

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
UNIVERSITY SEMINARY
1963

SONS OF THE PROPHETS

*Leaders in Protestantism from
Princeton Seminary*

EDITED BY HUGH T. KERR



PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

1963

Copyright © 1963
by Princeton University Press
All Rights Reserved
L. C. card no.: 63-12665



Printed in the United States
of America by Princeton University Press
Princeton, New Jersey

copy 2

II. CHARLES HODGE (1797-1878)

*Theology—Didactic and Polemical**

BY LEONARD J. TRINTERUD

IT is widely believed that Charles Hodge lies buried in three volumes. While this may have been true, existentially, for some Princetonians through the years, the Hodge who lived was not that mythical Hodge. The Hodge who lived was so completely captivated by The Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey, while yet a boy of fourteen, that henceforth his whole life was determined by what he supposed was the good of the Seminary. Throughout the century and a half of its existence no man has ever been so completely the embodiment of the school. There, in the Seminary, rather than in three volumes, lies Charles Hodge.

But whence the Hodge of the myth? Given a man of strong personality in a prominent seminary, for many years the leading mind of that school, idolized by students and alumni, in control of a privately owned journal of great influence, a writer of both popular and professional books, with a wide correspondence in various parts of the country, a man human enough to enter deeply into the lives of his friends—in short, given a man so gifted and so situated, it was inevitable that

* The best sources for the life of Charles Hodge are his letters and papers deposited in the Firestone Library, Princeton University. Speer Library, Princeton Seminary, has a large collection of his lecture notes, his diary, and some letters and other miscellaneous manuscripts. The correspondence of Samuel Miller now in Firestone Library and the letters of James Waddell Alexander, published and manuscript, provide much additional material. The Durrett Collection at the University of Chicago has in the Joshua L. Wilson Papers a great store of materials dealing with the Old School party in the West. Articles in *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* are indispensable. The Presbyterian periodicals of the era regularly referred to Hodge and Princeton. Several unpublished doctoral dissertations on Hodge provide background material; microfilm copies of these are in Speer Library, Princeton Seminary.

CHARLES HODGE

he should build and guide a large and influential group of disciples. The disciples themselves became a self-conscious group amidst the controversies of the half-century of Hodge's career. Wherever these disciples went—in the pastorates, in the colleges and seminaries, and on the mission fields—they continued to look to their mentor. In any crisis, to know what Professor Hodge would say was to clarify one's thinking. To quote Professor Hodge was to bring the whole weight of the master and the discipleship to bear against an opponent.

Men such as Charles Hodge, situated as he was, can never be buried in books. But they may suffer severely at the hands of their eager disciples, or they may find themselves adopted by power groups who profess great admiration and zeal for the famous man whose public image is better than their own. The Hodge of the myth is "the authorized portrait of our leader" done by command of followers whom in the end Hodge could not control. Yet the record is quite plain that the leader squirmed a good deal while this authorized portrait was being made. It was only his unquestioning devotion to the Seminary which made the sittings for this portrait enduring.

I

Charles Hodge was born in Philadelphia, December 28, 1797, of a family rooted in the revival of 1733-1742 and in the Second Presbyterian Church, founded by George Whitefield and Gilbert Tennent. The pastor of this church in 1797 was Ashbel Green, to whose vanity and ambition Hodge was to owe much of the unhappiness of his years as a professor. In due time he attended the College of New Jersey at Princeton. While a first-year student at college, aged fourteen, he witnessed with something like religious fascination the installation of Archibald Alexander as the first professor of the newly founded Theological Seminary. Before long he came to Alexander's attention, and within months each had adopted the other. The attachment was unbroken until Alexander's death in 1851. No other influence upon Hodge ever equalled that of

SONS OF THE PROPHETS

his "father" Alexander. After graduation from college young Hodge entered the Seminary. Upon his graduation there, Alexander told Hodge that he had chosen him to be a teacher at the Seminary. His appointment was in Biblical studies. Before long, however, he became persuaded that his training in the field was inadequate for the demands of the day. Men from New England had studied abroad, and Hodge asked permission to do the same.

In October 1826, Hodge sailed for Paris to study Oriental languages. He was not much impressed with the religious life of Paris and soon moved on to Germany. Here he found a wonderful new world. He found erudite, highly placed professors who were interested in small prayer-bands, in revivals, and in the private study of the Bible. He became a fast friend of such professors as August Tholuck, Johann Neander, Ernest Hengstenberg, and prominent nobles such as the brothers von Gerlach, Baron von Kottwitz, Chancellor le Coq, and many others. Otto von Gerlach was noted as "the Wesley of Berlin." The religious movement of which all these men were a part included men and women of rather diverse theologies, among them some liberal Catholics. Hodge was much interested in the German revivals and noted that in them there had occurred some of the "bodily exercises" or demonstrations which had accompanied the American revivals. Yet neither Hodge nor his German friends were troubled by these "excesses" nearly as much as they were by the policies of the ruling clique in the various German state churches. Hodge deplored, as did his friends, the high-handed methods of the ecclesiastical bureaucracy against the revivals and against the Bible-study and prayer groups. He little guessed that in three short years he would be thrown headlong into a similar maelstrom of conflict back home. No doubt the role he sought to play in that American conflict was in some measure influenced by his experiences while in Germany.

After nearly two years in Germany, Hodge turned homeward after a brief tour through Switzerland, France, and Great Britain. In view of the role which the terms "Scottish"

and "Scotch-Irish" were to play in his later polemical writings against the New England theologians, it is interesting to note that Hodge did not visit Ireland, and that he spent less than a week in Scotland, of which his diary is silent. He met in Scotland no one who interested him, nor did he gain any interest in Scottish Church affairs from the few days' visit. In England he was most impressed by the Evangelical leader Charles Simeon. About mid-September of 1828 he reached Princeton.

II

The America to which Hodge returned in 1828 was entering a stormy and troubled era. The new West was filling up at a rate beyond the wildest imagination of men. By 1830 Ohio had a population (937,000) greater than Massachusetts and Connecticut combined. Kentucky and Tennessee each passed the half-million mark about 1820. The West was expanding so rapidly that the older East was apprehensive lest it lose control of the nation. The election of President Jackson in 1828 seemed to many easterners the beginning of the end. On the religious scene, the Congregationalists and Presbyterians, who had always regarded themselves as the religious leaders of the nation and as better-class, educated, socially responsible Churches, had been outstripped by the Baptists and Methodists before 1830. In one generation the lead had gone to the groups despised as uneducated, lower-class, and "popular."

In the first years after the founding of the new nation a variety of factors brought the Congregationalists of New England and the Presbyterians of the middle seaboard states into close cooperation in the Plan of Union of 1801 for joint home mission work. The effective power of the Presbyterian Church was in the former New Side regions and was friendly to New England. The Presbyterians were as yet very weak in the entire South and even weaker on the new western frontier. The former Old Side regions of Pennsylvania and Maryland had not opposed the Plan of Union because it was assumed—evidently by all parties—that this plan would function mostly

SONS OF THE PROPHETS

in New York state, where the sentiment was pro-New England already. But the Plan of Union plus the changing situation in the nation and in the Church were soon to become the occasions for a series of controversies.

The theological controversies which occupied so much of Hodge's career had begun in a very small way about the time of the founding of the Seminary. In fact, theological conflict had much to do with the founding of the Seminary. In the anti-religious era immediately following the Revolutionary War, the College of New Jersey, the principal Presbyterian school, had declined in number of students and in religious influence. In New England also, the decline was being felt. In both Presbyterian and Congregational circles the cry was going up for more ministers, for better trained ministers to evangelize the new West and the changing East. The existing colleges were not doing the job. In 1808 a theological seminary was founded at Andover, Massachusetts, which sought to combine orthodox trinitarian Congregationalists with Presbyterians in a dual thrust to offset Unitarianism and to train an adequate evangelical ministry. A number of New York and New Jersey Presbyterians friendly to New England supported this move, among them Gardiner Spring of New York and Edward D. Griffin of Newark. Other Presbyterians such as Ashbel Green, Samuel Miller, and Archibald Alexander held back from making common cause with the Andover group. These men were averse to certain newer trends in New England Calvinism, and, though they were anxious to continue cooperation with New England on many fronts, they wished to have a seminary which would teach their views in theology. This they achieved with the founding of the seminary at Princeton in 1812. They set forth the ideal of one great central seminary which was to unify the Church by having all its ministers trained by one faculty at one place. But this ideal of one seminary through which to "type" the Church had been opposed by many. Only ten out of thirty-six presbyteries had approved it. Nonetheless its promoters had managed to get it through the General Assembly.

Andover Seminary had been founded in 1808 as a Maginot

CHARLES HODGE

Line against Unitarianism. Its defensive work was a doctrinal subscription of unprecedented detail and rigor. When Princeton was founded four years later it was given an ironclad subscription formula written by Ashbel Green and ardently supported by Samuel Miller. Whereas the New York-New Jersey Presbyterians of New England orientation supported the Andover subscription formula because it was aimed at Unitarianism, by 1818-1819 Spring, Griffin, James Richards, and others were aroused by the Princeton subscription formula. Griffin wrote an attack upon it calling it "The New Test." These men charged that the Princeton-Philadelphia group were in fact seeking to make their personal interpretation of the Church's standards the test by which all others were to be judged orthodox or unorthodox. This, they charged, was an attack upon the rights of all other Presbyterians. The Princeton-Philadelphia group took the attitude that they were merely being good Presbyterians. And so the wars within nineteenth-century Presbyterianism began as the Princeton-Philadelphia group assumed the honorific claim to be Presbyterians of the "Old School" over and against the innovators who drew non-Presbyterian ideas from New England and were thus merely "New School" men.

It now became clear that the real purpose behind the determination of Green, Miller, Alexander, and the Philadelphia group to have only one seminary for the entire Church was that in this way—as the plan of the school indeed said—controversies might be avoided by having all the future ministers of the Church taught by one faculty rigidly bound to one interpretation of Presbyterianism. By 1830 the inevitable answer was apparent: five other Presbyterian seminaries had been founded in various parts of the nation.

Even before Hodge went abroad, the rumblings of the controversies which were to involve him throughout his career had begun. In 1826 Ashbel Green had noted bitterly that whereas Pennsylvania (for him the center of his power and prestige) had a total of 196 Presbyterian licentiates and ministers, New York had a total of 426. In 1829 New York had more students in colleges than did the combined colleges of

SONS OF THE PROPHETS

Pennsylvania and New Jersey (which regarded themselves as the bastions of the Presbyterian Church). One half of these students, moreover, were in New York state colleges. What was to become now of Princeton? While Hodge was in Germany (1827), Alexander had written to him of his apprehension for the future of the Seminary. Alexander feared that a New England-New West axis would leave Princeton to shrivel and die. In 1828 he wrote to Hodge (in Germany) that the new Presbyterian seminary founded that year in Pittsburgh was being "viewed by many as the last stronghold of orthodoxy, and the most secure deposit for funds intended to support the truth; and at this time, I have little doubt but that Dr. [Ashbel] Green and others of our staunch friends feel a deeper interest in that institution than in this. . . . After all we shall be forced to look to New England for our students."

In 1830 there were a total of seventeen Protestant seminaries in the nation. From the New England seminaries a goodly number of men were coming into the Presbyterian ministry each year. In western Pennsylvania, western New York, Ohio, Indiana, Tennessee, and Virginia, Presbyterian seminaries were competing with Princeton for students and money. If, as Alexander gloomily wrote to Hodge, Princeton were confined to eastern Pennsylvania and New Jersey it would be helpless, for the population in the area was not expanding much. In Hodge's lifetime his native city of Philadelphia went from the largest in the nation to a rather stagnant city less than half the size of New York City.

III

Worse by far than this form of competition for Princeton was the growing threat of popular religion. Both Alexander and Hodge regarded themselves as favorably disposed toward revivals, free religious associations, lay piety, and the like. Miller stood aloof from most of such movements, though no tensions had emerged before Hodge left for Europe. But beginning in 1827 Princeton began to be increasingly aware of



Charles Hodge

the violent controversy raging in New York state and in New England over the revivals conducted by Charles G. Finney and his followers. To the anxious Princeton professors it seemed by 1830 that the whole of New York state Presbyterianism, with its 426 ministers and licentiates, and all its college students would go over to a kind of popular religion which was anathema to them. From both the West and the South Princeton was already under heavy fire for, it was charged, making its students first gentlemen, and then ministers. In so doing, the charge went, Princeton unfitted men for the work of the Church in the new states on the frontier.

Despite what Hodge and the other Princeton professors thought of themselves, throughout the nineteenth century they found themselves unable to understand the popular religious movements of the day. The popular movements in turn rejected Princeton as "high-toned," "book-learned," and interested only in the upper classes. Hodge and J. W. Alexander (the son of Archibald Alexander) recognized the tension but did not know how to deal with the problem. As J. W. Alexander wrote, with italics, "To the poor the Gospel is *not* preached in our crack Presbyterian Churches." He told a friend, the famous elite preacher John Hall, that bad as Finney's "new measures" in truth were, they were better than no measures at all—i.e. the Philadelphia indifference to people. For several years Hodge, Archibald Alexander, J. W. Alexander, and Albert Dod of the College, tried to steer a middle course on the popular religious movements of the day, critical of their theological vagaries but seeking to win and to change them rather than attempting to blot them out. The attempt proved futile.

Among the many aspects of the popular religious movements of the day none was more characteristic, and none was destined to cause Presbyterianism, Princeton, and Hodge more trouble, than the so-called voluntary benevolent societies. By the time Hodge returned from Germany these benevolent societies included a number of anti-slavery societies, plus the missionary, education, and reform societies. As though

SONS OF THE PROPHETS

this were not ferment enough, long smoldering anti-Yankee feelings and theological differences burst all the seams just about the time Hodge returned. The ensuing struggle caught him up, gave him grievous trouble, and occupied him until the end of his life. He was always very distrustful of ecclesiastical power, and he questioned the characters and motives of "the Philadelphia junto" (as he called them), which was driving for a powerful ecclesiastical machine. Yet theologically and socially he was utterly opposed to the total ideology of those who were resisting the Philadelphia group led by Ashbel Green. In the bitter end the good of the Seminary, as he understood it, made him the foremost apologist of the Philadelphia policies and the great opponent of all popular movements and ideas in Presbyterianism.

Charles Hodge returned from abroad to a troubled Church, an insecure school, and a nation which was undergoing rapid and radical change. The leadership of the Seminary was solidly in the hands of Alexander and Miller. Their answer to the problems of the day was simple: allow no changes. This position Hodge loyally accepted and supported. In 1825 a group of men in and about Princeton had founded a small quarterly journal called the *Biblical Repertory*. It had carried at first mostly reviews, reprints, and general surveys. It was now re-organized with the added backing of several New York area New School Presbyterians. Princeton, led by Miller and Alexander, had embarked upon a policy of steering a middle course between Old School and New School lest she be left to wither and die as the other seminaries became party organs. The *Repertory* was to be a major instrument in this endeavor. It was to carry articles of opinion and comment, thoroughly orthodox but uncommitted to any of the warring parties. A local editorial committee from the Seminary and the College was to control its contents. All articles were to be unsigned, and for decades most of the material was written by this local group. All controversial topics were subjected to the decision of this group, usually numbering from six to ten men. Hodge became the "beast of burden," as he called it, of the venture but by no means the master or driver.

IV

It is often assumed that Hodge was a leader in the violent controversies of 1831 to 1837 which broke the Presbyterian Church into two denominations. Though he later became the great defender of the Old School party and denomination, he was actually an opponent of the rupture at the time. Both the opposition to the rupture before 1837 and the defense of it afterward were motivated in large measure by the good of the Seminary as he understood it. Even so, Hodge's role must not be over-stressed. Throughout this period it was Alexander and Miller who controlled policy, not Hodge and the other younger members of the faculty. Moreover from 1833 to 1838 Hodge was confined by illness to his house and unable even to leave it for classes. A great part of this time he was forced to read and write while lying on his back. His malady was an infection in one leg. Of the more extreme remedies, he wrote his wife from Philadelphia, where he had been taken once for treatment, "I had sixty leeches applied to the groin last evening. . . ." A newly invented treatment was "a piece of lighted punk, or rather thin tree bark, is put on the flesh and allowed to burn out. It of course burns to a crisp the skin under it. . . ." This was done to him daily for a time. By the winter of 1838 he was able to go about on crutches, though he did not resume preaching until 1842.

By 1830-1831 controversy was rife in the Presbyterian Church yet without any very clear pattern of parties or of issues. Dominant Old School demagogues like R. J. Breckinridge condemned the doctrine of a limited atonement as vigorously as did New School heretics like Albert Barnes. Yet to Princeton this was one of the three essentials of the "Triangle." Joshua L. Wilson, the heresy hunter of Cincinnati and the unsuccessful prosecutor of Lyman Beecher, was almost fanatically anti-Yankee, if not anti-easterner. Yet Wilson was a bitter personal enemy of the entire Pittsburgh Old School group who with Breckinridge and Ashbel Green were most responsible for the rupture of 1837. Breckinridge, Wilson, and their friends, were more outright and outspoken against slav-

ery than was Beecher. Yet the Pennsylvania Old School men fought *all discussion* of slavery lest the South secede from the Church leaving the northern Old School party a minority.

Until 1834 Thomas Baird of Pittsburgh, who later was to claim credit for having first seen the need for dividing the Church, was asserting in his paper that the whole controversy in the Church was due to the personal ambitions of the Philadelphia clique. At the height of the heresy trial of Albert Barnes, Ashbel Green raised the cry that bad as Barnes' heresies were, the greater crisis was the danger of the voluntary societies to the boards of the Church, all of which, Green boasted, he was a member of and the head of several. On the western frontier, mission board secretaries like Joshua T. Russell, Green's man, subsidized local journals and pastors who could be useful to the cause of the Old School. In New York state, New School Presbyterians were divided between a pro-Finney group and an older New School group based on New York City and Auburn Seminary. The latter was as opposed to Finney's new measures as were many Old School men. Yet Joshua L. Wilson had himself been a campmeeting evangelist employing all the Finney techniques, even the anxious bench and early admission to the church, as late as 1832. R. J. Breckinridge as late as 1834 defended camp meetings and the new measures when Wilson had turned against them. In the East, Hopkinsianism, the advanced New England "heresy" of the early 1800's, had all but been forgotten by 1832. The leading men of the party, such as Gardiner Spring, were now Old School men, and the former opponents of Hopkinsianism, such as Ezra S. Ely, were now New School men. Both parties had changed sides. Wilson saw the dangers of Hopkinsianism everywhere. Baird of Pittsburgh, who later claimed to have been consistently anti-Hopkinsian and anti-New England since 1814, seldom noticed the Finney revivals at all in his paper.

In this crazy-quilt pattern of affairs, with the Church burdened by several dozen half-pint demagogues backed by a newspaper of some kind, or a synodical or assembly board, or a voluntary society, or an emergency committee, the reaction

of the Princeton faculty was typically academic. They set out to *educate* the Church. Miller wrote several small books on various controverted issues, Hodge and the two younger Alexanders, Joseph Addison and James Waddell, projected a complete popular commentary on the Bible, of which Hodge's volume on Romans became the best known. No doubt this set was intended, in part at least, to compete with Barnes' phenomenally successful *Notes* on the various books of the New Testament. Most important, however, was the role of the *Biblical Repertory*. In this journal the Princeton group sought desperately to moderate the controversies and to guide the Church to a wise solution of the problems. In article after article they sought to show that the basic problems were doctrinal and could only be settled over a period of time. They sought to conciliate the South by opposing abolitionism and by emphasizing piety and sound revivalism. They opposed the Taylor-New Haven theology and the revivalism of Taylor and Beecher as well as the revivalism of Finney. They also tried earnestly to secure the aid of the famous New England conservative evangelist Asahel Nettleton. At their solicitation he visited Princeton several times and made one extended trip in the South. The Princeton group treated the Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Kentucky Old School groups as doctrinally sound but wrong in their ecclesiastical policies.

V

The Old School groups reacted violently to the Princeton program. Beginning in 1831 the various Old School papers, especially the *Presbyterian* of Philadelphia, so frequently attacked Hodge that a member of his family kept a running account of the articles. The Old School party regarded the Princeton program as a betrayal of the cause. On numerous occasions, in various papers, in various synods and presbyteries, and in the General Assembly, threats were made to discipline or to re-organize the faculty. From 1833 to 1838 the faculty was frequently left without salary for as long as eight or nine months. Hodge borrowed money from his well-to-do

brother, but the senior Alexander was several times in a pitiful situation. Yet until 1834 the personal ambitions, petty vanity and demagoguery of the various Old School parties kept them from making any common cause. The Old School clique which met after the General Assembly of 1834 to unite upon a common platform which it called *The Act and Testimony* was, therefore, a thunderclap to the Princeton group. It meant that Princeton, which was in fact solidly Old School in theology would now have little hope of resisting the Old School politics in the Church. Samuel Miller wrote anxiously and secretly to Gardiner Spring asking if he thought the Princeton group should make peace with the Old School politicians and how they could best do it without admitting too much error.

Though Miller and others of the Princeton group who are not now identifiable began to ease over to the politicians, the group as a whole (about ten from the Seminary and from the College) moved more slowly. Hodge began in 1835 an annual feature review of the actions of each General Assembly. This he was to keep up until 1867 (with the possible exception of 1841). In these reviews he sought to analyze critically and theologically the work of each assembly. In view of the extreme pressure upon the Seminary faculty, unpaid salaries and more besides, this was a courageous venture indeed. Though Hodge wrote these reviews, they were frequently censored drastically by the group. On several occasions Hodge was forced under great protest to write that which he did not think.

In spite of these cautious censorings the Old School reactions became even more menacing. The "Ultras," as Hodge called them, demanded that the Princeton faculty be disciplined for presuming to sit in judgment upon the highest judicatory in the Church. They demanded also that the Assembly forbid any Seminary faculty from publishing a journal or periodical. Secret and public conclaves were held on whether or not to change the faculty. Miller's son-in-law, a committed member of the political group, was placed on the faculty. In late 1836 a delegation of Old School men came to Princeton

to "persuade" the faculty to change its course. They informed the faculty that unless it did so, the Old School financiers, Robert and James Lenox, had the money, the plans, and the land ready to found a new, thoroughly Old School, seminary in New York City, where the New School had just founded Union Seminary.

That same year, 1836, Hodge wrote and published in the *Biblical Repertory* what became his most notorious article, a long book review on the issue of slavery. He argued that slavery as such was accepted in the Bible and that only its abuse was to be condemned outright. The article was bitterly anti-abolitionist and full of signs of the extreme pressure under which the Princeton group was living. Alexander, Miller, Hodge, and others of the Princeton group had at one time or another held slaves themselves or had purchased indentured white or black servants. Alexander had a very sentimental, romantic, patriarchal interpretation of slavery, which regarded it almost wholly from the standpoint of domestic household servants, and he ignored as much as possible the problems of plantation slavery, slave-trading, slave-breeding, etc.

Hodge followed Alexander's views. He had no personal knowledge of the South, and seems to have made no effort to learn anything about the situation. The article was several times reprinted, once as late as 1860, and was widely circulated. Of him, the Old School theologian E. D. McMaster wrote, "Dr. Hodge has done more to pervert the public mind on the subject of slavery than any hundred men in the Church." Hodge wrote the article as part of the Princeton group's desperate attempt to keep the South from seceding from the Church and leaving the New School with a working majority in the Assembly. He little realized what use interested parties would make of his article, and of the names Princeton and Presbyterian.

VI

His illness prevented Hodge from attending the fateful meeting of the Assembly of 1837, which resulted in the rupture of the

Church. Miller was there working solidly with the Old School party. Alexander was active also but seems to have had some reservations about the methods of the Old School clique. When Hodge came to write his annual review of the actions of the Assembly there was great dissension in the Princeton group. Hodge wished to condemn the New School, to approve some aspects of the Old School policy, and to question the constitutional grounds of the Old School's excising acts against the New School. In the end he was forced to come almost all the way to Miller's approval of the acts. Yet even the slight critique which he was allowed aroused a barrage of protests from Pennsylvania to Kentucky and further threats against the faculty. Miller and John McLean of the College, both on the *Biblical Repertory* committee, wrote in vigorous defense of the Old School actions in various weekly papers. Only two younger Princeton men stood with Hodge, J. W. Alexander and Albert Dod.

Once it was clear that henceforth there would be two Presbyterian Churches in the nation, the New School and the Old School denominations, Princeton's course became clear. Peace had to be made with the politicians if the Seminary faculty was to continue. The problem for the faculty was eased somewhat, however, by the public reaction to the rupture. No one had supposed that four-ninths of the Church would follow the New School denomination. The politicians themselves were in need of peace and public support. The more moderate Old School men approached Hodge in 1839 to write a history of the Church which would vindicate the Old School point of view. So difficult still were relations between Hodge and Ashbel Green, who had possession of most of the official records, that a third party had to make the arrangements for Hodge to use the documents. Yet when Hodge was through with his *Constitutional History*, he had so wholeheartedly defended an ultra Old School interpretation of things that Alexander was deeply pained.

In 1840 Hodge was made Professor of Theology, taking over most of Alexander's work. From this time also his health improved rapidly. The two older men became less active, and

Hodge for the first time moved toward actual leadership in the Seminary. Alexander and Miller retained a hold on affairs, however, until their deaths in 1851 and 1850. With the passing of some of the more ultra Old School men, and of the pressing needs of the Church, peace came for Hodge in other ways. He became accepted on several Church boards and was Moderator of the Old School General Assembly of 1846. His influence as a teacher was broadened by further writing and by travel. By the time of the Civil War he was regarded by many as the leading theologian of the denomination. The war put him again to a severe test. Until the last he sought to play down controversy and to conciliate the South in every possible way. Once the war had gone on for a year, he changed enough to charge that it was being fought largely at the behest of the slave-interests of the South. Yet before he was through, he had returned to his old insistence that slavery as such could not be condemned because the Bible approved of it.

The war came to an end, and the Old School found itself unable to reunite with the former southern Old School Churches which had formed a new denomination during the war. Moreover the younger generations in both the New School and the Old School in the North were agitating for a reunited northern Church. Hodge fought the proposal vigorously but failed to prevent the reunion. The terms of the reunion were hard for the Princeton group because they allowed constitutional status for the Princeton theology only as one possible interpretation of the Church's standards. Since 1812 Princeton had assumed that its theology was *the* faith of the Church. This Hodge had always maintained against the New School. After 1870 Hodge was again merely the theologian of a party. Yet he set out vigorously now to make for that theology its grandest monument. Hitherto the Board of the Seminary had prevailed upon him not to publish his theology lest it thus become available for use in any Old School seminary. Princeton might lose students if Hodge's theology could be studied anywhere. Between 1871 and 1873 he issued his now famous "three volumes." Very quickly they became the standard conservative Federal theology among the Eng-

SONS OF THE PROPHETS

lish-speaking Reformed Churches. The work was the capstone of his long career. Fittingly, upon the fiftieth anniversary of his entrance upon teaching at the Seminary, a celebration of considerable importance was held. He had indeed been the greatest of the Seminary's students and the greatest of its professors. When he passed from the scene on **December 19, 1878**, he had been the acknowledged leader of the Seminary for more than a generation. No other individual has ever served the Seminary so long, or so greatly furthered its cause.