him that if he turned away from the Seminary, his influence would inevitably be to lead others to do the same, and that that meant that, instead of helping to build up what his spiritual forebears had started at such great cost, he would be tearing down their work and rendering it nugatory to the extent of his personal example and ability.

Such was the argument that I used to induce young Gillespie to enter Columbia Seminary. What other could I use? I could not deny facts. Union Seminary did have at that time a larger faculty, a larger student body, a larger and better plant, and was located in the outskirts of a larger and more rapidly growing city than the Seminary of his own Synod. It had everything to attract an intelligent young man with worthy ambition. Of course, if one were to be controlled merely by such considerations as those that I have mentioned, instead of going to Union Seminary, he would have gone to Princeton, which had a yet larger faculty, a yet larger student body, and a yet more impressive plant. Further, Princeton was located within easy reach of two great intellectual and cultural centers, New York and Philadelphia, and right beside it was a great university.

I thought then, and I still think, that the argument that I presented to young Gillespie was a solid and unanswerable argument. No people will ever have or can ever have great institutions,

unless they themselves make them great. If they turn their sons and daughters away from them, while such institutions are yet in the making, or while they are recovering from the shock of some great disaster such as war, or a heated religious controversy, they can never hope to have great institutions. I am not sure that they deserve to have them. The apostle says: "If any provide not for his own, specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

I know that there are those who say that when a young man is preparing for the ministry his first duty is to himself and he must go where he can get the best advantages. The statement is plausible enough on its face. And, if it only meant that he ought not to attend an institution where the instruction is inadequate, or incompetent, where the educational ideals are low, and the work done by the professors slovenly and not up to a high intellectual and educational standard, it would be true. But it is too often forgotten that while there are unquestionably subtle and powerful educational influences in one's external surroundings, and in the general atmosphere of an institution, all of the essentials may be present in an institution that is relatively small and lacking in some, it may be, quite valuable incidental advantages. So far is it from necessarily being to the advantage of a young man to go to an institution where there is a large and brilliant faculty—if, indeed, there are any such faculties—where there are great numbers of students, and where he will come in contact with currents of thought and life that unquestionably exercise a stimulating influence, it is only the especially well-equipped man—the man who has solid foundations, well-laid, who can really get the full benefit that such an institution has to offer; whereas, the man who is intellectually still in the making is apt to be more wholesomely and effectively developed in a smaller institution than in the larger one. In this matter, I am happy to have my judgment confirmed by that of two such notable educators in the theological field as Drs. B. B. Warfield and Francis L. Patton. Both of these distinguished men taught first in a small institution and then in a larger one. Both of them have said to me they believed they did their best work and that the students did the best work in the smaller institution. Of course, they were referring to their classroom work. Further, it may not be improper in this connection to state that students from Columbia Seminary, a number of whom, after graduating at Columbia, have gone to Princeton at my instance, or at that of other members of the faculty, have reported, so far as I know without exception, that they think that it was their good fortune to have had their undergraduate work at

Columbia, rather than at Princeton. In saying this, they were in no sense of the word depreciating either the student body at Princeton or the work done in the classrooms there. They were simply recognizing the fact that there are real advantages for students in smaller classes, as over against students in classes so large that they are seldom called upon to recite and can have but little personal contact with their teachers.

So far as I know, young Gillespie never regretted his choice of a seminary and his subsequent career showed that he had gotten an education at Columbia that put him upon a footing of equality in the actual work of the ministry and of the church at large with those who had gotten their education elsewhere.

By his loyalty to his own people and to the institution that they had founded and fostered—and that, in the day of its sorest need—Richard T. Gillespie placed himself in this respect in the same class with men like Robt. E. Lee and Robt. L. Dabney.

After the War Between the States, Gen. Lee had numerous offers made to him of positions that would have given him personal prominence and would have provided him not only with a comfortable living, but with many of the most coveted luxuries of life—not material luxuries merely, but luxuries of a higher kind, such as come with the opportunity for satisfying one's higher tastes and social instincts. All of these he put aside in order that he might become the president of a war-wrecked educational institution at the pitiful salary of \$1,500.00 a year. This he did as an expression of his love for and loyalty to his own people. He had shared their good things in the day of their prosperity—he was not the man to turn his back upon them in the day of their adversity. He might have said, as many did say, that a man's first duty is to himself and to his family. Certainly, he did not neglect his family in providing them not only with the necessities of life, but with a noble example, the worth of which cannot be estimated in dollars and cents, or in material advantages and luxuries of any kind. Having shown himself ready to die for his country, he showed himself ready to do what is perhaps harder still, to live for his country and to live in it and with it through the bitterest and darkest period of its history. In doing so, he rendered not only his native state, not only the South, but the nation and the world a service, the memory of which will not be permitted to perish as long as there are men who can feel and respond to the inspiration of a splendid example.

Dr. Robert L. Dabney, after he left the University of Virginia, was urged by affectionate but unwise friends to turn his back upon Union Seminary, which at that time was a feeble and struggling

institution with limited faculty and still more limited equipment, and go to Princeton Seminary, which even then had a faculty than which it has never had as a whole a more distinguished one. But, Dr. Dabney was wiser than his well-meaning friends, and said to them in effect: "If I do not go to Union Seminary, how can I expect others to go there, and if the candidates for the ministry in Virginia and North Carolina turn their backs upon Union Seminary and their faces to Princeton, we can never hope to have an institution that will meet the needs of our people." And he, along with Boccock and other distinguished men, few in number, but great in gifts, went to Union Seminary in spite of certain incidental disadvantages, with the result that the Union Seminary of that day has been transformed into the Union Seminary that is now flourishing at Richmond, Va. These men, like Gen. Lee, have left an example that is of priceless value to any people. They have not only reflected glory upon Union Seminary by their gifts and graces and achievements, but, it seems to me, in some respects a greater glory by the nobility of their devotion to their own people and their own institutions at a time when the latter needed their support. The price of loyalty, like that of wisdom, is beyond rubies. The fine gold cannot be compared with it. God pity the people whose sons and daughters are destitute of it, and to whose heart it is a stranger.

Richard T. Gillespie, I say it to his lasting honor, showed the same inspiring spirit of devotion to his own people and to their institutions as did the great men whose names I have mentioned. And, he will not be without his reward. As long as the name of Columbia Seminary is known, his name will be linked with it. He will be recognized as having started it upon a new career and the longer and more fruitful that career is, the greater will be the distinction that will come to his name and the honor that men will accord him. His service was a service that could not be paid for in money. It was the devotion of a heart to a great and worthy cause. When, toward the close of his career, he mistakenly thought that the Board in providing a period of rest for him were simply seeking in a kind and courteous way to relieve him of the onerous duties of the presidency, because they felt that his physical frame had given way under the weight and pressure of them, he was like a man who has been stricken by a deadly dart. He said to me in private conversation that if he were no longer physically fit for the duties of the presidency, he wanted the Board to retain him in some relation in connection with the institution—that his life was centered in it and that he was prepared, if need be, to die in its service. It was no idle boast. Such devotion deserves to be remembered. I hope to

see the day when it will be recorded upon some memorial tablet, that will arrest the attention of every student that enters the Seminary, of every stranger that visits it, not merely that it may perpetuate the memory of a man worthy to be honored, but that it may be an inspiration to a like loyalty on the part of every student that goes out from this institution, wherever he may go—loyalty not merely to this institution itself, but also loyalty to their people, their church, and above all to their Saviour. God has set this Seminary in a great section of our common country, a section with many noble traditions and whose history is adorned with many names illustrious in science, literature, statesmanship, war, law, medicine and theology; a section with an amazing future before it. Let us by God's help make Columbia Seminary a source of blessing to it—an institution to which our choicest young men will throng, where they can be fully equipped intellectually to grapple with the grave problems with which the Church of God is even now confronted, and where their own hearts may be thoroughly leavened with the gospel of Christ, as set forth in the writings of the evangelists and apostles, so that they will go forth to proclaim that gospel that is the only "glad tidings" for sinful men and women, and that alone can save our people from the fatal dangers of that material prosperity with which God seems certain to trust them and to test them.

Resolutions

WHEREAS God, in His wisdom, has permitted the removal of Rev. R. T. Gillespie, D. D., from his place amongst us by an untimely death; and

WHEREAS the home has been bereft of a worthy son, affectionate to his mother, and an exemplary husband and father who ruled his house well in the Lord; and

WHEREAS the Seminary has been deprived of a president who believed in its future, who loved it for its past, and who was intelligently and loyally devoted to its interests in the present; and

WHEREAS the Church has lost a stalwart son and single-hearted servant, who held not his life as dear unto himself in comparison of accomplishing the ministry which he received from the Lord Jesus to testify the gospel of the grace of God; and

WHEREAS mankind have lost a friend, whose heart had compassion on them because they were as sheep not having a shepherd; and

WHEREAS all good causes have suffered the loss of a liberal-minded supporter of proved ability and efficiency;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

First. That we, the members of the faculty of Columbia Seminary, humbly accept this discipline of Divine Providence.

Second. That we express our deep sorrow and sense of personal loss, and extend to the bereaved family our Christian sympathy and pledge to them our friendship in Christ.

Third. That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of the faculty, and that copies be sent to the stricken family and to the religious and secular papers.

FACULTY COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

J. B. GREEN,

Chairman of Committee on Resolutions.

Rev. R. T. Gillespie, D. D.

WHEREAS God in His wisdom has seen fit to remove Dr. Richard T. Gillespie from his labors; and

WHEREAS the Presbyterian Church in the United States has lost an outstanding son, a faithful minister of the Gospel, and an educator of ability; and

WHEREAS Columbia Theological Seminary has lost an able executive through whose courage and faith the institution has entered into greater opportunity and usefulness; and

WHEREAS each member of the Seminary student body is keenly aware of a personal loss with the passing of a sympathetic friend and adviser; and

WHEREAS a Christian home has suffered the loss of a beloved husband and father;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED:

First. That we, the members of the student body, do earnestly thank God for the life of His servant who has given himself without reserve in order that our lives might count for most in the Gospel ministry.

Second. That we express our sorrow and sympathy, and extend our continued friendship to the bereaved family and relatives.

Third. That these resolutions be sent to the family of our late president and that copies be sent to our church publications.

STUDENT BODY,

COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Committee on Resolutions,

WALLACE MCP. ALSTON, *Chairman,*

WALTON STEWART,

THOMAS GRAFTON.

A Few Extracts from Letters Received

FROM PRESIDENT B. R. LACY, JR., Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.:

Dr. Gillespie was a student at Davidson while I was there and he then demonstrated those administrative qualities which afterwards were exercised so well in his ministry, but especially as President of Columbia Seminary. I feel that the Church has sustained a great loss by his removal.

FROM PRESIDENT J. R. CUNNINGHAM, The Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, Louisville, Ky.:

I am in receipt of the invitation to be present at the memorial services of Dr. Gillespie next Sunday afternoon. I am appreciative of the thought and would be glad, because of the high regard in which I held him and because of his generous service to our Seminary, if I could be present. Since that is impracticable, I wish again to express for myself and for the Seminary our deep sympathy and lasting appreciation of him as a servant of God.

FROM PRESIDENT THOS. W. CURRIE, The Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Austin, Texas:

Yesterday's mail brought your invitation to me to attend the Memorial Service for Dr. Gillespie. I wish so much that I might be present on that occasion. I certainly share with you people there in the Seminary the great sense of loss in the homegoing of Dr. Gillespie.

FROM PRESIDENT JOHN TIMOTHY STONE, Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago:

This is to express to you and to your officers and the family of the late President Gillespie our thoughtful and earnest consolation and to let you know we are thinking of you at the memorial service to be held on November 2nd.

FROM DR. HENRY H. SWEETS, Secretary, Christian Education and Ministerial Relief of the Presbyterian Church in the United States:

Dr. Gillespie was one of the truest men I have ever known. His friendship has meant much to my life. He made a great pastor, but he did not submerge all of his interests in the local church. Had it not been for Dr. Gillespie, I am fully persuaded that we would never have been able to successfully carry through the Presbyterian Educational Movement in the Synod of Kentucky. His statesman-like leadership, his overcoming courage and his persistent and efficient work helped us to do for our educational work in Kentucky what it seems to me, humanly speaking, could not otherwise have been done.

The whole church followed with admiration and appreciation his splendid work as an administrator and executor in the reestablishment of Columbia Theological Seminary. A great man has been taken from us and our Church has suffered a great loss by reason of his going. I imagine there was strong emphasis on the part of the greeting of the Master he has so faithfully served as He said: "Well done, good and faithful servant."

FROM DR. WM. C. COVERT, General Secretary, Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.:

I have the invitation to join with the Faculty of Columbia Theological Seminary in grateful recognition of the life and work of our beloved friend, the late President Gillespie.

The testimony of his life is permanently written in all our hearts. His faithful discharge of his duties as president, teacher and executive, together with his sacrificial spirit in the education of well-trained ministers enshrines his memory in the heart of the whole Church he served so well. I share with you all in the poignant sorrow of his early going. Earnestly do I pray that his dreams and plans for Columbia Seminary may be realized and the institution take her place among the great formative influences working for a better leadership in the Kingdom of God at home and abroad.

FROM DR. CHAS. E. DIEHL, President Southwestern, Memphis, Tenn.:

It is a source of deep regret to me that an imperative engagement here in Memphis for Saturday night makes it impossible for me to be present with you on Sunday afternoon. But for this obligation,

which cannot be delegated, I would be with you to unite in the tribute of respect and affectionate regard for a great life whose sudden removal from our midst fills our hearts with genuine sorrow, and shocks us into the realization of an abiding loss.

My experience in the removal of Southwestern from Clarksville to Memphis, and the erection of a new plant, was so similar to that of President Gillespie that I can possibly appreciate more fully than many others the magnitude of the task which he had undertaken. It is not difficult for me to realize the tremendous strain under which he was working, nor to imagine how his whole heart and soul were wrapped up in the accomplishment of his great task. He has rendered a magnificent service to the Church, his loss will be keenly felt, and we here at Southwestern desire to record our appreciation of President Gillespie, of his life and work, and our deep sympathy with his family and with the friends of Columbia Theological Seminary.

*Servant of God, well done!
Rest from Thy loved employ;
The battle fought, the victory won
Enter Thy Master's joy!*

*Soldier of Christ, well done!
Praise be Thy new employ;
And, while eternal ages run,
Rest in Thy Saviour's joy."*

—MONTGOMERY.

