



Millennium Edition

The Millennium Edition of
THE
MAN OF GALILEE

BY

ATTICUS G. HAYGOOD

Lord, to whom shall we go, but unto thee? Thou hast the words of eternal life.
--Simon Peter

THE MAN OF GALILEE

Introduction to the Millennium Edition

“Who and What was Jesus of Nazareth? In this question and its answer is involved the whole of what we mean by Christianity.” So begins “The Man of Galilee,” by Bishop Atticus G. Haygood. It provides the clear answer to this most fundamental of all questions.

Originally published in English, Spanish and Japanese, Haygood’s piercing devastation of the writings that attack the doctrines of Jesus is as timely for the beginning of the Second Millennium, as it was when “The Man of Galilee” was first published in 1889. This little book is a must read for the agnostic, strengthens the faith of believers, and explains to all why Jesus is a thousand times worth dying for and following forever, through time and eternity.

An April, 1996 article in Newsweek summarizes recent attacks on the Historic and Risen Jesus:

“Over the past five years, scholars have published more than a dozen books and scores of footnoted articles, ‘initiating a fierce debate’ (sic) over the Risen Jesus . . . [they] argue that the Gospel stories of the empty tomb and post-resurrection appearances are fictions devised long after his death to justify claims of his divinity . . . [they] argue that the early Christians applied to Jesus all the myths that had accumulated about the expected Messiah.”

Rethinking the Resurrection
Newsweek Magazine
April 8, 1996

And from a recent issue of Life Magazine:

“To some, Jesus is the son of God, born to a virgin . . . to others, he’s a myth, a novelistic invention of the Gospel writers, who required a charismatic anchor for their nascent churches. He is they say, an idea.”

Other critics of the Risen Jesus (such as Seyyed Nasr, professor of Islamic Studies at George Washington University) say he was only a man, “[but] see him as the greatest prophet before the prophet of Islam (Mohammed). [for Muslims], He is the prophet of inward spiritual life.”

[some say] “there is no such person in the history of the world as Jesus Christ. There was no historical, living, breathing, sentient human being by that name. Ever. The Bible is a fictional, non-historical narrative.”

Life Special -- Who was Jesus
Life Magazine
December, 1994

Take the whole of agnostic literature--from pre-Twentieth Century writers, such as: Voltaire, who ridicules the Bible; Paine; Hume; and Strauss, who published *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*, and who argued that Jesus was an early

Christian myth. Continue with recent authors, such as: Episcopal Bishop John Spong (*Resurrection: myth or Reality?*), and Gerd Ludemann (*What Really Happened to Jesus: A Historical Approach to the Resurrection*). Both are among the modern writers who argue that the resurrection is a myth.

And then there is the small band of agnostic “scholars” who have been meeting semi-annually for years to vote on which parts of the new testament should be kept and which parts should be thrown out. This group, dubbed the Jesus Seminar, uses the so-called “critical historical method” to attack the Risen Jesus. This *Alice in Wonderland* analysis, which has nothing to do with history, picks and chooses bible passages and event sequences to allow this band of self-appointed “experts” to reconstruct the life of Christ, rejecting his divinity. For example, John Funk, the founder of the Jesus Seminar, suggests that the Gospel of John was a figment of the evangelist’s imagination. He says in his opening statement to his Jesus Seminar in 1985: “Our fictions, though deliberately fictive (fictitious) . . . we recognize as fictive.”

“The Man of Galilee” lays these attacks--all of them--to waste.

According to the April 1966 Newsweek article, many of the recent attacks on the historical Jesus are not based on disinterested historical investigation, but scholarship with a frankly missionary purpose:

[B]y reconstructing the life of Jesus, they hope to show that belief in the bodily resurrection of Jesus is a burden to the Christian faith and deflects attention from his role as a social reformer.

As a reading of the “The Man of Galilee” will make clear, these writers understand neither! If it could be proved that there never existed such a person as the Risen Jesus, Christianity as a living force, would cease from the earth.

The “Man of Galilee” sets out to prove the divinity of Jesus, while shattering the arguments of those who contradict his doctrines--which seek to overthrow them. Nothing will be assumed:

- It will not be assumed that the little books called the “Gospels” were inspired at all.
- You will not be asked to consider any miracle said to have been performed by Jesus, as making proof of his divinity.
- Proof text will not be quoted to prove that Jesus is divine.
- And you will not be asked to accept anything on faith. You will be asked to carefully and fairly view the information presented.

If it be reasonable, you may accept it as true. However, nothing in the teachings of Jesus calls on you to profess to believe what to you is not true.

Jesus says and acts in many ways and in many places that he, in origin and character, is more than a man; that he is supernatural. He says, “I and my father are one.” He says that he is divine--that he is God.

If Jesus was only a man such claims cannot be reconciled with his sanity or his sincerity. As Augustine said “Christ, if he not be God, he is not good.” In other words, if Jesus is not divine, he is the greatest liar the world has ever known.

Either way, doctrines such as those propped by Professor Nasr, which reject his divinity, which do not accept that he was crucified, died, and was then resurrected; but nonetheless proclaim Jesus as the “second greatest profit,” are an oxymoron--a self-contradiction. And so are the theories of writers, such as Kazantzakis, author of *The Last Temptation of Christ*, who deny his divinity, but say he was a great teacher, who led an exemplary life--who say is the supreme model for humankind.

I think you'll conclude that “The Man of Galilee” clearly proves the critics of the Historical and Risen Jesus to be wrong, and demonstrates that he is indeed, the Risen Lord--the Son of the Living God!

My copy of “The Man of Galilee” was given to me by Bishop Haygood's daughter, my grandmother, many years ago. The following is handwritten on the inside of the back cover of the book:

“A man living across the street from us in Los Angeles in 1892 read this book--he had been a confessed infidel--was converted and joined the church--I was 17 then.”

My original idea was to re-publish “The Man of Galilee” for family members, relatives and close friends. However, as I began to examine the recent literature attacking the divinity of Jesus, I decided it would be useful to make this book available to people everywhere, because Bishop Haygood's message rings just as true today, as it did more than a century ago.

So be transported across space and time and hear Dr. Haygood in his lecture-room at the old Emory college at Oxford in the year 1880. If you will, let his writing be your companion on your journey of faith--with each reading giving you a clearer understanding of *The Man of Galilee*.

Hopefully, as we head into the 21st century, this little book will strengthen the faith of believers; and for scoffers, atheists, and agnostics--infidels as my beloved grandmother termed them--may His Light fill their hearts.

William Haygood Shaker
Arlington, Virginia
April 2002

CONTENTS

Introduction to the Millennium Edition.....	3
Dedication of the First Edition.....	7
Prefatory to the First Edition.....	8
CHAPTER I.	
Did the Evangelists Invent Jesus?	9
CHAPTER II.	
" No Dramatist Can Draw Taller Men than Himself"	13
CHAPTER III.	
Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John Neither Good nor Great Enough	16
CHAPTER IV.	
Is Jesus an Ideal Jew of the Time of Tiberius?	21
CHAPTER V.	
Jesus and Myths.....	24
CHAPTER VI.	
Jesus and Hebrew Human Nature.....	28
CHAPTER VII.	
His Method of Thought Differences Him from Men	32
CHAPTER VIII.	
"Never Man Spake Like this Man"	36
CHAPTER IX.	
The Son of Man and Sin	41
CHAPTER X.	
The Magnitude of the End He Proposed and Set About	46
CHAPTER XI.	
Never Man Planned Like this Man.....	48
CHAPTER XII.	
Jesus Neither Theologian nor Ecclesiastic.....	53
CHAPTER XIII.	
"Jesus Christ Took the Way of Perishing".....	56
CHAPTER XIV.	
His Grasp upon Mankind.....	58
CHAPTER XV.	
What Jesus Claims and Demands.....	63
CHAPTER XVI.	
Jesus the One Universal Character.....	66
CHAPTER XVII.	
The Christ, tile Son of the Living God.....	70
About Atticus G. Haygood.....	74

THE "EMORY BOYS,"
WHO WERE WITH ME IN THE OLD COLLEGE IN 1876-84,
THIS LITTLE BOOK IS
Dedicated
BY ONE WHO LOVES THEM ALL
THE AUTHOR

Decatur, GA, April 9, 1889

PREFATORY.

DECATUR, GA., *April 9,*

1889

MY DEAR LUNDY:

You and many others of my students at Emory of the years 1876-1884 have often asked me to put into permanent form the thoughts concerning "The Man of Galilee" — "Jesus of Nazareth " — I brought before you when we were together at the old college in Oxford. In this little book I have had the boys in mind all the way through, as if they were before me in my lecture-room in "Seney Hall." Many times the very faces of the boys seemed to be about me as I have written, and I could almost hear them ask me questions as they used to do.

Scattered about the world now—not a few of them in distant mission fields—my heart follows them every one, and these pages, which would never have appeared but for them, bear them the assurance of an interest in them that can never die.

Your friend,

ATTICUS G. HAYGOOD.

The REV. LUNDY H. HARRIS,
Professor in Emory College, Oxford, Ga.

THE MAN OF GALILEE

CHAPTER I

DID THE EVANGELISTS INVENT JESUS?



WHO and what was Jesus of Nazareth? In this question and its answer is involved the whole of what we mean by Christianity.

If it could be demonstrably proved that there never existed such a person as Jesus, Christianity, as a living force, would cease from the earth. There would indeed be a history, a literature that would interest people according to their tastes; but there would be no heart changing, world-up-lifting system of vital and vitalizing truths and corresponding duties, binding upon the conscience of every human being and inspiring hope in every breast.

In the discussions we are about to enter nothing will be assumed except what is too obvious to question. It will not be assumed that the little books called "gospels" were inspired at all. You will not be asked to consider any miracle, said to have been performed by Jesus, as making proof of his divinity. Nor will I quote proof-texts to show that he is divine.

The first question to ask is this: Did such a person as Jesus is described to have been ever really exist? Did Jesus really live in Nazareth and work in Joseph's shop? Did he, for some three years and six months, go to and fro among men teaching them? Was there, in the days of Herod and Pilate, a Jesus as surely as there was a Caesar?

This much is certain: we have in these four little books—compared with what is every day written about common men how small they are!—attributed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, a most distinct character, known to us and known to history as Jesus. Whether the men whose names the little books bear, or some other men whose names are lost to us wrote them, matters not in the least. What books contain is more important than the question of authorship. No matter who wrote them, the character we know as Jesus is in the books; there can be no dispute about this; here it is, before our eyes. And this character is as surely in history, in literature, in men's thoughts, in all that we mean by Christian civilization, as it is in the writings of the four men we call evangelists.

Not only do we have the character, but also we see clearly that it is a character absolutely unique. It is unique in many respects, but pre-eminently in this—it is the one perfect character that has appeared in the world that ever had a place in the history or the thought of men. It is said that the volatile Voltaire once compared Jesus to Fletcher of Madeley, thinking him as good a man as the Nazarene. But the light Frenchman understood neither the one nor the other. As one said of an unfit biographer of Fletcher's great friend, John Wesley: "He had nothing to draw with, and the well was deep."

Is there one solitary defect, the very least, in this character that we find in the evangelists? Is there one weak spot, or suggestion of fault, or intimation of infirmity, or suspicion of failure, the slightest, to do and to be what was right for him to do and to be?

Look at him as he is set before us in these brief writings; look, reverently if you will, but with open and fearless eyes, to see all that may be seen of him. What least flaw can be found in him? Is there the least possible shadow of reason for reversing, or so much as questioning, Pilate's verdict, "I find no fault in him?" Is there in all history one other character of which you can say or believe as much? Is there any other you are willing to name second to him?

If you are making an estimate of any other character—whether of a real person, as a sage, a statesman, or a philanthropist, or of some imaginary person, as the hero of a story—how would you judge him most severely? You would compare him with Jesus. We must remember that it is to Jesus we owe those higher standards by which we judge men in our times. Christ-likeness expresses the highest ideal of character we are capable of conceiving.

Some writers, as you know, have denied that Jesus, the Jesus of the four gospels, did at any time really live, a man among men. Of far more importance than any mere denials in books is the failure of many thousands to realize in their inmost consciousness that the story of the evangelists is the record of a life actually lived.

We will demand of those who deny or doubt that Jesus really lived to account to us for the existence of the character. This they must do, for the existence of the character they cannot deny; it is here before men's eyes, as it is in men's thoughts and lives. This character is not in these little books only; it is in a hundred thousand books. It was not only in the minds of four writers long ago; it is in the minds of millions of men, women, and children to day. If any deny or doubt the historic Jesus, let them explain to us how this character, flawless and perfect, ever got itself into the thoughts of men and is now in history, literature, art, law, custom, in human life itself.

Some have tried to explain the existence of the character, while denying that Jesus really lived among men, by telling us the evangelists invented the Jesus of these stories. They tell us Jesus is the product of the dramatic genius of the four men whose names go with the brief account we have of him, his words, and his deeds. It would not alter the case to deny that these four wrote the books, and to say some other writers whose names we do not know invented the character.

Let us look carefully and fairly at this view of the subject. If it be reasonable it may be true; if it be true we need not fear to accept it. Nothing in Jesus calls on men to profess to believe what to them is not the truth; nothing can be more unlike him than to use words without convictions. We cannot do otherwise than "hold fast that which is true" to us; indeed we cannot hold fast to any thing else, though it be called truth by never so many voices of men.

The theory that Jesus is an invention is another way of saying that he is the hero of a romance, a creation of constructive imagination. It involves this: four

Jews at about the same time, among a people not given to making books of any kind—least of all books of the imagination—were seized with desire to write books, and thus it came about that they have given to the world, as the product of dramatic genius, this character of Jesus. As, for illustration, it may be said, in a sense, that Bulwer invented the "Margrave" of *A Strange Story*.

Let us inquire into the antecedent probabilities that these men would naturally attempt to construct and put into form such a work of the imagination; nay, more: whether they were likely to attempt any dramatic work at all.

We are not left to guesses in considering such questions. It is historically certain that the Hebrew mind in ancient days was not given to this sort of literary work. The Greek mind gave dramas to the world, matchless of their kind; the Hebrew mind gave none. There is nothing in Hebrew literature of the period assigned to Jesus, of the period succeeding him, or from the time of Moses, to indicate so much as a tendency to such creations of the imagination.

We have much to judge by, and there can be no mistake. We have the Old Testament Scriptures, the apocryphal books, the comments of the scribes—called Targums—upon their sacred writing, the little book called "Acts of the Apostles," the other New Testament writings, and the works of Josephus as specimens, showing the trend and method of Hebrew literature.

The Hebrew mind in ancient days was not given to art, but to morals. The Jew did not develop art impulses till he had become cosmopolitan and Christianity had changed the world. In ancient Hebrew literature, whether in plain prose—in history, statute laws, or proverbs; whether in psalms or other poetry; whether in the magnificent imagery of the prophets, we find that morals, not art, inspire the thought and form the expression. There are neither paintings, nor statues, nor dramas. Their architecture was borrowed from the Phoenicians; they were original in their ideas of morals and in their laws and customs relating to rights and wrongs. Their literature is dominated by religion, and not by art, in any of its manifold developments.

Read it all—all ancient Hebrew literature; we have history, laws, proverbs, poetry, prophecies, but we have no dramas.

You may cite me to the book of Job. This is more like a drama than any other. If this be allowed, it is the one exception. But it belongs to a period very remote from that of the evangelists, and if it be a drama it is, as may be shown, such a work as a Hebrew might have written. But the story of Jesus is not such a drama as a Hebrew of his period might have written, allowing, what is not true, that at some other period it might have been imagined by a Hebrew, or any other writer of books. As to the book of Job, it is in harmony with Hebrew characteristics and with the time and country in which its scenes are laid. The books of the evangelists are not in harmony with them; they contradict them all and utterly.

Consider well the four little books of the evangelists that we call gospels; study them just as you would any other ancient writings. See what is in them, that you may know what manner of men they were who wrote them. Reject them all, if there be reason, but look carefully to this one thing—whether these writers were

given to dramatic creations, or, indeed, had faculty for such work. There is evidence enough in their writings that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were not of the literary and bookmaking classes. They were of the common people; unlearned and unskilled in literature, laboring and business men, trained as laymen. Their lives were very far removed from the occupations and influences that dominated the very feeble literary instinct that belonged to that period of Hebrew literature.

I conclude that it was antecedently as improbable that the evangelists would have attempted the production of any drama whatever, as I will show that it was impossible, had they made the attempt, for them to have invented such a story as they tell us of "The Man of Galilee."

THE MAN OF GALILEE

CHAPTER II.

" NO DRAMATIST CAN DRAW TALLER MEN THAN HIMSELF."

The doctrine I set forward concerning Jesus is this: Such a person must have actually lived, as the condition of conceiving such a character, for the reason that the power of creating such a character was never in the Hebrew mind, or any other.

At this point let me tell you how my thoughts were directed in the lines the argument takes in this discussion.

In the month of April, 1861, while a pastor in Sparta, Ga., I was reading one of Hugh Miller's books, *First Impressions of England and Its People*. The writer of this to me entertaining and instructive volume was comparing, on the occasion of a visit to the grave of Shakespeare, the great poet, Sir Walter Scott and Charles Dickens. Hugh Miller said (I believe the quotation is substantially correct; I have not seen the book in a long time—it was loaned to some of you): "No dramatist, whatever he may attempt, can draw taller men than himself."

I closed the book and said to myself: "Then Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John did not invent Jesus."

It was not till February, 1864, that the thought, which I often brooded, was brought into a discussion. While in camp as a missionary chaplain with Longstreet's corps of the Army of Virginia, near Greenville, East Tennessee, I sketched rudely enough, one snowy day, the outlines of an argument, using it one night, soon after, in a sermon preached in the First Methodist Church, Atlanta, Ga. In the course of years it grew upon me into a series of lectures delivered to senior classes in Emory College. It outgrew the limits of a sermon at Monticello, Ga., August, 1878. My old students and certain life-long friends will pardon this much of personal reminiscence. For reasons connected with these personal statements are introduced.

"No dramatist can draw taller men than himself." Hugh Miller did not mean that a writer may not describe greater men than himself, but that he cannot invent a character greater than his own. It is as plain as the axiom in physics that water cannot rise above its level. That which is created cannot be greater than that which creates.

It is very common for us to write of "taller men" than ourselves; we all do this. When you were but a college boy you did not, as you will remember, shrink from writing essays upon Cromwell, Washington, Gladstone, Bismarck, and the few such men who have lived. I have known a young man to write fairly well of even Socrates. But he had the cyclopedias. He was not creating—thinking out for himself and of himself—the good and wise old sage.

Hugh Miller says, " Dickens knows his place." The gifted novelist did not attempt great characters. Shakespeare did; he was greater than any character he produced; "taller" than any man he "drew."

When you come to ask whether these four Jews, the evangelists, could have invented the character we know as Jesus you must remember that they had, first of all, in order to do it, to throw themselves outside the sphere of Jewish thought and sentiment. If to them had been granted all personal qualifications the conditions under which they lived made the invention of such a character impossible; they could not breathe the intellectual, social, and moral air in which they lived and do it. For this character, the Jesus of the evangelists, is not in harmony with the essential characteristics of the Jewish race or with the dominant influences of that time; this character antagonizes these characteristics and influences at every point.

Granting—and it is admitting an intellectual miracle that staggers credulity—that these men did meet the first condition for the invention of such a character, and overcame, as no other men ever did in any nation or time, the controlling influences under which they lived, let us ask whether, in view of what they reveal in these writings of themselves, they were capable of such an intellectual and spiritual feat as inventing a drama that should give Jesus to the world.

To have achieved such a result they must have been in breadth, depth, and elevation of intellect capable of thinking out the mighty doctrines that Jesus taught. And this, we may well believe, was the least part of their task.

To me it is incredible that these four men could have thought out the teachings of Jesus. For such thinking they lacked all things that history and philosophy show to be necessary for such thinking.

Why could not Socrates and Plato, great, learned, wise, and good, to whom came more than glimpses of heavenly truths, think out what the Sermon on the Mount contains?

Socrates and Plato, if mere men could do such thinking, ought to have thought out the Sermon on the Mount; for they had every gift that nature could bestow and every opportunity cultured Athens could offer. And they did their best to think out the truths that bind man and God together. They failed; and Plato sighed for the coming of a divine man who would make clear what to him was dark.

If Jesus never lived then the four evangelists, or men like them, thought out his wonderful doctrines. It is unthinkable.

But theirs was a far harder task than thinking out the truths attributed to Jesus in the gospels; they had also to think out a man who lived up to them. It is easier to write a great speech than to set before the reader a man he knows to be capable of making it; but this is easier than to proclaim a lofty doctrine of morals and show a man as living up to it. Their problem, if they thought it all out, was immeasurably more than the invention of the Sermon on the Mount and of the other discourses that move so easily on the same high plane of thought and spiritual life; it was to invent a life and reveal a life in absolute harmony with these matchless discourses. But Jesus lived the Sermon on the Mount and all else

that he ever taught. Not once, in the least particular, in word or deed, does he fail; always he lives up to his teaching; he incarnated his doctrine. No other human being, before or since Jesus, ever lived up to the Sermon on the Mount; the best men and women have only approximated it; and it is the best who have most realized their failure. But Jesus lived his teachings so perfectly that it is only in his life that we truly read their meaning.

How shall we measure the capacity of these four, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, for creating this character of Jesus? By the revelations they make in their writings of themselves: their capacity and character.



BISHOP ATTICUS G. HAYGOOD, D.D., LL.D.

As he appeared in his 52nd year when elected Bishop in 1890. He described this pose, Preaching the Gospel. This is generally regarded as the best likeness of Atticus G. Haygood.

About Atticus G. Haygood

Atticus Greene Haygood, LL.D., A.D., was born in Watkinsville, Georgia in 1839, and died of a stroke at the age of 56. Dr. Haygood accomplished much in this short time, as chronicled by several biographies, including: Elan Franklin Dempsy's Centennial edition of *The Life of Bishop Haygood*, published by Parthenon Press, Methodist Publishing House, Nashville, 1939; *Atticus Greene Haygood, Methodist Bishop, Editor and Educator*, by Harold W. Mann, University of Georgia Press, Athens, 1965, and *Atticus Greene Haygood: Christian Educator*, by Marion Loftin Smith, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1929. Among his many pursuits, he was editor of the *Wesleyan Christian Advocate* and Agent of the John F. Slater Fund, established for the education of Blacks. As a chaplain and a journalist, he reported from the front lines of Civil War battles for Southern newspapers. The Special Collections section of the Woodruff Library at Emory University is the repository for a massive array of material by and about Dr. Haygood.

He is a graduate of Emory College and Vanderbilt University. He was president of Emory from 1875-1884. It was during this time that he was first elected bishop of the Methodist Church. He declined to serve at that time--being fully engaged in restoring the college's financial viability following the Civil War. Having put Emory on a secure financial footing, he was again elected bishop and served from 1890-1893, his principle work as bishop being to strengthen the church in California.

Substantial financial help came with the first major benefaction Emory had yet received, given by philanthropist George Seney. Impressed by the spirit of an address given by Haygood on Thanksgiving in 1880, Seney gave a considerable sum to Emory to pay off debts, construct a new main building, and establish an endowment. Haygood's friend Asa Candler, founder of Coca Cola, later provided the funds and the land for the move of the college from Oxford to Atlanta. Today, the Haygood Gate marks the entrance to the Atlanta campus. Dr. Judson Ward, former Dean of the College of Arts and Science at Emory, writes a good summary of Haygood's life in his introduction to *Haygood's The New South: 1880*, published by the Emory Library in 1950, reprinted in 1972. Ward echoed many writers in describing Haygood as a visionary ahead of his time, and a man from whose flame, other leaders lighted their torch. It is thus appropriate that *The Man of Galilee* by Atticus Haygood, who was often described as being a hundred years ahead of his time, should be republished on the 100th anniversary of Haygood's death. Other books by Atticus G. Haygood include:

Sermons and Speeches, New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1889

Our Children, New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1888

Our Brother in Black: His Freedom and His Future, New York: Hunt & Eaton; 1881; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe and republished in 1970 by Books for Libraries Press, Freeport New York

Pleas for Progress, New York: Hunt & Stowe 1895; Nashville: Methodist Publishing House

Jack Knife and Brambles, Nashville: South Publishing Co., 1894

The Monk and the Prince, Foote & Davis, 1885

Jesus, the Christ, St. Louis: Advocate Publishing House (2 vols.), 1877

Where "The New South" was born – and "The Man of Galilee" was penned



On prominent display at Emory University's Oxford College Library is a rich store of Emory history. Inevitably, visitors are drawn to the most imposing object in the library—a massive, U-shaped mahogany desk. Although it appears to be little more than a curiosity from a bygone age, the desk holds a significant place in American history. A set of notions that would help transform the late-nineteenth-century South was conceived on its worn, scarred surface.

A small brass plate on the left side of the desk states that it was made for Atticus Greene Haygood, Emory's president from 1875 to 1884. The desk's unusual construction features ornate carved mahogany brackets in each corner, a removable writing surface that slopes downward to the right, and myriad cabinets and cubbyholes.

In the waning years of Reconstruction, Methodist Bishop Haygood, an 1859 Emory College graduate and its eighth president, wrote and spoke extensively on the tenuous but hopeful state of his region. The most famous of his writings was his Thanksgiving Day 1880 sermon, "The New South," which focused on the improving financial condition and the challenges of race relations in the South in the decades following the Civil War. "I, for one, thank God that there is no longer slavery in these United States," Haygood said in his sermon. "It is better for our industries and our business, as proved by the crops that free labor makes." He expanded on his ideas in a landmark book, which shook the South to its very foundation, *Our Brother in Black: His Freedom and His Future*, published in 1881.

Haygood's work continues, more than a century after his death, with publication of the Millennium edition of *The Man of Galilee*, by his great-grandson, William Haygood Shaker.



Today, the Haygood Gate marks the entrance to the campus of Emory University in Atlanta