

THE
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 6.—April, 1881.

I.

INSPIRATION.

THE word Inspiration, as applied to the Holy Scriptures, has gradually acquired a specific technical meaning, independent of its etymology. At first this word, in the sense of God-breathed, was used to express the entire agency of God in producing that divine element which distinguishes Scripture from all other writings. It was used in a sense comprehensive of supernatural revelation, while the immense range of providential and gracious divine activities concerned in the genesis of the Word of God in human language was practically overlooked. But Christian scholars have come to see that this divine element, which penetrates and glorifies Scripture at every point, has entered and become incorporated with it in very various ways, natural, supernatural, and gracious, through long courses of providential leading, as well as by direct suggestion, through the spontaneous action of the souls of the sacred writers, as well as by controlling influence from without. It is important that distinguishable ideas should be connoted by distinct terms, and that the terms themselves should be fixed in a definite sense. Thus we have come to distinguish sharply between Revelation, which is the frequent, and Inspiration, which is the constant attribute of all the thoughts and statements of Scripture, and between the problem of the genesis of Scripture on the one hand, which includes historic processes and the concurrence of natural and supernatural forces, and must account for all the phenomena of Scripture; and the mere fact of Inspiration

V.

CHARLES HODGE.*

THE notice of this volume, which appeared in the last Number of THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, leaves nothing to be said respecting the admirable manner in which the son and successor of CHARLES HODGE has discharged the responsible and somewhat delicate duty of preparing his Biography. More, indeed, might have been made of the materials in the author's possession; and had he not been so scrupulously guarded against any exhibition of filial partiality, the present work would undoubtedly have been, in a greater degree even than it is, a valuable contribution to the history of opinion and to the history of the Presbyterian Church in America. For, while the life of Dr. Hodge was uneventful in itself, it was coeval with events of the most important character that followed each other in quick succession; and no name stands so conspicuously related to them all as does that of him whose life is described in these pages. Other men have been more distinctively the leaders of particular ecclesiastical movements, or for a time at least have divided with Dr. Hodge the honors of eminence and popular regard; but no other man has touched the thought and activities of the Church at so many points and during such an extended period. So that when we consider his long life, his uninterrupted literary career, his polemic surroundings, and the trusted position which he held in the Presbyterian Church, it is not extravagant to say that he is *par excellence* the representative man in the history of American Presbyterianism.

A few autobiographical pages at the beginning of the volume give us the facts respecting Dr. Hodge's ancestry and

* The Life of Charles Hodge, D.D., LL.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. By his Son, A. A. Hodge. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

early life. His grandfather was a successful merchant in Philadelphia, and one of the founders of the Second Presbyterian church in that city. His eminent brother, Dr. Hugh L. Hodge, was an elder in the same church, and has left five sons, one of whom inherits his name, profession, and ecclesiastical office; the others being ministers of the Gospel. Charles Hodge was born in 1797. His father, who was a physician, died when he was six months old, and his education devolved, therefore, upon his widowed mother, to whom he says he owed "absolutely everything." He matriculated in Princeton College in 1812, and after graduation entered the recently established Theological Seminary. A suggestion made to him by Dr. Archibald Alexander turned his mind in the direction of special studies, and led to his appointment by the General Assembly in 1822 as Professor of Oriental and Biblical Literature. In 1826 he married Sarah Bache, a great-granddaughter of Benjamin Franklin. In 1828 he went abroad. During his stay in Europe we find him studying Arabic with De Sacy in Paris, forming his life-long friendship with Tholuck in Halle, listening to Schleiermacher, and attending the lectures of Neander and Hengstenberg in Berlin. Of course he came in contact with German philosophy, and his colleagues in Princeton were not free from anxiety on his account. Dr. Alexander wrote: "I wish you to come home enriched with Biblical learning, but abhorring German philosophy and theology." His subsequent life was a witness to the extent in which this wish was realized.

The letters of Dr. Hodge's later years are less indicative of his intellectual life, and tell us less than we should like to know regarding his habits of study, the books he read, and the subjects in which he was interested. In this respect they are in marked contrast to the charming letters of Dr. James W. Alexander. But if they fail to gratify curiosity, they more than make up for this disappointment in the light they throw upon Dr. Hodge's character. Free, simple, and unaffected, they tell the story of his home, and, like the sphygmograph of the physician, register the pulsations of his heart. It is not easy to put down in words the unformulated induction gathered as the result of intimate acquaintance with his writings and repeated perusal of his "Life," which embodies our esti-

mate of Dr. Hodge's character. Yet it is a blessing to have been brought into close contact with his mind. For, great as the theologian was, the man was greater, and the greatness of the man adds lustre and gives individuality to the greatness of the theologian. No man ever obtruded his personality upon his readers less than Dr. Hodge; but no one ever wrote whose works are more distinctly pervaded by the salient characteristics of his manhood. He was intuitively and by heredity a gentleman, and hence he was a gentleman everywhere and under all circumstances. He possessed a strong emotional nature, and was born for friendships and affection. This characteristic, so apparent in childhood when he slept in his brother's arms, did not become less manifest as he advanced in life and became accustomed to the experiences of the world or absorbed in the exacting duties of his calling. In his letters to his brother, in his devotion to his wife, in his indulgence to his children, in his tribute to the memory of his mother, in his warm letters to Bishop Johns, and particularly in the affecting scene where the aged Presbyterian and Prelate embrace each other and thus symbolize the solvent power of love, it is easy to discover the organizing and directing principle of his life. Love reigned in his home, and the love of Christ had full possession of his heart. His theology may or may not have been Christo-centric. Technically speaking it was not. But his religion was certainly Christ-centred—it was Christ. No one can doubt that who ever sat at his feet or heard him on Sabbath afternoon at the "conference." In one of his "conference papers" recently published he remarks that a man ought not to depreciate himself. It cannot be said that Dr. Hodge fell into this error, and yet he was a remarkably modest man. He never spoke of "my system" or "my views," and it would be difficult to name an author who has written so much and found so little use for the pronoun I. Yet Dr. Hodge was not wanting in confidence. He did not distrust his conclusions. He had the courage of his convictions if ever man had. Perhaps his editorial career had something to do with this, and may explain the fact that while his writings have an *ex cathedra* air about them that may sometimes be suggestive of pride of opinion, the world may be challenged to find a syllable in all

that he has spoken or written that savors of vanity. All great men are not like him in this respect. But, as has been said, Dr. Hodge was an editor; and an editor comes to invest his organ with a quasi-personality distinct from his own, and to treat it with the deference that he expects it to receive from others. The *Princeton Review* might say in the terms of dogmatic and authoritative statement what Charles Hodge in his individual capacity might hesitate to say, or might utter in a somewhat qualified form. And it is easy to imagine that, writing under a sense of responsibility in a journal that was a recognized organ of thought, he would regard it as a surrender of the dignity with which a subject was invested for him to introduce his own personality and make discriminating and antithetical use of the pronouns "I" and "he." But his Christian character never appeared to greater advantage than during the long sickness (1833 to 1840) that followed soon after his return from Europe. His biographer tells us how patiently he bore the most excruciating pain; how willingly he submitted to treatment quite as painful as the disease it was meant to cure; and how, moreover, under the greatest physical disadvantages, he labored with incessant industry in the discharge of the duties that had been given him to do. During these years of prostration his study became the gathering-place of the coterie who were interested in the *Princeton Review*, and during this period, too, he accomplished much of the literary work that established his reputation as a theologian.

Human greatness is a subject about which it is hard to speak with accuracy and without doing injustice. It is difficult to institute a comparison between the man of thought, the man of genius, and the man of erudition; for as expressing the modes in which mind manifests itself these terms seem to be incommensurable. Then there are men who die young or who live under unfavorable circumstances, and whose potential greatness never finds adequate expression. Potential greatness, however, can never be the basis of anything more than a sentimental estimate. We must judge men by what they actually accomplish, and, as what they accomplish is due in great part to the circumstances in which they are placed, it would seem to follow that in all the great-

ness of this world there is much that in one sense may be called adventitious. There is no way of separating a man from his surroundings and taking his measure. The man and the environment are two aspects that make up the totality of manifestation, and it is on the basis of the manifestation that we predicate the greatness of the man. What other men might have done had they been in Dr. Hodge's circumstances we do not stop to inquire. It is a needless question. Every great man's life is unique. It cannot be duplicated, for the reason that the concurrence of a particular mind in relation to particular circumstances is a solitary fact. The great man is thus an *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον* on the page of God's great book of history. It is easy to see that Dr. Hodge was not as great in some respects as some men with whom it is natural to compare him. In the sphere of constructive thought he does not rank with Jonathan Edwards. In genius he was not equal to Dr. Archibald Alexander. To the prodigious attainments of Dr. Addison Alexander he laid no claim. In philosophical and historical erudition it is probable that Dr. Henry B. Smith surpassed him. He added nothing to the world's epoch-making phrases. He founded no school like Taylor; and if like Bushnell he had claimed to originate a new idea, it would not have gone forth into the world in the shining drapery of Bushnell's beautiful speech. There have been more brilliant debaters, more eloquent preachers, more accomplished linguists, more astute ecclesiastics, more original or more erudite dogmaticians; but to no one in America has it been given, as it was given to Dr. Hodge, to achieve greatness in all departments of theological study and to influence the movements of thought as a trusted leader of a great denomination during two generations. His was not the greatness of the mere specialist, who knows nothing outside of a narrow department, and is deep only in the sense that he spends his life in boring a hole. Nor, on the other hand, was he an example of extensive mediocrity which is so often mistaken for greatness. The law, however, holds good in the development of mind as in the logical notion that the greater the extension the less the intension. For a man, therefore, to be great in many departments is to be less great than he might otherwise have been in one. Dr. Hodge's

greatness was of the comprehensive kind. His claim to a place among the great men of America and of the world is found in the fact that he brought the powers of his strong intellect to bear upon the discussion of a great variety of questions ; that through his logic, learning, and moral earnestness he has enriched the literature of theology in all its departments ; that he achieved distinction as a teacher, exegete, preacher, controversialist, ecclesiastic, and systematic theologian ; and, finally, that through a long life, in which he preserved his powers in undiminished vigor to the last, he was the tireless defender of the great system of theology with which his name will forever be identified.

In 1840, at the suggestion of Dr. Alexander, a readjustment of departments in the seminary was effected, whereby Dr. Hodge was made Professor of Didactic and Exegetical Theology. It was in this chair that the great work of his life was done. Professor Warfield, a very competent judge, bears testimony to Dr. Hodge's eminence as a teacher, in the following words : " I have sat under many noted teachers, and yet am free to say that, as an educator, I consider Dr. Hodge superior to them all. He was, in fact, my ideal teacher." This opinion will be corroborated by the testimony of Dr. Hodge's pupils far and near, though it is our impression that his finest powers as an instructor were most displayed at the beginning and toward the close of his professorial career--before he had abandoned the use of a text-book and after his own " Systematic Theology " was in the hands of his students. Whether theological instruction should be conducted by text-book or by lecture is a question that does not easily admit of a categorical answer. Much depends upon the man and not a little on the subject. Some subjects can be discussed advantageously in no other way than by lectures, and a text-book in the hands of some instructors would prove a serious hindrance to their highest usefulness. Speaking now only with reference to the department of systematic theology, it would probably be correct to say that a wise combination of both methods is the best. There are special reasons which make a text-book in such a department very desirable, and its use, so far from superseding the lecture, might enable the Professor to employ it as

a co-ordinate means of instruction to the highest possible advantage. Sheldon Amos, speaking in reference to another profession, has some fine remarks, on this matter that would be relevant here if the limits allowed in this article justified their insertion.* But it is far more important to ascertain what the theological lecture ought to be, than to inquire whether it should be an exclusive mode of instruction, and it is safe to say that a text-book in manuscript does not give us the best idea of its form and function. There is great force in the suggestion sometimes made, that, where it is possible, the printed page should be relied upon for didactic details, and that the lecture should be made the avenue for the presentation of original work in the form of a critical examination of the author read, or of special investigation of particular points, or of exhaustive monographic study, or of some comprehensive bird's-eye view of the whole dogmatic area. All these forms of work possess the highest value, and there is a proper place for them all in the theological curriculum. The minute study of individual doctrines and the exhibition of all the doctrines in systematic relation are both important; though it is difficult to present both methods under the same rubrics without doing violence to perspective and proportion. But, if the course of study were long enough to permit it, the student might learn the value of patient work in the examination of a doctrine like the Atonement, without missing the advantage of taking in at times the whole theological landscape from some mountain-top of generalization. And there are times when the patient toiler in the field of a dogmatic specialty would do well to turn tourist and refresh his spirit by broad and comprehensive views of Divine truth. Perhaps this is the cure for some of the theological pessimism with which so many are afflicted. This, however, by the way. There is no one method of teaching or studying Theology, and perhaps there is no one method that is best. That of mere routine, however, is beyond all doubt the worst, and of this no one was more conscious than Dr. Hodge, "who always maintained," says his biographer, "that the true method in teaching didactic theology involves the use of

* "A Systematic View of the Science of Jurisprudence," p. 497.

the text-book, the living teacher, practice in writing, and an active drill in verbal questions and answers."

The long illness of Dr. Hodge has already been referred to. His commentary on the Epistle to the Romans was written in a sick-room. The volumes on the Corinthians and Ephesians belong to a later period. It is the first-named volume that must be regarded as the monument of Dr. Hodge's exegetical talent, and it is in connection with it that his position as a commentator may be most conveniently spoken of. It is often stated as a most happy circumstance that Dr. Hodge went into the chair of Didactic Theology from that of Exegesis, and it is probably true that the Scriptural tone which pervades his system is due in no small degree to this fact. But it is also true that Dr. Hodge came to his work as a commentator with dogmatic prepossessions. Exegesis is not a mere matter of philology and grammar. Call it "the analogy of faith," or what we will, it is certainly true that no great work in science or theology can be accomplished by any man who does not have some hypothesis or dogma into which he can put the individual and scattered facts of experience or interpretation. Without the category of doctrine the exegetical facts would be isolated or meaningless; without the exegesis the categories of doctrine would have no content, or rather no support. To determine the relations of exegesis and dogma by insisting upon the universal logical priority of the former, as though a doctrine which is itself an exegetical induction may not be the logical *prius* of further exegesis, is certainly not wise; and Dr. Hodge is the last man who should be quoted in support of such an idea, for his greatest exegetical work was written in a dogmatic interest. It was hailed on its appearance as a defence of the faith, and a grand defence of the faith it is. Dr. Hodge was a dogmatic exegete. His commentaries are not pre-eminently grammatical like Ellicott's, or historical like Lightfoot's, or eloquent like Eadie's. He was not a textual critic like Alford, or a patristic student like Wordsworth. But he has excellences that are peculiarly his own; and for masterly analysis of Pauline thought, for luminous exposition of the sequences of Pauline sentences, for ability to seize upon the central idea of a passage and bring the rays of contextual light

to bear upon its elucidation, he is unexcelled, if he is not unrivalled. In the niceties of philology and grammar he undoubtedly had superiors, and the experts in exegesis will be able to show that here and there he has fallen into error. But in his case, as in Calvin's, his dogmatic instinct went far toward compensating for these defects. He knew Greek, it is true, but, better still, he knew Paul.

It is in writing, and not in oral discourse, that Dr. Hodge has his chief title to distinction. His sermons were characterized by the clearness, comprehensiveness, and coherence that marked everything he did. Dr. Paxton, a high homiletical authority, has recorded his estimate of Dr. Hodge as a preacher and mentions one occasion, at least, when he rose to the highest eloquence. Such instances, however, were not frequent. Still, it cannot be said that he needed the stimulus of a great occasion, or that, like Cunningham, it took the excitement of forensic encounter to bring out his best powers as a speaker. It was on Sabbath afternoons in the "Oratory," with only the Professors and students for his audience, that he revealed the depths of his emotional nature, and that his pupils learned what a preacher he might have been, had he been called to speak from the pulpit instead of the professor's chair. A volume of his "Conference Papers" lies before us. They contain few thoughts that are not to be found in his other writings. There are no literary surprises, no flashes of genius, few fresh metaphors, few illustrations. Nor can it be said that the old doctrines are presented here in any form of striking originality. Dr. Hodge had the gift of seeing the inter-dependence of the truths of the Christian system; but kaleidoscopic variety in the combination of these truths is not a characteristic of his writings. These "conference papers" are simply the theology of the lecture-room thrown into homiletic form, with rich and precious application to Christian experience. They are only skeletons, however, and from them alone one would derive a very inadequate idea of the unique devotional services for which they were prepared. The subject for the day, let us suppose, is "Preaching Christ" (p. 316). The other members of the Faculty have spoken. It is the senior Professor's turn. The outline, printed now, but present then only to his mind, is clothed in the flowing words of simple, but dignified, ex-

temporaneous speech. Deliberate and measured in his manner, there is, nevertheless, nothing awkward or mechanical in his passage from point to point. The fire of moral earnestness has fused the logic of analysis, and the transitions that sometimes seem abrupt, as they stand in numbered succession on the printed page, are made naturally and with smoothness. The students follow him with interest as the discourse proceeds, some taking notes, some storing memory. And now he tells them what a privilege it is to be an ambassador for Christ. The clear, crisp statements of dogmatic truth, in which the far-reaching relations of the subject have been presented, are exchanged for soft and tender words of child-like faith and grateful love. The theology of the intellect has become the theology of the feelings. The voice grows tremulous; the beautiful face is suffused with a heavenly radiance; the tide of emotion overflows, and, borne along, the speaker then portrays the love of God, and, with a pathos that touches every heart, acknowledges our obligation to His grace.

Forensic efforts such as the General Assembly witnessed when Rice and Breckinridge and Thornwell were acknowledged leaders of debate, are not common now. Why this should be the case it may be difficult to say. Perhaps the General Assembly was more patient then, and the five-minute rule and the previous question were resorted to more sparingly. Or, there may not have been the temptation that now exists for the Assembly to do its work vicariously, and it may not have become the paradise of the phlegmatic committee-man. Perhaps the practical work of the Church was neglected then, and balance-sheets and statistics may have received less attention than they deserved. And it may be true, for that matter, that these great men, like the Apostles, have left no successors, or perhaps the system of rotation in the election of commissioners may stand in some way related to this matter. Some say, moreover, that the occupation of the forensic orator is gone, and that ecclesiastical principles should be discussed in the columns of the newspaper and not on the floor of the General Assembly. Be this as it may, it is undoubtedly true that in the period of which we speak the greatest men in the Church employed their highest powers in the discussion of questions in constitutional

law and ecclesiastical polity, and it is difficult to resist the conviction that it was the golden age of debate. To say, therefore, that Dr. Hodge could not cope with the men who have just been named does not by any means imply that he did not possess forensic powers of a superior quality. Those who remember the Rochester Assembly speak of the debate in which Hodge and Thornwell crossed swords as something never to be forgotten. That debate is printed in full in Dr. Thornwell's collected works. These men were conspicuously the greatest men in the Old School Presbyterian Church at that time, and the discussion was eminently worthy of both. It ceased in the Assembly, to be carried on with greater thoroughness in the pages of the *Repertory* and the *Southern Presbyterian Review*.

The readers of this biography will refer with interest to the pages which recount the history of the *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*. It was established in 1825, and was for some years conducted by an "association of gentlemen," the most prominent being the Princeton men already mentioned, together with the brilliant Professor Dod. In 1856 Dr. Hodge became sole editor of the *Review*, and sustained this position of unshared responsibility till 1868, when Dr. Atwater was associated with him in its management. Anonymous writing was usual in the conduct of reviews a generation or two ago, and the *Repertory* was no exception to this rule. It was, or rather it became, distinctively the organ of Dr. Hodge's opinions. It did not offer a theological *menu* to the varying and divergent tastes of readers. Nor was it a place where good-natured advocates of different opinions might meet and hold a symposium. It was the very opposite of all this. Matthew Arnold describes Calvinism as "rigid, militant, and menacing:" and, making due allowance for caricature and over-statement, the *Princeton Review* of those days might very easily have suggested these epithets. They were days of hot controversy, and the *Repertory* gave no uncertain sound. Great doctrines were in debate, and for forty years it did battle for what it believed—and rightly believed—to be the truth of God. It is not strange that men who remember the *Repertory* of twenty years ago should contrast its inflexible purpose, its uncompromising orthodoxy, its hot advocacy

of the right, and its scathing rebuke of error with the more irenic, judicial, and sometimes apparently neutral attitude which writers in some of the periodicals of to-day assume in reference to the most vital questions in morals and religion. Times have changed, however. The modern review is apt to be a tourney ground where interest centres in knowing who are the knights of conflicting opinion. The old *Review*, no matter who loaded or aimed it, was a field-piece that "volleyed and thundered" wherever error showed its front. Dr. Hodge was possessed of just the qualifications that fitted him for editing a controversial journal. What his literary habits were we do not know, but, judging from the amount of material that has come from his pen (140 articles, besides books), he must have been a very rapid writer. Given, then, his wide knowledge; his ample vocabulary; his clear, concise, and rhythmical style, his firm belief in any controversy that his cause was the cause of God; his ability to sink his personality in that of the editor, without so far forgetting himself as to be guilty of editorial discourtesy: and we can easily imagine that when the materials of an article had been marshalled by his logic and set in motion by his feelings, the result would be the highest type of controversial writing. If we sometimes find the ashes of controversy in his "Systematic Theology," we shall find the fire of controversy hot and bright enough in the pages of the *Repertory*. It was there that his greatness revealed itself in its highest forms, and Dr. Prime was not far wrong when he said that Dr. Hodge was the greatest reviewer in the world. It is only necessary to look over the outlined account of his contributions to his *Princeton Review* which is given in his biography, in order to see how wide a field he covered and to what extent he has placed Christendom under obligation to him by his masterly discussion of fundamental questions in which all believers in Revealed Religion are alike concerned. It is chiefly, however, as a Calvinistic theologian that he will be remembered; and it was as the defender of historic Calvinism that the *Princeton Review* won its world-wide fame. One must know something about that historic Calvinism in order to know Dr. Hodge's place in the history of opinion. He must know, that is to say, the history of its confessional development and the modifications

that it underwent in the anti-confessional drift of a later day. In one sense, Protestantism was a diremption of the individual from the organism. It made the Word of God the only rule of faith and practice, and denied the right of the organism to be a co-ordinate factor. It affirmed the right of private judgment, and challenged the right of the organism to impose an authoritative interpretation upon the Scriptures. It placed the ground of salvation in the righteousness of Christ and its guarantee in the mental state of the individual, and so delivered him from the tyranny of "works" that the organism might impose. Justification by faith, in short, became the article of a standing or a falling church. Protestantism took two forms: the Lutheran and the Reformed. The one was theo-centric and predestinarian; the other was anthro-centric and sacramentarian. The doctrine of the covenants found confessional expression at a later day. The theological doctrine of the divine purpose, and the anthropological doctrine of the solidarity and depravity of the race, were formulated under the anthro-theological conceptions of the Federal theology. Differences, however, were developed: Gomarus on the right; Arminius on the left. The Synod of Dort met, and the "five points" became standard orthodoxy. Arminianism was ejected. And thus, while logically we may speak of the Reformed Theology under the two species of Calvinism and Arminianism, ecclesiastically we must speak of the Reformed Theology as distinctively Calvinistic. The mediating theology of Saumur was taught at a later date by Amyraldus and Placaeus. Before that, or rather, before Heidegger's protest in 1675, the Westminster Assembly met. Hence the Westminster Confession does not pronounce in terms against the Salmurian theology, although it very distinctly teaches the Dordrechtian. The confessional orthodoxy of the Presbyterian Church is to be found in the Westminster symbols. The Princeton professors began their labors with these symbols as their creed-statements and the Genevan Turretine as their master dogmatician. "Princeton theology" is therefore a distinctive term only in so far as Princeton has won the reputation of being the redoubtable champion of Westminster orthodoxy. If the expression implies that Princeton has originated a peculiar phase of the Re-

formed faith, it is a distinction that she does not covet; if it implies that she is the only defender of that faith, it is a distinction that she does not deserve.

The simple discharge of didactic functions would not meet the exigencies of those days. Controversy was then as it is now the price of a perpetuated faith. Say what we will against the systems of New England theology, it is certainly true that the men who lived during the period marked by Edwards and Taylor have contributed a great chapter to the history of religious thought. An age of synthesis may come in which it will be possible to read that chapter with some profit, and learn that even the most divergent systems have contained some important lessons. That, however, was an age of antithesis. The polemic and the irenic method supplement each other. Error commonly has some truth in what it affirms, and is wrong generally in what it denies. While it is active, aggressive, and eager to be the substitute for established orthodoxy and cherished faith, the method of polemic is the only one that is wise. But when it ceases to occupy this position, and takes its place in the history of opinion, the irenic thinker is apt to ask what lessons it taught, under what conditions it arose, and to what neglected truth, as by some nemesis of faith, its origin can be traced. It would be uncandid not to acknowledge the influence of New England theology in America to-day, yet it is quite safe to say that, in the presence of current issues, it has little or no polemic significance. It was otherwise, however, fifty years ago. Calvinism was undergoing the modifications known as "The New Divinity." These modifications were mainly ethical and anthropological. They had reference to Ability, Depravity, the Nature of Virtue, Regeneration, and the Atonement. On all these subjects Dr. Hodge wrote with great earnestness. He opposed the Hopkinsians and he opposed the Taylorites. These, though historically related, were the antipodal forms of New England theology. With Emmons, the most outspoken and original Hopkinsian, God was the power behind phenomena, and therefore the efficient cause of all acts. There were no second causes, and Providence was continued creation. This was the transcendental side of his theology, and he was therefore a Predesti-

narian of the severest type. On the empirical side, however, he was a Phenomenalist; 'The soul is a series of exercises. Phenomenally, we are free. Moral conduct is a series of volitions that are either right or wrong. There is no character, no original sin, no imputation.' He reminds us of the attempts that are being made at the present day to unite the Pantheism of Spinoza with the Positivism of Compté.* It would be quite as correct to call him a Positivist as to call him a Pantheist. He was neither.

In Dr. Taylor's system the autonomy of the human will is substituted for the Hopkinsian doctrine of the Divine efficiency; self-love takes the place of disinterested benevolence, and instead of the doctrine that sin is the necessary means of the greatest good, we are told that possibly God could not prevent the occurrence of sin in a moral universe. Between these extremes the pendulum of thought was swinging when Dr. Hodge came upon the arena as a controversialist. Opposite as these systems were, they both led to or involved a denial of the doctrine of original sin and a strictly vicarious atonement. Dr. H. B. Smith† has presented this with matchless vividness of antithetical statement; and Dr. Atwater, in the last Number of this REVIEW, has shown how the theological movements of those days prepared the way for the warmer and more sympathetic, though equally heterodox, theology of Bushnell. These successive phases of opinion must be kept in mind in order to understand the statement that the Princeton men never originated a new idea. Dr. Hodge was fond of making this statement. It occurs in the *Repertory*; he makes it in a letter to Principal Cunningham; and at his semi-centennial celebration, with representatives from Andover and New Haven before him, he repeated it again. This, however, was only a modest way of stating the magnificent truth that the Professors of Princeton had been doing battle for Westminster orthodoxy. It is true that the name of Dr. Hodge is associated with no new departure in Theology; but it is far from true that he came to the defence

* See the recently published work entitled "Spinoza: His Life and Philosophy." By Frederick Pollock.

† See his "Idea of Christian Theology as a System" and "The Theological System of Emmons," in the volume called "Faith and Philosophy."

of the faith with no originality or independence of thought. His place undoubtedly is among the defenders of the faith rather than among the constructive thinkers of the world. Still, he gave the old theology a new setting. His controversies enabled him to treat it with fresh vigor, and the clearness with which the doctrines of the Reformed faith are stated in contrast to the opposing theories of recent years is one of the leading characteristics of his "Systematic Theology." It is possible that his controversies sometimes show faults in theological perspective, and that in contending for a truth he did not always make due allowance for its relative importance or prominence. And his biographer says: "He was apt sometimes, as his critics have successfully pointed out, to go beyond the warrant of historical fact in asserting that the Church had everywhere and always held as he held as to secondary matters." It is, however, a truth that all Presbyterians may generously admit that, battling for confessional orthodoxy, he has done more than any other man to save our Church from the growing influence of a theology that is both anti-confessional and provincial. In doing this he has earned the gratitude of all Calvinistic theologians, even though on some points touching the philosophy of race-connection he held a position differing from their own.

It would be wrong to infer that because Dr. Hodge was so active as a writer he was a mere student or a recluse. He lived in a quiet college town, but he took a great interest in the outside world. He was not a book-worm, and he was by no means indifferent to the amenities of life. He could enjoy a novel, and was capable of discriminating admiration of a horse; he prided himself on the products of his garden, and loved a game of chess or backgammon; he took pleasure in the boyish sports of his children, remembering their sayings and entering with zest into everything that interested them. Even when he was busy he seems not to have been disturbed by their presence, for "his study was always the family thoroughfare through which the children, boys and girls, young and old, and after them the grandchildren, went in and out for work and play." His letters show that he took an interest in politics. He was a devoted friend of the College of New Jersey, and one of its Trustees from

1850 to the day of his death. From 1840 to 1870 he was a member of the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions. He was also for many years a member of the Board of Foreign Missions, and its President in 1868, after the death of Dr. Spring. He was several times a member of the General Assembly, and was elected to the Moderatorship in 1846. In 1839 he published his "Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church." The disruption had taken place two years before, and it is interesting to notice the position taken by "the Princeton men" during that crisis. They did not sympathize with either the Hopkinsian or the Taylorite wing of New England Theology, though they distinguished between them by regarding the former as properly within the area of tolerated divergence from the Standards. They were aware of the evils that had grown out of the "Plan of Union," and were as anxious as any of their brethren to have them abated. But save in the case of the Synod of Western Reserve, which was overwhelmingly Congregational, they disapproved of, and Dr. Alexander voted against, the Excising Act of the General Assembly of 1837. Of the legality of the measure whereby the "Plan of Union" was dissolved they had no doubt, inasmuch as it was the creature of the Assembly; nor did they doubt the right of the Assembly to exclude the Synods of Western New York. But they more than doubted the wisdom of the proceeding.

In 1835 Dr. Hodge began to write a series of annual articles in reference to the General Assembly, the material portions of which have been gathered into a volume and published under the title of "Church Polity." It is to be regretted that a complete treatise on Ecclesiology, which he had projected early in life, and which was always a fondly cherished literary plan, was never prepared for publication. A didactic treatise, however, would not have superseded the present volume which Mr. Durant has so admirably edited. Dr. Hodge had those qualities of mind which go to make what members of the bar call an elementary lawyer, and it is his power of bringing fundamental principles to bear upon the settlement of concrete cases that invests this volume with permanent value. It will not be possible to do more than indicate here the leading principles that conditioned the author's judgment in regard to

the great ecclesiastical questions that he discussed. He was invincibly settled in the belief that in all questions of conduct the Word of God, and it alone, must be our guide. Hence, contrary to the judgment of many, who it must be said were as jealous as he of the honor of the Bible, he defended the doctrine of the Confession regarding the marriage of a deceased wife's sister. Hence, also, he refused to take extreme Abolitionist views in opposition to Slavery, though he deprecated its existence and sought its extinction. He would not part with his right to judge *in foro conscientiæ* concerning things indifferent, and, with the miracle of Cana before him, he refused to be the advocate of an ethical maxim that would make his Lord a transgressor. He was by conscientious conviction a Presbyterian; and, therefore, while sympathizing to a proper extent with the work of undenominational societies, he was opposed to the plan of relegating to such agencies the Church's specific work of Education and Missions. Yet he did not hold extreme opinions in Church polity. With Dr. Miller he believed that the office of the ruling elder is Scriptural, though he did not base it specifically on 1 Tim. v. 17. He held, moreover, that the ruling elder is a layman and, as our Form of Government teaches, "a representative of the people." He was a *jure divino* Presbyterian to the extent of believing that certain great principles, such as the parity of the ministry, popular government, and ecclesiastical unity are clearly taught in the Scriptures, and that these principles are contrary to the Prelatic theory of ecclesiastical polity on the one hand and to the Congregational on the other. He denied, however, that the New Testament contained such specific instructions in regard to the management of the Church's affairs as would make it wrong for her to entrust her missionary schemes to the agency of Boards. This was the subject of his debate with Dr. Thornwell in the General Assembly at Rochester, to which reference has already been made. A thorough-going Protestant, there was in his mind no trace of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the grace of "orders," and he was one of the first to advocate what is now known among us as the "demission of the ministry." His writings give ample proof that he recognized the individual as the true ecclesiastical atom, and that he believed that organization, though necessary to the well-being,

was not necessary to the being of the visible Church. Had he been interrogated upon the point, there is little doubt that he would have said that the botanical conception of the Church, which is so prevalent, is erroneous, and that in view of the statement of our standards that the visible Church consists of "all those who profess the true religion, together with their children," the inquiry whether any denomination quâ denomination is a *branch* of the visible Church is irrelevant. He was, of course, opposed to the decision of the General Assembly which pronounced against the validity of Roman Catholic baptism, and in this opinion he had the cordial support of Principal Cunningham, who has said respecting that action: "It is to be regretted that the General Assembly of so respectable and influential a body should have ventured to give such a deliverance, in opposition to the whole Protestant Churches and their own most distinguished theologians." Dr. Hodge was a believer in the separation of Church and State, yet when the nation was in peril none spoke more loyally than he, and the journal that had battled for the integrity of doctrine did battle for the integrity of the Union. His feelings, however, were under the control of his judgment, and he therefore opposed the "Spring resolutions" in 1861, the "Pittsburgh orders" in 1865, the action of the Assembly in the McPheeter's case in 1866, and the Deliverance at St. Louis respecting the "Declaration and Testimony" in 1867. There is a conflict of opinion in the Presbyterian Church respecting the right of the General Assembly to exercise original jurisdiction. Conceding, however, that the right exists (Dr. Hodge strongly argued, and, as we believe, correctly, that it does exist), it was still an open question whether the action taken in St. Louis was eminently wise, and even the most strenuous defender of that action might easily admit that something forcible and really worthy of consideration might be said in behalf of a position which he did not approve. And as the question mooted was not an article of faith defined in the symbols or declared in Scripture, it seems to one, at this distance from the event, that Dr. Hodge hardly deserved the treatment he received in some quarters for giving frank expression to his views on this and similar occasions. Perhaps it never occurred to those who assailed him, and who sought to move the highest judicatory to take action

respecting him, that there was an element of tyranny in their behavior. This, however, is an unpleasant subject, and the biographer parts with it in the following words: "No picture can be drawn if the shadows are left out, and these shadows of storm-drifted clouds are left where they fell, that the truth of history may be preserved in its integrity."

That Dr. Hodge had lost none of the confidence in which he was regarded by the whole family of Presbyterian Churches, was abundantly proved in the enthusiasm with which he was greeted by the National Convention of Presbyterians in Philadelphia, 1867. Henry B. Smith is the hero of Reunion. Dr. Hodge opposed it. Yet Dr. Hodge's speech in that convention and his subsequent article on Adoption of the Confession of Faith had not a little to do with the Reunion movement, and it is safe to say that in these utterances he has voiced the sentiment of our Church respecting both the liberty and the obligations of creed-subscription. A grander testimony to the value of Dr. Hodge's services and to the esteem in which he was universally held was given on the 22d of April, 1872. From far and near they came—old pupils, professors in other institutions, representative men from all evangelical denominations—filling the First Church of Princeton to its utmost capacity. Congratulations came from across the sea, and letters expressing the deepest sympathy with the occasion poured in from every part of the Union. "But one name among the living," said Dr. Boardman, "could have drawn such a concourse together." It was the first time in America that the Jubilee of a Theological Professor had been celebrated, and there was a combination of circumstances in connection with the event that gave it peculiar interest and made it an occasion never to be forgotten by any who participated in it. "Three events," said Dr. Duryea, in the opening words of his oration, "unite to give dignity to this memorial gathering—the completion of fifty years of patient toil and faithful teaching in the sphere of Divine Science; the presentation to the world of the results of study, experience, and prayer, in a work of Theology which gives expression to the profoundest religious thought, and stands as a proof that our English tongue has not lost its beauty, power, or purity; the endowment of a chair in the Theological School that shall preserve the memory of an

honoured and cherished name, and that shall continue the usefulness of a prolonged and fruitful life."

Dr. Hodge's "Systematic Theology" is his *magnum opus*. Here we have the garnered wisdom of his life, and his ripest judgments are presented in these volumes, with a calmness and a comparative freedom from controversial *animus* that invest them with special attractiveness. That the work has no faults only an indiscriminating reader would say; that compared with other systems of theology in respect to erudition, comprehensiveness, and argumentative ability it stands at the head of the dogmatic literature of our language, is certainly not too much to say. It does not exhibit the architectonic power that is seen in Calvin's "Institutes." It aims rather at the completeness and comprehensiveness of Turretine: and since Turretine's day it is doubtful whether there has been so rich and at the same time so able an exhibition of Systematic Theology under Calvinistic conceptions.

The extensive erudition of the author, and the wide area of discussion covered by his work, will appear to the most superficial reader. There are some topics, nevertheless, that might have been handled with more fulness. The Theistic controversy would need a somewhat different treatment if the book were to be written to-day; and in the masterly discussion of the philosophy of faith, the opinions of Positivists like Bain and Sully deserve attention as well as those of Kant and Jacobi. Owing to the changes that are constantly taking place in respect to the relative importance of controversies, it is impossible for a system of theology to be polemic without some loss of symmetry, and in the pages of Dr. Hodge this want of proportion is here and there quite visible. Thus, considering the neglect that has overtaken Sir William Hamilton, the attention bestowed upon him seems disproportionately large, and considering the present interest in the doctrine of Retribution, the space allotted to it seems far too small. It must be remembered, however, that this work appeared eight years ago. Nor should we look for the erudition exhibited in a monograph in a work that covers the wide area of Systematic Theology; therefore, under "Justification" we shall not find the fulness of Ritschl, nor would Dr. Bruce expect Dr. Hodge's acquaintance with Kenotic literature to be equal to his own.

It should be conceded, too, that Dr. Hodge has treated rival systems of theology with great fairness. He writes, of course, as a Calvinist, and it is quite apparent that the first meridian of theological longitude passes through Geneva. All the more valuable on this account, therefore, is the testimony of a man like Dr. Krauth to the general fairness with which Lutheranism is presented. And, notwithstanding the Calvinistic viewpoint of the author, the "Systematic Theology" makes on the whole an irenic impression. Dr. Hodge takes more pleasure evidently in citing the *consensus* of Christendom in opposition to error, than in criticising opinions that are adverse to the Reformed theology. No attempt is made to trace the principles that underlie the symbolic divergences of Christendom or write the natural history, so to speak, of the great creed systems. This would have called for a special treatise, and perhaps have required a greater infusion of the historic spirit than Dr. Hodge possessed. Yet it is no misrepresentation of him to say that earnestly as he contended as a polemic theologian for the distinguishing truths of the Reformed theology, he would just as earnestly, and without seeing any inconsistency between the two positions, have made common cause with Christians of every name by exhibiting the radical and generic truths in which they all agree, and in defence of which, as God-given, the Church must do an apologetic work in opposition to the naturalism of to-day.

In the later years of his life Dr. Hodge was disposed to attach less value than is customary with theologians to theological metaphysics. Thus, while not rejecting, he refused to set forth the scholastic doctrine of *concursum* as a reliable explanation of the method of Providence or the Patristic theory of "eternal generation," as fully warranted by what the Scriptures affirm as to the relations of the Father and the Son. He might have gone further without giving offence and without abating a syllable of confessional orthodoxy. It was not his habit, however, to plead ignorance, and there are few theologians, and certainly no American theologians, whose reasoned opinions can be quoted on so many subjects. It is not to be expected that he has fallen into no error, or that there are no subjects covered by his discussions that need to be probed with a deeper analysis. But it is indicative of the impression that he has made on the

thought of the world, as well as a token of his enduring influence, that the venerable author of these volumes is everywhere quoted on all questions within the purview of Theology, and that the dogmatic specialists and monograph writers refer to him with respect, even when they feel compelled to differ with his conclusions.

The "Systematic Theology" is conditioned by two all-pervading principles: the author's unflinching belief in the plenary inspiration and infallible authority of the Bible, and his uncompromising opposition to Speculative Theology. The proper place for the discussion of the Rule of Faith is where the author puts it, among the *prolegomena*. The apologete may, and sometimes must, defend Christianity as a supernatural and revealed religion, on grounds that do not assume the inspiration of the Scriptures. But with the dogmatician, unless he is a Roman Catholic or a Rationalist, this doctrine must be a postulate. Given this, the second principle just mentioned follows by obvious necessity. If the Bible be God's Word, there can be no legitimate *à priori* Theology. Accordingly, against all attempts to construct a speculative theology independent of the Scripture, as well as against all attempts to adapt Scripture to a preconceived philosophy or ethical maxim, the author enters his earnest protest. Our knowledge of God must come from the Bible, the constitution of our nature and the external world. The dogmatic theologian undertakes to ascertain the truth that is to be derived from these sources and put it into systematic form. God might reveal Himself to the individual soul by the witness of the Spirit, interpreting or even supplementing Scripture; but however convincing to the individual it would need the corroboration of exceptional facts to make it convincing to others. And there is nothing absurd in the idea that God might reveal Himself through His Spirit to an ecclesiastical organism, though it is impossible to make a claim for such a revelation under the Roman Catholic doctrine of Infallibility, or the Protestant doctrine of Christian consciousness that would overthrow the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture. A mystical theology is as absurd, therefore, as a mystical geology, and a Speculative Theology is as valueless as real estate in Utopia. On this point one might even go further than Dr. Hodge. For while it is

true that to a certain extent a philosophy conditions our acceptance of a Revelation, it may be questioned whether Dr. Hodge has not made his philosophical Confession of Faith larger than was necessary. To believe in Revealed Religion one must believe in God, the world, and the soul as separate and distinct, that is to say, he must have a Theistic as distinguished from a Materialistic or Pantheistic theory of the Universe. There is no reason, however, why Christianity should be conditioned by a theory of Substance, Identity, and the Constitution of Matter. Nor can complaint be reasonably made against the intrusion of philosophy into theology if in the theory of God's relation to the world we use the tenets of one metaphysic to refute those of another. This is a point upon which Dr. Hodge has been criticised, it may be with undue severity, but not without some reason.*

Inspiration and Induction are the premise and the method of Dr. Hodge's system. How, then, are the doctrines of Scripture to be organized? That will depend upon the aim of the dogmatician. If he wishes simply to exhibit the relations of God and man, he may proceed upon an ethical basis (Taylor); he may give an account of the kingdom of God (Van Oosterzee), or the disease and the remedy (Chalmers), or the economy of the covenants (Witsius); he may adopt a Trinitarian basis of classification (Calvin); or he may group the doctrines round the Incarnation (Edwards). But these methods are all inadequate if a complete statement of what is known concerning God be aimed at: and the division of the subject into Theology, Anthropology, Soteriology, Eschatology, and Ecclesiology is far more convenient and admits of a more comprehensive treatment of dogmatics. This distribution, however, is faulty, inasmuch as the subjects are not co-ordinate, eschatology being a division in the category of time; and as Dr. Hodge remarks, "the classification is far from being exhaustive." But the system begins right by making God the first and main topic. Dörner keeps the unity of his theme by making God in His relation to the world his second grand division, and Lipsius avoids the disparate division of soteriology, eschatology,

* See Laidlaw's "Bible Doctrine of Man," p. 27.

and ecclesiology by considering these subjects in his chapters on the historical development of the religious life in the individual and in the society, or what comes to the same thing, the logical and the chronological unfolding of the covenant of grace.

Ebrard's system is very logical, but it is not Christo-centric, as some say, in any other sense than that Christ is the middle term in a division essentially linear. It proceeds upon a Trinitarian division under the supreme category: God. Dr. Hodge's logic was that of syllogism and controversy, not of division and classification. He has therefore made no contribution to dogmatic method, and his discussions are arranged under the old rubrics. His system must be studied to be appreciated. It does not appear to the best advantage in a *conspectus*. It is in his grasp of the whole subject of Theology, his familiarity with all phases of opinion, and his ability not only to defend the orthodox faith against error, but to exhibit its excellences and advantages as contradistinguished from error, and especially the error of our times, that Dr. Hodge has his chief merit as a systematic theologian. In knowing how to secure the advantage of situation in a controversy; in ability to seize upon the central topic of debate and hold the discussion rigidly to it, to the sacrifice, if need be, or neglect of relatively minor points, Cunningham is superior to Hodge. But Cunningham's dialectic was employed on a few great controversies, and he did not have the breadth of view which distinguished the American theologian, who shared with him the reputation of being the ablest Calvinist of his day. Hodge proves, Cunningham disproves. Hodge shows the strength of Calvinism, Cunningham the weakness of Arminianism. In Dr. Hodge's system the doctrines are first stated according to the Reformed Confessions, and the separate points in a doctrine are discussed *seriatim*; the statement of rival confessional systems are then exhibited and discussed, and afterward the modern or anti-confessional views are presented. The work is thus a contribution to comparative theology, and is polemic as well as didactic. Here and there in the work the author's argument from consciousness should probably be qualified by the terms of his able contribution to the *Independent* (the last that came from his pen) in reference to intuitive truth. And his argument from the consen-

sus of Christendom leaves us sometimes in doubt respecting the unexpressed major premise. There is a strong probability that what Christians agree to be the teaching of the Bible, is the teaching of the Bible. This is all we suppose that Dr. Hodge means, and there is no doctrine of quasi-infallibility in it. But when we are told that the Protestant doctrine of common consent is that the children of God are led by the Spirit of God to a knowledge of fundamental truth, the implication would seem to be that there is a guarantee of infallibility for a certain dogmatic area. The question then emerges: Why should we limit the authority of common consent to fundamental doctrines, and wherein are we less arbitrary in so doing than the Anglican who limits it to the teaching of the first few centuries?

The author's views upon this question will be found in his chapter on the Rule of Faith. Following it are the chapters on Theism and the anti-theistic theories, among them the one on the question, Can God be known? the ablest in the volume and one of the ablest in the work. Discussions on the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, Creation, Providence, and Miracles take us through the first volume. The author's great chapter in Anthropology is the one on Sin. In it he defends the doctrine of Imputation and Total Depravity, and replies to philosophical theories. It is preceded by discussions on the origin and antiquity of man, and is followed by a very lucid chapter advocating the Edwardian doctrine of the Will. Part III., Soteriology, opens with a chapter on the plan of Salvation, and is a comparison of views respecting the Divine purpose with a defence of sublapsarian Calvinism. But by far the ablest chapter in this Part is the one on the Person of Christ, defending the Chalcedonian Christology. In volume III. we have Regeneration, with special reference to the systems of Emmons, Taylor, and Finney. Following this is a masterly chapter on Faith, and another on Justification. In the chapter on Sanctification one would have looked for a discussion of the Perseverance of the Saints. This does not occur, but Perfectionism is dealt with very satisfactorily. The author's treatment of The Law is a valuable contribution to the literature of Christian ethics, and quite as worthy of commendation is his chapter on the Sacraments. In the last chapter he opposes the pre-millennial view

of the second advent, and defends, though not with the fulness that the subject deserves, the orthodox doctrine of Retribution.

But the circumstances of Dr. Hodge's life had not led him to take special interest in eschatological subjects. His great work was done in connection with the doctrines of Imputation, Depravity, Regeneration, and the Atonement. The chapters that deal with these doctrines, therefore, stand out conspicuously in the work.

Dr. Hodge was fully three-score years and ten when the publication of his "Systematic Theology" was undertaken, and he lived to receive the congratulations of his friends on his eightieth birthday. The story of these closing years is told with rare delicacy of feeling and expression in the pages of the Biography. In 1849 Dr. Hodge's first wife died. "She had lived with her husband, his joy and crown, twenty-seven years and a half. She had borne for him eight children, three daughters and five sons, all of whom, by God's singular mercy, lived to mature age, and have been gathered with their parents into the number of those who profess Christ." In 1852 Dr. Hodge "contracted his second marriage with Mrs. Mary Hunter Stockton, widow of the late Lieutenant Samuel Witham Stockton of the United States Navy. . . . This noble Christian lady supported and brightened all his later life, and assiduously attended him with her tender ministrations until his eyes closed in death." The "sweet old age" that President Woolsey wished for him was the crowning blessing that God kindly added to a beautiful and favored life. "The controversies were all past. The old warrior hung his arms upon the wall as he rested under the clear skies of universal peace." His home was happy. Dutiful children loved and honored him. Affectionate grandchildren, the joy of his heart, saved him from the depression that a growing sense of isolation would naturally produce. And, more than all, his unwavering confidence in Christ made his last days serene and sunny. One by one his early friends passed away. His brother died in 1873. Then comes the record in his journal of the death of Bishop McIlvaine, followed by the pathetic words: "I am almost alone." There are few friendships in this world like that of John Johns and Charles Hodge; and when, in 1876, the one was taken home, the other wrote: "I have no such

friend on earth. I mourn apart." On the 16th of May, 1878, he participated in the services at the funeral of Professor Henry, another life-long friend, and this "was the last occasion on which he was ever in a church." During these years the breadth of his Christian sympathies became more and more apparent. All men loved him. The publication of his "Systematic Theology" had served, perhaps, to change the opinions of some who, knowing him only as a champion of the strictest Calvinism, had not credited him with the catholicity of feeling that was so truly characteristic of him. The change was in them, and not in him. And what to some may seem the paradox of his life, finds an easy explanation in his unflinching loyalty to his Lord. Fidelity to Christ made him suspicious of every, even of the least, divergence from the system of truth that centred in His Divine Person and His atoning blood. And so central, so supreme, in his religious life was his devotion to Christ that, in spite of all, even the greatest, divergences of creed, he recognized a brother in every man who loved the Lord. He was a Protestant, out-and-out, but he refused to widen the schism of Christendom by denying the validity of Roman Catholic ordinances. He was a Presbyterian by birth and by conviction, but he refused to advocate a high ecclesiasticism that would cut him off from sympathy with men whose creed and cultus differed from his own. He was a Calvinist of the strictest school. He was a firm believer in every article of the Westminster Confession of Faith. But he has put on record his confidence in Schleiermacher's heavenly felicity, and but a short time before he died he traced in trembling lines his belief "that the vast majority of the human race were to share the beatitudes and glories of his Lord's redemption." He spent his life in the service of the Presbyterian Church, but his sympathies went far beyond the boundaries of sect. In 1841 the American Sunday-school Union published his "Way of Life," and that little book has carried the common salvation into thousands of homes, irrespective of denominational attachments. Once more in 1873 he gives expression to his practical belief in the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints. "The Unity of the Church based on Personal Union to Christ"—this was his theme at the meeting of the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical

Alliance in the City of New York. With the exception of his historical sermon, delivered at the reopening of the Seminary Chapel in 1874, the reading of that paper was his last important public service.

In 1877 his son, the author of the biography, was inducted into his Professorship. For the venerable man, who sixty-five years before had looked down from the gallery of the same church in which these services were held upon the inauguration of Dr. Alexander, this must have been an event of most tender interest. Dr. Alexander had been as a father to him, and on his death-bed had entrusted him with the maintenance of the orthodox traditions. Into the hands of his own son, the wearer of Archibald Alexander's name, was now committed the keeping of the trust that had given Princeton a name in all the earth. His work was done. He was only waiting for the message that should take him to his rest and his reward. His education was complete. Commencement-day was near at hand. And so on the 19th of June, 1878, while the students of the college were going out to the work and warfare of life, he too exchanged the exile and the discipline of earth for the welcome of his Father's house. His own sons carried him to the grave. They laid him beside the wife of his youth; and, reading in the light of the setting sun the graven words that years ago had given expression to a sorrowing husband's heart, they doubtless said once more: "WE LAY YOU GENTLY HERE, OUR BEST BELOVED, TO GATHER STRENGTH AND BEAUTY FOR THE COMING OF THE LORD."

FRANCIS L. PATTON.