

blessing of the sinner (p. 32f.); thinks that tongues in Corinth were ecstatic speech (p. 61).

Roberts, Richard. *The Gospel at Corinth*. New York: Macmillan, 1924. 173 pp.

Sermons drawn from I Corinthians. He does not think that fundamentalists would acknowledge Paul today (p. 11); thinks that the apostle Paul was a child of his time (p. 13), stresses the new birth (p. 26); and the tolerant mind (p. 34); views seriously the judgment and mercy in the cross (p. 54); claims to be a Presbyterian (p. 93); emphasizes the incarnation (pp. 125f.) and the reality of the empty tomb (p. 172).

Scroggie, W. Graham. *The Greatest Is Love*. Belfast, Ire.: Ambassador, 1995. 96 pp.

A warm-hearted exposition of I Corinthians 13 by a master expositor. He gives an analytical outline of the chapter (pp. 9-10); organizes the chapter into the Value of Love (vv. 1-3), the Virtue of Love (vv. 4-7), the Victory of Love (vv. 8-13); stresses that only Christian character abides (p. 87).

Witherington, Ben, III. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995. Pp. 1-324.

He organizes I Corinthians on a rhetorical basis (pp. vi-viii); stresses that Paul should not be interpreted in a way that violates the apostle's intended sense and meaning (p. xiii, n. 12); gives the background of Roman Corinth (pp. 5-19); classes I Corinthians as a problem-oriented letter (p. 73); defends the idea of the universal church (p. 90); warns against a too exalted view of baptism (p. 104); discusses the social make-up of the Corinthian church (pp. 114ff.); holds that pagans felt that Christians were a threat to their social-religious order (pp. 119f.); describes the Roman court system (pp. 162f.), slavery in Roman Corinth (pp. 181ff.), dining customs (pp. 191ff.), headcoverings (pp. 232ff.); gives illustrations of homes and customs (pp. 11, 27, 115, 194, etc.).

© 1998 Bob Jones University
Reproduced with permission.
Further reproduction prohibited.

Francis Grimké and the Fundamentalists

by Mark Sidwell

In 1927 Mrs. W. T. Larimer, Assistant Secretary of the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the USA, stood before an audience at the Winona Lake Bible Conference in Indiana and urged the churches to remember America's black population. In great detail, she listed the accomplishments of blacks in every field of endeavor. She asked that African Americans enjoy what every citizen wanted: education, equal wages, protection of their lives and property, the right to vote, and decent housing to rent or purchase. Above all, she urged churches to hold interracial meetings and to enlist black Christians in support of causes that would benefit the whole nation. Christians, she argued, must lead the way in reaching out to blacks and helping them achieve "their rightful place."¹

There is no record of how Mrs. Larimer's address was received. Certainly the fact that the Winona Lake organization chose to print it shows at least a tacit approval. What makes it stand out is its uniqueness among not just Fundamentalist Christians of the 1920s or even among the nominal Christians of that day but among the mainstream of American society at that time. Interaction of the races was rare. Fundamentalists, like most white Christians of their day, had limited interaction with black churches or individual black Christians. Virtually throughout its borders, the United States suffered from either *de jure* segregation (in the South) or *de facto* segregation (in much of the rest of the country). With its social conservatism, Fundamentalism was not likely to challenge this situation, and it apparently did not.

Among the important black leaders that Mrs. Larimer mentioned to the crowd at Winona Lake was "Mr. Grimke of Washington City."² Her recognition was fitting, for Francis Grimké was among the best known African American pastors of that day. Grimké's career and particularly his interaction with

evangelical and Fundamentalist leaders of his day shed some light on relations between orthodox Christians of both races.

The Career of Francis J. Grimké

Francis James Grimké (1850-1937) was the illegitimate son of white planter Henry Grimké and his slave Nancy Weston.³ Grimké and his two brothers lived on a plantation near Charleston, South Carolina, where their father attempted to provide for his sons as best he could under the legal limitations governing slaves before the Civil War. When their father died, however, the Grimké brothers came under the control of their older, white half-brother, Montague Grimké. He in turn treated them as slaves, renting them out to other families as "house servants." Young Frank often ran off, only to be brought back and beaten. He was eventually sold to a Confederate officer.

This situation changed with the abolition of slavery at the end of the Civil War. At a freedman's school in the South, Frank and his brother Archibald impressed the principal so much that she arranged for them to go north to study. They graduated from Lincoln University, an evangelical Presbyterian school for blacks. Archibald went on to become a lawyer, a vocal advocate of civil rights for black Americans, and a diplomat, serving as U.S. consul to Santo Domingo (the Dominican Republic).

While in law school, however, Frank Grimké decided to enter the Presbyterian ministry. Grimké's decision was unexpected. Apparently, he left no description of his conversion, but he wrote in his journal in 1918,

I call myself a Christian,—and, if believing that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and the Saviour of the world,—believes that his blood alone cleanses from sin, I am. For I do believe in him, and trusting him for salvation, I am depending upon no merit of my own, but upon his righteousness alone when I shall appear before the bar of God to render up my account. If I understand my heart, Jesus is truly my prophet, priest and king. I do sit at his feet and try to learn of him; I have accepted the atonement which he made for my sins; and I am trying to obey him, to follow his lead.⁴

Grimké chose to attend Princeton Theological Seminary, one of the most theologically orthodox schools in America at that time. Grimké spent most of his career as pastor of the Fifteenth Street Presbyterian Church in Washington, D.C. (1878-85, 1889-1928), with only the interlude of a brief pastorate in Jacksonville, Florida (1885-89). Throughout his career, Grimké defied easy categorization in either his theological or social views. Indeed one might label Francis Grimké both "orthodox" and "progressive."

Ideology of Francis Grimké

Randall Balmer and John Fitzmier correctly observe that Grimké was "[b]roadly evangelical in his theological sympathies, neither a fundamentalist nor a promoter of the Princeton theology."⁵ But although not narrow, his theological views were certainly orthodox. He considered evangelical Christianity superior to other forms of the Christian faith, such as Unitarianism, which he described as "not genuine." Evangelical Christianity alone, he said, had a missionary impetus arising from its belief in the deity of Christ and the necessity of His atonement for sin as the way of salvation.⁶ On the fiftieth anniversary of his ministry he said, "The findings of the higher critics; the rationalistic tendencies within the church and without it; the dogmatic and arrogant assumptions and declarations of science, that would banish God from the universe, or limit his power, telling him what he may do, and what he may not do, have not affected in the least my perfect faith in the Bible as the word of God, and in the saving power of faith in Jesus Christ."⁷

Connected with this theological position was a strong emphasis on personal morality. Grimké, for example, expressed strong distaste for the use of tobacco.⁸ Although he was not totally opposed to the cinema, he called movies "a very serious menace to the proper training of our children and to the home itself."⁹ He warned sternly against immodest dress, "a corrupter of morals" that "excites evil passions and desires" and "puts bad thoughts into the minds of people."¹⁰ Many forms of the modern dance, Grimké preached, "tend to inflame the passions and to engender impure thoughts."¹¹ Speaking in 1925 of a stage production that featured scantily clad women, the minister said, "It only shows how, under the influence of such performances, the standard of decency has steadily gone down and is sinking ever lower and lower. There is apparently no longer any sense of modesty or decency left... How anyone claiming to be decent can go down into that hog wallow, can be content to feed on such moral filth is beyond my understanding."¹² He wrote in his journal in 1929, "Rum, women, the love of money, and worldly pleasures, are now, and have been the main gateways to hell."¹³

As the last quotation suggests, to no issue of personal morality did he devote more time and passion than the evils of alcohol. Grimké appealed not only to the moral evil of liquor but also to its damaging social effects on the black race. He argued that alcohol took hard-earned money from families and that the blighting effects of drunkenness were destroying entire families.¹⁴ The liquor traffic, Grimké wrote, "has not one redeeming quality. It has everywhere been an unmitigated source of evil. It destroys soul and body. There is nothing so vile, so debasing that it will not stoop to in carrying out its purpose."¹⁵ Such was Grimké's opposition to alcohol that he became distinctly

uncomfortable during a get-together in his home when he was informed that the jelly they were eating was made with wine.¹⁶

Grimké's temperance stand actually represents both the orthodox and progressive sides of his ideology. Support of prohibition was not limited to religious conservatives. In fact, prohibition was one of the last causes in which liberal and conservative Christians stood shoulder to shoulder in common cause.¹⁷ On many social issues, Grimké was at least as blunt as he was on he was on issues of personal morality. Those stands, however, were not as typical of orthodox Protestantism, or even liberal Protestantism, in Grimké's day. The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were a low point in the social and political situation of African Americans. Supreme Court decisions upheld "Jim Crow" laws mandating segregation of the races. Black voter registration plummeted as states and local governments enacted poll taxes and literacy tests to deny blacks the vote. Some black leaders such as Booker T. Washington advocated winning approval of the white majority by going along with these restrictions and pursuing economic development. Others such as W. E. B. Du Bois argued that blacks must pursue every judicial and legislative avenue for securing their rights under the Constitution. Du Bois's faction eventually founded the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) to pursue this policy.

Despite early admiration for Washington, Grimké came to side with the Du Bois position. Grimké lent his name to the call for the founding of the NAACP and supported it warmly. "I belong to what may be called the radical wing of the race, on the race question," the minister said. "I do not believe in compromises; in surrendering, or acquiescing, even temporarily, in the deprivation of a single right, out of deference to an unrighteous public sentiment."¹⁸ He said elsewhere, "We have got to agitate; we have got to continue to keep before the public eye the facts touching the wrongs from which we are suffering in this country, and the rights of which we are deprived."¹⁹ He practiced what he preached in June 1899 when he preached a famous and controversial series of sermons condemning lynching.²⁰

Carter Woodson notes, however, that although Grimké spoke out on these issues from his pulpit, he did not consider the church the proper channel for political agitation, hence his support for nonchurch organizations such as the NAACP.²¹ Nor did Grimké allow his passion for civil rights to modify his theological beliefs. When in 1930 W. E. B. Du Bois publicly attacked Christianity, Grimké roundly criticized him.

Men, like DuBois, when they speak on economics, or on the civil and political rights of the Negro as an American citizen, speak with authority and may be safely followed; but when it comes to religion and morality, they are sadly in need of guidance themselves. They are far, far out of the way as tested by the Word of God and the ideals and principles of Jesus

Christ. Their views are distorted, perverted, erroneous. To follow them is to be misled, to be facing in the wrong direction. Not being right themselves, they are incapable of pointing out the way to others.²²

Nevertheless, Grimké likewise passionately believed in a Christianity free of racial prejudice, and some of his harshest words were for what he viewed as hypocrisy among Christians. He differentiated between real Christianity and that faith as it was practiced in most American churches. "That real genuine Christianity is powerless in the presence of race prejudice, is not true; back of it is the mighty power of God. The gates of hell can not prevail against it. That the Christianity represented in white America is spurious, I am not prepared to say. That the church has failed to do its duty, in this matter, I am prepared, however, to say."²³ The pattern of racial prejudice of his time—and apparent Christian acquiescence to it—appalled Grimké. "Think of Christian men and women drawing the color on a brother or sister! Think of Christian men and women standing idly by, and often taking part in the murder of a fellow human being by a band of lynchers! Think of Christian men and women sanctioning the Jim Crow car and all the other forms of segregation practiced against colored people!"²⁴ At times he seemed almost pessimistic about the situation, as when he observed of white congregations, "If Jesus Christ should come in the guise of a black man, they would not listen to him, they would not permit him to occupy their pulpits."²⁵

The two aspects of Grimké's ministry, orthodox and progressive, were well summarized by Grimké himself when he wrote to his Princeton classmates on the fortieth anniversary of their graduation: "During these forty years two things I have tried to do with all my might: (1). To preach the gospel of the grace of God,—to get men to see their need of a saviour, and to accept of Jesus Christ as the way, the truth, the life.... (2). I have sought with all my might to fight race prejudice, because I believe it is utterly un-Christian, and it is doing almost more than anything else to curse our own land and country and the world at large."²⁶

Francis Grimké and Evangelical Leaders

Francis Grimké may not have been a Fundamentalist, but he had no use for Modernism. Carter Woodson notes, "Dr. Grimké was a plain logical outspoken minister ever fighting all compromise with the world, especially if there were manifested any tendency toward modernism. There was not a scintilla of such thought in the message of Dr. Grimké."²⁷ The minister wrote unsparingly "of what is being done by the Higher Critics, and Modernists to destroy men's faith in the Bible as the word of God, given by holy men as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."²⁸ He rejected evolution as having "not the

scintilla of evidence, in spite of all the pretensions of Science."²⁹ Despite his progressive social views, Grimké criticized the social gospel for under-emphasizing the fact that only as individuals are redeemed in Christ can society be transformed.³⁰ Anti-Modernism was not a major theme of Grimké's message, but one should keep his orthodoxy in mind in noting his relations with evangelical Christians. It was not Modernism that motivated his criticisms of their actions.

One of the earliest clashes with a noted evangelical leader came during Grimké's brief pastorate in Jacksonville (1885-89). Evangelist D. L. Moody had originally attempted to hold racially integrated campaigns in the South. Concerted white opposition, however, caused him to bow to prevailing custom and hold segregated campaigns.³¹ When Moody agreed to hold segregated campaigns, Grimké roundly criticized him in print. He accused the evangelist of "pandering to an unholy prejudice—the direct effect of which would be to harden men in their sins." Grimké thundered that if John the Baptist had followed the example of Moody, he never would have been beheaded by Herod. He was particularly angered because he felt that Moody, with his international reputation, could have challenged and broken the color barrier. "It is impossible to contemplate this man from his lofty eminence as the most noted evangelist of modern times, and yet stooping to a thing so mean, so cowardly, so utterly opposed to the plainest teachings of the holy religion in which he professes to believe, without mingled feelings of pity and disgust."³²

One would imagine, then, that Grimké had completely written Moody off. Yet he also referred to Moody as one of the "great soul-winners of the world."³³ And in 1930 he wrote of Moody, "He was ever looking out for opportunities to point men to Jesus, the Lamb of God, whose blood cleanses from all sin. That was his business; he had no other, lived for no other purpose. And hence the tremendous work which he did, and the wonderful success which attended his efforts."³⁴

Even rockier was Grimké's encounter with evangelist Billy Sunday. Prior to Sunday's first campaign in Washington, D.C., Grimké wrote to him:

Race prejudice is rampant in this city; it flaunts itself everywhere. Has Christianity no message on the subject? Is this evil, this ever-growing evil that is doing almost more than anything else to destroy the self-respect and to increase the burdens of ten millions of colored people in this country, to go unrebuked by the representatives of religion? Will you not say a word on the subject while you are in our midst? I notice that you have been striking with sledge-hammer blows some of the great evils of today—intemperance, impurity, gambling, the lust for gold, frivolity, political corruption, the tobacco habit, and the like. Will it be asking too much of you to turn for a moment to this gigantic evil, RACE PREJUDICE, and deal it also one of those sledge-hammer blows?³⁵

When Sunday, however, struck no "sledge-hammer blows" against racial prejudice during his Washington campaign, Grimké published a pamphlet rebuking the evangelist. At its conclusion he said, "This man, Rev. Billy Sunday, at times, seems to be a little courageous, judged by his vigorous denunciation of many sins; but when it comes to this big devil of race prejudice, the craven in him comes out; he cowers before it; he is afraid to speak out; at heart, he is seen to be a moral coward in spite of his bluster and pretense of being brave. What are you afraid of Mr. Sunday, and, what are your ministerial brethren afraid of?"³⁶

Sunday was never quite rehabilitated in Grimké's eyes, as Moody was. But he was still willing to quote the evangelist favorably, as when Sunday praised the influence of good mothers and attacked immodest dress.³⁷ On prohibition, they saw eye to eye, as shown by the black pastor's quotation of Sunday in describing "the whiskey gang" as "that dirty, rotten, stinking bunch of moral assassins" and then adding, "That sounds very much like Billy, and it sounds a little harsh, perhaps, but it is true."³⁸ But he could not abide Sunday's silence on the race question.

Two controversies at his alma mater, Princeton, indirectly indicate Grimké's attitude toward one of Fundamentalism's most noted figures, J. Gresham Machen. In 1913 Machen and Benjamin B. Warfield clashed over the housing of a black student in the dormitory in which Machen had rooms. They had a heated two-hour discussion in which Warfield supported placing the student in the dormitory and Machen opposed it.³⁹ The following year, in an unrelated incident, Grimké received a letter from a black student complaining about segregated rooms at Princeton.⁴⁰ Referring to this second case in an address in 1916, Grimké castigated Princeton for this policy, which had not been in place when he was a student there. "Are the professors responsible for it? Then they are not fit to be professors. They may have the scholarship, the technical knowledge, but the higher qualification, the mind that was in Jesus, the spirit and temper of the great Teacher, without which mere scholarship counts for nothing, they are sadly lacking in."⁴¹

Many of Grimké's disagreements with conservatives arose over misunderstanding or misrepresentation of his views. In 1916 he received a letter from Sol Dickey, the leader of the Winona Lake organization. Dickey wrote, "I wish you would let me know what you consider the Negro problem, and if you really insist on social equality, by which is meant inter-marriage of the races." Grimké replied that white Christians "seem ... determined to make Christianity conform to your notions rather than make your notions and prejudices conform to its teachings." As for social equality, he asked, "Why do you ask that question? Have you ever seen any statement of mine, in any shape or form, intimating in any way that such a thought was even remotely in my mind?" He continued, "Instead of facing the issue squarely that is involved in

this so-called Negro question and handling it fearlessly in the light of Christian principles, the whole tendency is to evade the question, to dodge the issue, as you are doing by mixing it up with the matter of social equality and the inter-marriage of the races." He signed the letter, "For a real, not a sham Christianity."⁴² Grimké said, "I never heard from him afterwards."⁴³

Race issues also sparked Grimké's criticism of one of Fundamentalism's most noted public figures, statesman William Jennings Bryan. Grimké, like many black leaders, was put out with Bryan's long-time silence on the race issue, but he became absolutely outraged at comments Bryan made in 1923. What likely offended Grimké were remarks Bryan made to a meeting of the Southern Society in Washington, D.C., in late February of that year, remarks which he then expanded into an article for the *New York Times*. Bryan defended the disenfranchisement of blacks in the South, saying, "The more advanced race will always control as a matter of self-preservation not only for the benefit of the advanced race, but for the benefit of the backward race also." If blacks ran the governments in the South, he asked, "is there any white man who believes that the laws made under these circumstances would be ... administered with more fairness than now?" Bryan contended that blacks could not rule as well as whites, although the race had certainly progressed but only because of their contacts with whites. Indeed, interaction with whites was so beneficial that Bryan contended, "Slavery among the whites was an improvement over independence in Africa." Disenfranchisement of blacks in the South is "a matter of self-preservation." Republicans, the Democratic Bryan said, "aggravate the situation by encouraging the blacks to put social and political equality above the cultivation of character."⁴⁴

Grimké wrote to a newspaper editor that "the astonishing thing about it, that he [Bryan] professes to be a Christian, and poses as one of the outstanding champions of Christianity and the Bible as the inspired Word of God." Hearing of this address, he said, "I confess it created in me a profound revulsion of feeling. I lost all respect for the man, all faith in him." The best Grimké could say was that somehow the remarks did not really reflect Bryan's true views. The comments would encourage the South "to continue its nefarious treatment of the colored people." Almost in despair Grimké asked, "How can any man believe in the Declaration of Independence and in the Bible as the Word of God, and say what he has said; take the position he has taken? How can he?"⁴⁵

By no means was Grimké always critical of evangelical leaders. He in fact wrote a letter to G. Campbell Morgan in 1914 commending him for an address on the value of the Bible. Even so, Grimké said that Christians need not be concerned so much about "what infidels, atheists, a godless world think of the Bible, but what the millions of professed followers of Jesus Christ think of it." Christians need something more than just talk about the Scrip-

tures. "What is needed is a living faith in the Word of God—a hearty acceptance of the great principles enunciated in the Bible—faith enough in it to live according to its teachings." William Jennings Bryan was on the platform with Morgan, and Grimké complained how, at that time, Bryan had never said anything about racial injustice. (In a few years, of course, he was to wish that Bryan had never addressed the subject at all.) "Eloquent addresses such as are delivered by Mr. Bryan from time to time are of no real help in buttressing up Christianity, in giving it a more commanding position among men unless back of them is a consistent Christian life." Grimké closed by urging Morgan to stress that Christians should be "witnessing for Christ—living the Christ-life, letting their light shine—shine so that others will see in them what Christianity means,—what it stands for, what kind of character it represents."⁴⁶

Analysis of Francis Grimké's Position

As the letter to G. Campbell Morgan indicates, Grimké's concerns were less for militant defense of the Faith against unbelief than for the expression of true Christianity in a believer's life and action. It would be a mistake, however, to see his concern for racial justice as anything other than what he viewed as the proper expression of biblical Christianity. Grimké said, "The plain, simple, faithful preaching of the gospel with power from on high is adequate to the needs of this age and of every age."⁴⁷ This statement takes on new meaning when one considers his view of social impact of the gospel. But his theology was almost entirely orthodox. For example, relying on the Bible "as the inspired word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice," Grimké argued for racial equality from the literal historicity of Noah and the Flood.⁴⁸

Because he viewed the cause of racial equality as a matter of divine justice, Grimké believed the church should lead not only in working for but also in defining that cause. Understanding this religious quality of Grimké's efforts is essential to understanding Grimké. James G. Carlile expressed it well in 1921 when he wrote to Grimké praising the minister for his efforts in behalf of racial equality and touching upon what he thought was Grimké's unique contribution: "Neither [W. E. B.] Du Bois nor [Marcus] Garvey stand on the religious foundation; [Booker T.] Washington did not. You do."⁴⁹ Significantly, Grimké saw himself discharging "the function of the prophet": "I have called, again and again, the whites to an account, again and again, the white man's Christianity as embodied in the church's treatment of the Negro; and I have no less clearly pointed out the weaknesses, the defects of the Negro, in the hope of leading him to forsake his evil ways.... I have done it in the fear of God."⁵⁰

An illustration of how social issues were the "cutting edge" of his thought is his opposition to the merger of the Presbyterian Church in the USA with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in the early 1900s. The Cumberland Church had begun on the frontier during the Second Great Awakening as a schism with Arminian leanings. Because of these Arminian tendencies, many conservatives had serious reservations about the merger. During the debate on the merger in 1904, Francis Patton, president of Princeton Seminary, argued against the union as "an indirect way of revising the Confession of Faith on radical grounds."⁵¹

Grimké also opposed the merger but on different grounds. For him the central question was that the predominantly southern Cumberland Church had racially segregated presbyteries. He had earlier opposed reunion talks with the southern Presbyterian Church in the US when segregated presbyteries were put forward as a condition of reunion; those discussions had failed in any case. He now led an effort against the Cumberland union. He both wrote and spoke against the move, but to no avail. Neither Calvinistic nor racial concerns were enough to halt the merger. Even Grimké's own presbytery voted for it.⁵²

In opposing the earlier discussion of segregated presbyteries, Grimké had written, "Organic union is a good thing, but it is by no means the most important thing. It is better to do right than to be organically united with any branch of the Church. I do not believe in compromise. Let the right be done, though the heavens should fall."⁵³ Many a Fundamentalist could have said those words, but he would have had different issues in mind when saying them. As Billy Sunday's career illustrates, Fundamentalists were willing to attack America's sins, but few of them recognized racism as one of those sins. It was this failure, characteristic of most white Americans of that time, that contributed to the divide between orthodox black Christians such as Grimké and white Fundamentalists and other conservative Evangelicals. In a sense, then, Francis Grimké was a prophet. In a time when comparatively few people of any ideological stripe were willing to confront the problem of racial prejudice, Grimké offered a critique of American society based on an orthodox approach to Scripture. He may or may not have been right in all of his conclusions, but Francis Grimké at least had the courage and theological conviction to offer that critique.

Notes

¹Mrs. W. T. Larimer, "They of Another Color" *Winona Echoes* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Victor M. Hatfield, 1927), pp. 147-57.

²*Ibid.*, p. 152.

³The starting point for studying the career of Francis Grimké is *The Works of Francis Grimké*, ed. Carter Woodson (Washington: The Associated Publishers, 1942), 4 vols., hereafter referred to as *Works*; Woodson provides a brief biographical sketch at the beginning of volume 1 (pp. vii-xxii). Some additional writings are collected in Anna J. Cooper, ed., *Life and Writings of the Grimké Family* (N.p.: n.p., 1951), 2 vols. in 1, hereafter referred to as *Life and Writings*. The best biographical study is Henry Justin Ferry, "Francis James Grimké: Portrait of a Black Puritan" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1970). Useful articles on Grimké are Henry Justin Ferry, "Racism and Reunion: A Black Protest by Francis James Grimké," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 50 (1972) 77-88; Louis B. Weeks III, "Racism, World War I and the Christian Life: Francis James Grimké in the Nation's Capital," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 50 (1973) 471-88; Clifton Olmstead, "Francis James Grimké (1850-1937): Christian Moralizer and Civil Rights," in *Sons of the Prophets: Leaders in Protestantism from Princeton Seminary*, ed. Hugh T. Kerr (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1963), pp. 161-75. Another useful source, particularly on Grimké's early years, is a biography of his brother: Dickson D. Bruce Jr., *Archibald Grimké: Portrait of a Black Independent* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993).

⁴*Works*, 3:62.

⁵Randall Balmer and John R. Fitzmier, *The Presbyterians, Denominations in America*, no. 5 (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1993), p. 170.

⁶*Works*, 3:370-71.

⁷*Life and Writings*, p. 129.

⁸*Works*, 2:27-28, 35.

⁹*Ibid.*, 2:41

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 2:77-78.

¹¹*Ibid.*, 2:396.

¹²*Ibid.*, 3:131.

¹³*Ibid.*, 3:344.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 2:482-84. Woodson preserves six special sermons on temperance in the published works alone (2:471-539).

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 3:337.

¹⁶*Life and Writings*, pp. 20-21.

¹⁷See Martin Marty, *The Noise of Conflict 1919-1941*, vol. 2, *Modern American Religion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 234. For a survey of conservative and liberal religious arguments for prohibition, see James Timberlake, *Prohibi-*

tion and the Progressive Movement, 1900-1920 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), pp. 4-38.

¹⁸*Works*, 1:399.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 1:97.

²⁰All three sermons are found in *Works*, 1:291-333.

²¹*Ibid.*, 1:xviii. Woodson says that for Grimké, "The church was God's altar, and this thought should be ever in the minds of those who sought the courts of the Lord."

²²*Ibid.*, 3:465. Woodson said elsewhere, "Dr. Grimké did not care for those friends of the race who did not believe in Christianity" (4:372).

²³*Ibid.*, 1:463.

²⁴*Ibid.*, 3:104.

²⁵*Ibid.*, 3:92.

²⁶*Ibid.*, 4:215.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 1:xxii.

²⁸*Ibid.*, 3:501; see also 3:191.

²⁹*Ibid.*, 3:185; see also 3:123 and 3:395.

³⁰*Ibid.*, 3:342. Grimké was an orthodox postmillennialist in eschatology. His 1935 sermon "Conditions Necessary to Permanent World Peace" (*Life and Writings*, pp. 187-97) illustrates his views. A significant indication of his theological orthodoxy, as opposed to liberal forms of postmillennialism, is his argument that human endeavors such as the League of Nations and the Washington Naval Conference lacked the right basis for world peace because "they do not touch sources from which peace, permanent peace must come. The human heart must be fundamentally changed. Into the human heart must be put the great principle of peace, the right inclination, the enlightened conscience, and the fear of God more than of man" (p. 194).

³¹See James F. Findlay, *Dwight L. Moody: American Evangelist 1837-1899* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), pp. 278-81.

³²*Life and Writings*, pp. 54-59.

³³*Ibid.*, p. 127.

³⁴*Works*, 3:420.

³⁵*Ibid.*, 1:611.

³⁶*Ibid.*, 1:559; see also his criticism of Sunday, 4:224.

³⁷*Ibid.*, 2:77, 464.

³⁸*Ibid.*, 2:141.

³⁹See George Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), pp. 186-87, 195-96. Grimké and Warfield had been classmates at Princeton. Although Warfield was two years ahead of the other, Warfield's brother Ethelbert told Grimké, "My brother used to talk about you.... He had a high regard for you" (*Works*, 4:357).

⁴⁰*Works*, 4:136.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, 1:526.

⁴²*Ibid.*, 4:147-50.

⁴³*Ibid.*, 1:613. The address by Mrs. Larimer at Winona Lake cited at the beginning of this article was given there seven years after Dickey's death.

⁴⁴William Jennings Bryan, "Bryan Says North Would Act as South on Negro Question," *New York Times*, 18 March 1923, sec. 8, p. 1.

⁴⁵*Works*, 4:373-75. Bryan had stated in the remarks that he did not believe the Declaration of Independence touched upon the question of black suffrage. Interestingly, Grimké also criticized Clarence Darrow, Bryan's opponent in the famous Scopes trial in 1925. Grimké's criticism had nothing to do with that trial or evolution, however; he was more concerned with Darrow's attacks on Christianity, e.g., "Mr. Clarence Darrow of Chicago, as announced in the papers, is to take part in a symposium to be held in the Washington Auditorium Nov. 18th. He is to speak on the subject, WHY I AM AN AGNOSTIC. It should be rather, WHY I AM A FOOL. In the inspired Record we read, 'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God'" (*Works*, 3:496; see also pp. 252, 254, 523-24, 530, 536).

⁴⁶*Works*, 4:139-40. The addresses Grimké refers to here are likely from the opening session of a regional Bible Conference in Washington, D.C., sponsored by the Winona Lake organization. For Morgan's address and a summary of Bryan's address, see *Mid-Winter Bible Conference Echoes: A Book of Sermons and Addresses* (Warsaw, Ind.: Rueb Williams and Sons, 1914), pp. 7-20.

⁴⁷*Works*, 3:452.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, 1:319-20.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, 4:306.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, 3:321.

⁵¹See Lefferts Loetscher, *The Broadening Church* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954), p. 96.

⁵²Grimké's stand against segregated presbyteries is fully discussed in Ferry, "Racism and Reunion"; his efforts against the Cumberland merger in particular are discussed on pp. 82-88.

⁵³*Life and Writings*, p. 51.