

BX
5995
M7G6

A
A
0
0
0
8
3
5
2
1
2
2



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY






THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

GIFT OF

FRAN. WELLS D. HUSLEY



R The Right Reverend
Richard Channing Moore,
D.D., and The Beginnings of the
Theological Seminary in Virginia



By Reverend Wm. A. R. Goodwin, B.D.



THE RIGHT REVEREND
RICHARD CHANNING MOORE, D. D.

The Right Reverend
Richard Channing Moore, D.D.

SECOND BISHOP OF VIRGINIA

AND

The Beginnings of the Theological
Seminary in Virginia

Faithfully yours

W. A. R. Goodwin

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE ALUMNI MEETING OF THE
VIRGINIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, ON JUNE 4TH, 1914.

BY

Rev. Wm. A. R. Goodwin, B. D.

March 5/1915

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

15 C1-10-12 51

Contents

I.	THE RT. REV. RICHARD CHANNIG MOORE, D. D.	7
II.	THE BEGINNING OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN VIRGINIA	40
III.	THE RT. REV. WILLIAM CABELL BROWN, D. D.	45

10/10/12

DEDICATED
WITH AFFECTIONATE REGARD
BY THE WRITER
TO
The Right Reverend
William Cabell Brown, D. D.
BISHOP COADJUTOR
OF THE DIOCESE OF VIRGINIA

Bishop Moore

History finds its best interpretation in the biographies of epoch making men. In them we see the forces of the past put to test, the forces of their contemporaneous life struggling for the mastery, and the creative spirit which is prophetic of the future made incarnate. In order to know a man we must know the past out of which he came, the conditions under which he lived, and the influence of his life upon the future; for life is the spirit of the past flowing through the soul of man into the future, but ever meeting in the soul of man the great vital and creative forces of an eternal Spirit world, which are incarnate there, to transform and enrich the spirit of the past, as it flows through the souls of men, in order that days that are to be may be better than the days that have been. From those lives which have exerted this transforming influence we are called of God to get inspiration, for they are the witnesses of the presence of His creative Spirit dwelling in men ever making all things new. Thus the past is transformed through the God filled present into the better future, and thus His Kingdom comes.

A study of the past which lies back of a man is essential to the understanding of the man himself, because the past creates the obstacles which he is called to overcome, furnishes the challenge to his spirit, creates the material upon which he has to make his impress, and tests his courage and tries his faith. A man's power to overcome resistance is the measure of the man.

Pre-Revolution Conditions

The past which lay back of Bishop Moore's ministry in Virginia therefore claims our attention as a necessary condition to the understanding of his task and an appreciation of his character and influence.

No statement could be more untrue to the facts of history than that the Virginia Colony was an enterprise conceived and executed for material and commercial ends

alone. It is true that it was not, like the New England Colony, the outgrowth of religious contention and persecution, and the men who composed it did not have religious grievances to proclaim to the world. Their religion was normal, and their faith the faith of their forefathers; and it expressed itself in Virginia, as it had in England, without ostentation, in a way that was perfectly normal and natural. The ancient royal Charter under which these Virginia settlers sailed, commended and accepted "their desires for a furtherance of so noble a work, which may, by the providence of Almighty God, hereafter tend to the glory of His Divine Majesty in propagating the Christian religion to such people as yet live in darkness and miserable ignorance of the true knowledge and worship of God, and may in time bring infidels and savages living in those parts to human civility, and to a settled and quiet government. (Hening, Vol. I, Page 57.)"

The Virginia Colony was a missionary as well as a commercial enterprise. If she is to remain true to her traditions and loyal to her ancient heritage, the Church in Virginia must ever continue to be devoted to the great mission of the Church to extend the Kingdom of God, for one of the fundamental objects in founding this colony was the extension of the Gospel under the influence of the Church of England. The Colonists were instructed "to provide that the true word and service of God and Christian faith be preached, planted and used according to the doctrine rites and religion now professed and established within our realm of England." The last instructions given to the Colonists by the King's Council were to "serve and fear God," remembering that "every plantation which our Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted out." The sermon preached on the 25th of April, 1609, and one preached in February, 1610, to the emigrants to Virginia have been preserved and live to rebuke the untruth so widely disseminated that the Virginia Colony in its incipiency was solely a commercial enterprise undertaken by a number of godless adventurers. The lone ivy-mantled tower at Jamestown, the many ancient churches which date back to the colonial period

of Virginia's history, bear witness to the faith of our forefathers.

COLONIAL CLERGY.

In superficial history and benighted fiction the custom has been to speak of the clergy of Colonial Virginia with ridicule and scorn. This has been done so largely and for so long a time that the vast majority of people, even in the Church, have come to believe that the term 'Colonial minister' is almost a synonym for all that was low and degraded in men. It is undoubtedly true that Virginia afforded a place of refuge to a number of ministers who left England because they could not well remain there, but these men who have been seized upon, advertised, exploited and held up to the public gaze and the public scorn were not types but exceptions. In St. John's Church, Hampton, a window has been placed memorial to the Colonial clergy of that Parish. Upon examining the records extending over 175 years, only one man was found who was unworthy of being named in the long list of godly men. On the walls of Bruton Parish Church, near the pulpit, a tablet has been placed in memory of the clergy of Bruton Parish Church from 1674 to 1873. During this period of one hundred and ninety-nine years, not one minister is to be found against whom there stands a word of censure or reproach. They were men of education and of godly piety. Most of those who ministered here in the Colonial times were masters of arts of the universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Edinburgh, and we have the records giving the testimony of contemporaneous men to the effect that as a rule they were earnest and faithful ministers of the Gospel of Christ. Vice is more advertised than virtue.

OTHER CONDITIONS.

The contribution of the Church to the cause of education, her influence upon legislation beginning with her prayers and benediction for the first legislative assembly held in America which assembled in the Church at James-

town in 1619 and extending down to the close of the Colonial period, culminating in her influence upon the patriots and statesmen of the revolutionary period of which the memorials in Bruton Parish Church bear witness, and her influence upon home, the life and personal character of her children, created an influence which was never quite obliterated by subsequent events, and which lived in the hearts of her people under the cold exterior of the winter days which followed after, when it seemed that the warm currents of life were frozen and dead beyond all hope of recall. The Church subsequent to the revolution needed a revivalist in the truest sense of the word. But it needed one of sound judgment and of undaunted faith and courage, for the Church had come upon evil days.

The Church Subsequent to the Revolution

The struggle of the Church for her life after the Revolution was almost as tragic and desperate as the struggle of the Colony of 1607 for existence.

About no period of American Church History are there more gross and yet more generally accepted misconceptions. We are told and our children are told, that the Church was disestablished by those who were the champions of religious freedom, and that these champions of liberty were the defenders of the people against the claims of the Church. The Church was disestablished by the champions of religious freedom, but, "the disestablishment of the Church in Virginia was the work of its own members, who, in laying the foundations of their country's liberty, believed that they should unselfishly sacrifice the privileges the law had hitherto secured to them, that civil and religious liberty might be found inseparably united" (Rowland's *Life of George Mason*, Vol. I, p. 243). Of the five men appointed to revise the laws of the commonwealth, namely: Jefferson, Pendleton, Wythe, George Mason and Thomas Ludwell Lee, four were active Vestrymen of the Episcopal Church, and Jefferson had also at one time been a Vestryman, and from papers extant it is in evidence that the very law in question was

drafted prior to the time when George Mason resigned from the Committee. A marked distinction should be made between the *disestablishment* of the Church and her *spoliation*. The acts of the Legislature passed in 1787, 1799, and finally in 1802, were *not* inspired by a spirit of religious liberty. They were designed to confiscate the property of the Church, and resulted in the sale of her glebe lands. Against legislation looking to this end George Mason, Edmund Pendleton, and other Virginia Churchmen, did protest, because they believed that such procedure was contrary to the principles of common honesty. This left the Church stripped and impoverished. Her once wealthy members had sacrificed their fortunes in behalf of their country. Among the masses of the people there was a feeling of prejudice. It has been generally stated and believed that this was due to the fact that the clergy of the Church had been Tories. As a matter of fact the records show that the Virginia Clergy, led by Rev. Drs. Madison and Bracken, were, with very few exceptions, ardent supporters of the cause of liberty. The prejudice had a reasonable basis in the fact that prior to the disestablishment the people had been taxed by the State to support a Church to which some of them did not adhere, to which was added the dislike which at this time was felt against the Church because of her English connection. Thrown upon her own resources the Church made a desperate struggle until almost the middle of the last century.

Other conditions contributed to the difficulties which the Church was subsequently called to face, and created obstacles which threatened to completely terminate her existence in Virginia.

The Church during the colonial period was conspicuously the church of the aristocracy. These old Virginians provided spiritual ministrations for their own souls and for their own slaves and legislated for the support of the Church by everybody whether they believed in it or not. The Church, however, seemed never to have won the affection of the middle classes generally. Subsequent to the revolution even to the present time this Church, while

the most democratic of all religious organizations in her constitutional provisions, has ever remained aristocratic in tone and too much so in tendency, creating the impression, which continues to exist, that she does not offer the most congenial atmosphere for the masses of the people. That this feeling has been and is still due as much to the prejudice of the masses as to the pride and prejudice found in the Church is unquestionably true. The fact is that the feeling exists, and it existed in the years subsequent to the revolution with an intensity which was exceedingly prejudicial to the Church, and there were not lacking those outside our fold who fanned this flame of prejudice into the white heat of bitter animosity for denominational advantage.

Then, too, our forefathers were not all saints by any means. The social life and personal habits of the Virginians of these bygone days were as far removed as can well be imagined from the stern and austere negative piety of Puritan New England. Indeed, subsequent to the revolution, and prior to the coming of Bishop Moore, not only the Church but spiritual religion also seemed to have declined to the point where license reigned with unbridled excess. A contemporaneous diary mentions five different kinds of wines and whiskey served at a dinner which followed immediately after Church in the hospitable home of a leading Churchman, and speaks of the occurrence as being customary and generally prevalent. Gambling was notoriously widespread, and profanity generally desecrated the speech of those whose education and culture did not demand it for clear and forcible expression of thought. So general were these lax moral conditions that for many years it was quite impossible to pass even in Church Conventions any legislation corrective of these practices on the part of those who hated to be reformed, and resented by majority votes every effort looking to a moral and social reformation even within the Church itself.

Added to these evil conditions the Church was beset with violent opposition from without. Into the valley of Virginia had come the immigrant Ulster men in large

numbers, bringing with them inherited and tenacious prejudices against the established Church, and sworn to opposition to her claims and to her extension. These Scotch-Irish settlers not only dominated in large measure the religious thought of the valley of Virginia, but extended their influence with immigration into Eastern Virginia.

The Methodists, though welcomed in the person of Whitfield, subsequently allied themselves with the Baptists and Presbyterians in opposing the Episcopal Church and confiscating the property which had been held by the Establishment.

Episcopacy in Virginia—The Election of Rev. Dr. Griffith

Prior to the Revolution the Church in Virginia during the whole Colonial period had been under the Episcopal jurisdiction of the Lord Bishop of London. Subsequent to the Revolution there existed in the mind of the many of the Virginia Churchmen a feeling of opposition to the idea of electing a Bishop and sending him to England for consecration. This opposition was due in part to a prejudice against taking any step which would renew and establish any vital connection between the State Church of England and the Church in Virginia. It was also due to indifference and to an indisposition on the part of many in the Church to have their lax living interfered with by Episcopal control and by a revived spirituality in the Church. Pursuant, however, to recommendations of the General Convention it was determined by the Virginia Council of 1786 to elect a Bishop, and the Rev. Dr. Griffith was elected by a vote of thirty-two out of a total vote of forty-nine. He was a man of marked ability and of spiritual power, but owing to a lack of personal means was unable to go to England to receive consecration, and the Churchmen in Virginia failed to respond to the subscription that was asked to send him at the expense of the Church. The confidence of the Church in Virginia in Dr. Griffith was, however, reasserted when

the Convention of 1787 directed the Standing Committee of the Diocese to ask for his consecration at the hands of Bishop White of Pennsylvania and Bishop Provost of New York. These Bishops, however, felt obliged to decline the request, having pledged the English Bishops, from whom they had received their consecration, not to consecrate anyone in the United States until three Bishops had received consecration from the English Church (Bishop White's Memoirs, 172). In 1789 Rev. Dr. Griffith resigned his election, and a few months afterwards died at the home of the Bishop of Pennsylvania while attending the General Convention of 1789.

The Election of Rt. Rev. James Madison First Bishop in Virginia

The Convention of the Church in Virginia which met in 1790 elected the Rev. Dr. James Madison, then President of the College of William and Mary, to be Bishop of the Diocese. He was a man of scholarly disposition, devoted especially to the study of science and philosophy; his manners were simple and courteous, and his nature kindly and benevolent. He was consecrated at Lambeth in 1790 by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of London and Rochester. The annals of his Episcopate can be dwelt upon here only in so far as they reflect the conditions which immediately precede the coming of Bishop Moore. That he was filled with an earnest desire to further the interests of the Church in Virginia may be seen from reading his early Convention addresses. He, however, faced stupendous difficulties and opposition from within, and especially from without, the Church. In the very first years of his Episcopate the Church was disestablished and ruthlessly despoiled by legislative enactments inspired by violent denominational opposition. The Church was left stripped of her possessions and dependent upon the support of her impoverished and discouraged members. Infidel tendencies which had become fashionable in France, found lodgment in the minds of many persons prominent in the social and legislative life

of Virginia, and among the unlearned and careless the influence of godless philosophy and materialistic thought sapped the spiritual energies of the people and demoralized the life of the Church. Gross laxness of living resulted, and as was inevitable, the growth of immorality, dissipation and irreverence increased and spread through the State and poisoned and depraved the lives of many within the Church. The Bishop upon the slender pittance of one hundred pounds a year continued to make his visitations and his annual reports which, however, became more and more disheartening. His last Council address was delivered in 1805, at which time, urging upon the Convention the feebleness of his health, he asked for an assistant. Action upon the matter was however deferred, and from this time, namely from 1805 to 1812, when the death of Bishop Madison occurred, there is no record of any Convention of the Church having been held.

The Election of Bishop Moore

The Convention called in 1812 to elect a Bishop to fill the vacancy, failed to secure a canonical quorum—of fifteen clergymen and fifteen laymen required. The thirteen clergymen and twelve laymen who convened proceeded to vote for a Bishop and chose the Rev. Dr. Bracken, who in 1813 declined the election.

The Convention of Virginia held in 1812 and 1814 revised and reenacted the canon relative to the number of delegates necessary for a quorum, fixing the number at nine, but providing that "for altering or fixing a canon the presence of fifteen delegates should be necessary." (Journals of Convention, Hawks, p. 95). In counting a quorum the clerical and lay-delegates were numbered together and not counted in the two orders. This fact is here mentioned because it appears that there were only seven clergymen present at the Convention of 1814. There were, however, present nineteen lay-delegates. The clerical delegates present at this memorable Council which met in the Capitol, in the City of Richmond, on May 4th, 1814, were the Rev. Oliver Norris and the Rev. W. H. Wilmer, of Alexandria, the Rev. Wm. H. Meade, of

Frederick Parish, the Rev. J. Cameron, D. D., of Cumberland, the Rev. John Dunn, of Shelburne, the Rev. J. Buchanan, D. D., of Henrico Parish, and the Rev. Andrew Syme, of Bristol Parish. The names of most of the nineteen lay-delegates present at this Council are nearly all familiar in the Church in Virginia today. Among them we find the name of the Hon. John Marshal, as a lay-deputy from Monumental Church.

It was "Resolved that the appointment of a Bishop for this Diocese is highly expedient and necessary for the maintenance and support of the Church."

It was next "Resolved that the Convention proceed immediately to the election of a person to fill the Episcopate in the same." Dr. James McClurg then presented a certified extract from the Vestry book of the Monumental Church in Richmond showing the appointment of the Rev. Richard Channing Moore, D. D., of the City of New York, to the Rectorship of that Church.

On motion, "Ordered that the Secretary read sundry letters, exhibited by members of the Standing Committee from Dr. Moore and the Rt. Rev. Bishop Hobart.

Dr. Moore was nominated to fill the office of Bishop in this State.

No other person being in nomination, the Convention proceeded to ballot for a Bishop.

The Hon. John Marshal and Mr. Edmund Lee were appointed to count the ballots, who reported that there were twenty-three votes for Dr. Moore and one for Dr. John Buchanan, whereupon Reverend Richard Channing Moore was declared to be duly elected to the Episcopate in the Diocese of Virginia, and the members of the Convention proceeded to subscribe to the testimonials required by the Constitution of the General Church in the United States." (Hawks' Journals, p. 92.)

His Early Life and Ministry

Bishop Moore was nearly fifty-two years old when made Bishop of Virginia, having been born in the City of New York on the twenty-first day of August, 1762. His father, Thomas Moore, was the son of the Hon. John

Moore, who had served as one of his Majesty's Council for the province of New York. At eight years of age he was placed under the care of Mr. Alexander Leslie, Professor of Languages in King's College, now Columbia College. At sixteen he began the study of medicine under Doctor Richard Bayley, a distinguished physician and surgeon of New York City, and having completed his professional studies he began the practice of medicine and built up a large and lucrative practice, which he continued until 1787.

Bishop Moore seemed prone to recognize an overruling providence in the common occurrences and coincidences of his daily life. He attributed the turning of his life to Christ with full and serious purpose to the chance reading of the passage of Scripture containing the question of Saul the persecutor, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" upon which he chanced to fall while waiting one day for his turn in a barber shop. His was a nature which gave itself with enthusiasm to the convictions of his mind and to the devotions of his heart, and it is not surprising that having found the more abundant life, he should have consecrated himself to the purpose of making the way of salvation known to others. Having read for orders, while continuing his medical practice, he was ordained deacon in July, 1787, by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Provost, in St. George's Church, New York City, being the first person to receive ordination at his hands. In September he was advanced to the priesthood and took charge of Grace Church, Rye, in the County of Westchester, New York. In 1788 he accepted a call to St. Andrew's Church, Staten Island, where he ministered for twenty-one years with fidelity and devotion.

While noted for his fidelity as a pastor, Dr. Moore was best known as a convincing and eloquent preacher. His intense spiritual conviction, his earnest piety, his charm and grace of manner, his tenderness of feeling, his sincere devotion to his Master, and absolute dependence upon the inspiration and power of the Spirit, whom he invoked in constant and earnest prayer, to which was added a voice of melodious sweetness whose tender and pleading tones

won the sympathy and engaged the attention of his hearers, combined to create for him a reputation as a preacher which attracted crowded congregations to hear him proclaim the message of salvation from the great gospel of redemption. It is stated that upon one occasion, when having preached and concluded the service with the benediction, to his great surprise he observed that no one present seemed disposed to leave the Church. After a short interval one of the congregation arose and requested him to preach to them the second time. After singing a hymn a second discourse was delivered, when again the congregation refused to leave and a request was made that he should continue to speak. Having responded to this second request, he concluded the service, and announcing that he was too exhausted to speak any longer, he again dismissed the people with the blessing and urged them to return to their homes. Having read this incident some time since to a young English clergyman, he remarked, "Well, really that is a very remarkable incident; you know I never had anything like that to occur during my ministry."

In 1809 Doctor Moore became rector of St. Stephen's Church in New York City, composed at the time of his acceptance of the call of not more than thirty families; when, in five years later, he resigned this Church to come to Virginia, he left in the Church about four hundred communicants.

His Life and Ministry in Virginia

The call extended Dr. Moore to come to Virginia was preceded by a number of interesting letters in which, on the one hand, he was urged by the Rev. W. H. Wilmer, the Rev. William Meade, the Rev. Mr. Norris, and by a joint letter signed by Bushrod Washington and Edmund L. Lee to come to Richmond and preach. In these letters assurance was given that if the people could hear him preach, his reputation would be established by the evidence which his presence would give of his power, and that there would be no question that he would be called to the rectorship of Monumental Church, and soon afterwards to

become Bishop of the Diocese of Virginia. Some of these letters Doctor Moore seems not to have answered at all. To others he sent belated replies. In all of them he decidedly but courteously declined to act upon the suggestion that he should visit Richmond in furtherance of the proposition of securing the call to the Church and the election to the Episcopate. To the letter of Bushrod Washington and Edmund Lee he sent the following reply:

"New York, Dec. 16th, 1813.

Dear Sir: The situation in which Providence hath placed me, and the blessings with which my labours in this city have been attended, would render me extremely culpable, were I to listen to any invitation, or consent to any change, except such an one as bore the evident traces of his own divine appointment. The destinies of my life I have long since submitted to the God I serve; it is therefore my duty, and I can assert with truth that it is my inclination, to be disposed of agreeably to his will. Could I be convinced that the sphere of my usefulness would be enlarged, or the cause of the Redeemer be promoted, by my removal to Virginia, I should think it criminal to hesitate a moment, or to indulge the least fear or apprehension. Your address to me upon the subject has excited my deepest attention, and has led me to seek most ardently for the direction of heaven upon the occasion, and although I cannot consent to visit Richmond as you propose, still I should not feel myself justifiable, were I to decline altogether the propositions you have made me. With respect to pecuniary matters, my present establishment is so comfortable, that I stand in need of no change; under this impression it would be imprudent in me to risk the alienation of my people's regard, by looking for a settlement which perhaps may not be within the control of my friends at the southward: for a man, Sir, who has seen fifty years, to rush into such an experiment, would betray, in my opinion, a want of those solid principles necessary to preserve the confidence of my old friends, and to secure the good opinion of those with whose acquaintance I may hereafter be honoured; in addition to which evil it would discover also a wish to lead, instead of being led by Providence. Should the congregation of the Episcopal Church at Richmond, from the representations of character which they may have received of me, think proper to call me as their rector, with a suitable support, and should the Convention of the state unite in my election to the episcopate, I should think it my duty to make them as early a visit as possible in order to converse with the leading members of the Church upon the subject, and to come to an immediate conclusion respecting the expediency of my removal. The Church in Virginia, I have been informed, is from a variety

of circumstances in a depressed situation. Should it fall to my lot to be appointed to watch over her interests, my utmost energies shall be exerted in repairing her waste and desolate places: it is the society, Sir, into whose bosom I was received at my baptism, and in whose religious peculiarities I have been educated from my infancy. To see her lay by her weeds and put on her beautiful garments, in which Zion in her prosperity shall be arrayed, would convey to my mind sensations of the purest joy. To promote this object, tidelity in her elergy is an indispensable requisite. To produce this effect they must be labourers indeed in the Vineyard of the Redeemer.

Believe me, dear Sir, &c.

RICHARD CHANNING MOORE."

Finally the call was extended to Dr. Moore to become the rector of the Monumental Church in Richmond and was accepted, it would seem, some time during April, 1814. Notice of his acceptance of this call having been certified to the Convention of the Diocese, which met on May 4, 1814, Dr. Moore was, as we have seen, elected without opposition to be Bishop of Virginia.

Bishop Hobart, with whom Dr. Moore had had a serious controversy while they were both serving churches in New York City, as to the expediency of conducting informal prayer meetings and services in the homes of the people, seems, in after years, to have become convinced of the supreme loyalty of Dr. Moore to the Prayer Book, and of his devotion to the use of the Liturgy unaltered and unimpaired in the service of the Church, and while at the time of the controversy he looked with scant respect upon the informal devotional services conducted with such marked success by Dr. Moore, he became convinced, when the heat of controversy had subsided, of his supreme loyalty to the Church, to her teachings and to her ancient liturgy, and sent to Virginia the following letter endorsing, as Bishop of New York, his life and ministry:

"New York, April 25th, 1814.

My Dear Sir,—I have furnished the Rev. Dr. Moore with the testimonial required by the canons in the case of a removal from one diocese to another. I deem it, however, an act of justice to him, further to state to you, that Dr. Moore's ministrations have been uniformly respectable, popular, and useful. He evinces sin-

cere attachment to the doctrines, the order, and the worship of the venerable Church in which he has been educated, and in which he has been for many years a zealous labourer. And such is the confidence placed in his fidelity to his principles, and in his prudent and zealous efforts to advance her interests, should the order of Providence remove him to Virginia, that I believe he will go there with the good wishes and the prayers of his brethren generally in this quarter. I very sincerely declare that Dr. Moore's intercourse with me is so frank, respectful, and friendly, and he appears so heartily disposed to co-operate with me in advancing the common interest of our Zion, that I shall regret his removal from this diocese, at the same time that I trust and believe that his ministrations and labours, by the blessing of God, will be advantageous to the cause of religion and the Church in Virginia.

I remain, dear sir,

Very sincerely and respectfully,

Your obedient friend and brother,

J. H. HOBART.

Edmund I. Lee, Esq."

Rev. Dr. Richard Channing Moore was consecrated Bishop of Virginia in St. James' Church, Philadelphia, on the 18th of May, 1814, by Bishops White, Hobart, Griswold and Dehon. It is distinctly interesting to note that this event, so significant and vital to the Church in Virginia, took place almost exactly one hundred years prior to the day when the Church in Virginia, on the 20th day of May, 1914, elected the Rev. Dr. William Cabell Brown to serve as a Bishop in the Church of God in this Diocese.

In this connection it may be permitted to us to express the hope and voice the prayer, which will, we are sure, receive the approbation of every heart here present, that the Spirit of Almighty God may so bless and empower him in the discharge of the duties and responsibilities of his sacred office that the Church, revived under Bishop Moore, may be strengthened and developed by the assistance which he will render to the present Bishop of Virginia, and by the witness which the Bishop Coadjutor elect will give to the truth as it is in Jesus.

From this digression from the annals, but not from the apostolic spirit of Bishop Moore's life, we return for what must of necessity be a brief and faintly suggestive outline of the events which characterized the eventful life

and service of Bishop Moore's Episcopate. In 1815 we find him presiding over the Convention of his Diocese, where fourteen clergymen were present, just twice as many as were present at the preceding convention, when his election took place. The address delivered by the Bishop on this occasion is imbued with the spirit of faith and optimism which characterized his entire ministry, and is full of the spirit of thanksgiving and praise. He seemed never to forget that he was but the instrument of God's gracious providence and was ever wont to ascribe to the Christ praise and honor for the gift of the Spirit, upon whom he relied for guidance and power. Where the human instrument was praised and honored the tribute was paid to those who labored with him in the ministry of the gospel. To this Convention he said in part:

"In every parish which I have visited, I have discovered the most animated wish in the people to repair the waste places of our Zion, and to restore the church of their fathers to its primitive purity and excellence. I have found their minds alive to the truths of religion, and have discovered an attachment to our excellent liturgy exceeding my utmost expectations. I have witnessed a sensibility to divine things bordering on the spirit of gospel times. I have seen congregations, upon the mention of that glory which once irradiated with its beams the church in Virginia, burst into tears, and by their holy emotions perfectly electrify my mind.

The apostolic rite of confirmation, which I have administered in several parishes, was received by people of all ages with the greatest joy, and a general principle of union and exertion was upon those occasions universally expressed. Parishes which have been destitute of ministerial aid for many years, which had slumbered until the warmest friends of the church conceived it to have been the sleep of death, have, in two instances, been awakened from that state of torpor in which they were involved, and have arisen in all the vigor of perfect health. The younger clergy of this diocese, who, from their youth and spiritual attainments, are well qualified for the glorious work, have exerted themselves in a manner deserving the

most honourable mention. They have carried the standard of the Lord Jesus Christ through a considerable portion of this church; they have gone out into the highways and hedges, preaching the truths of their Divine Master; and by their holy conversation with the people, have adorned the Gospel of Christ. A number of their elder brethren, though prevented by age from using the same exertion, have laboured with fidelity, and contributed their best efforts to promote that work which has been committed to their hands. The laity have been equally assiduous in the discharge of that duty peculiar to their station—the duty of providing for the ministers of religion. May heaven reward them for their labours of love; and may every cup of cold water which they have given to a disciple, in the name of a disciple, receive a disciple's reward.

“The members of the church in this city, brethren, deserve my sincerest thanks, for the friendship, affection, and indulgence with which they have favoured me:—they have shown, by their marked and continued tenderness towards me and my family, that they are alive to all the sensibilities which adorn our nature. I have found in them not only friends, but brothers and benefactors; they have met my necessities with a solicitude beyond my expectations; they have anticipated my every want; they have discharged the duty of the most affectionate children towards their spiritual father.

* * * * *

“If there ever was a period in which exertion was necessary, and if there ever was a period which bids fair to crown that exertion with success, this is the time. Though few in number, yet, depending for support upon the promises of God, we may look for an abundant blessing upon our labours. Jehovah has promised to be with his church to the end of the world, and he will fulfil his declaration. The parishes are invoking our aid. Oh!

listen, I beseech you, to their numerous entreaties. Be steadfast, then, be unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, and your labour will not be in vain in the Lord."

From the rush and turmoil of our modern life it would be most diverting to be transported back for a while to the almost primitive simplicity of these bygone days. We would be willing for a while to exchange the fast flying train with its shrieking whistle for the packet boat running from Richmond to the mountains, whose coming was announced by the far away tremulous notes of the echoing horn whose bygone call still comes to some of us out of the reveries of the past. It would be a diverting and unique experience to take a vacation by stage coach journey through valleys and over the hills of Virginia from Richmond to Frederick County, and over the vast territory beyond to the Blue Ridge Mountains. But to have no other way of going, and to be impelled by the perennial call of duty to make these long and wearisome journeys regardless of weather conditions, and to keep going when old age and bodily infirmity were creeping on, tested the fidelity and devotion of the Bishop. With unrelenting zeal he met the hardships which his large Diocese caused him to face and was ever among his brethren as one who served as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.

His first Episcopal act was the consecration of Monumental Church, which he continued to serve as Rector during the entire period of his Episcopate.

THE BELOVED PASTOR.

As a pastor he won the esteem and affection not only of his own congregation, but of all the community where he lived. While devoted and loyal to the doctrines and worship of his own Church, he was entirely free from the bigotry which so often makes churchmen narrowminded and sectarian. Christians of every name loved him for his exceeding goodness. A striking testimonial of this high regard and affection was given when on the first of January, 1835, he was presented with a beautiful copy of the New Testament printed in golden letters on porcelain

paper, which bore the following inscription: "Presented to the Right Reverend R. C. Moore by the Citizens of Richmond, members of the different religious denominations, as a tribute of their affectionate regard and esteem for one who has so long and so carefully devoted his life to the great cause of Christianity." The cost of the book was fifty dollars, but that many might be privileged to join in the gift, no individual was allowed to contribute more than fifty cents.

CHRISTIAN COOPERATION.

His truly catholic views were strikingly exhibited in connection with his cooperation in the extension of the work of the American Bible Society. There were those in the Church who interpreted their ordination vows in terms of narrow exclusiveness, and by means of a process of reasoning, ecclesiastically logical, concluded that loyalty to the Church required them to withhold from any cooperation with those who were not in organic union with the Church. Bishop Hobart in 1816 issued a pastoral letter reiterating the views of Bishop Marsh and some others in England advising Episcopalians to withhold their patronage and support from the Bible Society upon the ground that cooperation with other Christians in this matter would be a virtual recognition of their defective ecclesiastical organizations and compromise their position as loyal Churchmen.

With a full knowledge of the arguments advanced in this controversy against cooperation with the American Bible Society, Bishop Moore cordially accepted the position as the first President of the Virginia Branch of the American Bible Society, as the venerable Bishop White had previously done in Pennsylvania, and gave the society his cordial support until the time of his death.

There are doubtless those who still persist in theorizing the Church into pure sectarianism, who would point to this Christian liberality on the part of Bishop Moore and Bishop White as an evidence of disloyalty to what they denominate as Catholic principles. Catholicity has ever been interpreted in the Virginia Church and by

Virginia churchmen in a far broader and more Christian spirit, and no one who knows the loyal devotion of Bishop Moore to the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Episcopal Church can question his loyalty as a Churchman and his devotion to the truly Catholic principles of her teaching. "There are some minds," says the Rev. Dr. Henshaw, the best known biographer of Bishop Moore, "so strangely constituted as to be incapacitated for "*holding the truth in love.*" They seem to suppose that an attachment to the distinctive principles of the Church must prove itself genuine by the indulging of an acerbity of temper towards all who do not embrace them by uttering the most bitter reproaches against the advocates of different principles, and by keeping entirely aloof from all intercourse with those who are not of our Communion." How far he was removed from these views is evidenced from the following extract from one of his Convention addresses: "We know no enemies, but the enemies of our own exalted Redeemer; we stretch forth the right hand of fellowship to all who, in sincerity, call upon the Lord Jesus Christ; we expect to meet in heaven with Christians of all denominations—and we wish prosperity to all the Savior's friends."

This position taken by Bishop Moore is in harmony with the Catholic sympathy and thought of the Church as we find it expressed by the Lambeth Conference of 1908 (p. 185), "The Committee believe that few things tend more directly to godly union and concord than cooperation between members of different communions in all matters pertaining to the social and moral welfare of the people. It is in the common service of humanity, in the name of Him Who is its Lord, that the ties of friendly relationship are most readily created and most surely strengthened."

His attitude relative to the question of Christian cooperation is also in harmony with the mind of those in the Anglican Communion who are in accord with the scholarly Bishop of Lincoln, who, in a recent pastoral to his Diocese, affirms his conviction as to the permanent value of this article of the Conference, and declared,

“This plan many of us have followed for long years past. We have never hesitated to co-operate freely with Non-conformists of every name in promoting those great social and moral reforms that all good men have at heart. We have never felt our Church principles compromised, nor our position misunderstood, through such co-operation.”

If this Church of ours is to become Catholic in her attitude and relationship as she is Catholic in her name and heritage, this principle must be accepted and allowed (we do not say *ordered*) as an essential principle of comprehensive churchmanship. On the one hand, those who favor such co-operation must learn to refrain from impugning the motives of those whose conscientious convictions keep them from being able to enter into such co-operation; while, on the other hand, those who interpret their ordination vows and Christian calling in terms which inspire and sanction such fellowship and co-operation, and who seek to make the Church sufficiently comprehensive to allow and invite such co-operation, cannot be justly charged with disloyalty, and will not be except by those who are either ignorant of the many declarations which the Church has made on this subject, or else by those who, in their effort to restrain the Catholic spirit of the Church within the limits of an individual or party interpretation of the ministry of the Church, repudiate this comprehensive principle which the Church allows. In the comprehensive realm of spiritual life and relationship the Church should be not only tolerant, but generously sympathetic, in her legislative provisions and official interpretations which are designed to guide and direct the expression of the spirits who seek to serve God and humanity. Love is Catholic minded, Unity grows out of fellowship, Service is the path-finder of Truth, Sympathy and Co-operation are the human interpretations and expressions of the Eternal love. While compelling none to serve contrary to their convictions, the Church must ever allow and invite convictions to serve and to find expression if the motive of service is in harmony with the fundamental truths of the Gospel revelation, otherwise the Church will become a sectarian body rather than a Catholic institution.

It was this larger vision of the mission and meaning of the Church which led Bishop White, of Pennsylvania, and Bishop Moore, of Virginia, to enter into co-operation with Nonconformist Churches in an effort to spread the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, revealed in the great gospel of redemption. Surely no charge of disloyalty to the Church can be justly made against those who follow the leadership of these two Reverend and Revere Fathers of God in the American Church.

HIS LOYALTY TO THE DISTINCTIVE PRINCIPLES OF THE CHURCH

To infer from these exhibitions of his spirit of co-operation that Bishop Moore was lax in his loyalty to the Church would be to draw an unwarranted inference which is refuted by the many evidences of his supreme devotion to the Church, and by numerous letters which he addressed to his clergy enjoining upon them the necessity of using the liturgy of the Church unimpaired in the public services. To one of his clergy he writes: "What assurance, I would ask, can our vestries have in our integrity other than that they derive from our promises of fidelity? If they see us violate our ordination vows, will that violation exalt us in their estimation? The Church boasts of her uniformity—I know if I were engaged as a private worshipper in the services of the Church, the devotional feelings of my heart would be distressed to perceive the officiating minister violating order, and thus depriving me of a service to which I have a legitimate claim, and which he is bound to perform." To another clergyman he writes: "As I know from experience, the temptations to aberrate from the Liturgy with which you will be assailed; you must pardon me, in requesting that you resist them all. We have solemnly promised to conform to the discipline and worship of the Church upon all public occasions; and however agreeable a departure from our obligation may be to some, still men of principle will venerate and respect us for our fidelity, and be pleased to see in us a scrupulous regard to our ordination vows."

In a letter to another of his clergy he expresses his opposition to combining with others in the use of free

churches in view of the doctrinal differences and controversies which in his day were so rife in the State. "A free Church," he says, "ever has been and ever will be a bone of contention. By inculcating from the same pulpit the propriety of infant Baptism one Sunday, and their want of title to that Sacrament, the next Sabbath; by inculcating particular election one Sunday, and general redemption another; by inculcating the use of the Liturgy one day, and insisting upon no Liturgy tomorrow, the minds of the people will become confused, and it will appear a matter of indifference what sentiments they cherish, and to what denomination they belong or what system of worship they adopt."

To his clergy he also wrote letters dealing with the practical and parochial side of their ministerial life. To one of restless mind and of a roving disposition he wrote: "Before you conclude to settle in any place, reflect deeply upon the subject, and, when your mind is made up, enter upon the discharge of your duties with spirit; never expect to fix yourself in any parish in which everything will be agreeable, but endeavoring to meet your difficulties with fortitude, enduring hardness as a good servant of Jesus Christ. A frequent change of residence will operate to the disadvantage of any man. Endeavor to be stationary in your habits, and in so doing Providence will take care of you and promote you in due time; but should you be found frequently on the wing, depend upon it such a disposition will prove a disadvantage to you through life. I have dropped the above remark from motives of a sincere and fatherly regard, they are such as I should present to my son, and endeavor to impress on his mind in indelible characters."

A letter addressed to another clergyman of the Diocese urging fidelity in pastoral visiting and giving practical instruction as to how such visits can be made effective is most interesting. "Take your horse and go to every family in your parish; breakfast with one and pass an hour in suitable religious conversation with the family; dine with a second and pursue the same course; take a cup of tea or coffee with a third, and read, converse and

pray with them all. When you have finished devote a few weeks to your studies and begin again, and never think the work finished so long as you possess health and strength and life." Surely "Old times have changed, old manners gone," and most of the pastoral calling of today has descended to a much lower plane.

The devotion of Bishop Moore to the Liturgy of the Church and his insistence upon its use without alteration in the regular services of the Church, did not preclude him from taking a vital interest in establishing and frequenting the more informal meeting of what was known as the "Associations," where a number of clergy gathered together for conference and prayer and series of services for the good of the community. Of an association held in Alexandria in 1831 he thus spoke in his address to the Convention of 1832: "I embarked for Alexandria at which place we held an association. On that occasion we were joined by a number of the clergy of this Diocese and of Maryland, and were assisted in our labours by the Rev. Dr. Henshaw, and the Rev. Mr. Johns, of Baltimore, and Rev. Dr. Bedell, of Philadelphia. To say that our meeting at that time was instructive and agreeable, would be expressing myself in language too faint for the occasion. A spirit of great zeal and fervour and devotion appeared to animate every bosom, the congregations were deeply solemn and attentive, and overflowing; many were awakened to the consideration of eternal things and openly avowed their love and gratitude to the Almighty. It would rejoice my heart, brethren, to witness a similar evidence of divine influence in every parish in the Diocese. As a proof of the devotional feeling which prevailed, more especially among the young, I with pleasure announce to the Convention, that I confirmed, during my visit, upwards of ninety persons."

In addition to the services rendered in his own Diocese Bishop Moore made Episcopal visitations in North Carolina from 1819 to 1823, and in Kentucky and Tennessee and other Dioceses during periods of vacancy, besides continuing to serve as Rector of Monumental Church.

The Election of Bishop Meade as Assistant Bishop

In 1823 he expresses the hope of soon having an assistant in Monumental Church, and offers to contribute personally five hundred dollars a year for his support. This hope was realized through the co-operation of the Conventions of 1824 and 1825. Thus Monumental Church became, as it were, the Cathedral Church of the Diocese of Virginia. There is, however, no record existent of its having been officially designated as such, and the Convention of Virginia seems for some reason to have failed to make any appropriation for building an Episcopal throne, nor does the Bishop seem to have been given either a miter, crosier, or pectoral Cross, and yet he seems to have been a very good Bishop after all.

In 1829 the Convention met in Charlottesville. The Bishop was now in his sixty-seventh year. At the Convention of the previous year he had asked that the constitution and canons of the Church should be so revised as to make the election of an assistant Bishop possible. This having been done, it was now "Resolved that this Convention deem it expedient, considering the age and bodily infirmity of our most venerated Bishop, to proceed to the election of an assistant, who is not to be considered as entitled to the succession, but that it shall be the right and duty of the Convention of the diocese of Virginia, on the demise of our venerated Bishop, to proceed to the election of a principal Bishop as a successor to the said deceased Bishop."

The Convention, upon the passage of this resolution proceeded to an election, and the Reverend Dr. Wm. Meade, who received every vote, excepting two blank votes, cast by the members of the Convention. This election proved a great satisfaction and relief to Bishop Moore, who ever spoke of Dr. Meade in terms of deep appreciation and affection. The General Convention, while consenting to the Consecration of Bishop Meade, in spite of what it considered the unwise and unprecedented restriction relative to the succession, passed a canon giving all future assistant bishops who should be elected the

right of succession, whereupon the next Virginia Convention repealed the restriction imposed upon the election of Bishop, and gave him the right of succession. The labors of Bishop Moore were, however, unabated, and at every Convention he had the satisfaction of reporting the progress and development of his diocese. In one of his addresses he reported that of the fifty-six clergymen belonging to the Diocese in 1833 not less than forty-four had been ordained by him.

DIOCESAN INSTITUTIONS ESTABLISHED.

During his Episcopate of twenty-seven years he had the satisfaction of seeing a number of Diocesan institutions and organizations established which have continued to help and bless the Church which he so deeply loved and so faithfully served.

In 1816 a society was formed for the distribution of Prayer Books and religious tracts.

At the Convention a fund was established for the support of the Episcopate.

In 1818 the Education Society was organized in Georgetown, D. C., and subsequently was transferred to Virginia, and was nourished and fostered by his interest and unfaltering co-operation. In 1835 it was reported by the Secretary of the Society that "nearly one-tenth of the clergy in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States have in whole or in part been assisted by this society. One-sixth of the present clergy of Ohio, one-eighth of those of Pennsylvania, one-fifth of those of Maryland, and a large proportion of those in Virginia have derived aid from its funds, while it is now affording assistance to about one-seventh of all the students in the several theological schools of the Church in the United States." In addition to all this the Education Society contributed from its funds money to aid in purchasing the present

site of the Theological Seminary in Virginia and paid in full the salary of the Rev. Dr. Lippitt, who was appointed to the Chair of Systematic Theology in 1825.

In 1829 the Diocesan Missionary Society was formally established, and its constitution adopted. This action was the culmination of efforts which had been made for the support of diocesan missionaries dating back as far as the Convention of 1813. (Hawks' Journals, p. 90.)

At this Convention a Committee was also appointed to take into consideration the laws and regulations for the government of the society for the relief of distressed widows and orphans of deceased clergymen.

The Bishop had also given his support to the establishment of the Southern Churchman, which he cordially endorsed and commended in his Convention address of 1835. The Institution, however, in which he took the most vital interest, and to which he gave his most earnest and devoted support, was the Theological Seminary, which began its life just at the time when he began his work as Bishop of Virginia. Of this institution further mention will be made in closing, as it constitutes the most potent and vital memorial of his Episcopate.

Convention Addresses and Virginia Church Conventions

His last addresses to his Convention glow with the fervor of matured affection, and with the devotion to the evangelical faith which constituted the unfailing theme of his preaching. In tender tones he urged his clergy to "Labour with diligence in the vineyard of your Master and be not weary in well doing. Be faithful unto death and God will give you a crown of life." To the laity he said:

"My brethren of the laity, accept my sincere thanks

for the patronage you have extended to myself and to the clergy. The Episcopal Church in Virginia, which was almost breathless and expiring a few years since, has not only revived, but, through the goodness of God on our joint efforts, now exhibits animation and strength. Instead of five or six efficient clergymen, the Almighty has increased our numbers to between fifty and sixty. 'Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but to thy name be the praise, for thy honour and for thy truth's sake.' Since my residence in this diocese, the laity belonging to our communion have erected between thirty and forty new churches, and have raised from a state of ruin and dilapidation at least thirty of the old places of worship. We have reason to be thankful for what God hath done for us, and to take courage and press forward. My brethren of the clergy and laity, I commend you to the care of that being in whose service you are engaged. May you long live to see our Zion increase in stature, under the ministry of my Right Rev. brother, Bishop Meade. My gray hairs point to the tomb. My frequent and violent attacks of disease remind me of my proximity to the grave, and proclaim to me, in language I perfectly understand, that we must soon shake hands and bid each other farewell. But let that event take place sooner or later, my heart is comforted with the hope that I shall leave you in safe hands; in the care of an individual who is in the vigour of life; who loves you, and will labour hard to promote your present and everlasting happiness. My blessing shall rest upon his head; and the welfare of himself, of the clergy and people of the diocese, will form one of the objects of my last earthly supplications."

These old Conventions of the Diocese of Virginia were unique in the history of our Church in America. Thither came the people from far and near, as the tribes came up to Jerusalem to the great feasts of the Temple. Writing to invite Bishop Ravenscroft, of North Carolina, to endeavor to be present at the Convention soon to meet in Petersburg, he mentions the fact that there had been at least twelve hundred visitors at the Convention which met

the previous year in Fredericksburg. Of these old Virginia Conventions a contemporaneous historian writes as follows:

“A Virginia Convention! There is something to animate and warm the heart in the very title! When we speak of most other Diocesan Conventions, we think of assemblages of the clergy and lay delegates, with the Bishop at their head, convened chiefly for the purpose of attending to ecclesiastical business—of regulating the fiscal and other ordinary interests of the diocese. But how different the impression made upon the mind when a *Virginia* Convention is spoken of! The annual ecclesiastical meetings of that diocese have but little of a secular character connected with them! Business is but a secondary and subordinate matter. The assembly is not limited to the elected members, but is a gathering together of the devoted friends of the Church, clerical and lay, from all parts of the state, not excepting the more distant and remote parishes. Persons of all ranks and ages—‘young men and maidens, old men and children’—are gathered together for the purpose of religious improvement and spiritual edification. It is such a scene as was exhibited among God’s people of old, at their solemn festivals, as described in the words of the Psalmist, ‘I was glad when they said unto me, we will go into the house of the Lord. Our feet shall stand in thy gates, O Jerusalem. Jerusalem is built as a city that is at unity in itself. For thither the tribes go up, even the tribes of the Lord, to testify unto Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord.’

“In the midst of the hallowed and interesting scenes of that annual festival, the Bishop moved as the presiding genius. He was the centre of attraction and unity to the numerous family of devoted and affectionate children by which he was surrounded. He was a leader or participator in the numerous devotional services which took place day after day, and night after night. His heart glowed with the kindled fervours of faith and love; his eyes sparkled under the inspiration of hope and joy; and his tongue flowed with melting eloquence, as now he

urged his ministers to greater zeal and faithfulness, and then exhorted the people to repentance and a holy life. These annual Conventions were to him sources of unaffected pleasure and delight. As, amidst these times of refreshing, he beheld the word of God taking effect upon the hearts and consciences of the people, and witnessed answers to prayer in the conversion of sinners, he rose to higher and higher degrees of enjoyment, till, as the end drew near, it seemed as if he were in a rapture or ecstasy; just ready, like Elijah, to go up in a chariot of fire to heaven! Never have we witnessed a spectacle which so nearly answered to our idea of the purity, and joy, and love of the primitive Church, as the closing scene of a Virginia Convention. When the body of weeping clergy gathered around the altar, while, in the presence of a crowded but praying assembly, their Right Reverend Father in God, with shaking hands and whitened locks, stood before them as an appropriate representative and successor of the Apostles—and, with streaming eyes, and a voice tremulous with emotion, gave them his parting counsels, and pronounced over them his affectionate farewell—a scene was presented upon which attending angels might gaze with rapture.”

The Closing Events of His Episcopate

In 1810 the Bishop journeyed to Baltimore to assist in the Consecration of the Rev. Dr. Whittingham to the Episcopate in Maryland, and also went to Philadelphia to ordain his kinsman, Rev. G. T. Bedell, to the Diaconate. Responding to an urgent invitation he went to Westchester, N. Y., in August, 1811, to ordain Mr. Bedell to the Priesthood, and was assisted in the service by two of his own sons. It is interesting to note that though the Bishop was seventy-nine years of age, he took an active part in an Association which Rev. Mr. Bedell had arranged in his

Parish co-incident with his ordination, and spoke with great earnestness and spiritual power four times in addition to conducting the examination for orders, celebrating the Holy Communion and taking the ordination service. Following the sermon by Dr. Tyng at the evening service, Bishop Moore made a touching appeal for personal consecration. "I shall never forget," wrote Rev. Mr. Bedell, "how the old man, eloquent, stood that evening on the border of the grave, his white locks, and his uplifted, trembling finger, telling of experienced age, but in the cause of Christ forgetting every weakness of the flesh, one finger only resting on the chancel rail, his whole frame roused by the energy of his mind and active under the influence of his feelings. How impressively he told us of the Savior whom he had served for fifty years and so bade us hear an old man's testimony.——The tears of not a few persons in the audience showed the power of his eloquence, among them being an old soldier of the revolution who said afterwards that he had not shed a tear before for many years."

While in New York Bishop Moore attended the session of the General Convention and lent his voice and influence to the project of appointing two bishops, one for Texas and the other for West Africa. This was his last service to the General Church. Leaving New York before the adjournment of the Convention he returned to Richmond, and two days after commenced, in his eightieth year, a journey of a hundred and fifty miles to Lynchburg, arriving there on the 5th of November, where, after speaking at an evening service previous to a confirmation service which was to take place on the following day, he was taken ill and died of pneumonia in the home of Rev. Thomas Atkinson, Rector of St. Paul's, on the 11th day of November, 1841. His death was mourned throughout the whole Church. His body was carried back to Richmond, where the last tributes of devotion were paid to his hallowed memory, not alone by the bereaved members of his Church, but by the whole community.

Over his grave the Vestry of Monumental Church erected a monument which bears the following inscription:

“RICHARD CHANNING MOORE, D. D.

WAS BORN IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
AUGUST 21ST, 1762.”

“HE LABOURED FAITHFULLY AND SUCCESSFULLY IN
THE MINISTRY OF THE
PROTESTANT-EPISCOPAL CHURCH 54 YEARS.”

“HE WAS RECTOR OF THE MONUMENTAL CHURCH
IN RICHMOND,
AND BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF VIRGINIA,
27 YEARS.”

“IN THE CONVENTION THAT CALLED HIM TO THE
EPISCOPATE,
THERE WERE ONLY 7 MEMBERS.”

“AT THE TIME OF HIS DEATH THERE WERE 95
CLERGY IN THE DIOCESE OF VA.”

“HE DIED IN LYNCHBURG, VIRGINIA,
NOV. 11TH, 1841,
AT THE AGE OF 79.”

Of this monument Rev. Dr. Henshaw gives this description:

“On the opposite side of this monument is an inscription commemorative of Mrs. Moore. At the base of the pyramid, on the east side, is sculptured in bas-relief, a cross, over a portion of which some drapery is hung, and on the opposite side an altar; on the northern side there is a representation of a Bible with the following inscription engraved thereon:

“DANIEL, CHAPTER XII.”

“THEY THAT BE WISE SHALL SHINE AS THE BRIGHTNESS
OF THE
FIRMAMENT, AND THEY THAT TURN MANY TO
RIGHTEOUSNESS
AS THE STARS FOR EVER AND EVER.”

“And on the opposite side a Prayer-Book is represented with this inscription:

‘IN THE MIDST OF LIFE, WE ARE IN DEATH.’”

The Beginnings of the Theological Seminary in Virginia

This Institution, whose beginnings were contemporaneous with the beginning of the Episcopate of Bishop Moore, is the most vital and potent memorial of his ministry. It is something difficult to say just what point marks the beginning of the Theological Seminary in Virginia, and it would be unfair to others to name any one man as exclusively entitled to be designated as its founder. This School of the Prophets is the child of faith and devotion of many sons of the Church. Laymen, Clergymen, and Bishops united in the dreams and aspirations out of which it was born, and co-operated in laying its foundation stones. Rev. W. H. Meade, who was chiefly instrumental, with Dr. Wilmer, in bringing Bishop Moore to Virginia, who gave to his Episcopate such constant and devoted support, and who saw before the coming of Bishop Moore the vision of the Virginia Church, lifted from the ruins into which she had fallen and made strong and glorious, was perhaps the most active and efficient agent in promoting the establishment of the Seminary in Virginia. This is unquestionably the opinion held by Bishop Johns.

To this Institution, however, Bishop Moore gave his earnest and constant endorsement and support. The following brief annals of its early history are therefore given, as they fall within the time of Bishop Moore's Episcopal supervision:

In the fall of 1811 Rev. Dr. John Augustine Smith, President of the College of William and Mary, met Bishop Moore on the street in New York, and suggested to him that a Chair of Theology be established in the College at Williamsburg. This suggestion marks the beginning of the Theological Seminary in Virginia.

When in 1815 a communication was received from the President of the College of William and Mary, suggesting the expediency of establishing a theological professorship in that institution, he gave the suggestion enthusiastic support in his address to the Convention.

At the Convention of 1821 it was determined to establish a Theological Department at the College of William and Mary, and a Board of Trustees was elected to have charge of the undertaking, and Mr. John Nelson was appointed to solicit subscriptions throughout the Diocese for the purpose. To the Convention of 1822 it was reported that \$10,268.33 had been secured; a constitution for the Theological School was adopted, and Rev. Dr. W. H. Wilmer was elected as first President of the Board of Trustees. To the devoted interest of Rev. Dr. Wilmer the Seminary owes a debt of gratitude and appreciation which has not, up to this time, been generally recognized and accorded. No man in the Church in Virginia had the Seminary nearer to his heart, and no one labored more zealously than he to promote its welfare.

The Trustees reported to the Convention of 1823 that they had selected and appointed the Rev. Mr. Keith Professor of Divinity in the College of William and Mary. In 1823 the Theological School was moved to Alexandria, where, in October, Dr. Keith, who had only one student to offer for instruction in Williamsburg, now took up the work of theological instruction with a class of fourteen students, thirteen of whom were candidates for orders. To the Convention of 1825 the Board reported a detailed course of theological study, and the rules and regulations which had been adopted for the government of the school. To the Convention of 1826 the Board reported the death of Rev. Prof. Norris and the election of Rev. Mr. Lippit as Professor in the school. Twenty students are reported, seven of whom were soon to be ordained. To the Convention of 1827 the Board reported that they had "determined to purchase or erect in some healthy situation near Alexandria, but in the State of Virginia, a house or houses sufficiently large to accommodate two professors and twenty students." In 1828 it was reported that the property, consisting of sixty-two acres and a brick house where the Seminary now stands, had been purchased, in June, 1827, at a cost of five thousand dollars, and that three thousand dollars additional had been expended in erecting a three-story brick building.

It was further reported that it had been found that seventy-five dollars was amply sufficient for the board of each of the seventeen students enrolled. There is, however, no report on this subject from the students. They, however, survived, and their successors have continued to survive, though complaints are perhaps heard more often of material limitations in these modern days than in the more Spartan days of old. Still through days of trial and through such periods of prosperity as have come to her, the dear old Seminary has still kept to the even tenor of her way. From her halls have gone forth consecrated men to witness to the truth both "in Jerusalem and Samaria and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." True to the Master's commission to teach the great Gospel of the one great Mediator, and loyal to His command: "Go ye into all the world" and "tell it out among the nations that the Lord is King;" constant in her faith that it is "not by human might or power," but by the Spirit's benediction that the witness is to be given to the presence and power of the living Christ, she has been instrumental in bringing many sons into the glory of the life redeemed by Him Who loved us and gave Himself for us.

The future calls us. From a world bound by the golden chains of materialism; from cities where industrial strife abounds because men know not in what the abundance of a man's life consisteth; from colleges where much learning has made men mind-mad, but left them spiritually blind; from homes where luxury is enervating the souls of men, and distorting the mental vision of youth; from social and philanthropic institutions where, as never before, it is coming to be seen that humanitarianism is impotent to nourish the immortal spirits of men; from the materialism of rationalistic and ritualistic ecclesiasticism; from every source where men are needed for leadership who have themselves seen in the silent place the vision of the all-sufficient Christ, and who have heard the voice of the Spirit, and been consecrated by the power, there comes the call for men to teach and preach the truth that makes men free, and minister the Sacraments that men may be made clean and strong to help

finish the great unfinished work of God's great unfinished world. To our Seminary comes this call at this time. The call is very clear. If true to the faith in which she was born, the Seminary will never die while the Church is militant for truth and righteousness upon the earth.

May the God of our fathers continue to bless this school of the prophets that Christ may be glorified with the glory which shall be revealed.

*Read at the Theological Seminary in Virginia,
Alumni Association, June 4, 1914.*



RT. REV. WILLIAM CABELL BROWN, D. D.
BISHOP COADJUTOR OF VIRGINIA

The Right Reverend
William Cabell Brown, D. D.

As announced by the writer when this address was ordered published by the Alumni Association of the Theological Seminary in Virginia, it is with deep affection and sincere regard dedicated to him who, one hundred years from the consecration of Bishop Moore on May 18th, 1814, was on the 14th of May, 1914, elected Bishop Coadjutor of the Diocese of Virginia.

The Rt. Rev. William Cabell Brown, D. D., was born in Lynchburg, Virginia, on November 22nd, 1861. He was the son of Robert and Margaret (Cabell) Brown, and is closely connected with many of the oldest families in the State. His boyhood was spent in Nelson County, near the once famous Norwood School which he attended for many years. He taught for several years in the public schools of Nelson County, Va., commencing this work when he was sixteen. In 1881 he became a teacher at the Episcopal High School, and for one session studied law at the University of Virginia. He graduated at the Theological Seminary of Virginia in 1891 and was ordained deacon by Bishop Whittle on June 26th in the Seminary Chapel, and priest in Grace Church, Berryville, Va., on August 2nd of the same year. Immediately afterwards, on September 13th, 1891, he went with the Rev. Mr. Meem to Brazil, joining the Rev. Messrs. Morris and Kinsolving, the pioneer missionaries of our Church in South America, who had gone out two years before. His remarkable work in that country as missionary, theological teacher and translator of the Prayer Book and Bible is well known. In 1901 he was elected Missionary Bishop of Porto Rico, and in 1913 Missionary Bishop of Cuba, but declined in both cases, feeling it his duty to remain in Brazil until the important work which he had in hand should be accomplished. Dr. Brown was elected Bishop Coadjutor of Virginia in St. James' Church, Richmond,

Va., on May 20th, 1911, just two days after the one hundredth anniversary of the consecration of Bishop Moore on May 18th, 1811.

The following account of the Consecration of Bishop Brown is taken from the Southern Churchman of October 30th, 1911:

Consecration of Bishop Brown

The consecration of the Rev. William Cabell Brown, D. D., as Bishop Coadjutor of the Diocese of Virginia, took place in St. James' Church, Richmond, on Wednesday, October 28th, the Feast of St. Simon and St. Jude. Morning Prayer was said in the church at half-past nine o'clock by the Rev. J. J. Gravatt, D. D., and the Rev. J. Y. Downman, D. D.

At eleven o'clock the procession of choir, clergy and bishops passed from the parish house by the front doors into the Church, singing the processional hymn 311. There were about sixty vested clergymen in the procession. They were followed by the Bishop-elect with his attending presbyters, the Rev. Berryman Green, D. D., and the Rev. James W. Morris, D. D., and the Bishops in order, the Right Rev. Arthur S. Lloyd, D. D., president of the Board of Missions; the Rt. Rev. Beverley D. Tucker, D. D., Bishop Coadjutor of Southern Virginia; the Rt. Rev. William Loyall Gravatt, D. D., Bishop Coadjutor of West Virginia; the Rt. Rev. Lucien Lee Kinsolving, D. D., Bishop of Southern Brazil; the Rt. Rev. Alfred M. Randolph, D. D., Bishop of Southern Virginia; the Rt. Rev. Robert A. Gibson, D. D., Bishop of Virginia, and the Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D. D., Bishop of Missouri, and Presiding Bishop.

The Ante-Communion service was said by the Presiding Bishop, the Epistle being read by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Randolph, and the Gospel by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Gibson.

Hymn number 586 was sung.

The sermon was preached by the Rt. Rev. Lucien Lee Kinsolving, D. D., Bishop of Southern Brazil, from the text, Romans 1: 1 "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the Gospel of God."

It was an eloquent discourse and worthy of the occasion. His charge to the Bishop-elect, for twenty-three years his fellow-worker in the mission field of Brazil, was especially tender and appropriate.

Dr. Brown was then presented for consecration by the Rt. Rev. William Loyall Gravatt, D. D., Bishop Coadjutor of West Virginia, and the Rt. Rev. Beverley D. Tucker, D. D., Bishop Coadjutor of Southern Virginia. The certificate of his election was read by the Rev. Edward L. Goodwin, D. D., Secretary of the Council of the Diocese; the testimonial signed by the members of the Council by Mr. Rosewell Page; the certificate of his ordination to the diaconate and priesthood by the Rev. William D. Smith, D. D.; the statement of the canonical grounds of his election by Mr. John M. Taylor; the certificate that all canonical requirements had been met by the Rev. H. B. Lee, D. D.; the consents of the Standing Committees by the Rev. William J. Morton; and the consents of the Bishops by the Rt. Rev. Arthur S. Lloyd, D. D. The Bishop-elect made the promise of conformity in a firm voice. The Litany was said by the Rev. Ernest Stires, Rector of St. Thomas' Church, New York.

The Presiding Bishop then proceeded with the examination of the candidate and the consecration proper. Rt. Rev. Bishops Gibson and Randolph were consecrators.


All the Bishops present united in the solemn imposition of hands. The Holy Communion service was taken by the Presiding Bishop, who also pronounced the benediction. The offertory was for the Diocesan Missionary Society.

The Recessional Hymn was 219.

The service throughout was a beautiful and stately one. The music was appropriate and admirably rendered. The church was filled to overflowing with a devout congregation. The Rev. Thomas C. Darst, Rector of St. James, was the master of ceremonies, and much was due to his careful arrangement of every detail.

To the regret of everyone Bishop Peterkin, of West Virginia, who had been appointed one of the consecrators, was unable to be present.

The Church may feel very sure that the historic position of the Diocese of Virginia, and her faithful witness to the fundamental and essential principles of the great Gospel of redemption will be strengthened through the influence and preaching of him who, with the honored Bishop of Virginia, is charged with the responsibility of high service in this ancient diocese of the Church of God



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

Form L9-50m-11, 30(2554)111

EX
5995 the Right Rev-
M7G6 erend Richard
Stanring Moore

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 835 212 2

EX
5995
M7G6

