

DEC 21 1865

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY:

A SERIES OF QUESTIONS

UPON THE

LECTURES DELIVERED TO THE STUDENTS

IN PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,

BY THE

REV. CHARLES HODGE, D. D.

EDITED BY A MEMBER OF THE SENIOR CLASS,

AND

PRINTED FOR THE USE OF THE STUDENTS.

PHILADELPHIA.

1865.

Entered, according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1865,
By REV. FREDERICK H. WINES,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, in and for the
Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

PRINTED BY ALFRED MARTIEN, PHILADELPHIA.

From the Library of
Professor William Henry Green
Bequeathed by him to
the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

BT

75

.H6233

1865

Copy 1

Rev. Wm H. Green, D. D.,
with the regards of
Fred. N. Mues.

Princeton, April 12, 1865.

P R E F A C E .

DR. HODGE'S method of teaching theology to the students in the Theological Seminary at Princeton is by manuscript lectures, which he reads to the successive classes. The questions printed in this volume are his own questions upon his own lectures, and furnish a general but not an exhaustive view of the course of study pursued in his department. They have been arranged for publication, (by authority of the Senior Class,) and appropriate headings added to them, in such a manner as to indicate to the eye the analysis of the subject, by one of the students, with Dr. Hodge's consent, but without his supervision or revision. Whatever of defect there may be in the arrangement is due to the compiler.

At present Dr. Hodge is engaged in rewriting his entire course of lectures, and has progressed as far as the subject of Original Sin. Up to this point, the questions are upon the new course. The remaining questions are upon the old course. In the new lectures, some modifications of the general outline have been made, which will account for the imperfection of this analysis. Attention is especially called to the transfer of the subjects of Election, Reprobation, and the order of the Decrees, from Theology

Proper to Soterology; and to the new division of the subject of Soterology into five parts. These changes were announced in the class-room, while these questions were in the hands of the printer, and too late for any alteration in the book.

It only remains to add, that this book is printed, but *not published*. It is printed for the use of students only, and will not be exposed for sale in bookstores. A few extra copies have been printed, to accommodate the graduates of the Seminary, and may be obtained of Mr. ALFRED MARTIEN, 606 Chestnut street, Philadelphia.

F. H. W.

PRINCETON, *March*, 1865.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

NATURE, FORMS, AND SOURCES OF THEOLOGY.

FIRST. ITS NATURE.

I. THEOLOGY.

What is the etymological meaning of the word "theology?"

What are the objections to defining theology as the science of the supernatural?

In what sense is it the science of religion?

II. RELIGION.

What is the etymology of the word "religion?"

What are the different senses in which it is used?

III. RELATION BETWEEN RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

[I.] SCHLEIERMACHER'S THEORY.

1. STATED.—In what sense is the word "religion" taken by the school of Schleiermacher?

What is theology, according to their view?

According to their view, what is Christianity?

In what relation, according to them, do different religions stand to each other?

What are, according to their theory, the doctrines of the Scriptures?

What authority do they give the Scriptures, as a rule of faith?

2. REFUTED.—(1.) How may it be shown that this theory proceeds upon a wrong view of the nature of religion, and especially of Christianity?
- (2.) How does it contradict the Scripture account of the importance of truth?
- (3.) How may it be shown to be inconsistent with the universal faith of the church?

[II.] THE TRUE VIEW.

In what, then, is theology the science of religion?

SECOND. ITS FORMS.

In what two methods has God revealed to men the truth concerning himself and our relation to him?

[I.] NATURAL THEOLOGY.

1. DEFINED.—What is Natural Theology?

In what sense is the word “nature” taken, when we speak of the religion of nature, or of Natural Theology?

2. ITS VALUE.—What are the extreme opinions as to the value of Natural Theology?

How may it be proved that a trustworthy revelation of truth is made in nature?

How may it be shown that such revelation is inadequate to salvation?

What is the true value and use of Natural Theology?

[II.] REVEALED THEOLOGY.

What is Christian Theology?

What is the distinction between Biblical, Systematic, Polemic, and Casuistic Theology?

THIRD. ITS SOURCES.

What are the four different theories as to the source of our knowledge of divine things, or of the rule of faith?

I. RATIONALISM.

[I.] RATIONALISTIC THEORIES.

What is rationalism?

§ 1. DEISM.

What is the deistical form of rationalism?

Why is that form of rationalism called naturalism?

In what other sense is the word "naturalism" used?

What is reason?

What is meant by a supernatural revelation?

1. POSSIBILITY OF A REVELATION.—(1.) What is the *metaphysical* ground on which rationalists deny the possibility of such a revelation?

How may their arguments on that point be answered?

(2.) What is the *moral* argument of rationalists against such a revelation?

What is the next point, after the possibility of a revelation, involved in this controversy?

2. NECESSITY OF A REVELATION.—How may the necessity of a supernatural revelation be proved?

3. FACT OF A REVELATION.—What are the heads of argument to prove that such a revelation has been made, and is recorded in the Christian Scriptures?

§ 2. PARTIAL REVELATION.

What is the second and more common form of rationalism?

What, according to this form of rationalism, is the class of truths revealed in the Bible?

On what is our assent to them founded?

How do rationalists get rid of that class of truths contained in Scripture, which are truths of the reason?

§ 3. ACCOMMODATION.

What is the doctrine of accommodation?

On what principle is this form of rationalism founded?

How may it be proved that the comprehension of the object of faith is not necessary to rational assent?

[II.] THE TRUE VIEW: OR, THE OFFICE OF REASON.

§ 1.—What is the first office of reason, in matters of faith?

What is it to know?

What is it to comprehend?

How may it be proved that knowledge, or the exercise of reason in cognizing truth, is essential to faith?

What is this use or office of reason called by the older theologians?

§ 2.—What is the second office of reason?

What is meant by the *judicium contradictionis rationis*?

What is credible? and what incredible?

How show that the strange, the improbable, the unaccountable, the incomprehensible, may be objects of faith?

How show that the impossible cannot be believed?

What is impossible?

How show that it is the prerogative of reason to judge whether the doctrines proposed to our faith are possible?

§ 3.—What is the third office of reason?

What is the kind of evidence required to establish a supernatural revelation?

By what standard does reason judge of that evidence?

How may it be proved that such is the province of reason?

What do the old theologians understand by the *usus catasceuasticus* and *usus anasceuasticus* of reason?

What is philosophy?

What is the relation between philosophy and theology?

How may it be shown that the former is subordinate to the latter?

How do Romanists and Protestants differ concerning the office of the senses, in matters of faith?

How may it be proved that the Protestant doctrine on that point is correct?

II. ENTHUSIASM.

1. DEFINED.—What is the popular meaning of the word “enthusiasm?”

What is its etymological signification?

In what sense is the word “mysticism” used in the history of philosophy?

In what sense is it used by rationalists and others, as applicable to the Scripture doctrine of the Spirit's influence?

What is its strict and proper sense in theology?

2. HISTORY OF THE THEORY.—How far were the *Montanists* mystics and enthusiasts?

What was the character of the *Alexandrian* school?

How far was their peculiar doctrine allied to rationalism? and how far to enthusiasm?

How far do the modern *Transcendentalists* adopt the same principle?

Who was *Dionysius the Areopagite*? and what work bearing his name became the foundation of the mystical theology of the Middle Ages?

What were the leading principles of that work?

Who were the most prominent mystics before the Reformation?

On what ground did Luther pronounce the *Romish* system to be a form of enthusiasm?

What was the doctrine of the early *Anabaptists* upon this subject?

Who were the *Quietists*? and what were their doctrines?

What was the origin of the *Quakers*?

Who are their standard writers?

What do they teach (1.) as to the nature of the inner light? (2.) as to its universality? (3.) as to its office? (4.) as to its authority and relation to the Scriptures?

What is their doctrine concerning the Scriptures?

How does this system differ from rationalism?

How, from spiritual illumination?

How, from what the Scriptures teach as to the leading of the Spirit?

How, from the Scripture doctrine of common grace?

3. REFUTED.—(1.) What is the argument against the Quaker doctrine from experience and history?

(2.) From the want of any criterion for this inner light, by which to distinguish it from the operations of our own minds?

(3.) From the errors and evils to which it has led?

(4.) From Scripture?

(5.) From its ignoring the distinction between inspired and uninspired men?

(6.) From its tendency to subvert the authority of the Scriptures?

III. ROMANISM.

[I.] THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RULE OF FAITH.

What is the Roman Catholic rule of faith?

§ 1. THE SCRIPTURES.

How do they agree with Protestants as to the authority of the Scriptures?

How, as to the canon of Scripture?

1. THE APOCRYPHA.—How do they regard the apocrypha?

2. COMPLETENESS.—What is their doctrine concerning the completeness of Scripture?

What are the principal doctrines which Romanists say are a part of divine revelation, and yet not contained in the Scriptures?

3. PERSPICUITY.—What is their doctrine concerning the perspicuity of Scripture?

On what ground do they deny the right of private judgment?

Who do they say has the right of interpreting the Scriptures?

How far does the Church of Rome discourage the use of Scripture by the people?

4. THE VULGATE.—What were the decisions of the Council of Trent concerning the vulgate?

What is the meaning of their decree?

§ 2. TRADITION.

What does the word *παραδοσις* mean in the New Testament?

In what sense did the early fathers use the word?

How did their doctrine differ from that of Romanists?

1. CLASSIFICATION.—Into what three classes do Romanists divide tradition?

2. OFFICE.—What, according to their doctrine, is the office of tradition?

3. AUTHORITY.—What its authority?

What is the ground of that authority?

4. CRITERION.—What is the criterion for distinguishing between true and false traditions?

§ 3. INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

1. ITS SOURCE.—What is the church, according to Romanists?

What its office as a teacher?

How qualified for that office?

2. ITS LIMITS.—Within what limits is the church infallible?

3. IN WHOM RESIDENT.—(1.) What is the Episcopal theory as to the organs of the church's infallibility?

(2.) What is the Papal or Transmontane theory?

When, according to this theory, is the Pope infallible?

[II.] THIS THEORY EXAMINED.

§ 1. TRADITION.

What is the Protestant doctrine of common consent, and the analogy of faith?

How does the Romish doctrine of tradition differ from this as to the origin, nature, and authority of this common consent?

What is the real *status questionis* on this subject?

(1.) What is the *a priori* argument against the Romish doctrine of tradition?

(2.) What is the argument from the fact that there is in Scripture promise on of infallibility?

(3.) What is the argument from the absence of any criterion for distinguishing between true and false traditions?

What is the criterion by which Romanists determine between them?

How may it be shown that there is no such common consent as that which they assert?

Why may not ancient creeds prove such consent?

Why may not early councils prove it?

Why may not the writings of the fathers?

How do Romanists abandon the criterion of common consent?

(4.) What is the argument from the inaccessibility of this rule of faith?

(5.) What from its human origin?

(6.) What from Scripture?

§ 2. SCRIPTURE.

How show that Protestants do not adopt the Romish doctrine, in its application to the canon and inspiration of Scripture?

§ 3. INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

What is the Romish doctrine upon this subject?

1. FIRST FALLACY.—What is the first fallacy on which that system is founded?

What is the Protestant doctrine as to the nature of the church?

(1.) How is that doctrine proved from what the Scriptures teach concerning the church as the “body of Christ,” “family of God,” “temple of the Holy Ghost,” “bride of Christ,” etc.?

(2.) How, from the designation given to members of the church, in Scripture?

(3.) How, from the fact that the church consists of those who are in Christ?

(4.) How, from the fact that it consists of the *κλητικοί*?

(5.) How, from the distinction made between Israel *κατα πνευμα* and Israel *κατα σαρκα*?

How may it be shown that Romanists abandon their own doctrine concerning the nature of the church?

2. SECOND FALLACY.—What is the second fallacy on which the Romish doctrine of an infallible church rests?

Who were the apostles? what was their commission? the design of their office? what were their gifts? and their credentials?

How show that Romish prelates do not claim the same office, though they claim the same authority?

What are arguments to prove that the apostleship has not been perpetuated?

3. THIRD FALLACY.—What is the third fallacy of the Romish doctrine?

How prove from history that the church (in the Romish sense of the word) has erred?

IV. PROTESTANTISM.

What is the rule of faith, as stated in the Protestant symbols?

What points are included in these statements? [I. THE PLE-NARY INSPIRATION; II. THE COMPLETENESS; III. THE PERSPICUITY OF THE SCRIPTURES.*]

How do Protestants determine the canon of the Old Testament?

How do they determine the canon of the New Testament?

INSPIRATION.

§ 1. NATURE OF INSPIRATION.

On what does the infallibility of Scripture depend?

* Under the third head, is included the Right of Private Judgment.

What is inspiration?

How does it differ from *revelation*?

How are the gifts of revelation and inspiration related?

How do inspiration and *spiritual illumination* differ?

What three elements are included in inspiration?

How may it be shown (1) that inspiration does not make the sacred writers machines, or destroy their self-control? (2) that it does not render them infallible as men in opinion, or (3) in conduct?

§ 2. INSPIRATION PLENARY.

In what sense is inspiration plenary?

1. PLENARY INSPIRATION DENIED.—1st. *The Theory of Partial Inspiration*.—(1.) What is the first form of this theory?

What are the arguments to prove that inspiration extends to the words of Scripture?

(2.) What is its second form?

(3.) What is its third form?

How show that inspiration is not confined to religious truths, but extends to the facts of the Bible?

In what points do all these views agree?

2d. *The Emotional Theory*.—What is the theory which makes inspiration the result of excited religious feeling?

What are the different forms under which that theory is held?

(1.) Rationalistic? (2.) Mystical? (3.) Philosophical?

What are the arguments against it? [Four points.]

3d. *The Pantheistic Theory*.—What are the representations adopted by the advocates of the pantheistic philosophy?

In what three points do the emotional and the pantheistic theories of inspiration agree?

2. PLENARY INSPIRATION PROVED.—1st. *The New Testament*.—

(1.) What is the argument for the plenary inspiration of the New Testament from the necessity of the case?

(2.) What, from miracles?

(3.) How show that Christ promised this gift to the apostles?

(4.) How prove that the apostles claimed it?

2d. *The Old Testament*.—(1.) How do the writers of the Old Testament claim inspiration?

(2.) How do the writings of the New Testament prove the inspiration of the Old?

How can the free manner in which the Old Testament is quoted in the New, be reconciled with this doctrine?

How are we to account for apparent inconsistencies between different portions of Scripture?

BOOK FIRST:—THEOLOGY PROPER.

PART I. DEUS EXISTENS.

I. GOD, CONSIDERED AS ONE.

I. THE BEING OF GOD.

I. ORIGIN OF THE IDEA OF GOD.

What are the different views as to the origin of our idea of God?

§ 1. IS IT INNATE?

What is meant by innate knowledge?

How can we determine whether any truth is innate or derived?

In what sense is it asserted that the knowledge of God is innate?

How can the assumption that it is innate be reconciled with the ignorance of some tribes?

How, with the experience of the deaf and dumb?

How, with the philosophical denials of atheists and pantheists?

§ 2. IS IT A DEDUCTION OF REASON?

What is the theory which makes the idea of God a deduction of reason?

What are the objections to that theory?

§ 3. IS IT DUE EXCLUSIVELY TO REVELATION?

What is that theory which refers all knowledge of God to a supernatural revelation?

What are the objections to that theory?

II. PROOF OF THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

In what sense does the being of God admit of proof?

How may we show that the argument for his existence does not involve a *petitio principii*?

What is the objection founded on the fact that the knowledge of God is innate or intuitive?

How is that objection to be met?

What is the objection to the proof of the being of God made by those who regard religious consciousness as the source of all theology?

[I.] THE ONTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

What is meant by the ontological argument?

1. DES CARTES.—In what form was that argument presented by *Des Cartes*?

What is the objection to it in that form?

2. ANSELM.—In what form was it presented by *Anselm*?

What are the objections to that form?

3. CLARKE.—How was it presented by Dr. *Samuel Clarke*?

What is the objection to that form?

4. COUSIN.—How is it presented by *Cousin*?

What value is to be attached to the argument in any of its forms?

[II.] THE COSMOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

1. STATED.—What is the cosmological argument? and why is it so called?

On what principle is this argument founded?

What is a cause?

Whence do we derive the idea of a cause?

1st. *Premise*.—What authority is due to the conviction that *every effect must have a cause*?

2d. *Premise*.—(1.) How can we prove that *the world is an effect*, from the impossibility of the assumption of an infinite series of contingent events?

(2.) How, from the recent date of all history?

(3.) How, from geology?

2. OBJECTIONS TO THIS ARGUMENT.—(1.) What is Hume's objection to the principle on which the cosmological argument is founded?

What is the answer to it?

(2.) What is Kant's objection?

What is the answer to it?

(3.) What is the objection to the argument made by those who admit the principle on which it is founded, but deny the conclusion drawn from it?

How is that objection to be met?

[III.] THE TELEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

1. STATED.—Why is the teleological argument so called?

On what principle is that argument founded?

1st *Premise*.—On what ground does the assertion rest that *design implies intelligence and will*?

2d *Premise*.—(1.) How is *design exhibited* in the mechanism of the heavens?

(2.) How, in the structure of our globe?

(3.) How, in the vegetable world?

(4.) How, in the animal world?

(5.) How, in the nature of man?

(6.) How, in the adaptation of nature to the wants of sensitive, organized beings?

How does all this prove the existence of an extra-mundane, personal God?

How far do the Scriptures recognize the validity of this argument?

2. OBJECTIONS TO THIS ARGUMENT.—(1.) What is the objection of materialists to this argument?

(2.) What is the objection founded on the distinction between a mechanism and an organism?

(3.) What are the objections of Hume and Kant?

(4.) What is the objection drawn from the operation of instinct?

(5.) What, from abnormal productions?

[IV.] THE MORAL ARGUMENT.

In what form does Kant present the moral argument for the being of God?

What is the common form of the argument?

How may the existence of God be inferred from our sense of guilt?

What does consciousness teach of the certainty, the authority, and the independence of our moral judgments? and what, of the representative character of conscience?

What is the argument from our religious nature?

[V.] THE ARGUMENT FROM CONSENT.

What is the argument from common consent?

III. SYSTEMS OPPOSED TO THEISM.

What are two comprehensive anti-theistic doctrines?

[I.] POLYTHEISM.

What is polytheism?

What was the popular polytheism of the Greeks and Romans?

What, the philosophical theories of the educated classes?

[II.] ATHEISM.

What is atheism?

How is the answer to that question to be determined?

On what ground do materialists and pantheists repudiate the name of atheists?

How may the propriety of restricting the meaning of the word "theism" to the doctrine of a personal, extra-mundane God be sustained?

§ 1. HYLOZOISM.

What is hylozoism?

What is the materialistic form of the doctrine?

What is its other and higher form?

What principles of this theory were held by many Stoics?

§ 2. MATERIALISM.

1. DEFINED.—What is materialism?

What is this doctrine, as held by some theists?

Who were the leading materialists of the French school?

What were their doctrines as to the origin of our ideas? as to the nature of the world and God? as to immortality and virtue?

Who was *Comte*?

What is the fundamental principle of his Positive Philosophy?

What is causation, according to his doctrine?

What the laws of nature?

How are these laws determined?

According to this theory, through what three stages does the mind pass, and has mankind passed, in its investigations?

How is this system applied to the sciences? and to social life?

What did Comte substitute for God, as the object of worship?

How does he provide for a universal religion?

2. REFUTED.—(1.) How may the assumptions on which Comte founds his theory be disproved?

(2.) How does this doctrine contradict intuitive truths?

How, as to liberty of conscience and moral judgments?

How does it destroy all virtue?

§ 3. PANTHEISM.

1. DEFINED.—What is the popular definition of pantheism?

Why do pantheists object to that definition?

What are the principles common to all systems of pantheism, as to dualism? substance? nature of the absolute, infinite being? and its relation to the world?

What does pantheism teach us as to the personality of God?

As to the nature of man? and a future state?

As to liberty? and sin?

2. REFUTED.—How is pantheism to be refuted?

3. HISTORY OF THE THEORY.—(1.) What was and is the pantheism of the East?

(2.) What, of the *Greeks*?

(3.) What, of the *Middle Ages*?

(4.) What, of *modern times*?

II. THE NATURE OF GOD.

I. THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

[I.] CAN GOD BE KNOWN?

What are the different answers given to the question, Can God be known?

§ 1. FIRST EXTREME.

1. STATED.—What is the doctrine of modern transcendentalists on this subject?

How, according to Schelling, is this knowledge attained?

How, according to Hegel?

How, according to Cousin?

2. REFUTED.—(1.) What is Sir William Hamilton's first argument to prove this claim unfounded?

- (2.) How is it refuted by the assumption which it involves of the nature of man?
- (3.) How, by the definition given of the absolute and the infinite?

§ 2. SECOND EXTREME.

1. STATED.—What is the inference which Hamilton and Mansel draw from these premises?
How do they reconcile this assumed ignorance of God with theism?
2. REFUTED.—(1.) How does Hamilton's theory involve the denial of the veracity of consciousness?
- (2.) How does it place our moral and rational natures in conflict?
- (3.) How does it destroy the possibility of all knowledge?
- (4.) How does it destroy the possibility of faith?
- (5.) How may it be shown to be illogical?
- What do Hamilton and Mansel mean by regulative knowledge?
How may their view on that subject be refuted?
In what different senses do they use the word "knowledge?"
What is the true sense of the word?

§ 3. THE TRUE ANSWER.

- In what sense is God *inconceivable*?
- In what sense, *incomprehensible*?
- In what sense, *knowable*?
- What is meant by partial knowledge?

[II.] HOW MAY GOD BE KNOWN?

1. METHOD.—How do we attain our knowledge of God?
2. PROOF.—(1.) From the fact that we were created in the image of God, what is the argument to prove that we attain to the knowledge of God by referring to him the perfections of our own nature?
- (2.) What is the argument from the fact that all men do and must conceive of God?
- (3.) What is the argument from our moral nature?
- (4.) What, from our religious nature?
- (5.) What, from the fact that atheism is the only alternative?
- (6.) What, from the works of nature?
- (7.) What, from the Word of God?
- (8.) What, from the manifestation of God in Christ?

II. THE DEFINITION OF GOD.

Can God be defined?

What are the different kinds of definition? and which is applicable to our idea of God?

What are the more common theological definitions of God?

III. THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

[I.] WHAT IS AN ATTRIBUTE?

When we speak of an *ens* or being, in what sense is the word used?

How do we get the idea of substance?

What are the attributes of an essence?

How do attributes differ from predicates, properties, and accidents?

[II.] HOW DO THE ATTRIBUTES DIFFER?

§ 1. EXTREME OPINIONS.

What are the two extremes to be avoided, in stating the relation of God's attributes to his essence?

1. REALISM.—What was the Realistic doctrine on this point?

2. NOMINALISM.—What the Nominalistic?

To what extreme do the older theologians tend?

What are their statements as to the simplicity of God?

What, as to the relation of God's attributes to one another?

What did they mean, when they said that the attributes differ only *ratione*?

§ 2. THE TRUE VIEW.

What is meant, when the attributes are said to differ *virtualiter*?

What is Schleiermacher's doctrine on this subject?

What is the true principle which should regulate our thoughts and language here?

[III.] CLASSIFICATION OF THE ATTRIBUTES.

1. OBJECT.—What is the object of the classification of the divine attributes?

2. METHODS.—(1.) What is the method of classification derived from our idea of an infinite and absolute being?
- (2.) What principle of classification is derived from the different methods by which we form our idea of God? (*Causation, Negation, and Eminence.*)
- What are the two classes into which this principle divides the divine attributes? and what terms are used to designate those classes?
- (3.) What method is derived from the constitution of our own nature?
- (4.) What, from the nature of the attributes themselves, as natural and moral?
- (5.) What is the method suggested in the definition of God given in the Westminster Shorter Catechism?

I. SPIRITUALITY OF GOD.

1. THE DECLARATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.—What is the principle which should regulate our interpretation of Scripture language?
- What is the meaning and usage of the words *רוח* and *πνευμα*?
- In what sense are they used, when applied to the soul and to God?
2. THE TEACHINGS OF CONSCIOUSNESS.—How does consciousness teach that our own soul or spirit is a *substance*?
- How, that it is an *individual* substance?
- What does it teach as to the *powers* of the soul?
- What, as to its *unity* and *simplicity*?
- What, as to its *moral nature*?
- What, as to its *personality*?
3. THE CONCLUSION.—In what sense, then, is God a Spirit?
- When it is said, “God is a Spirit,” what is affirmed? and what denied?

II. INFINITUDE OF GOD.

1. DEFINED.—What is meant by the infinite?
- How does it differ from the indefinite?
- What is intended, when we say that God is an infinite being?
- How far is our notion of the infinite negative? and how far positive?
- In what sense do philosophers say that an infinite being includes all being?

In what sense have theologians asserted the same thing?

How may it be shown that infinite being does not include all being?

What is included in the infinitude of God's being?

What is meant by the immensity and omnipresence of God? and how do they differ?

In what relation do bodies, created spirits, and God, respectively stand to space?

What are the wrong views held of God's omnipresence?

2. PROVED.—(1.) How do the Scriptures teach God's omnipresence?

(2.) How does the evidence of mind everywhere in nature prove it?

(3.) How is this attribute involved in our religious apprehension of God?

III. ETERNITY OF GOD.

What is eternity?

What is time?

In what relation does time stand to eternity?

(1.) In what respect are all things equally present with God?

If all things are equally present with God, how is it that they do not co-exist?

(2.) What do the modern philosophers teach as to the nature of eternity and its relation to time?

(3.) How do the Scriptures present this subject?

IV. IMMUTABILITY OF GOD.

1. DEFINED.—What is meant by the immutability of God?

In what sense is God immutable in his being and perfections?

In what sense, in his plans and purposes?

2. PROVED.—(1.) What are the Scripture proofs of this doctrine?

(2.) How does it follow from the perfection of God?

3. PHILOSOPHIC OBJECTION.—What is the philosophic and scholastic mode of presenting this doctrine?

What are the objections to that mode of representation?

What is the argument against the personality of God founded on these absolute attributes (eternity and immutability)?

V. OMNISCIENCE OF GOD.

[I.] KNOWLEDGE.

§ 1. MODE OF THE DIVINE KNOWLEDGE.

What is knowledge?

Can God know?

By whom is this expressly denied? and by whom, virtually?

What is Schleiermacher's doctrine as to God's knowing?

What do those mean, who say that the world is included in the consciousness of God?

What do the Scriptures teach on this subject?

What are the limitations and imperfections which belong to man's mode of knowledge?

How are these limitations removed from the mode in which God knows?

§ 2. OBJECTS OF THE DIVINE KNOWLEDGE.

What are the objects of God's knowledge?

(1.) What is the distinction between *scientia necessaria* and *scientia libera*?

(2.) What, between the knowledge of vision and the knowledge of simple intelligence?

(3.) What is *scientia media*?

By whom, and for what purpose, was this distinction introduced into theology?

What arguments are used in support of it?

What are the arguments against it?

How prove that the free acts of men are foreknown?

On what ground do Socinians and others deny the knowledge of free acts?

How may foreknowledge be reconciled with freedom in the agent?

[II.] WISDOM.

1. DEFINED.—What is meant by wisdom?

2. PROVED.—How is the wisdom of God revealed?

VI. WILL OF GOD.

1. DEFINED.—What are different senses of the word "will?"

In what sense is it used by theologians, when they say that the object of the will is good?

In what sense does God will himself?

What is the proper sense of the word?

In what senses is the will of God free?

What is the difference between spontaneity and liberty?

2. DISTINCTIONS.

1st. *Admissible*.—(1.) What is the distinction between the decretive and preceptive will of God?

(2.) What, between the will *eudokias* and *euarestias*, *signi* and *bene-placiti*, secret and revealed?

2d. *Inadmissible*.—In what sense do Augustinians admit a distinction between (1.) the antecedent and consequent? (2.) the absolute and conditional? (3.) the effective and inefficient will of God?

In what sense do Lutherans and Arminians understand these distinctions?

What are the objections to their view?

What are the different senses of the word “*θελω*” in Scripture?

3. THE RULE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.—What are the different views as to the ground of moral obligation?

In what sense is the will of God that ground?

VII. OMNIPOTENCE OF GOD.

1. DEFINED.—Whence do we get the idea of power?

What are limits of direct power in man?

How do we get the idea of omnipotence?

What is the ordinary definition of God's omnipotence?

Within what limitations do we say that God can do whatever he wills?

2. DISTINCTIONS.—What is the ordinary distinction between *potentia absoluta* and *potentia ordinata*?

On what grounds do the moderns reject that distinction?

What did the Schoolmen and Des Cartes mean by absolute power?

What are the objections to that doctrine?

What is the doctrine which denies the distinction between power and efficiency? between the actual and the possible?

According to this view, what is God's omnipotence?

What is Schleiermacher's idea of omnipotence?

What are the objections to it?

VIII. HOLINESS OF GOD.

What is holiness in God?

What is a frequent sense of קֳדֹשׁ , as applied to God?

On what grounds do transcendentalists deny moral attributes to God?

How may the insufficiency of these grounds be shown?

How does Schleiermacher define holiness in God?

What is the objection to that definition?

IX. JUSTICE OF GOD.

1. DEFINITION.—What is the usage of the Scriptures as to the words $\delta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\nu\gamma\eta$, $\delta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$?

What is the general sense in which God is said to be just, or righteous?

What is meant by rectoral justice?

What, by God's justice as a judge?

What, by vindicatory justice?

2. RELATION BETWEEN DIVINE JUSTICE AND THE PUNISHMENT OF SIN.—What is the relation of justice to the punishment of sin?

1st. *Erroneous Views*.—What are the different answers given to the question, Why is sin punished?

(1.) How prove that the reformation of the offender is not the primary nor the only legitimate ground of punishment?

(2.) How prove that the prevention of crime is not the primary nor the only ground of punishment?

What is the view of the nature of justice on which that doctrine is founded?

(3.) How prove that justice is not a mere form of benevolence?

2d. *The True View*.—How prove that the inherent ill-desert of sin is the primary ground of its punishment? and that justice is a distinct form of moral excellence?

(1.) What is the argument from consciousness on this subject?

(2.) What, from the common sentiments of mankind?

(3.) What, from the distinction in all languages between words signifying justice, and others signifying benevolence?

(4.) What, from the sacrifices and expiatory rites of all nations?

(5.) What, from the exercises of men under conviction of sin?

(6.) What, from the express declarations of Scripture?

- (7.) What, from the doctrine of the nature and necessity of a satisfaction for sin?
- (8.) What, from the doctrine of justification?
- (9.) What, from the holiness of God?

X. GOODNESS OF GOD.

1. DEFINED.—What attributes are included under the general idea of goodness?
- What is benevolence?
- What is love?
- What is mercy?
- What is grace?
- In what sense can feelings be ascribed to God?
2. PROVED.—What is the evidence of God's goodness, or that he is love?
3. OBJECTION REFUTED.—THE EXISTENCE OF EVIL.—What is evil?
- (1.) What is the theory which denies that God can prevent moral evil in a moral system?
- What are the objections to it?
- (2.) What is the theory which represents sin as the necessary means of the greatest good?
- What are the objections to it?
- (3.) What is the scholastic mode of accounting for the existence of sin under the government of God?

XI. TRUTH OF GOD.

- What is truth?
- What is meant by the veracity of God?
- What, by his fidelity?
- How show that the truth of God is the foundation of all knowledge?

XII. SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD.

- What is meant by the sovereignty of God?
- On what is his sovereignty founded?
- What is the proof of God's sovereignty?

II. GOD, CONSIDERED AS TRIUNE.

I. THE TRINITY.

How far is the doctrine of the trinity peculiar to the Scriptures?

What is the Hindoo trinity?

What was the trinity of Plato?

I. THE BIBLICAL STATEMENT.

What are the essential elements of the Scripture doctrine?

1. How do the Scriptures teach there is **BUT ONE** divine being?
2. How do they teach that the Father, Son, and Spirit, are **ALIKE DIVINE**?
3. How is it to be proved that these terms do not express a modal, but a **PERSONAL** Trinity?
4. In what relation does the Son stand to the Father? and the Spirit to the Father and the Son?
5. What are the **WORKS PECULIAR** to each?

II. THE ECCLESIASTICAL STATEMENT.

[I.] HISTORY OF ERROR.

How is the doctrine of the trinity connected with the personal experience of believers?

What led to the more precise and scientific statement of the doctrine?

1. **GNOSTICISM**.—What were the erroneous explanations of the trinity derived from Gnosticism?
2. **PLATONISM**.—What was the Platonic doctrine of the *λογος ἐνδιαθετος* and the *λογος προφορικός*?

How was this applied to the explanation of this doctrine?

3. **ORIGEN**.—What was Origen's doctrine of the trinity?
4. **ARIANISM**.—How did his doctrine give rise to Arianism?

[II.] THE COUNCIL OF NICE.

What was the state of the church, when the Council of Nice was convened?

For what purpose was that council called?

What three parties were represented in it?

(1.) What was the *Arian* doctrine, concerning the Son and the Spirit?

(2.) What was the *Semi-Arian* doctrine?

(3.) What was the doctrine of the *Homoousians*?

What is the Nicene Creed? and how was it modified at the Council of Constantinople?

[III.] THE CHURCH DOCTRINE.

§ 1. THREE PERSONS.

What is the first point decided in the Nicene Creed?

What is meant by "person?"

What is the meaning and use of the word *προσωπον*?

What, of *ὑποστάσις*?

What, of *substantia* and *subsistentia*?

What, of *persona*?

§ 2. ONE ESSENCE.

What are the Greek words for "essence"?

How was the community of essence in the trinity expressed?

What are the two senses of the word *ὁμοουσιος*?

In which of these senses was it used by the church?

On what grounds was the use of that word objected to?

§ 3. RELATION OF THE PERSONS.

1. SUBORDINATION.—In what sense was the Son said to be "of the Father?"

In what sense was the Father represented as being the fountain, principle and cause of the other persons?

In what sense was he said to be greater than the Son?

How far did the reformers dissent from this representation?

In what sense did they teach that the Son is *ἀπόθεος*?

2. HYPOSTATIC CHARACTER.—What is meant by the eternal generation of the Son?

What is meant by the procession of the Spirit?

How are the persons of the trinity distinguished by personal properties?

3. INTEREXISTENCE.—What is meant by *περιχώρησις*, as expressing the relation of the persons of the trinity to each other?

4. CONCURRENCE OF ACTION.—How do the persons of the trinity concur in works *ad extra*?
5. ECONOMIC DIVERSITY.—How do they severally bear special relation to particular operations in the work of redemption?

What is what is called the Athanasian Creed?

[IV.] ETERNAL GENERATION.—SONSHIP OF CHRIST.

1. STATED.—What are the different opinions on this subject?
What is the church doctrine?
2. PROVED.—(1.) What argument for the eternal generation of the Son is derived from the *meaning* of the terms, Father, Son, and Spirit?
- (2.) What argument from the fact that these terms are *actually applied* to the persons of the trinity?
- (3.) What *Scripture* proofs of this doctrine? Rom. i. 3, 4. John i. 14, 18; v. 17—25; x. 30, *seqq.* Heb. ch. 1.
- (4.) What argument from the use of the terms *μονογενής* and *ἰδιος*?
What is the church explanation of the relation indicated by the terms Father and Son?
What are the scriptural grounds on which that explanation rests?
What are the two interpretations of which John iii. 16, admits?
- (5.) What is the argument from the use of *synonymous expressions*?
3. OBJECTIONS.—(1.) What is the objection to this doctrine founded on the assumption that if Christ is Son of God, he is not truly God?
- (2.) What is the objection founded on Psalm ii. 7? and Acts xiii. 32, 33?

What, on Luke i. 35?

What, from passages in which the Son is said to be “subject to the Father,” “ignorant,” etc.?

[V.] PROCESSION OF THE SPIRIT.

1. STATED.—What is the church doctrine as to the relation of the Spirit to the other persons of the trinity?
2. PROVED.—What are the scriptural grounds of that doctrine?
How may it be proved that the Spirit bears the same relation to the Son, that he does to the Father?

III. THE PHILOSOPHICAL STATEMENT.

§ 1. ILLUSTRATIVE STATEMENTS.

- (1.) What was the mode of illustrating this subject among the Fathers?
- (2.) What, among the Schoolmen?
- (3.) What is the illustration borrowed from the mode in which self-consciousness developes itself in us?

§ 2. SABELLIAN AND PANTHEISTIC STATEMENTS.

What are Sabellian statements of the doctrine of the Trinity?
 What, Pantheistic?

III. THE SECOND AND THIRD PERSONS OF THE GODHEAD, CONSIDERED SEPARATELY.

I. CHRIST.

FIRST. THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

I. PROOF FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

GENESIS.—What is the argument for the divinity of Christ from the promise made to Adam?

What, from the promise made to Abraham?

What, from the intimations of a plurality of persons in the trinity made in the Old Testament, and from what is there taught of the manifested Jehovah?

What proof, from what is said of the angel who appeared to Hagar? xvi. 7.

What, from the appearance to Abraham, before the destruction of Sodom? xviii. 19. xix. 24. xxi. 17.

What, from the account of the offering of Isaac? xxii. 1, 16.

What, from the appearance of the angel to Jacob? in Haran? xxxi. 11, 13.

What, from the appearance of the angel who wrestled with Jacob? xxxii. 24, 30. *Cf.* Hos. xii. 3, 4.

EXODUS.—What proof from the appearance to Moses in the burning bush? iii. 2, 6.

What, from the guiding of the Israelites? xiv. 19. xxiii. 20, 21. xxxii. 34. xxxiii. 14. *Cf.* Isa. lxiii. 9.

JOSHUA.—What proof from the appearance to Joshua? v. 13. vi. 2.

JUDGES.—What proof from the appearance to Manoah? xiii. 3, 23.

What, from the appearance to Gideon? vi. 11, 14, 15.

[What are the three principles on which these passages have been explained? and what are the reasons for these principles?]

PSALMS.—What proofs from Psalms ii? xxii? xlv? lxxii? cx?

ISAIAH.—What from Isaiah iv. 2? vi? vii. viii. ix? xi? xl. and lxvi?

MICAH.—What, from Micah v. 1—5?

JEREMIAH.—What, from Jeremiah xxiii? xxxiii. 14—18?

JOEL.—What, from Joel ii. 23?

ZECHARIAH.—What, from Zechariah i.—vi? ix.—xii?

DANIEL.—What, from Daniel ii. 44? vii. 9—14? ix. 24—27?

MALACHI.—What, from Malachi iii. 1—4?

II. PROOF FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. DIVINE TITLES.—What is the argument for Christ's divinity from the peculiar manner in which in the New Testament he is called "Lord"? Rev. iv. 4. 1 Cor. i. 2. *Cf.* 1 Sam. ii. 2. Psalms xxxiii. 12. Exod. xv. 11.

What, from the kind of lordship attributed to him? Acts x. 36. Rom. xiv. 9. 1 Cor. ii. 8. 1 Cor. xv. 47. Phil. ii. 11. 1 Tim. vi. 15.

What, from the application to Christ of passages from the Old Testament in which "Lord" means Jehovah? Mal. iii. 1, and Luke i. 76. Joel ii. 32, and Rom. x. 13. Isa. xxviii. 16, and Rom. x. 11. Psalm xlv. 6, 7, and Heb. i. 8.

2. DIVINE WORSHIP.—What is the argument from the relation in which believers are said to stand to Christ?

In what passages is he represented as the object of supreme love?

In what passages are believers said to regard him as their moral ruler?

In what passages is he represented as the ground of confidence and the portion of the soul?

3. DIVINE ATTRIBUTES.—How does Christ present himself to us as God by the authority which he claims as teacher? John xiv. 6; x. 30. Matt xxiv. 35; v. 18, 22, 26, 28, 32, 39, 44. Gal. i. 12.
- How does Christ present himself as God by the control which he claims over all creatures? Matt. xiii. 41. And over the course of events? and over the temporal and eternal destiny of individuals? Matt. xvi. 27; xiii. 30; xxv. 34, 41; x. 37.
- How do the promises of Christ prove him to be God? *Forgiveness.* Luke vii. 48. *Gift of Holy Spirit.* Acts 2. John xvi. 7. Eph. iv. 7. *Answer to Prayer.* John xvi. 23. Matt. xxviii. 20; xviii. 20. *Eternal Life.* John vi. 54. 2 Tim. iv. 8. Matt. xi. 28. John xiv. 2. Gal. vi. 18.
4. DIVINE ACTS.—How does the control over the external world exercised by Christ prove him to be God? Acts iii. 12. John xiv. 12; x. 18.

JOHN.—Why is the second person of the trinity called the Logos?

Why does John only of the apostles use that term?

What is taught concerning the Logos in John i. 1—14?

What, in the discourse with Nicodemus?

What, in chaps. v. 16? vi? vii? x? xi? xiv.—xvi? xvii?

How does the language of Thomas (xx. 28,) prove Christ's divinity?

EPISTLES OF JOHN.—What evidence of the deity of Christ is given in John's Epistles? 1 John i. 1, 23? iv. 2, 3, 15? v. 12.

REVELATION.—What proof of Christ's divinity from the book of Revelation? i. 8, 11, 13, 18? ii. 1—iii. 22? v. 6—14? xvii. 14.

ROMANS.—What proof from the epistle to the Romans? ix. 5.

1 CORINTHIANS.—i. 4? ix. 30, 31? viii. 6? x. 5? xv. 22? xlvi. 47? xvi. 22? xvi. 23?

2 CORINTHIANS —iii. 15—17? iv. 4—6? v. 6? v. 10? v. 14?

GALATIANS.—i. 1? ii. 15, 16? ii. 20? ii. 6—8? iii. 26, 28, 29? v. 25, vi. 4? vi. 18.

EPHESIANS.—i. 7? i. 21—23? i. 23, iv. 10? ii. 1? iii. 9? iv. 7? i. 22, iv. 16, v. 23? vi. 24?

PHILIPPIANS.—i. 21, 22? ii. 6—11?

COLOSSIANS.—i. 15—18? What is meant by *πληρωμα της θειοτητος* in ii. 9? iii. 2?

1 THESSALONIANS.—ii. 19? iii. 11, 12? iv. 18?

2 THESSALONIANS.—i. 1? i. 7—9?

1 TIMOTHY.—i. 1? i. 12? ii. 3? iii. 16?

TITUS.—i. 3? ii. 13?

HEBREWS.—i. 2? i. 6? i. 8? i. 10? ii. 8? ii. 9, 14? iii. 3, 6? iv. 14? vii. 25? vii. 27? viii. 1—4? x. 26? xiii. 8?

JAMES.—ii. 1?

1 PETER.—i. 8, 9, 11? ii. 4—8? iii. 18, 22?

2 PETER.—i. 1? i. 8? i. 11? i. 16? ii. 20? iii. 18?

II. THE HOLY SPIRIT.

I. THE DOCTRINE.

§ 1. USAGE OF TERMS.

What are the signification and usage of the words *קדש* and *πνευμα*?

Why is the third person of the trinity called Spirit?

Why called the Spirit of God?

Why called the Spirit of truth, of holiness, etc.?

How is the meaning of the phrase "Spirit of God" in the Old Testament to be determined?

§ 2. THE SPIRIT'S PERSONALITY.

1. STATED.—What is included in personality?

2. PROVED.—(1.) What is the argument for the personality of the Holy Spirit from the use of the personal pronoun?

In what passages are the pronouns so used as to prove the Holy Spirit to be a person? Acts xiii. 2. John xv. 26; xvi. 13, 14.

(2.) What argument from the formula of baptism? (Matt. xxviii. 19.) and the apostolic benediction? (2 Cor. xiii. 14.)

(3.) What argument from the relation in which believers stand to the Spirit?

(4.) What argument from the relation in which he stands to us?

(5.) What argument from the ascription to him of intelligence and will?

- (6.) What argument from the manifestations of the Spirit?
- (7.) What argument from the acts attributed to him?
- (8.) What argument from the faith of the church?

§ 3. THE SPIRIT'S DIVINITY.

- (1.) How may it be proved that divine *titles* are given to the Spirit?
- (2.) Divine *attributes*?
- (3.) Divine *works*?
- (4.) Divine *worship*?

§ 4. THE SPIRIT'S OFFICES.

- (1.) What is the office of the Spirit in the *external* world?
In what sense is he said to be "life-giving"?
- (2.) What is his office in the *intellectual* world?
- (3.) What is his office in the *spiritual* world? as to the revelation of truth? and as to the work of redemption?

II. HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE.

- 1. ANTE-NICENE.—What was the faith of the church on this subject, during the ante-Nicene period?
Why did some of the fathers identify the Word and the Spirit?
Who among them regarded the Spirit as a creature?
- 2. NICENE.—What were the doctrines of the Nicene Council?
of the Council at Constantinople? and of the Athanasian Creed?
- 3. POST NICENE.—What has been the history of the doctrine since that period, in the church?
- 4. SPECULATIVE.—What are the modern speculative doctrines on that subject?

II.

PART III. DEUS VOLENS.

I. THE DECREES OF GOD.

I. THE DOCTRINES STATED AND PROVED.

What are the decrees of God?

§ 1. THE DECREES OF GOD ARE FOR HIS OWN GLORY.

What is the end of God's decrees?

How may this be proved?

How is the principle stated in these words characteristic of Augustinianism?

§ 2. THE DECREES OF GOD ARE ONE PURPOSE.

In what sense are the decrees of God one purpose?

Why must they be so regarded?

How, then, are they spoken of in Scripture as many?

§ 3. THE DECREES OF GOD ARE ETERNAL.

In what sense are they eternal?

How may this be proved?

What objections are made to the eternity of the decrees?

§ 4. THE DECREES OF GOD ARE IMMUTABLE.

How prove that the decrees of God are immutable?

§ 5. THE DECREES OF GOD ARE FREE.

What are the three senses in which they are said to be free?

How prove that they are rational and self-determined?

How prove that they are sovereign and unconditional?

§ 6. THE DECREES OF GOD ARE CERTAINLY EFFICACIOUS.

In what sense are the decrees of God efficacious?

What is the distinction between efficient and permissive decrees?

What are the proofs that the decrees of God are efficacious?

§ 7. THE DECREES OF GOD ARE UNIVERSAL.

How are events divided or classified?

How prove that the decrees refer to events of all classes?

How prove this especially with reference to free acts?

How prove it with reference to sinful acts?

II. OBJECTIONS REFUTED.

1. How can foreordination be reconciled with LIBERTY?
2. How can the foreordination of sin be reconciled with the HOLINESS OF GOD?
3. How can foreordination be reconciled with the USE OF MEANS?
4. How does foreordination differ from FATALISM?

II. ELECTION.*

I. THE DOCTRINE STATED AND PROVED.

[I.] ERRONEOUS VIEWS.

1. What is the doctrine which makes COMMUNITIES the objects of the election spoken of in Scripture?
2. What is the doctrine which makes CLASSES the objects of election?
3. What is the doctrine which makes INDIVIDUAL BELIEVERS the objects of election?

[II.] THE ORTHODOX STATEMENT.

What is the doctrine of the reformed churches, on this subject?

What are the points included in that doctrine?

§ 1. ELECTION IS TO ETERNAL LIFE.

How may it be proved that election is to eternal life?

§ 2. INDIVIDUALS ARE THE OBJECTS OF ELECTION.

How may it be proved that individuals are the objects of election?

* Election, Reprobation, and the Order of the Decrees, in Dr. Hodge's new analysis of the subject of theology, are included as the first topic under Soterology, namely, *The Purpose of Grace*.

§ 3. ELECTION IS SOVEREIGN.

How is the sovereignty of election proved (1) from Rom. ix. 11, and xi. 5—8?

- (2.) From the fact that men are said to be chosen to holiness?
- (3.) From the fact that faith is the gift of God?
- (4.) From the nature of the objections which Paul was called upon to answer?
- (5.) From the gratuitous character of salvation?
- (6.) From the Scripture doctrine of man's natural state?
- (7.) From the doctrine of efficacious grace?
- (8.) From Christian experience?
- (9.) From the providential and gracious dispensations of God in his actual dealings with men?

II. OBJECTIONS REFUTED.

1. How can this doctrine be reconciled with the JUSTICE OF GOD?
2. How, with the RESPONSIBILITY OF MAN?
3. How, with those declarations of SCRIPTURE, which assert that God wills all men to be saved?
4. How is it consistent with the USE OF MEANS?

III. HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE.

What has been the history of the controversy upon this point?

III. REPROBATION.

I. THE DOCTRINE STATED AND PROVED.

1. STATED.—What is meant by reprobation?
How far is reprobation sovereign, and how far judicial?
2. PROVED.—(1.) How does election necessarily involve reprobation?
- (2.) How is this doctrine proved from the direct assertions of Scripture?
- (3.) How, from the illustration used by the apostle, in Rom. ix. 10?

- (4.) How, from Matt. xi. 28?
- (5.) How, from the general doctrine of foreordination?
- (6.) How, from the nature of the objections which Paul answers?

II. OBJECTIONS REFUTED.

1. How can reprobation be reconciled with JUSTICE?
 2. How, with the GENERAL CALL of the gospel?
 3. How, with the HOLINESS OF GOD?
 4. How, with the declarations of SCRIPTURE previously referred to?
-

IV. ORDER OF THE DECREES.

What is the nature of the question concerning the order of the decrees?

What importance belongs to this question?

What are the three methods of determining their order?

§ 1. ARMINIANISM.

What is the Arminian theory of the order of the decrees?

§ 2. SUPRALAPSARIANISM.

What is Supralapsarianism?

What are the objections to it?

§ 3. SUBLAPSARIANISM.

What is the Sublapsarian scheme?

How does that view differ from the French or New School view?

How may the common view of the Reformed church be proved?

PART III. DEUS AGENS.

I. GOD'S ORDINARY WORKS.

I. CREATION.

I. THE DOCTRINE OF CREATION STATED.

1. AFFIRMATIVELY.—What is the Scripture doctrine on this subject?
2. NEGATIVELY.—(1.) What is the doctrine of *emanation*, and how does it differ from creation?
- (2.) What was the old *Greek* theory as to the origin of the world?
- (3.) What is the *dualistic* system?
- (4.) What are the different forms of the doctrine of an *eternal* creation?
- (5.) What is the *pantheistic* doctrine as to the origin of the world?

II. PROOF OF THE DOCTRINE.

What is the scriptural use of the words אֶרֶץ and κτισθεν?

- (1.) What is the negative argument in favour of a creation *ex nihilo*?
 - (2.) What is the argument from the manner in which the work of creation is described?
 - (3.) What is the argument from the dependence of all things on God?
 - (4.) What is the argument from those passages of Scripture in which τα πάντα are said to be ἐκ Θεου, etc.?
 - (5.) What is the argument from Heb. xi. 3? and Rom. iv. 17?
 - (6.) What is the argument from the fact that a beginning is ascribed to the world?
 - (7.) What is the argument from the perfections of God?
- Whence is the vital importance of this doctrine?

III. OBJECTIONS REFUTED.

1. PHILOSOPHICAL.—How is the objection to be answered, founded on the axiom, that “nothing can come out of nothing”?

2. THEOLOGICAL.—How, the objection that this doctrine is inconsistent with the nature of God?

How, the objection that it implies change in God?

IV. THE DESIGN OF CREATION.

What is the nature of the question as to the design of the creation?

What different answers are given to that question?

1. HAPPINESS OF CREATURES.—What are the objections to the theory that the happiness of creatures is the end of creation?
2. GLORY OF GOD.—How is the doctrine that the glory of God is the end of creation, to be proved and vindicated?

V. MOSAIC ACCOUNT OF THE CREATION.

1. METHODS OF INTERPRETATION.—What are the different modes of interpreting the Mosaic account of the creation—historical, allegorical, and mythical?
2. PROOF OF HISTORICAL CHARACTER.—What is the proof that it is historical?
3. OBJECTIONS TO HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION.—(1.) *Critical*.—What are the critical objections to this interpretation? and how are they answered?
- (2.) *Astronomical*.—What are the astronomical objections? and how answered?
- (3.) *Geological*.—What are the geological objections? and how answered?

II. PROVIDENCE.

What are God's works of providence?

What is included in the doctrine of providence?

I. PRESERVATION.

[I.] THE FACT.

1. STATED.—What is preservation?
2. PROVED.—How is the doctrine of preservation proved from Scripture?

[II.] NATURE OF THE DIVINE EFFICIENCY IN
PRESERVATION.

What are the different theories as to the nature of preservation?

§ 1. FIRST EXTREME.

1. STATED.—What is the remonstrant and deistic view of the nature of preservation?
2. REFUTED.—(1.) What is the objection to this view from the language of Scripture?
- (2.) What, from the absolute dependence of creatures?
- (3.) What, from our religious nature?

§ 2. SECOND EXTREME.

1. STATED.—What is the opposite extreme view of the nature of preservation?
- What are the three forms of this view that preservation is a continued creation?
- What are the points of difference between creation and preservation?
2. REFUTED.—What are the objections to the *first* form?
- What, to the *second*?
- What, to the *third*?
- (1.) How does the doctrine of continued creation destroy identity?
 - (2.) How does it lead to idealism?
 - (3.) How does it involve the denial of second causes?
 - (4.) How does it destroy freedom and responsibility?
 - (5.) How does it lead to pantheism?

§ 3. THE TRUE VIEW.

What is the true doctrine between these extremes?

II. GOVERNMENT.

[I.] THE FACT.

1. STATED.—What is included in the idea of providential government?
- In what sense is this providential government universal?
- In what sense powerful?
- In what sense wise?
- In what sense holy?

2. **PROVED.**—(1.) How does the doctrine of providential government flow from the idea of God?
- (2.) How, from the external evidence of a mind present and active everywhere?
- (3.) How, from the religious instincts and necessities of our own nature?

Why may not these religious feelings be accounted for from our education?

- (4.) What is the argument for God's providential government from the predictions and promises of Scripture?
- (5.) What from history, personal and general?

[II.] UNIVERSALITY OF THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT.

1. **NATURE.**—(1.) What passages of Scripture teach that the providence of God extends over all the ordinary operations of nature?
- (2.) What passages teach that it extends over the extraordinary operations of nature?
- (3.) What passages teach that it extends over fortuitous events?
2. **THE BRUTE CREATION.**—What passages teach that it extends over irrational animals?
3. **NATIONS.**—What passages teach that it extends over the destiny of nations?
4. **INDIVIDUALS.**—What passages teach that it extends over the destiny of individuals?
5. **FREE ACTS, EVEN SINFUL ACTS.**—What passages teach that it extends over men's free acts?
- Over their good acts?
- Over their sinful acts?

[III.] NATURE OF GOD'S PROVIDENTIAL GOVERNMENT.

§ 1. THE MECHANICAL THEORY.

1. **STATED.**—What is the rationalistic and deistic theory of the divine government?
2. **REFUTED.**—What are the objections to that theory?

§ 2. THEORY OF OCCASIONAL CAUSES.

- (1.) What is the theory founded on the assumption that God is the only cause?

Who among the schoolmen adopted that principle ?

Who among the reformers ?

How may it be proved that neither Calvin nor the reformed church as a body held that doctrine ?

What classes of modern theologians adopt it ?

What are the objections to the principle ?

(2.) What is the theory founded on the assumption that matter cannot act ?

What is meant by saying that the laws of nature are the uniform modes of divine operation ?

What are the objections to that doctrine ?

§ 3. THE HARMONIC THEORY.

What is the theory founded on the assumption that neither mind can act on matter, nor matter on mind ?

What was Leibnitz's doctrine of preëstablished harmony ?

§ 4. THE DOCTRINE OF CONCURSUS.

1. STATED.—What is the doctrine of *concurus* ?

On what principle is that doctrine founded ?

(1.) What is meant by general *concurus* ?

(2.) What by simultaneous *concurus* ?

(3.) What by previous and predetermining *concurus* ?

How extensively has this doctrine been held in the church ?

According to this theory, how does the first cause stand related to second causes ?

(1.) Is the effect referred to the first or the second cause ?

(2.) Does *concurus* destroy the efficiency of second causes ?

(3.) Does the agency of God change the nature of the second cause ?

(4.) Is this *concurus* the same, in relation to all acts ?

(5.) How is it reconciled by its advocates with the liberty of free agents ?

(6.) How, with the sinful acts of men ?

What four points of difference between this theory and that which denies second causes ?

2. REFUTED.—What are the objections to the doctrine of *concurus* as thus explained ?

§ 5. THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE.

1. RELATION OF GOD TO THE MATERIAL WORLD.—(1.) *The Reality of Matter.*—What is the first great principle involved in the Scripture doctrine of providence?

To what two sources must the idea of substance be referred?

To what doctrines does the principle of the real existence of the material world stand opposed?

(2.) *The Activity of Matter.*—What is the second great principle involved in this doctrine?

How prove that matter is active, or that material causes exist?

To what does this principle stand opposed?

On what ground do many assume that mind only can be a cause?

How may that assumption be disproved?

(3.) *The Uniformity of Material Activity.*—What is the third principle involved in the doctrine of providence?

What is meant by nature? and what by law?

What are the laws of nature?

(4.) *The Subordination of Material Forces to the Will of God.*—What are the two relations in which the Bible represents God as standing to material causes?

2. RELATION OF GOD TO THE SPIRITUAL WORLD.—(1.) What is the essential characteristic of the human mind?

(2.) How does God stand related to the freedom and activity of man?

(3.) How far does the providential control of God extend?

What are the points of distinction between natural and gracious operations of the human mind?

How many classes of acts are there? and what?

II. GOD'S EXTRAORDINARY WORKS.

MIRACLES.

I. WHAT IS A MIRACLE?

1. SCRIPTURE TERMS.—What are the Scripture terms applied to miracles? and their meaning?

2. DEFINITION.—What are the characteristics of a miracle?
 3. OBJECTIONS TO THIS DEFINITION.—(1.) What is the objection to this definition of a miracle, founded on the fact that nature and the will of God are identical?

How is it answered?

(2.) What, on the fact that miracles may be due to a higher law? How answered?

(3.) What, on the absence of distinction between miracles and a higher providence?

How answered?

II. ARE MIRACLES POSSIBLE?

- (1.) What is the argument against the possibility of miracles founded on the pantheistic theory?
 (2.) What argument against their possibility founded on the denial of second causes?
 (3.) What argument founded on the theory that miracles suppose successive acts in God?
 (4.) What argument founded on the mechanical theory?

III. CAN A MIRACLE BE KNOWN?

- (1.) What is the objection against the possibility of an event being known as truly miraculous, founded on the assumption that such knowledge requires a full acquaintance with all the laws of nature?

How far is this assumption correct?

How can we tell whether an effect is due to the agency of God or of evil spirits?

How may it be shown that the moral criterion does not destroy the value of miracles?

- (2.) What is Hume's argument against miracles?

What is the answer to it?

IV. VALUE OF MIRACLES AS EVIDENCE.

What are the two extremes as to the value of miracles as proofs of a divine revelation?

What do the Scriptures teach as to their value?

THE LAW OF GOD.

I. IN GENERAL.

What is the proper place for the consideration of the law, in a system of theology?

1. THE LAW DEFINED.—What is the meaning and usage of the words *התורה* and *νομος*, in Scripture?

What is the true idea of law?

2. HOW REVEALED.—How is the will of God as a law revealed? How prove that the will of God as a law is revealed in the constitution of our nature?

How is the diversity of opinion on moral subjects consistent with the doctrine that the knowledge of God is innate?

3. CLASSIFICATION OF THE LAWS OF GOD.—(1.) What are *positive* laws?

By what criteria are these to be distinguished from other laws?

(2.) What are the laws founded on the *temporary* relations of men?

How may they be distinguished?

(3.) What laws are founded on the *permanent* relations of men?

(4.) What are *immutable* laws? and on what are they founded?

4. HOW FAR DISPENSABLE.—How far are moral laws dispensable?

5. PERFECTION OF THE LAW.—In what two senses is the law of God, as revealed in Scripture, perfect?

How do Romanists and Protestants differ concerning the completeness of the law?

What distinction do Romanists make between matters of law and matters of precept?

What important practical inference flows from the principle that the law of God, as revealed in Scripture, is a complete law?

How far is expediency a legitimate rule of duty?

How prove (1) that no obligation resting on expediency can be either universal or permanent?

How prove (2) that acts deemed wrong on the ground of expediency cannot be the ground of church censure?

II. THE DECALOGUE.

In what sense may the decalogue be regarded as a complete law?

On what principles is the decalogue to be interpreted?

[I.] FIRST COMMANDMENT.

What is the general principle inculcated in the first commandment?

What is the meaning of the word "worship?"

What different kinds of worship are admitted by Romanists?

What is divine worship?

How prove that the worship rendered by Romanists to saints, to angels, and to the Virgin Mary, is divine worship?

[II.] SECOND COMMANDMENT.

What is the general principle involved in the second commandment?

(1.) How does it appear that it does not forbid *pictures and statues*?

(2.) How far does it forbid any *symbolic representation of God*?

(3.) What is the *direct object* of the commandment?

How do Romanists define idolatry?

How do Protestants define it?

How prove from Scripture that the Protestant definition is correct?

On what theory do Romanists justify the homage paid to images?

(4.) What is the *history* of the use of images in the church?

What course did Luther adopt with reference to them?

What course was adopted by the Reformed church?

What is meant by saying that the second commandment forbids the worshipping of God "in any way not appointed in his Word?"

What was the controversy between the Puritans and the authorities of the Church of England as to religious ceremonies?

[III.] THIRD COMMANDMENT.

What is the literal meaning of the third commandment?

What is the general principle involved in it?

§ 1. OATHS.

1. DEFINED.—What is an oath?

2. THEIR LAWFULNESS.—How may the lawfulness of oaths be proved from the nature of an oath, and from the Scriptures?

3. PROPER OCCASION.—When may oaths be taken?

4. MODE.—What are the different modes of swearing?

5. OBLIGATION.—On what principles are oaths to be interpreted?

Under what circumstances does the obligation of an oath cease?

How may it be proved that oaths exacted by deceit or fraud are nevertheless binding?

§ 2. VOWS.

1. DEFINED.—What are vows?

2. THEIR LAWFULNESS.—When are vows lawful?

When are vows unlawful?

3. OBLIGATION.—When does the obligation of a vow cease?

[IV.] FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

§ 1. ITS DESIGN.

What does the fourth commandment require?

What is the design of this requirement?

§ 2. ITS NATURE.

How far is this commandment positive? and how far moral?

§ 3. PERPETUAL OBLIGATION.

How may the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath be proved?

§ 4. METHOD OF OBSERVANCE.

How is the Sabbath to be sanctified?

What is the rule to determine what is, and what is not lawful on the Sabbath?

[V.] FIFTH COMMANDMENT.

What is the principle of duty included in the fifth commandment?
On what ground does it rest?

§ 1. OBLIGATIONS.

- (1.) What obligation does it impose in reference to God?
- (2.) What, to parents?
- (3.) What, to magistrates, or the State?

§ 2. LIMITATIONS.

What is the general principle which limits our obedience to our fellow-men?

Specially to parents?

Specially to magistrates, and to human laws?

What was the old doctrine of Passive Obedience?

Who is to judge when human authority binds the conscience?

On what does human government rest?

What legitimately determines the *form* in which such government should exist?

[VI.] SIXTH COMMANDMENT.

§ 1. ITS REQUIREMENTS.

What does the sixth commandment enjoin?

§ 2. ITS PERMISSIONS.

1. HOMICIDE.—How prove that it does not forbid homicide in self-defence?
2. CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.—How prove that it does not forbid capital punishment?
How prove that capital punishment is not only just, but in certain cases obligatory?
3. DEFENSIVE WAR.—How prove that defensive war is justifiable?

What wars are properly defensive?

§ 3. ITS PROHIBITIONS.

1. SUICIDE.—How prove that the sixth commandment forbids suicide?
2. DUELLING.—How, that it forbids duelling?
In general, what is prohibited in the sixth commandment?

[VII.] SEVENTH COMMANDMENT.

What is the design of the seventh commandment?

§ 1. CELIBACY.

How prove that the Scriptures do not countenance the Romish doctrine of the special virtue of celibacy?

§ 2. MARRIAGE.

- (1.) In what aspects is marriage a *religious* contract?
- (2.) In what aspects is it a *civil* contract?

§ 3. POLYGAMY.

How is monogamy proved to be the Scripture doctrine?

Was polygamy lawful under the Old Testament? and why?

What is the duty of the church and its ministers in reference to polygamy, in the case of conversion of heathen polygamists?

§ 4. DIVORCE.

- (1.) What was the *Jewish* law of divorce?
- (2.) What is the *Christian* law?
- (3.) What is the *Romish* doctrine on this subject?

What is the duty of the church and its ministers in the case of unscriptural civil laws of divorce?

§ 5. INCEST.

What is incest?

- (1.) How prove that the Levitical law is still in force?
- (2.) What two principles of interpretation of this law are advocated?

What reasons are there for supposing that the literal interpretation is too narrow?

[VIII.] EIGHTH COMMANDMENT.

What is the design of the eighth commandment?

What is the foundation of the right of property?

When may the right of private property be disregarded?

[IX.] NINTH COMMANDMENT.

What is the design of the ninth commandment?

What is falsehood?

When is intentional deception lawful?

[X] TENTH COMMANDMENT.

What is the design of the tenth commandment?

III. THE CEREMONIAL LAW.

What are the general divisions of the ceremonial law?

What ends was it designed to effect?

BOOK SECOND:—ANTHROPOLOGY.

PART I. ORIGIN, NATURE, AND PRIMITIVE STATE OF MAN.

I. CREATION OF MAN.

I. THE SCRIPTURE ACCOUNT.

What is the Scripture account of the origin of our race?

What is included in that account?

What is meant by God's "breathing into man the breath of life?"

In what sense did man become a "living soul?"

How prove that man was created *ex nihilo*, and not formed from the substance of God?

II. FALSE THEORIES.

§ 1. STATED.

1. HEATHEN.—What was the ancient heathen doctrine as to the origin of man?

How far do modern transcendentalists teach the same doctrine?

2. DEVELOPMENT.—What is the theory of the author of the "Vestiges of Creation?"

3. DARWIN.—What is Darwin's theory, in his "Origin of Species?"

What specific point of difference between this and the development theory?

§ 2. REFUTED.

What is the proper mode of dealing with all such theories?

What are admitted objections or difficulties connected with them?

II. NATURE OF MAN.

I. DUALISM.

[I.] THE DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE.

According to the Scriptures, what are the constituent elements of our nature?

1. THE SOUL A SUBSTANCE.—What is the idea of substance? and whence is it obtained?
2. DISTINCT FROM THE BODY.—How prove that matter and mind are distinct substances?
How do the Scriptures teach this distinction (1) directly? (2) figuratively? (3) impliedly?
3. RELATION OF SOUL AND BODY.—What is the relation between the body and the soul?
What is the theory of occasional causes? and what fact was it invented to explain?
What is the theory of preëstablished harmony?

[II.] OPPOSING ERRORS.

§ 1. MATERIALISM AND IDEALISM.

What are the materialistic and idealistic theories?

§ 2. PANTHEISM.

What is the pantheistic theory?

§ 3. TRICHOTOMY.

1. STATED.—What is trichotomy?
What was its origin and what has been its history in the church?
2. REFUTED.—(1.) How is that doctrine opposed to the account of the creation of man in Gen. ii. 7?
(2.) What is the argument against it, from the Scripture usage of the words נִשְׁמָה, רִיחַ, ψυχή, πνεύμα?
(3.) What is the argument from consciousness?
(4.) How are 1 Thess. v. 23 and Heb. iv. 12 to be explained?
What is the true interpretation of 1 Cor. xv. 44?

II. REALISM.

§ 1. ITS FIRST FORM.

1. STATED.—What is the realistic and naturalistic view of the nature of man?

In what relation is this generic humanity assumed to stand to the individual man, and the individual to the genus?

How do scientific naturalists describe it?

How is it represented by the school of Schleiermacher?

How do these several representations agree or merge into one?

What attributes are ascribed to this generic humanity?

2. REFUTED.—(1.) In what sense is this realistic doctrine an arbitrary hypothesis?

(2.) How may it be shown that it finds no direct support in Scripture?

(3.) How, that it derives no support from consciousness?

(4.) How does it conflict with the doctrine of the immortality of the soul?

How, with the existence of the soul, between death and the resurrection?

How do the advocates of the doctrine get over that objection?

(5.) How may it be shown to overthrow the doctrine of the trinity?

In what sense are the persons of the trinity *ὁμοουσιοι*? and in what sense are men *ὁμοουσιοι*?

What answer is attempted to the foregoing objection?

(6.) How does it affect the doctrine of the incarnation?

How does it involve the assumption that Christ's human nature was depraved?

(7.) How does it modify other doctrines of the gospel?

§ 2. ITS FORM.

What is that form of realism which admits that universals do not exist out of individuals? or in other words, what is meant by *universalia in re*, as distinguished from *universalia ante rem*?

What are genera and species, according to this view?

What definitions of species are given by Prof. Dana? Dr. Martin? and Agassiz?

How far may these definitions be accepted?

How are they understood by realists?

III. ORIGIN OF THE SOUL.

What are the different theories as to the origin of the soul?

[I.] PREEXISTENCE.

What was the Platonic doctrine of preëxistence?

What was Origen's doctrine?

[II.] THE TRADUCIAN CONTROVERSY.

1. HISTORY.—What is traducianism?

What is creationism?

What is the history of the two theories in the church?

2. ARGUMENTS FOR TRADUCIANISM.—(1.) What are the passages of Scripture urged by traducianists in favor of their doctrine? and what do those passages prove?

(2.) What is their argument from the history of the creation of Eve?

(3.) What, from the doctrine of the origin of sin?

(4.) What from the incarnation and its object?

(5.) What, from the assumption that the work of creation ceased on the seventh day?

(6.) What, from the transmission of mental and moral peculiarities from parent to child?

3. ARGUMENTS FOR CREATIONISM.—(1.) What is the Scripture argument for creationism?

(2.) What, from the nature of the soul?

(3.) What, from the purity of Christ's human nature?

4. OBJECTIONS TO TRADUCIANISM.—Why should the advocates of either theory abstain from dogmatism?

(1.) What is the danger of traducianism, in denying that God now exercises creative power?

What is the Scripture doctrine as to the relation of God to the world?

How show that this is not inconsistent with the nature or design of miracles?

How show that it does not assume that God sanctions by his creative power the acts of free second causes?

(2.) How does the theory of the derivation of the human soul conflict with the realistic theory, which traducianists maintain?

IV. UNITY OF THE RACE.

What are the two points involved in this question?

How do unity of origin and unity of species stand related to each other?

1st. UNITY OF SPECIES.

What do the Scriptures teach as to the unity of mankind?

What are the views of naturalists on this subject?

[L.] THE ZOOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

§ 1. WHAT ARE SPECIES?

1. DR. HODGE'S DEFINITION.—(1.) What is meant by the originality of species?

How prove that any species is an original type?

(2.) What is meant by the universality of species?

(3.) What is meant by the permanence of species?

How is the immutability of species determined?

2. CUVIER.—What is Cuvier's definition of species? and what is the objection to it?

3. PRITCHARD AND CARPENTER.—What definition is given by Pritchard and Carpenter? and what objection to it?

4. MORTON.—What is Dr. Morton's definition? and what objection to it?

5. AGASSIZ AND DANA.—What is the definition given by Agassiz in his Zoölogy?

What is Prof. Dana's definition?

Why are these definitions to be preferred?

§ 2. WHAT ARE THE CRITERIA OF SPECIES?

1. CORPOREAL.—How far does the *σωμα* determine the species?

2. PHYSICAL.—How far the *φυσικς*?

3. PSYCHOLOGICAL.—How far the *ψυχη*?

4. PROCREATIVE.—How far is permanence a proof of the identity of species?

What is the proof that hybrids cannot propagate?

§ 3. APPLICATION OF THESE TESTS TO THE HUMAN RACE.

1. CORPOREAL.—How does the somatic structure of mankind prove that all men belong to the same species?

2. PHYSICAL.—How is this proved by their physiology?
3. PSYCHOLOGICAL.—How, from their psychological nature?
4. PROCREATIVE.—How, from their power of propagation?

[II.] THE PHILOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

What is the argument on this subject from the relation of different languages?

[III.] THE MORAL ARGUMENT.

What is the argument on this subject from man's religious nature?

What, from the fallen state of all men? and the universal need of the gospel?

2d. UNITY OF ORIGIN.

If men are of one species, how prove that they all have had a common origin?

III. ORIGINAL STATE OF MAN.

I. THE PROTESTANT DOCTRINE.

[I.] MAN WAS CREATED MATURE, PERFECT.

How prove that man was created in a state of maturity?

In what sense was he created perfect?

What are the different views as to the nature of that perfection?

How was man's body perfect?

In what sense was it immortal? and impassible?

In what relation did it stand to the soul?

[II.] IN THE IMAGE OF GOD.

§ 1. MEANING OF THE TERM.

1. A FALSE STATEMENT.—What are the different interpretations of "image" and "similitude," (Gen. i. 26,) supposing those words to be distinct?

What is the true explanation of them?

2. MAN'S SPIRITUALITY AND MORAL CHARACTER.—According to the reformed doctrine, wherein did the image of God, in which man was created, consist?

3. EXTREME OPINIONS.—(1.) What was the extreme view on this subject held by the *Greek* church?

What is the *Socinian* view?

(2.) What is the *Lutheran* view?

§ 2. ORIGINAL RIGHTEOUSNESS.—THE TRUE ELEMENTS OF LIKENESS TO GOD.

In what sense was man created with knowledge?

What was the extent of the knowledge of nature with which he was endowed?

What was the nature of his knowledge of God?

What is the true interpretation of Col. iii. 10?

In that passage, what is the sense of *νεος*? what the force of *εἰς ἐπιγνωσιν*? and the meaning of *κτίσαντος*?

What is the proper interpretation of Eph. iv. 24?

In what passage, how do *δικαιοσύνη* and *ὁσίωτης* differ?

What is the meaning of *ἀληθείας*? and what is the force of the genitive case?

How may it be PROVED that man was thus created in the image of God, (1) from Scripture? (2) from the nature of the case? (3) from what is involved in the restoration of humanity by Christ?

[III.] WITH DOMINION OVER THE CREATURES.

What is the proof that man's dominion was included in his likeness to God?

What was the extent of the dominion designed for him?

II. THE ROMANIST DOCTRINE.

1. STATED.—What do Protestants mean by original righteousness?

What do Romanists mean by it?

In what sense do Protestants hold that original righteousness was natural?

Why do Protestants insist upon this definition?

In what sense do Romanists hold that it was supernatural?

2. REFUTED.—(1.) How does this doctrine degrade the original state of man?

- (2.) How is it inconsistent with the wisdom and goodness of God?
- (3.) How does it pervert the doctrine of original sin?
- (4.) How does it modify the doctrine of regeneration and other important doctrines?

III. THE PELAGIAN DOCTRINE.

[I.] MAN AT CREATION WAS WITHOUT MORAL CHARACTER.

What is the Pelagian and rationalistic doctrine as to man's original state?

On what view of the nature of virtue and sin is that doctrine founded?

§ 1. DOES MORAL CHARACTER RESIDE IN INWARD DISPOSITIONS, AS WELL AS IN OUTWARD ACTS?

1. THE PELAGIAN DOCTRINE STATED.—What is the fundamental principle of the Pelagian system?

What is meant by dispositions, habits, or principles, as distinguished from acts?

3. REFUTED.—(1.) What is the argument from conscience to prove that such principles may have a moral character?

(2.) What, from our instinctive judgments of other men?

What, from the common judgments of men?

(3.) How prove that if dispositions have no moral character, acts cannot be either morally good or evil?

What is the argument from the nature of character?

(4.) What is the direct argument from Scripture on this subject? and what, from the doctrine of original sin and regeneration?

(5.) What, from the faith of the church?

§ 2. DOES THE MORAL CHARACTER OF ANY DISPOSITION DEPEND ON ITS ORIGIN? OR ON ITS NATURE?

1. THE PELAGIAN DOCTRINE STATED.—What is the doctrine of those who make the moral character of dispositions depend on their origin?

2. REFUTED.—(1.) What is the argument from consciousness, that the character of moral dispositions does not depend upon their origin, but upon their nature?

(2.) What, from the judgments of men?

(3.) What, from Scripture?

- (4.) What, from the faith of the church?
3. OBJECTION ANSWERED.—How may it be shown that the doctrine of concreated righteousness does not involve the doctrine of what is called physical holiness and physical depravity?

[II.] MAN WAS CREATED MORTAL.

1. PELAGIAN DOCTRINE STATED.—What is the second element in the Pelagian doctrine as to the original state of man?
2. ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF IT.—What are the arguments in favor of the doctrine that man was created mortal? (1) from his nature? (2) from analogy? (3) from Scripture?
3. ARGUMENTS AGAINST IT.—What two points are involved in this question?
- (1.) How prove that death is the penalty of sin?
- (2.) How is 1 Cor. xv. 42—50 to be explained?

PART II. MAN'S PROBATION AND APOSTASY.

THE COVENANT WITH ADAM, AND THE FALL.

I. THE COVENANT WITH ADAM.

§ 1. THE FACT OF THE COVENANT.

- Why is the arrangement with Adam called a covenant?
- What is the importance of its being so presented?
- Why is it called the covenant of life? and of works?

§ 2. THE PROMISE.

1. STATED.—What was the life promised?
2. PROVED.—How prove that the life promised includes spiritual and eternal life?

§ 3. THE CONDITION.

What was the condition?

- (1.) How prove that perfect obedience was the condition?
- (2.) Was perpetual obedience the condition?

§ 4. THE PENALTY.

1. STATED.—What was the penalty?
2. PROVED.—How prove that spiritual and eternal as well as temporal death were included in the threatening?

§ 5. THE PARTIES.

Who were the parties to the covenant?

How prove that Adam acted as the representative of his race?

§ 6. PERPETUITY OF THE COVENANT.

Was this a perpetual covenant?

II. THE FALL.

1. THE SCRIPTURE ACCOUNT.—What is the scriptural account of the fall?
How prove that this account is historical?
2. THE TREE OF LIFE.—What was the typical import and virtue of the tree of life?
3. THE TREE OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND EVIL.—What are the different views of the meaning of the phrase, “knowledge of good and evil?”
What was the symbolical character of the tree of knowledge of good and evil?
4. THE SERPENT.—Why are we bound to assume that a real serpent was engaged in the temptation?
How prove that Satan was the real tempter?
5. THE TEMPTATION.—What was the nature of the temptation?
6. THE IMMEDIATE EFFECT.—What were the effects of disobedience upon our first parents?

PART III. NATURE OF SIN, AND OF ADAM'S TRANSGRESSION.

What are the data from which we can determine the nature of sin?

In what respects is it a metaphysical question?

In what respects is it a moral and theological question?

I. METAPHYSICAL THEORIES.

I. THE DUALISTIC THEORY.

1. STATED.—What is the dualistic theory, in its different forms, as to the origin and nature of sin?

2. REFUTED.—What are the arguments against that theory?

II. THE LIMITATION THEORY.

1. STATED.—What is the theory which makes sin a mere limitation of being?

On what principle is that theory founded?

How is this doctrine presented by Spinoza? and by Baur?

2. REFUTED.—(1.) How does this theory confound physical and moral evil?

(2.) How does it conflict with the idea of a personal God?

(3.) How does it destroy all virtue, and make might right?

III. LEIBNITZ'S THEORY.

1. STATED.—How does Leibnitz present the theory of limitation?

What was the design of the Theodicy?

How does it account for the origin of sin?

Wherein does it make sin to consist?

What were the reasons which led to the adoption of this theory?

2. REFUTED.—(1.) How does this theory make sin necessary?

(2.) How does it make God responsible for the existence of sin?

- (3.) How does it tend to destroy the distinction between moral and physical evil?
 (4.) How does it tend to destroy the sense of guilt?

IV. THEORY OF ACTION AND REACTION.

1. STATED.—What is the theory which refers sin to the antagonism which is necessary to life?
 How is life in all its forms actually developed?
 2. REFUTED.—How does this view destroy the nature of sin?

V. SCHLEIERMACHER'S THEORY.

1. STATED—(1.) What is Schleiermacher's idea of God and his attributes?
 (2.) What does he mean by omnipotence?
 (3.) What is the relation of this absolute power to the world? and is the world finite or infinite?
 (4.) What is the distinction which he makes between self-consciousness and God-consciousness?
 (5.) Wherein consists the normal or ideal state of man?
 (6.) What is the sense of absolute dependence in which he makes all religion to consist?
 (7.) What, according to his theory, was the original state of man?
 (8.) What is his present state? and wherein does its sinfulness consist?
 (9.) What is redemption?
 What is his doctrine concerning Christ, and the mode in which we are redeemed through him?
 2. REFUTED.—How does this theory preclude the possibility of sin in the true sense?

VI. THE "FLESH" THEORY.

1. STATED.—What is the theory which makes the flesh the seat and source of sin?
 In what sense is the word "flesh" used by the advocates of this theory?
 (1.) What is the Manichean form of this doctrine?
 (2.) What is the Romish form?
 (3.) What is the common form?

What are the three methods adopted to account for the fact that the higher powers yield to the lower?—weakness?—freedom?—development?

2. REFUTED.—(1.) What is the argument against this theory, from the sinfulness of fallen angels?

(2.) What, from spiritual sins?

(3.) How does it weaken the sense of guilt?

(4.) What argument against it, from its tendency to asceticism?

(5.) What, from the fact that the old, if unrenewed, increase in sinfulness?

(6.) What are the two modes of interpreting the passages of Scripture in which *σαοξ* and *πνευμα*, *σαοικιοξ* and *πνευματιοξ* are opposed to each other?

What are the arguments in favor of the orthodox interpretation?

VII. THE "SELFISHNESS" THEORY.

1. STATED.—What is the theory which makes all sin to consist in selfishness?

What is the difference between self-love and selfishness?

What is the difference between selfishness as a disposition and selfishness as a purpose?

What are the principles on which this theory founded?—as to (1.) the greatest good? (2.) the nature of virtue? (3.) the benevolence of God? (4.) the design of the universe? (5.) God's reason for permitting sin? (6.) the amount of sin in the world?

2. REFUTED.—(1.) How may it be shown that this theory contradicts our native moral convictions?

(2.) How, that it is opposed to our religious nature?

(3.) How, that its practical effect is corrupting and degrading?

(4.) How, that we are incompetent to decide what is for the greatest good?

(5.) How does it confound sin and holiness? and justify the principle that it is right to do evil that good may come?

ANOTHER FORM OF THE SAME THEORY.

What is the doctrine which makes selfishness not as opposed to benevolence, but to the love of God, to include all sin?

What are the arguments against this form of doctrine?

II. THEOLOGICAL THEORIES.

What is the difference between a philosophical and a theological theory of sin?

I. PATRISTIC THEORIES.

What was the general state of opinion on this subject in the early church?

What were the earliest forms of error on the subject?

What was the main design of the teachings of the early fathers on this subject?

What did those fathers teach as to (1.) the universality of sin? (2.) the relation of all sin to that of Adam? (3.) the necessity of divine grace? (4.) the state of infants?

How far did the Greek fathers teach the doctrine of original sin?

II. PLAGIANISM.

1. STATED.—Who were Pelagius, Cœlestius, and Julian?

What was the radical principle of their theory of sin?

(1.) How did this determine their doctrine of the liberty of the will?

(2.) How, as to the nature of sin?

(3.) How, as to inherent or transmitted sin?

(4.) How, as to the effects of Adam's sin?

(5.) How, as to perfection, or the possibility of living without sin?

(6.) How, as to the terms of salvation?

(7.) How, as to grace?

(8.) How, as to infant baptism and infant salvation?

2. REFUTED.—What was the action of the church in reference to Pelagianism?

(1.) What may be said against the fundamental principle of Pelagianism?

(2.) What, against the Pelagian view of the nature of sin?

(3.) What, against the Pelagian doctrine of liberty?

(4.) How does Pelagianism leave the universal sinfulness of man unaccounted for?

(5.) How does it fail to satisfy the necessities of our nature?

- (6.) How does it do away with the need of redemption?
 (7.) How does it contradict the teachings of Scripture?

III. AUGUSTINIANISM.

Who was Augustine?

What are the two distinct elements in Augustine's doctrine of sin?

§ 1. THE SPECULATIVE ELEMENT.

What was his doctrine as to the formal nature of sin?

What led to that view of its nature?

In what particulars did Augustine differ from Origen, in his view on this subject?

What objects was this theory of Augustine designed to accomplish?

§ 2. THE EXPERIMENTAL ELEMENT.

What was the true foundation of Augustine's doctrine of sin?

1. AUGUSTINE'S EXPERIENCE.—(1.) What is included in conviction of sin?

(2.) To what acts and states of the mind does the sense of sin attach?

(3.) What does consciousness teach as to the commencement of sin in us?

(4.) What, as to our ability?

(5.) In what sense is sin, according to Augustine, voluntary, as distinguished from a necessary evil?

(6.) How do we know that what is true of ourselves in this matter is true of other men?

2. AUGUSTINE'S INFERENCES.—(1.) How, then, must men be saved?

(2.) How does the doctrine of efficacious grace necessarily flow from the above mentioned facts of consciousness?

(3.) How, the gratuitousness of salvation and the sovereignty of election?

How do these facts preclude the possibility of merit?

(4.) How, the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints?

What is the great fundamental point of difference between Augustine and Pelagius, underlying all these particulars?

3. THE SCRIPTURE SOLUTION.—(1.) What do the Scriptures teach, confirmatory of these facts, as to Adam's original state?

- (2.) As to his apostasy?
 - (3.) As to the effects of Adam's sin on himself?
 - (4.) As to the effects on his posterity?
 - (5.) As to the nature of inherent corruption as sin?
- And as to the penal character of original sin?
- (6.) As to our union with Adam?
 - (7.) As to our inability?
 - (8.) As to grace and election?

How does it appear that the above doctrines constitute the theory of Augustine, to the exclusion of his opinions on minor points?

What were some of his peculiar opinions which do not enter into his system?

What did he teach especially as to our union with Adam?

How far was the doctrine of Augustine received and sanctioned in the church?

IV. SEMI-PELAGIANISM.

What was the historical origin of Semi-Pelagianism?

Who were the leaders of that party?

- (1.) What was the principal work of Cassian, and his doctrine?
- (2.) What, of Vincent of Sirius?
- (3.) What of Faustus?

In what points did these all agree with each other, and differ from Augustine?

V. ROMANISM.

§ 1. ANSELM.

What was the doctrine of Anselm on the subject of original sin?

§ 2. ABELARD.

What was the doctrine of Abelard? and afterwards of Catharinus and Pighius?

§ 3. AQUINAS.

What was the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas and the Dominicans?

- (1.) As to the original state of man?
- (2.) As to the effects of Adam's transgression?

- (3.) As to the nature of original righteousness?
- (4.) As to the nature of original sin?
- (5.) As to the nature and moral character of concupiscence?
- (6.) As to the nature of the deterioration of the soul by the fall?
- (7.) As to ability or free will?

§ 4. DUNS SCOTUS.

What were the opinions of Duns Scotus and the Franciscans on these points?

§ 5. COUNCIL OF TRENT.

1. HISTORY.—What rendered the task of the Council of Trent in deciding what was the church doctrine of original sin so difficult?

How did they meet the difficulty arising from the fact that the Protestants whom they intended to condemn professed the Augustinian doctrine?

How did they endeavor to meet the difficulty arising from diversity of opinion in the Latin Church itself?

What was the council directed by the legates to do?

2. DECISIONS.—(1.) What did the council decide as to the effects of Adam's sin on himself?

(2.) What, as to its effects upon his posterity?

(3.) What, as to the universality of sin and the mode of its removal?

(4.) What, as to the design and effect of infant baptism?

(5.) What, as to the ability of man, since the fall?

3. INTERPRETATION OF THE CANONS.—How have the canons of the council been interpreted by Romanists?

How, by Protestants?

1st.—(1.) What doctrine as to the nature of sin was taught in the Church of Rome, which seems incompatible with original sin?

How does Bellarmine meet that objection?

(2.) How does the doctrine that original righteousness is a supernatural gift apparently conflict with the doctrine of original sin?

(3.) What is the argument to prove that the Church of Rome denies that doctrine, drawn from the fact that the council decided that concupiscence in the baptized is not sin?

2D.—What are the arguments on the other side?

- (1.) From the condemnation of Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian doctrines?
 - (2.) From what the council declared to be transmitted from Adam to his descendants?
 - (3.) From their doctrine of infant baptism?
- In what sense did all parties teach the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin?

VI. PROTESTANTISM.

What is the Protestant definition of sin?

§ 1. A SPECIFIC EVIL.

In what sense is sin a specific evil?

§ 2. BEARING RELATION TO LAW.

What is meant by its bearing relation to law?

What are the different senses of the word "law?"

§ 3. NAMELY, THE LAW OF GOD.

What are the different views of the nature of the law to which sin stands related?

1. NEGATIVELY.—(1.) How show that it is not merely the law of reason?
- (2.) Nor the eternal fitness of things, the moral order of the universe?
- (3.) Nor expediency?
2. AFFIRMATIVELY.—How prove that it must be the will of a personal being?

§ 4. WANT OF CONFORMITY.

What is the scriptural and Protestant doctrine as to the demands of the moral law?

How prove that it demands entire conformity to the will of God?

- (1.) How does this exclude the idea of perfection in this life?
- (2.) How does it exclude the idea of merit?
- (3.) How does it exclude the possibility of works of supererogation?

What is the Papal doctrine of works of supererogation?

(4.) How does it follow from the Protestant doctrine of sin, that sin does not consist exclusively in voluntary exercises?

What are the different senses of the word "voluntary?"

What is the distinction between sin and sinfulness, or between actual and habitual sin?

How show that sin consists in want of conformity to the law of God?

What is the true interpretation of 1 John iii. 4?

§ 5. INCLUDING BOTH GUILT AND POLLUTION.

What are the two elements included in sin?

What is meant by guilt?

How is it distinguished from demerit or blameworthiness?

What is the theological distinction between *reatus culpæ* and *reatus pœnæ*?

What are the arguments against the doctrine that guilt attaches only to what consists in voluntary action, or flows from it? and in favor of the doctrine that it is the nature and not the origin of sin, or what is sinful, which makes the just ground of punishment?

(1.) What is the argument from conscience on that subject?

(2.) What, from analogy?

(3.) What, from Scripture?

(4.) What, from the faith of the church?

PART IV. EFFECT OF ADAM'S SIN ON HIS POSTERITY.

In what respect do all Christian churches agree as to the effect of Adam's sin upon his posterity?

As to what points do they differ?

What is the Augustinian or Reformed doctrine as to the effect of Adam's sin upon his posterity?

What is the Reformed doctrine as to the reason why we suffer the evil consequences of his sin?

What are the three great doctrines included in the Augustinian view of our relation to Adam, and its consequences?

I. IMPUTATION.

I. IMMEDIATE IMPUTATION.

[L.] THE DOCTRINE STATED.

§ 1. THE FACT OF IMPUTATION.

1st. What is the Scripture meaning of the word "imputation?"

2d. In what sense is Adam's sin said to be imputed to us?

What is meant by the guilt of that sin?

3d. What is the analogy between (1) the imputation of Adam's sin, (2) the imputation of our sins to Christ, and (3) the imputation of Christ's righteousness to us?

§ 2. THE GROUND OF IMPUTATION.

What is the ground of the imputation of Adam's sin? or the nature of the union between him and his posterity?

(1.) What is the *natural* relation between Adam, as the father of of the human race, and his descendants?

(2.) What is the *federal* relation between him and us?

What is the real point of dispute between those who affirm and those who deny the imputation of Adam's sin?

[II.] THE DOCTRINE PROVED.

- (1.) What is the argument for the doctrine of imputation, from the facts stated in the account of the apostasy, and from the federal headship of Adam?
- (2.) What, from the fact that the evil consequences of his sin do actually come upon us?
- (3.) What, from the Scripture proof of the penal character of these evil consequences?
- (4.) What, from the fact that the principle of representation pervades the whole Bible? and is constantly recognized in the dispensations of Providence?
- (5.) What, from the connection between this doctrine and the other great doctrines of the Bible?
- (6.) What, from the design of the apostle's argument in Rom. v. 12—21?

What fact is asserted in v. 12?

What proof of that fact in vv. 13, 14?

In what sense is Adam declared to be a type of Christ?

How are they said to differ, in vv. 15, 16, 17?

What is the purport of vv. 18, 19?

What inferences are drawn in vv. 20, 23,

What is the argument from 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22?

(7.) What is the argument from common consent?

[III.] OBJECTIONS.

1. STATED.—What are the popular objections to the doctrine of imputation?
2. REFUTED.—How may those objections be answered?

II. *MEDIATE IMPUTATION.*

§ 1. STATEMENT AND HISTORY OF THE THEORY.

On what points did the Reformed theologians of the school of Saumur, in the seventeenth century, depart from the common doctrine of the church?

What was the doctrine of Placæus on original sin?

What was the judgment of the National Synod of France on that doctrine?

What, of the Swiss churches?

What, of the church of Holland?

By whom was the doctrine of mediate imputation favored?

What was the doctrine of President Edwards on this point?

How can it be reasonably accounted for, that the doctrine of immediate imputation was less clearly presented before than after this controversy?

How may it be proved that it was nevertheless universally adopted?

§ 2. REFUTED.

- (1.) How may it be shown that the doctrine of mediate imputation directly contradicts the Scriptures, as to the ground of condemnation of our race?
- (2.) How, that it denies the penal character of the loss of righteousness and inherent depravity?
- (3.) How may it be shown that it increases rather than relieves difficulties?
- (4.) What is the argument against the doctrine, from the analogy between Adam and Christ, presented by the apostle?
- (5.) What is the objection drawn from the false principle on which the doctrine is founded?

III. "PROPAGATION" THEORIES.

§ 1. PRE-EXISTENCE.

1. STATED.—What was Origen's solution of the problem of native depravity in this world?
2. REFUTED.—(1.) What is the argument against this theory, founded on the absence of any scriptural proof of its truth?
- (2.) How may it be shown to be contrary to Scripture?
- (3.) How may it be shown from consciousness to be an arbitrary assumption?
- (4.) How may it be shown to be an unsatisfactory solution?

§ 2. REALISM.

Edwards' Theory.

1. STATED.—What is the realistic explanation of the fact of universal corruption?
- Why is Adam's sin imputed to us?
- 1st. *Stated.*—What constitutes identity, according to Edwards?
- By what illustrations does he attempt to show that there is no such thing as numerical identity?

According to this doctrine, wherein consists the identity of the soul?

How may this view be shown to be identical with the doctrine of continued creation?

2d. *Refuted*.—(1.) What is the false assumption on which this theory rests?

(2.) How does this theory destroy the distinction between creation and preservation?

(3.) How does it involve the denial of the idea of substance?

(4.) How does it tend to pantheism?

(5.) How may the "identity" of Edwards be shown to be only apparent identity?

Wherein does this doctrine agree with the realistic theory? and wherein does it differ from it?

2. REALISTIC THEORY REFUTED. 1st. *Arguments against the Theory*.—(1.) What is the argument against realism, from its hypothetical character?

(2.) What, from the absence of Scripture support for the doctrine?

(3.) How is it contrary to consciousness?

(4.) How, to Scripture?

(5.) How does it subvert the doctrine of the Trinity?

(6.) How is it inconsistent with the fact of Christ's sinlessness?

(7.) What are the philosophical objections to this theory?

2d. *Arguments against its Application*.—What facts is this theory designed to explain?

(1.) Show that this explanation is unsatisfactory.

(2.) What is the inherent absurdity of this theory?

(3.) What is the argument against it, from its neglect to assign any reason why we are not responsible for the sin of Eve? or for Adam's subsequent sins?

(4.) What argument may be derived from the fifth chapter of Romans?

(5.) How may this be shown to be a purely philosophic theory?

What is the true relation of philosophy to theology?

II. ORIGINAL SIN.

What are the effects of Adam's transgression?

What is original sin?

Why is it called original?

I. ITS NATURE.

§ 1. ERRONEOUS VIEWS.

- (1.) What is the Pelagian doctrine as to original sin?
- (2.) What is the view of original sin, which makes it physical in its nature? and by whom has it been held?
- (3.) What is the doctrine which makes original sin purely negative?
- (4.) What is the Romish doctrine?

What distinction do some orthodox theologians make between *vitium* and *peccatum*?

What are the objections to it?

- (5.) What is the doctrine which lowers the degree of original corruption?
- (6.) What is the doctrine which denies that it affects the whole man?

§ 2. THE TRUE VIEW.

What is the doctrine of original sin, as stated in the symbols of the Lutheran and Reformed churches?

According to those standards, is original sin a corruption of the soul's substance? or an essential element infused into the soul?

What five elements are included in the orthodox doctrine of original sin?

II. PROOF.

§ 1. THAT DEPRAVITY IS UNIVERSAL.

- (1.) How do the Scriptures assert, assume, and prove the universality of sin?
- (2.) How does experience teach that all men are sinners?

§ 2. THAT DEPRAVITY IS TOTAL.

What is meant by total depravity—negatively and affirmatively?

- (1.) How do the fruits of the corruption which is in man, show that this corruption is entire?

- (2.) How is this proved from the enmity of the human heart against God?
- (3.) How, from the universal rejection of the Saviour?
- (4.) How, from the incurable nature of the depravity of the race?
- (5.) How, from Christian experience?

§ 3. THAT DEPRAVITY IS INBORN.

What are the facts as to the early manifestation of corruption in children?

To what conclusion do these facts inevitably lead?

What are the three erroneous theories devised to account for them? and how may they be answered?

- (1.) How may it be proved that men are by nature sinners, from Matt. vii. 16—19?

How, from the fifty-first Psalm? Job xi. 12; xiv. 4?

How, from John iii. 6?

How, from Eph. ii. 3?

How, from Rom. v. 12, 20?

- (2.) How is this doctrine involved in the scriptural descriptions of the state of man since the fall?
- (3.) How does it follow, from the universal necessity of redemption?

What erroneous view of redemption is held by those who deny original sin, and believe in infant salvation? and how may it be disproved?

- (4.) How is the doctrine of innate depravity involved in the universal necessity of regeneration?

How is it proved that infants need regeneration?

- (5.) How does it follow, from the universality of death?

How may it be proved that death is the penalty?

- (6.) What argument for the doctrine of innate depravity is derived from common consent?

III. OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

1. How may the doctrine of original sin be proved to be consistent with the nature of sin?
2. And with the justice of God?
3. And with the liberty of man?

III. INABILITY.

SYMBOLIC STATEMENTS.

1. PELAGIAN.—What is the Pelagian doctrine as to the ability of man, since the fall?
2. SEMI PELAGIAN.—(1.) What, the Semi Pelagian? (2.) What, the Romish? (3.) What, the Arminian?
3. AUGUSTINIAN.—What is the Augustinian doctrine?
 - (1.) How is that doctrine stated in the Lutheran symbols?
 - (2.) How, in the Reformed symbols?

I. THE NATURE OF INABILITY.

§ 1. NEGATIVELY.

What are the negations contained in the Augustinian statements of the doctrine of inability? (1) as to the rational faculties? (2) the power of self-determination? (3) conscience? (4) liberty?

§ 2. AFFIRMATIVELY.

1. SPIRITUAL.—What are the “things of the Spirit” which sinners are said to be unable to receive?
 2. NATURAL.—How far is this inability natural?
 3. MORAL.—How far is it moral?
- What is the popular distinction between natural and moral ability and inability?
- What are the objections to that distinction, and to the terms in which it is expressed?

II. PROOF OF INABILITY.

- (1.) What is the argument for the Augustinian doctrine derived from the fact that the Scriptures never assert nor appeal to the ability of men?
- (2.) What, from those passages which directly assert the sinner’s inability?
- (3.) What, from those which assert that this disability is not merely disinclination?
- (4.) What, from the Scripture doctrine of original sin?

What, from the uniform ascription of all good in man to the Holy Spirit?

- (5.) What, from consciousness?
- (6.) What, from experience?
- (7.) What, from the doctrines of the Bible concerning election and efficacious grace?
- (8.) What, from the testimony of the church?

III. OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

1. What is the objection that this doctrine destroys responsibility?
 Why is a man responsible for his external acts?
 Why, for his volitions?
 Why, for his affections?
 How is this the turning point in the controversy?
2. How show that the doctrine of inability does not naturally lead to the neglect of the use of the means of grace?
3. How show that it does not lead to delay, idly awaiting God's time?

IV. FREEDOM OF THE WILL.

[Dr. Hodge omitted the consideration of this topic, in lecturing to the Class of 1865.]

BOOK THIRD:—SOTEROLOGY.

THE COVENANT OF GRACE.

Why is the plan of salvation exhibited under the form of a covenant?

Why is it called the covenant of grace?

I. THE REMONSTRANT THEORY.

1. STATED.—(1.) According to the Arminians, who are the parties in the covenant of grace?

(2.) What is the promise?

(3.) What the condition?

2. REFUTED.—(1.) How does this view contradict the Scripture doctrine of total depravity and inability?

(2.) How, the doctrines of personal election and efficacious grace?

(3.) How, the doctrine of gratuitous salvation?

II. THE REFORMED DOCTRINE.

[I.] FIRST FORM.—ONE COVENANT.

1. STATED.—(1.) According to the common view, who are the parties in the covenant of grace?

(2.) What is the promise?

(3.) What the condition?

2. OBJECTIONS.—What objections are there to this mode of representation?

[II.] SECOND FORM.—TWO COVENANTS.

§. 1. THE COVENANT OF REDEMPTION.

(1.) In the covenant of redemption, who are the parties?

(2.) What is the promise?

(3.) What the condition?

§ 2. THE COVENANT OF GRACE.

- (1.) In the covenant of grace, who are the parties?
- (2.) What is the promise?
- (3.) What the condition?

What are the different senses of the word "condition?" and in what sense are faith and repentance conditions of the covenant of grace?

[III.] IDENTITY OF THE COVENANT OF GRACE.

§ 1. ONE COVENANT.

- 1st. *One Promise.*—How may the identity of the promise in the covenant of grace, under all dispensations, be proved?
- 2d. *One Mediator.*—How may it be proved that under all dispensations, Christ has been the Mediator?
- 3d. *One Condition.*—How prove that faith has always been the condition of salvation?

§ 2. TWO DISPENSATIONS.

1. OLD TESTAMENT.—(1.) How was the covenant revealed from Adam to Abraham?
- (2.) How, from Abraham to Moses?
- (3.) How, from Moses to Christ?

Under what three aspects may the covenant from Sinai be viewed? What are the different representations of that covenant given in the New Testament?

How are those different representations to be reconciled?

2. NEW TESTAMENT.—What are the principal points of distinction between the Mosaic and Christian dispensations?

Romanist View of the Old Dispensation.

What is the Romish doctrine as to the salvation of believers under the old dispensation?

How may that doctrine be disproved?

PART I. THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

I. CHRIST'S MESSIAHSHIP.

§ 1. THE MESSIAH HAS COME.

- (1.) How may the coming of the Messiah be proved from Gen. xlix. 10?
- (2.) How, from Dan. ix. 24—27?
- (3.) How, from Hag. ii. 6—9 and Mal. iii. 1?
- (4.) What were the two great signs of Messiah's advent predicted repeatedly in the Old Testament?

§ 2. JESUS IS THE MESSIAH.

- (1.) What argument to establish the claim of Jesus to Messiahship, from the time of his birth?
 - (2.) What, from the place of his birth?
 - (3.) What, from his family?
 - (4.) What, from the manner of his birth?
 - (5.) What, from the fact that he was preceded by a forerunner?
-

II. CHRIST'S PERSON.

I. *THE DOCTRINE.*

[I.] CHRIST'S TWO NATURES.

§ 1. HIS HUMANITY.

What is necessary to the integrity of Christ's human nature?
 How may it be proved that he had a true body?
 How, that he had a reasonable soul?
 What is necessary in order to the completeness of a reasonable soul?

§ 2. HIS DIVINITY.

How is it proved that Christ had a true divine nature?

[II.] CHRIST'S ONE PERSON.

How may it be proved that Christ was one person?

How, that he was a divine person?

THE HYPOSTATICAL UNION OF NATURES.

State the arguments for the doctrine of Christ's person, derived from 1 John i. 3? 1 Tim. iii. 16? Rom. i. 3, and ix. 9—5? Phil. ii. 6—11? Heb. ii. 4?

What are the three classes into which the acts of Christ are distributable? (1.) As *Theanthropos*. Heb. i. 3. Col. i. 13, 14. Heb. ix. 14. 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. (2.) Acts xx. 28. Rom. viii. 32. 1 Cor. ii. 8. 1 Cor. xv. 47. (3.) John iii. 13, vi. 62. Rom. ix. 5.

Quote passages of Scripture in which Christ is designated from a single nature, where the predicates belong to the whole person. John viii. 58, xi. 35.

How may this subject be illustrated from the union of soul and body in a man?

II. SYMBOLIC STATEMENTS OF THIS DOCTRINE.

1st. *Confessio Helvetica Posterior*, xi. § 2.

2d. *Westminster Confession*, Chap. viii. § 2.

3d. *Athanasian Creed*.

4th. *Augsburgh Confession*, Chap. iii. part 1.

What is the meaning of the word "nature" as used in relation to this subject?

What is included in the idea of personality?

How can Christ's soul possess intelligence and will, and yet not personality?

What is the relation of the two natures, or what is called the hypostatical union?

What is the effect of the hypostatical union upon the human nature of Christ?

5th. *Early Creeds*.—In what form was the doctrine of Christ's person presented in the early church?

III. HISTORY OF ERROR.

[I.] A. D. 70—681.

1. THE EBIONITES.—Who were the Ebionites?

What was their doctrine concerning Christ's person?

2. THE NAZARENES.—How did the Ebionites and Nazarenes differ?
3. THE DOCETÆ.—Who were the Docetæ? and why so called? What was their doctrine of the person of Christ? What gave rise to that doctrine?
4. APOLLINARIUS.—What was the Apollinarian doctrine?
5. NESTORIUS.—What was the Nestorian doctrine? When and where was that doctrine condemned?
6. EUTYCHIANISM.—1st. *The Monophysite Controversy.* What was the Eutychian doctrine? and its history? (Council of Constantinople, 448. Ephesus, 449. Chalcedon, 451.)
2d. *The Monothelite Controversy.*—What was the history of the Monothelite controversy? and when and where was it decided?

[II.] FROM THE TRULLAN COUNCIL TO THE REFORMATION.

[III.] THE REFORMATION.

§ 1. THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE.

1. STATED.—In what points does the Lutheran doctrine agree with the Reformed?
How does it differ from it as to the *communicatio proprietatum*?
2. REFUTED.—(1.) What was the historical origin of this doctrine?
(2.) Upon what false assumption is it based?
(3.) How does it involve a contradiction?
(4.) How does it tend to Eutychianism?
(5.) How may it be shown to be without scriptural foundation?

[IV.] FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE PRESENT TIME.

1. SOCINIANISM.—2. SUPERNATURALISM.—3. RATIONALISM.—
4. PANTHEISM.—5. SCHLEIERMACHER.

PART II. THE WORK OF CHRIST.

- What was the design of the incarnation?
 What is salvation?
 What has Christ done, to effect our salvation?

CHRIST A MEDIATOR.

§ 1. IN WHAT SENSES IS CHRIST OUR MEDIATOR?

§ 2. WHAT ARE CHRIST'S QUALIFICATIONS FOR ACTING AS
 MEDIATOR?

Is Christ mediator as to both natures?

Into what three classes do theologians divide the acts of Christ?

How may it be proved that the work of redemption is a theanthropic act?

§ 3. IS CHRIST THE ONLY MEDIATOR?

In what sense, and on what ground, do Romanists regard saints as mediators?

I. CHRIST'S OFFICES.

I. CHRIST'S OFFICE, AS PROPHET.

1. WHAT IS THE SCRIPTURE SENSE of the word "prophet?"
2. HOW DOES CHRIST EXECUTE the office of a prophet?

II. CHRIST'S OFFICE, AS PRIEST.

I. IN WHAT SENSE IS CHRIST OUR PRIEST?

§ 1. DEFINITION OF A PRIEST.

What is the Scripture sense of the word "priest?"

What inferences are drawn from this definition by those who claim that the Christian ministry is a priesthood?

How may it be shown that ministers are not priests?

§ 2. CHRIST A REAL PRIEST.

1. DENIED.—By whom is the reality of Christ's priesthood denied?
2. PROVED.—(1.) How may it be shown that Christ was truly a priest, from the titles ascribed to him in Scripture?
- (2.) How, from his qualifications for priestly office?
- (3.) How, from the functions exercised by him?
- (4.) How, from the effect of his mediatorial work?

§ 3. NATURE OF CHRIST'S PRIESTHOOD.

1. NOT LEVITICAL.—How did Christ's priesthood differ from the Levitical (1) as to its origin? (2) as to the place in which it was exercised? (3) as to ritual character? (4) as to its relation to the old covenant?
 2. AFTER THE ORDER OF MELCHIZEDEK.—In what respects was Melchizedek a type of Christ?
- How was Christ's priesthood superior to the Levitical (1) in point of blessings secured by it? (2) in itself considered?

 II. HOW DOES CHRIST EXECUTE THE OFFICE OF PRIEST?

FIRST. THE SATISFACTION OF JUSTICE.

- What facts connected with the atonement are universally admitted by Christians?
- What are the disputed points on this subject, (1) as to the nature of the reconciliation effected by Christ's death? (2) as to the ground of reconciliation in God?

DEFINITIONS.

1. ATONEMENT.—What are the different senses of the word "atonement?"
- What are the objections to it as expressing the priestly work of Christ?
2. SATISFACTION.—What is the meaning of the word "satisfaction?"
- In what sense is Christ's work a satisfaction?
- In what does his satisfaction consist?
- What are the points of difference between pecuniary and legal satisfaction?

3. PENALTY.—What is the precise meaning of the words “punishment,” “penal,” and “penalty?”

In what sense were the sufferings of Christ penal?

4. SUBSTITUTION, VICARIOUS.—What is the sense of the words “substitution” and “vicarious?”

In what sense were the sufferings of Christ vicarious?

5. EXPIATION, PURIFICATION, PROPITIATION.—What is the sense of the words “expiate,” “purify,” and “propitiate?”

What are the different senses of the word “guilt?”

In what sense did Christ bear our guilt?

I. NATURE OF THE ATONEMENT.

§ 1. STATED.

1. SYMBOLIC STATEMENTS.—*Augsburg Conf.* p. 93; *Cat. Maj.* p. 495; *Form of Concord*, p. 684; *Con. Helv.* § 15, p. 484; *Form. Consens. Helv.* xv. 734; *Heidellb. Cat.* p. 401; *Westm. Conf.* c. viii. 1.

2. ESSENTIAL POINTS.—What are the essential points included in the statements as to the nature of the atonement, in the standards of the Protestant church? (*Forensic—complete—twofold—vicarious.*)

§ 2. PROVED.

1. NATURE OF GOD.—(1.) What is the argument in favour of this doctrine derived from the justice of God?

(2.) What, from the immutability of the law?

(3.) What, from the veracity of God?

2. DECLARATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.—(1.) What argument from those passages in which Christ is said to have borne our sins?

(2.) What, from those which set him forth as a sacrifice?

(3.) What, from those which speak of our redemption?

(4.) What, from those which ascribe our salvation to the blood, cross, and death of Christ?

(5.) What, from those which describe the effects of Christ's death?

3. OTHER DOCTRINES.—(1.) How does the doctrine of the necessity of Christ's death involve the doctrine of salvation?

(2.) How is the doctrine of satisfaction involved in the doctrine of justification?

- (3.) How, in the doctrine of deliverance from the law?
- (4.) How, in the doctrine of union with Christ?

§ 3. OBSERVATIONS.

- (1.) How may it be shown that this doctrine does not ascribe vindictiveness to God?
- (2.) How can it be reconciled with the grace of the gospel?
- (3.) How, with the fact that Christ's obedience was due from himself and for himself?
- (4.) Why was it not necessary for Christ to suffer eternal death, in order to redeem us?
- (5.) How could the finite sufferings of Christ atone for the sins of the world?
- (6.) How can the doctrine of satisfaction be reconciled with the impossibility of any transfer of guilt?

II. NECESSITY OF THE ATONEMENT.

§ 1. STATED.

- 1. ERRONEOUS VIEWS.—What are the different views as to the necessity of a satisfaction for sin, in order to forgiveness?
- 2. THE TRUE VIEW.—What is the doctrine of the Reformed church on that point?

§ 2. PROVED.

- (1.) How is the real necessity of the atonement manifest from the greatness of the sacrifice?
- (2.) How, from the declarations of Scripture, especially Gal. ii. 21, and iii. 21?
- (3.) How, from the justice of God?
- (4.) How, from the truth of God?
- (5.) What was the governmental necessity of the atonement?

III. PERFECTION OF THE ATONEMENT.

§ 1. ITS INTRINSIC VALUE.

- 1st. *Does God accept the sufferings of Christ, instead of ours, on account of their intrinsic value?*
- 1. NEGATIVE ANSWERS.—*Duns Scotus*, in his reply to *Anselm*, *Cur Deus Homo?* *Limborch*, *Apol. Theol.* xxi. 6; *Curcellæus*, *Iust.* 5. 19, 25.

2. AFFIRMATIVE ANSWERS.—What is the doctrine of the Latin, Lutheran, and Reformed churches on this point?

2*d.* *What gives to the sufferings of Christ their value?*

1. NEGATIVELY.—(1.) How may it be proved that the divine nature did not suffer?

(2.) How, that Christ's sufferings were not infinite?

2. AFFIRMATIVELY.—(1.) How far was the degree of Christ's sufferings important?

(2.) How may it be proved that the dignity of Christ's person is the ground of the infinite merit of his sufferings?

§ 2. ITS APPLICATION OR EFFECT.

1. ROMISH DOCTRINE.—What is the Romish doctrine as to the application of the atonement?

What are its modifications?

What are the objections to this doctrine?

2. PROTESTANT DOCTRINE.—What is the teaching of Scripture as to the efficacy of atonement?

IV. EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT.

(1.) How far is the nature of the atonement involved in the question of its extent?

(2.) How far its value?

(3.) How far, its applicability or application?

(4.) What is the precise point in dispute on this subject?

§ 1. THE LUTHERAN VIEW.

What was the design of Christ's death, according to the Lutheran system?

§ 2. THE ARMINIAN VIEW.

What, according to the Arminian System?

§ 3. THE GOVERNMENTAL THEORY.

What, according to the governmental theory?

§ 4. THE REFORMED VIEW.

1. STATED.—What is the doctrine of the Reformed church, as to the design of Christ's death?

2. PROVED.—(1.) What argument, to prove that Christ's death had a special reference to the elect, may be derived from the consistency of this view with the other particulars in the scheme of redemption?
- (2.) What, from the nature of the covenant of redemption?
- (3.) What, from the doctrine of election?
- (4.) What, from God's special love to his own people?
- (5.) What, from those passages of Scripture in which the special design of Christ's death is stated?
- (6.) What, from the effects of Christ's death?
- (7.) What, from the Scripture doctrine concerning the union of Christ and his people?
- (8.) What, from the fact that the Reformed doctrine includes and harmonizes all the truths contained in the other systems?

On what ground is the gospel offered to all men?

3. OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—How are those passages to be explained, which speak of Christ's bearing the sins of the world, dying for all men, or of those perishing for whom Christ died?

What is the difference between saying that Christ died for all men, and saying that he died equally for all men?

[I.] CLASSIFICATION OF THEORIES CONCERNING THE ATONEMENT.

What are the various ends which, in Scripture, the satisfaction of Christ is said to answer?

§ 1. SOCINIAN.

1. STATED.—*1st. Pure Socinian.*—What is the Socinian view of the atonement?
- 2d. Schleiermacher.*—What is Schleiermacher's view?
- 3d. Symbolical.*—What is the symbolical or allegorical view?
- In what point do all these theories agree?
2. REFUTED.—How may it be shown that this whole theory denies what is essential to the idea of atonement?

§ 2. GOVERNMENTAL.

1. STATED.—What is the governmental view of the nature of the atonement?
2. HISTORY.—What is the history of that view?
3. REFUSED.—(1.) What argument against the governmental theory, from the false assumptions involved in it?
- (2.) What, from its unscriptural character?
- (3.) What, from its inconsistency with the doctrine of justification by faith?
- (4.) What, from its tendency?

§ 3. CATHOLIC.

1. STATED.—What is the catholic or common doctrine on this subject?
2. PROVED.—What are the general considerations in its favor?

[II.] HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

1. PATRISTIC PERIOD.—What peculiar view of the atonement was presented by many of the Fathers, founded on the idea that it was a ransom paid to Satan?
 2. SCHOLASTIC PERIOD.—What doctrine was taught by Anselm, in his work, *Cur Deus Homo*?
- By whom was that doctrine defended? and by whom assailed?
3. THE REFORMATION.—How do the Lutherans and the Reformed agree on this subject?
 4. SUBSEQUENT PERIOD.—What errors have been advocated with regard to the atonement, since the Reformation?

SECOND. INTERCESSION.

- (1.) What are Scripture expressions, by which the intercession of Christ is set forth?
- (2.) What is the nature of that intercession? figurative or real? Is it verbal?
- (3.) For whom does Christ intercede?

III. CHRIST'S OFFICE AS KING.

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

§ 1. ITS EXTENT.

What three forms of dominion are attributed to Christ in the Scriptures?

What is the distinction between his kingdom of power, of grace, and of glory!

§ 2. PRESENT OR FUTURE.

What is the origin of the expressions, "kingdom of God," "kingdom of Christ," and "kingdom of heaven?"

What are the three different senses in which those expressions are used in Scripture?

What is the difference between the kingdom of Christ and the church?

§ 3. ITS SPIRITUALITY.

1. NOT OF THIS WORLD.—In what three senses is Christ's kingdom "not of this world?"

2. SPIRITUAL.—In what senses is it spiritual?

§ 4. CHRIST ITS ONLY HEAD.

What is included in the doctrine that Christ is the only head of the church?

§ 5. ITS ADMINISTRATION.

How is Christ's kingdom administered?

§ 6. ITS DURATION.

What do the Scriptures teach as to the duration of Christ's kingdom?

II. CHRIST'S ESTATES.

I. HUMILIATION.

§ 1. THE LUTHERAN VIEW.

What is the Lutheran doctrine concerning the humiliation of Christ?

§ 2. THE REFORMED VIEW.

What is included in Christ's humiliation?

What was the original import of the expression, "descended into hell?"

What are the four interpretations of that article in the creed?

What bearing have Psa. xvi. 10, Eph. iv. 9, 1 Tim. iii. 16, and 1 Peter iii. 19, on this subject?

II. EXALTATION.

What is included in the exaltation of Christ?

What is the proof of Christ's resurrection?

By whose power did he rise?

III. VOCATION.*

What is the usage of the New Testament as to the words *καλεω*, *κλησις*, and *κλητος*?

I. THE CALL OF THE GOSPEL.

What is meant by the external call?

What is included in it?

1. TO ALL MEN.—How may it be proved that it is addressed to all men, and not exclusively to the elect?

How can this general call be reconciled with the doctrine of man's inability, and not of election?

2. ONLY IN THE GOSPEL.—How may it be proved that the knowledge of Christ is necessary to salvation? (1.) From Scripture? (2.) From the incarnation and work of Christ? (3.) From the command to proclaim the gospel? (4.) From experience?

II. EFFECTUAL CALLING.

[I.] PELAGIAN VIEW.

What are the Pelagian and Rationalistic doctrines as to vocation?

[II.] SEMI-PELAGIAN VIEW.

1. REMONSTRANT.—What is the doctrine of the Remonstrants?

2. LUTHERAN.—What is the Lutheran doctrine?

[III.] REFORMED VIEW.

SYMBOLIC STATEMENTS.—*Helv. Conf.*, Pars I., cap. ix., pp. 479, 481; *Gall. Conf.*, Art. xxi. and xxv., pp. 334, 335; *Can. Syn. Dord.*, cap. iii., art. xi., p. 710; *West. Conf.*, ch. x.

* Vocation was included under the Work of Christ, rather than under the Application of Christ's Work, in Dr. Hodge's old arrangement of subjects, because Christ calls by his Spirit; and the second head was intended to include only the believer's subjective experience. In Dr. Hodge's new arrangement, it is included under the Application of the Work of Christ.

§ 1. IT IS INTERNAL.

- (1.) How may it be proved, from what the Scriptures teach concerning the natural state of man, that there is an inward call by the Spirit, in addition to the outward call of the gospel?
- (2.) How, from the ascription of conversion, in Scripture, to God? Psa. li. 10; John iii. 5, vi. 44; Acts xvi. 14.
- (3.) How, from the fact that not all who know the truth are regenerated?
- (4.) How, from the command to pray for the influence of the Spirit? Eph. i. 15, 19; Col. i. 9, 12; 1 Pet. v. 10.
- (5.) How, from the distinction made in Scripture, between the efficacy of the truth and the influence of the Spirit? John vi. 44; 1 Cor. vi. 7; 1 Thess. i. 5, 6.
- (6.) How, from the necessity of divine influence, in order to the right apprehension of the truth? Psa. cxix. 18; Eph. i. 17; Acts xvi. 14; 1 Cor. ii. 14
- (7.) How, from those passages in which a work upon the heart is spoken of? Phil. ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 11; Heb. xiii. 21.
- (8.) How, from the character of the terms employed to describe this work?
- (9.) How, from experience?

§ 2. IT IS COMMON AND EFFICACIOUS.

1. COMMON.—*1st. Defined.*—What is meant by common grace? How does common grace differ from efficient grace?
- 2d. Proved.*—(1.) How is the Reformed doctrine of common grace proved from Scripture?
- (2.) How, from experience?
2. EFFICACIOUS.—*1st. Defined.*—What is efficacious grace? In what sense is it irresistible? Why is it so called?
- 2d. Proved.*—(1.) How is the doctrine of efficacious grace proved from from the natural state of man?
- (2.) How, from the doctrine of election?
- (3.) How, from the promises of God?
- (4.) How, from the prayers which we are taught in Scripture to offer?
- (5.) How, from the express declarations in Scripture?

§ 3. IT IS CONGRUOUS TO THE NATURE OF MAN.

1. STATED.—What is meant by saying that grace is congruous to the nature of the soul?

What is the relation of the internal to the external call?

2. PROVED.—How is this doctrine proved, (1) from Scripture? (2) from experience?

§ 4. OBJECTIONS TO THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE.

(1.) How is the doctrine of efficacious grace vindicated from the objection that it supposes successive acts in God?

(2.) How can it be reconciled to human liberty?

(3.) How, with human responsibility?

HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE.

What are the three comprehensive forms of doctrine concerning grace and vocation?

How are these doctrines concerning grace related to the corresponding views concerning sin?

I. PRIOR TO THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

What was the state of opinion in the church on these points before the Pelagian controversy?

What determined the form of doctrine in the Greek church?

II. THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

§ 1. PELAGIANISM.

What was the origin of the Pelagian doctrine?

What was the doctrine of Pelagius as to sin? ability? grace? and vocation?

How was Pelagianism received by the church?

§ 2. AUGUSTINIANISM.

What is the system of Augustine?

How far did that system receive the sanction of the church?

§ 3. SEMI-PELAGIANISM.

What was the theory of the Semi-Pelagians?

What was the historical origin of that system?

III. THE SCHOLASTIC AGE.

Into what classes were the Schoolmen divided, on this subject?

IV. THE REFORMATION.

§ 1. ROMANISM.

What were the decisions of the Council of Trent, on this subject?

What was the dispute between the Jansenists and the Jesuits?

§ 2. PROTESTANTISM.

1. REFORMED CHURCH.—Which system was adopted by the Reformed church?

2. LUTHERAN CHURCH.—What was the doctrine of the Lutheran church?

What was the Synergistic controversy?

What were the decisions of the Form of Concord?

V. THE ARMINIAN CONTROVERSY.

What was the origin of Arminianism?

What were its five points?

What was the decision of the Synod of Dort?

What churches were represented in that Synod and concurred in its decisions?

What has been the subsequent history of Arminianism?

VI. MODERN VIEWS.

What three systems have prevailed among nominal Calvinists in this country?

What is the New School system?

What is the New Haven doctrine?

PART III. APPLICATION OF CHRIST'S WORK.

I. REGENERATION.

What are the different senses of the word "regeneration?"

I. *ITS NATURE.*

[I.] RATIONALISTIC THEORY.

What is the rationalistic theory of the nature of regeneration?

[II.] RITUALISTIC THEORY.

What is the ritualistic or Romish doctrine as to the nature and means of regeneration?

What are the various opinions upon this subject entertained in the English church?

[III.] EVANGELICAL THEORY.

§ 1. ORTHODOXY.

1. STATED.—What is the evangelical doctrine on the subject of regeneration, as presented in the symbols of the Presbyterian church?

What are the principal points involved in the doctrine?

2. PROVED.—How may be it proved that regeneration is not a physical change?

How may it be proved that it is a divine, not a human act?

How may it be proved that the whole man, and not the heart only, is the subject of regeneration?

What is the nature of habits, disposition or principles of grace?

How may it be proved that regeneration consists in the infusion of such habits?

3. OBJECTIONS.—What are the objections to this view of regeneration? and how may they be answered?

§ 2. DEPARTURES FROM ORTHODOXY.

(1.) What is the doctrine of Dr. Emmons as to regeneration? and the objections to it?

(2.) What is Prof. Finney's theory? and the objections to it?

What is the New Haven theory? and the objections to it?

- (3.) What is the theory which confines regeneration to the affections? and the objections to it?

II. NECESSITY OF REGENERATION.

- (1.) How is the necessity of regeneration an inevitable inference from the doctrine of native depravity?
 (2.) How may it be proved, from the nature of heaven?
 (3.) How, from the express declarations of Scripture?

II. FAITH.

What is FAITH, in the popular sense of the word? in its strict or limited sense?

How is faith distinguished (1) from sight? (2) from intuition, from knowledge and from opinion?

What is RELIGIOUS faith?

What is SAVING faith?

I. THE PROTESTANT DOCTRINE.

How is saving faith defined in the Symbols of the Protestant church?

[I.] ELEMENTS OF FAITH.

§ 1. KNOWLEDGE.

1. STATED.—(1.) Does faith include comprehension?
 (2.) What is the Romanist distinction between “explicit” and “implicit” faith?

How does this differ from the Protestant doctrine of faith?

2. PROVED.—(1.) How is the necessity of knowledge in order to faith proved from the very nature of faith itself?
 (2.) How, from the effects ascribed to faith?
 (3.) How, from the interchange of these terms (knowledge and faith) in Scripture?

How does the difference between Romanists and Protestants upon this point modify the entire religious systems of the respective churches?

§ 2. ASSENT.

1. STATED.—What is the nature of the assent which is included in faith?

How do Romanists and Protestants differ on that point?

What is the ground of hereditary, of historical, and of temporary faith?

What is the ground of saving faith? on what kind of evidence is the assent included in it founded?

2. **PROVED.**—How may it be proved that the demonstration of the Spirit is the foundation of saving faith?

§ 3. TRUST.

1. **STATED.**—In what sense is trust included in saving faith?

How do Romanists and Protestants differ on that point?

2. **PROVED.**—How may the Protestant doctrine be established?

[II.] OBJECT OF FAITH.

What is the object of saving faith?

What is the distinction made by Protestants between general and special, or saving and justifying faith?

How far is Christ in all his offices the object of justifying faith?

[III.] THE EFFECTS OF FAITH.

1. **UNION WITH CHRIST.**—What is the nature of the union with Christ arising from faith?

2. **PEACE.**—What is the nature of Christian peace? and what its foundation?

Is assurance assented to faith?

What are the grounds of assurance?

Is assurance attainable?

3. **LOVE AND GOOD WORKS.**—What is the Romish doctrine of a “formed” and “unformed” faith?

How is the inseparable connection between faith and love proved?

II. THE ROMISH DOCTRINE.

[I.] THE NATURE OF FAITH.

What is the Romish view of the nature of faith?

[II.] THE OBJECT OF FAITH.

According to Romanists, what is the object of faith?

[III.] THE GROUND OF FAITH.

What is the Romish doctrine as to the ground of faith?

[IV.] THE EFFECTS OF FAITH.

- According to the Romanists, does faith alone justify?
 Does faith necessarily involve justification?
 What is the relation of faith to other Christian graces?
 Does faith produce peace?
 How does this view of faith account (1) for the withholding of the Scriptures, (2) the doctrine of reserve in preaching, (3) the symbolical worship, and (4) the use of an unknown tongue in worship, in the Romish Church?
 What grace is the instrument of salvation, according to the Romanists?

III. REPENTANCE.

- What are the Hebrew words usual to express repentance? and what are their respective significations?
 What is the difference between *μετανοια* and *μεταμελεια*?

I. THE PROTESTANT DOCTRINE.

[I.] NATURE OF REPENTANCE.

§ 1. DEFINITIONS.

- (1.) What is the Lutheran definition of repentance?
 (2.) What was Calvin's definition?
 (3.) How is it defined in our catechism?
 According to that definition, what is included in repentance?

§ 2. ANALYSIS.

1. EXERCISES WHICH FLOW FROM THE APPREHENSION OF GOD'S JUSTICE.—What is the nature of the conviction of sin included in repentance?
 2. OF GOD'S HOLINESS.—What emotions are awakened in the soul which apprehends the holiness of God?
 How do these feelings naturally express themselves?
 How far is the confession of sin necessary?
 What is the Lutheran doctrine of auricular confession?
 What is the Reformed doctrine?

3. OF GOD'S MERCY.—What is the nature of the grief and hatred of sin experienced by the true penitent?

How far is the apprehension of mercy necessary to repentance?

[II.] EVIDENCES OF REPENTANCE.

What are the evidences of genuine repentance?

II. THE ROMISH DOCTRINE.

What is the sacrament of penance, according to Romanists?

What is the design of that sacrament?

Of what does it consist?

§ 1. ON THE PART OF THE PENITENT.

1. CONTRITION.—What is the Romish doctrine as to contrition?

(1) perfect? (2) initial? (3) imperfect?

2. CONFESSION.—What, as to confession?

3. SATISFACTION.—What, as to satisfaction? What, as to indulgence?

§ 2. ON THE PART OF THE PRIEST.

What is the Romish doctrine of sacerdotal absolution?

IV. JUSTIFICATION.

I. THE COMMON PROTESTANT DOCTRINE.

How is the doctrine of justification stated in the symbols of the Lutheran and Reformed churches?

[I.] NATURE OF JUSTIFICATION.

§ 1. IT IS A FORENSIC ACT.

1. STATED.—How is a forensic act distinguished from an executive act?

How, from an efficient act?

2. PROVED.—(1.) What argument to prove that justification is a judicial act may be derived from the uniform meaning in Scripture of the word *δικαιωω*?

(2.) From those passages in which men are said to be justified gratuitously?

(3.) From analogous figurative expressions in Scripture?

- (4.) From the antithesis between justification and condemnation?
- (5.) From equivalent Scripture expressions?
- (6.) From the general tenor of Scripture?
- (7.) From the substitution of the word "sanctify" for "justify" in those passages in which the word "justify" occurs?

§ 2. IT INCLUDES IMPUTATION OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.

1. STATED.—Does justification signify simple pardon?
2. PROVED.—(1.) How may it be proved that justification includes a declaration of righteousness, from the universal signification of the word?
- (2.) What error does the opposite doctrine involve?
- (3.) How are the representations of Scripture as to the ground of justification inconsistent with the doctrine that justification is simply pardon?
- (4.) What argument may be derived from the effects of justification?

[II.] GROUND OF JUSTIFICATION.

§ 1. NOT WORKS.

1. PELAGIANISM.—How do Pelagians understand the declaration that justification is "not of works?"
2. ARMINIANISM.—What works do Arminians exclude?
3. ROMANISM.—What works do Romanists exclude?
4. PROTESTANTISM.—How may it be proved that the Scriptures exclude *all* works from being the ground of justification?
- (1.) From the whole course of Paul's argument?
- (2.) From the character of the law of which he speaks?
- (3.) From the antithesis between works and faith?
- (4.) From the declaration that justification is gratuitous?
- (5.) From Christian experience?

§ 2. BUT THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST.

1. STATED.—(1.) How may it be proved that the righteousness of Christ is the only ground of justification? Rom. iii. 25, v. 18, 19; 1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 21.
- (2.) How may it be proved that the righteousness of Christ includes his active as well as passive obedience? Gal. iv. 4; Rom. v. 18.
- (3.) In what sense is Christ's righteousness imputed to us?

What is the ground of its imputation? or the nature of the union between Christ and the believer?

What is the proof of its imputation? Rom. iv. 6, v. 18, 19; 2 Cor. v. 21.

2. OBJECTIONS.—(1.) How is the objection to be answered that the Protestant doctrine makes justification merely outward?

(2.) How, that it represents the believer as being as righteous as Christ?

(3.) How, that the obedience of Christ was due for himself?

(4.) How, that this doctrine destroys the grace of the gospel?

(5.) How, that it renders good works unnecessary?

(6.) How, that the elect come into the world under condemnation?

(7.) How, that believers are punished after justification?

[III.] MEANS OF JUSTIFICATION.

What do the Romanists make the means of justification?

What is the Arminian view as to the relation of faith to justification?

What is the common Protestant view?

How is it proved that faith is the instrument of justification?

What is the object of justifying faith?

II. PROTESTANT DEPARTURES FROM THE TRUE DOCTRINE.

[1.] PISCATOR.

How did Piscator differ from the doctrine of the Reformed church

(1) as to the nature, and (2) as to the ground, of justification?

How were his innovations received?

[II.] ARMINIANISM.

§ 1. STATED.

What was the historical origin of Arminianism?

1. NATURE OF JUSTIFICATION.—What is the Arminian doctrine as to the nature of justification?

2. GROUND OF JUSTIFICATION.—What, as to the ground of justification?

In what respect is justification gratuitous, according to the Arminian doctrine?

3. NATURE OF JUSTIFYING FAITH.—What is the Arminian doctrine concerning the nature and office of faith in justification?

§ 2. REFUTED.

What are the leading objections to the Arminian doctrine of justification?

[III.] RATIONALISM.

In what sense do rationalists admit that men are justified or saved by faith?

[IV.] NEW SCHOOL THEOLOGY.

How do the more orthodox of the New School theologians differ from us as to the nature of justification?

How, as to its ground? or as to the imputation of righteousness?

[V.] GOVERNMENTAL THEORY.

What view of justification is connected with the governmental theory of the atonement?

[VI.] DR. EMMONS' DOCTRINE.

What is Dr. Emmons' doctrine on this subject?

III. THE ROMISH DOCTRINE.

[I.] NATURE OF JUSTIFICATION.

What does justification include, according to Romanists?

- (1.) What is meant by remission?
- (2.) What, by the infusion of righteousness?

[II.] GROUND OF JUSTIFICATION.

- (1.) What is the *efficient* cause of justification?
- (2.) What, the *meritorious* cause?
- (3.) What, the *formal* cause?
- (4.) What, the *predisposing* causes?

[III.] MEANS OF JUSTIFICATION.

What is the means of justification, according to Romanists?

How does this involve the doctrine of progressive justification?

V. SANCTIFICATION.

I. NATURE OF SANCTIFICATION.

[I.] PELAGIANISM.

What is the Pelagian view of the nature of sanctification?

[II.] ARMINIANISM.

What is the Semi-Pelagian view?

[III.] ROMANISM.

What is the Romish theory?

[IV.] PROTESTANTISM.

What are the Scripture expressions for sanctification? and what is their import?

§ 1. THE AUTHOR OF SANCTIFICATION.

To whom is the work of sanctification ascribed in the Scriptures?

(1.) 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. xiii. 21; (2.) Tit. ii. 14; Eph. v. 26; John xvii. 15; (3.) Rom. xv. 16.

In what sense is sanctification a work of free grace?

§ 2. THE SUBJECT OF SANCTIFICATION.

(1.) How does it appear that the mind is sanctified?

(2.) How, the heart?

(3.) How, the body?

§ 3. SANCTIFICATION NOT MERE REFORMATION.

How does sanctification differ from mere moral reformation?

§ 4. THE MEANS OF SANCTIFICATION.

1. INWARD.—How are we sanctified by faith?

2. OUTWARD.—(1.) How, by the truth?

(2.) How, by the sacraments?

(3.) How, by prayer?

§ 5. THE FRUITS OF SANCTIFICATION.

1. NATURE OF GOOD WORKS.—What is the distinction between the Reformed and the Remonstrant doctrine as to absolutely good works?

2. CONDITIONS OF GOOD WORKS.—1st. What are the necessary conditions of a good work?

(1.) In what sense do Protestants teach that no uncommanded work can be good?

(2.) What must be the nature of every good work?

(3.) In what sense must a good work be done for the glory of God?

2d. In what sense are the works of the unrenewed good?

What does the Bible mean when it says that the ploughing of the wicked is sin?

3. NECESSITY OF GOOD WORKS.—What is the Protestant doctrine as to the necessity of good works?

What are the grounds of this necessity?

4. RELATION OF GOOD WORKS TO REWARD.—1st. *Protestant Doctrine*.—What is the Protestant doctrine as to the relation between good works and reward?

✓ What is the meaning of the word “merit?”

What are the conditions of a meritorious work?

2d. *Romish Doctrine*.—What is the Romish doctrine on this subject?

What is the Romish distinction between the merit of congruity and the merit of condignity?

II. PERFECTONISM.

[I.] THE DOCTRINE STATED.

What is included in perfection, according to all the advocates of perfectionism?

As to what points do perfectionists differ from each other?

§ 1. PELAGIANISM.

What are the two radical principles of Pelagianism?

What is the Pelagian doctrine of perfectionism?

What is the Pelagian view of grace?

How was this doctrine received by the church?

§ 2. ROMANISM.

What is the Romish doctrine on this subject?

In what sense do they teach that men may be free from sin, and perfectly obey the law?

§ 3. ARMINIANISM.

(1.) What is included in perfection, according to the Remonstrants and Wesley?

What are the three degrees of perfection?

(2.) What is the Wesleyan definition of sin?

In what sense does perfection include freedom from sin?

(3.) In what sense is the obedience rendered perfect?

(4.) According to what law are men pronounced perfect?

(5.) How is perfection due to the grace of God?

§ 4. OBERLIN THEORY.

What is the Oberlin theory?

According to this theory, what does the law demand?

On what principles is this theory founded, as to holiness, sin, obligation, and ability?

[II.] ARGUMENTS FOR PERFECTIONISM.

What is the argument for ability urged in favor of perfectionism? and how is it answered?

What are the other arguments in favor of the doctrine?

[III.] ARGUMENTS AGAINST PERFECTIONISM.

(1.) How may this doctrine be shown to rest on false views of sin?

(2.) And on false views of the nature of God's law?

(3.) How does it create a false standard of character?

(4.) How does it contradict Scripture?

(5.) How does it contradict experience?

(6.) How do perfectionists themselves illustrate the delusive character of their belief?

(7.) How does it tend to Antinomianism?

ESCHATOLOGY.

I. STATE OF THE SOUL AFTER DEATH.

I. THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

- (1.) What is the argument for the immortality of the soul, derived from common consent?
 - (2.) What is the metaphysical argument?
 - (3.) What, the teleological argument?
 - (4.) What, the theological argument?
 - (5.) What, the Scripture argument?
- How far is this doctrine taught in the Old Testament?

II. INTERMEDIATE STATE.

[I.] THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE.

1. BELIEVERS.—(1.) How may it be proved that believers are at death made perfect in holiness?
 - (2.) How, that they do immediately pass into glory?
 2. IMPENITENT.—What is the condition of the impenitent, immediately after death? and how is it proved?
- What difference is there between the condition of the soul, immediately after death, and its condition after the final judgment?

[II.] ERRONEOUS VIEWS.

§ 1. THE SOUL ASLEEP.

How far did the doctrine of a sleep of the soul after death prevail?

§ 2. HADES.

What was the Jewish doctrine of *hades*?

To what extent did this view prevail in the Christian church?

§ 3. PURGATORY.

What was the earliest form of the doctrine of a purification by fire after death?

What was the origin of that doctrine?

What was the doctrine taught by the Schoolmen?

1. ROMISH DOCTRINE STATED.—Into what classes do Romanists divide the souls of the dead?

Who go immediately to heaven? who immediately to hell? and who to purgatory?

What do Romanists teach as to the nature, design, and duration of the pains of purgatory?

How far, and on what grounds, do they represent purgatory as under “the power of the keys?”

2. ROMISH ARGUMENTS.—(1.) What is the argument for purgatory from tradition? and how answered?

(2.) What is the argument from the rites of the church? and how answered?

(3.) What, from special revelations?

(4.) What, from the custom of praying for the dead? and how answered?

(5.) What, from Scripture?

What are the real foundations of this doctrine? (1) theoretical? and (2) practical?

3. PROTESTANT ARGUMENTS.—(1.) How is this doctrine refuted by its unscriptural character?

(2.) How does it contradict the Scripture doctrine of justification?

(3.) How, that of probation in this life?

(4.) How, that of the state of the dead?

II. THE RESURRECTION.

I. THE DOCTRINE.

§ 1. THE FACT.

(1.) State the argument in favor of a resurrection of the body, from the distinction which the Scriptures make between the soul and the body?

(2.) What passages speak of the inhabitants of the grave rising? John v. 26, 28, vi. 39; Acts xxiv. 15; Rom. viii. 11, 22; Phil. iii. 20, 21; 1 Thess. iv. 16.

How does the apostle prove the resurrection in 1 Cor. chap. xv?

How is the resurrection of Christ established?

(3.) State the argument from the subject of the change spoken of—Rom. viii. 22; 1 Cor. vi. 15, 20; xv. 21, 22.

§ 2. UNIVERSALITY OF THE RESURRECTION.

What passages of Scripture teach that the impenitent as well as believers shall be raised up? Dan. xii. 2; John v. 28, 29.

§ 3. IDENTITY OF THE RESURRECTION BODY.

How may it be proved that the Scriptures teach the identity of our future with our present bodies?

Is it necessary, in order to faith in the doctrine, to know in what that identity consists?

What is necessarily involved in the idea of identity of substance?

How may it be shown that an identity as to substance in this case is not impossible?

Is identity of substance necessary in order to the identity of the resurrection body?

Wherein consists the identity of the body in this life?

Wherein consists the identity of a work of art?

§ 4. NATURE OF THE RESURRECTION BODY.

What do the Scriptures teach as to the nature of the future body?

In what sense is it to be spiritual?

In what sense is it not to be flesh and blood?

§ 5. TIME OF THE RESURRECTION.

What do the Scriptures teach as to the time of the resurrection?

II. HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE.

How far did the doctrine of the resurrection prevail among ancient nations?

How is the coincidence between their views and those of the Bible to be accounted for?

How far is the doctrine of the resurrection taught in the Old Testament?

By whom was this doctrine opposed at the time of the advent of Christ? and by whom immediately after?

Under what different forms did the doctrine appear in the early church?

What were the representations common in the seventeenth century?

III. THE END OF THE WORLD.

I. THE SECOND ADVENT.

What is the meaning of the phrases "coming" and "day of the Lord," as used in the Old Testament?

What is the meaning of the same phrases in the New Testament?

What are the different views of the nature of Christ's coming, as spoken of in the New Testament?

§ 1. THE FACT OF THE ADVENT.

1. PROVED.—How may it be proved that the Scriptures foretell a second, visible, glorious advent of the Son of God? Matt. xvi. 27, xxiv. 30, xxv. 31, xxvi. 64; Mark viii. 38; Luke xxi. 27; Acts i. 11, iii. 19, 21; 1 Cor. i. 7, iv. 5, xv. 23; 2 Cor. i. 14; Phil. i. 6, ii. 16, iii. 20, 21; Col. iii. 4; 2 Thess. i. 7, 10, ii. 1, 12; 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 8; Titus ii. 13; 1 Peter i. 4, 7, iv. 5, 13, v. 4; 2 Peter i. 16, iii. 3, 13; James v. 7, 8.

2. OBJECTIONS.—(1.) How is the objection to this view to be answered, derived from the manner in which similar predictions of the Old Testament have been fulfilled?

(2.) How is this view to be reconciled with the declaration that the generation then living should not pass away until those prophecies were fulfilled?

What are the three different methods of interpreting the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew?

§ 2. TIME OF THE ADVENT.

What were the expectations of the apostles with regard to the second advent? and how were those expectations modified?

What do the Scriptures teach concerning the time of Christ's second advent?

What are the different opinions in the church with regard to it?

II. THE MILLENNIUM.

§ 1. JEWISH DOCTRINE.

What was the Jewish doctrine of the millennium?

§ 2. EARLY CHRISTIAN OPINIONS.

What view on that subject prevailed in the early church?

§ 3. THE ALEXANDRIAN VIEW.

How was the view of the early church superseded?

§ 4. MODERN OPINION.

What is the common modern opinion on the subject?

Restoration of the Jews.

1. ARGUMENTS FOR A LITERAL RESTORATION.—What are the arguments in favour of the return of the Jews to the land of Palestine?

2. OPPOSING ARGUMENTS.—What are the arguments against it?

§ 5. THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

What was the teaching of the Saviour concerning his kingdom?

What did the apostles teach, on this subject?

What is the true interpretation of the twentieth chapter of Revelation?

III. THE FINAL JUDGMENT.

[I.] ERRONEOUS VIEWS.

§ 1. THE JUDGMENT PRESENT.

- (1.) What is the common rationalistic form of the doctrine that the judgment is a process now in progress?
- (2.) What form of this opinion is founded on the prophecies of the Old Testament?
- (3.) What is the pantheistic form of this opinion?

§ 2. A FUTURE DISPENSATION.

What erroneous opinion as to the nature and duration of the final judgment is connected with one common form of millenarianism?

[II.] THE TRUE VIEW.

What are some of the passages of Scripture in which the final judgment is described? Matt. xi. 24, xiii. 30, xxxix. 43, 49, xvi. 27, xxiv. 29, 35, xxv. 30, 40; John v. 22, 29, xii. 48; Acts x. 42, xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 5, 16, xiv. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Cor. v. 10; 2 Thess. i. 7, 10; 2 Tim. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 4, iii. 4, 13; Jude 6; Rev. xx. 12, 13.

- (1.) What do we know with regard to the duration of the judgment?
- (2.) With what other predicted events is it to be connected?

- (3.) Who is to be the judge?
- (4.) Who are to be judged?
- (5.) What do the Scriptures teach concerning the completeness of the revelation of sin to be made at the judgment?
- (6.) When is the judgment to take place?
- (7.) What are two remarkable characteristics of the prophecies of Scripture already accomplished? and what is the bearing of the remark upon the literal fulfilment of the prophecies concerning the judgment?

IV. THE DESTRUCTION OF THE WORLD.

What passages of Scripture refer to the destruction of the world?
 Psa. cii. 25, 26; Isa. li. 6, lxxv. 17; Matt. v. 18, 24, 29;
 Luke xxi. 33; Rom. viii. 19, 21; Heb. xii. 26, 27;
 2 Pet. iii. 5-13; Rev. xx. 11, xxi. 1.

- (1.) What is the *figurative* interpretation of these passages entertained by some? and why is it untenable?
- (2.) According to the *literal* interpretation, is the world to be destroyed? or to be renewed?

What is meant, in these passages, by "world," "heavens," and "earth?"

IV. HEAVEN AND HELL.

I. EVERLASTING LIFE.

Is heaven a place or a state?

Wherein does the blessedness of heaven consist (1) negatively?
 (2) positively?

Will there be degrees of blessedness in heaven?

II. ETERNAL DEATH.

§ 1. NATURE OF HELL.

Is hell a place or a state?

Wherein does the misery of hell consist?

Is the fire of hell literal fire?

§ 2. DURATION OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

What are the various opinions with regard to the duration of future punishment?

1. PROVED.—(1.) How may the absolute eternity of future punishment be proved from the silence of Scripture?
- (2.) How from the signification of the terms $\alpha\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\alpha\iota\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$?
- (3.) How, from other synonymous expressions?
- (4.) How, from Christ's declaration concerning the sin against the Holy Ghost?
- (5.) How, from the declaration that the wrath of God abideth on the condemned?
2. OBJECTIONS.—(1.) What is the Scripture objection to this doctrine?
- (2.) What is the objection founded on God's justice? and how may it be answered?
- (3.) What is the objection founded on the benevolence of God? and how may it be answered?

THE SACRAMENTS.

I. THE SACRAMENTS.

I. NATURE OF A SACRAMENT.

- What is the classic usage of the word *sacramentum*?
- What was the meaning of the term in the early Latin church?
- What was the patristic definition of a sacrament?
- What, the scholastic?
- What, the Romish?
- What, the Protestant?
- How is the idea of a sacrament to be determined?

II. NUMBER OF SACRAMENTS.

- How is the number of sacraments to be determined?
- What is the Romish doctrine on that point?
- What are the objections to it?

III. EFFICACY OF THE SACRAMENTS.

§ 1. ROMANISM.

What is the Romish doctrine as to the efficacy of the sacraments in general?

What peculiar efficacy in addition is ascribed to baptism, confirmation and orders?

In what sense do Romanists teach that the sacraments contain the grace which they convey?

In what sense do they convey grace *ex opere operato*?

What are the conditions required in the recipient?

What is necessary in the administrator?

What is the Romish doctrine of intention?

§ 2. LUTHERANISM.

What is the Lutheran doctrine as to the efficacy of the sacraments?

In what points does it differ from the Romish doctrine?

§ 3. THE REFORMED DOCTRINE.

What is the Reformed doctrine as to the efficacy of the sacraments?

How does it differ from the Lutheran doctrine?

§ 4. THE REMONSTRANT DOCTRINE.

What was the Zwinglian (afterward the Remonstrant) doctrine on this subject?

IV. NECESSITY OF THE SACRAMENTS.

(1.) What is the *Romish* doctrine as to the necessity of the sacraments?

(2.) What, the *Lutheran*?

(3.) What, the *Reformed*?

V. VALIDITY OF THE SACRAMENTS.

What is meant by the validity of the sacraments?

On what does it depend?

II. BAPTISM.

I. THE EXTERNAL FORM.

§ 1. MODE OF BAPTISM.

What was the prevalence of religious washings in the East?

What is Christian baptism?

- (1.) What is the argument in favor of the view that baptism is a washing, and not merely immersion from the design of the ordinance?
- (2.) What, from the character of the Christian dispensation?
- (3.) What, from the usage of the words βαπτω and βαπτίζω? What, from the baptism of cups, etc.?
- What, from the interchange between βαπτω and νιπτω?
- (4.) What, from the record of baptisms in the New Testament?
- (5.) What, from the significance of the rite?
- (6.) What, from the baptism of the Holy Ghost?

§ 2. FORMULA OF BAPTISM.

What is the prescribed formula of baptism?

What is its import?

What does "baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus" mean?

II. DESIGN AND EFFICACY OF BAPTISM.

§ 1. THE REFORMED DOCTRINE.

What is the twofold design of baptism?

1st. On the Believer's Part.

What does baptism involve, upon the part of the recipient?

2d. On God's Part.

1. IT IS A SIGN.—What does baptism signify?
2. IT IS A SEAL.—How is it a seal?
3. IT CONVEYS BLESSING.—In what sense does baptism convey the blessings of the covenant?

To what is this efficacy to be referred?
How is the efficacy of baptism proved?

§ 2. THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE.

What is the Lutheran doctrine as to the efficacy of baptism?
To what is this efficacy due?
Why is faith essential to its efficacy?
What was the origin of Luther's view of baptism?

§ 3. THE ROMISH DOCTRINE.

What is the Romish doctrine upon this subject?

III. SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

To whom is baptism to be administered?

[I.] ADULT BAPTISM.

§ 1. POINTS AGREED UPON.

What are the qualifications for adult baptism?
How is that point determined?
(1.) What is meant by "competent knowledge," as a qualification for baptism?
(2.) What, by "a credible profession?"

§ 2. POINT DISPUTED.

(1.) What is the usage of the *Romish*, *Greek* and *Anglican* churches as to adult baptism? and on what does it rest?
(2.) What is the *Pelagian* doctrine and custom?
(3.) What, the common Protestant?

[II.] INFANT BAPTISM.

§ 1. ARE INFANTS PROPER SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM?

1. AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT.—What is the church?

1st. How may it be proved that there was a church under the Old Testament dispensation?
2d. How may it be proved that the condition of membership was then the same as it is now?

3d. (1.) How may it be proved that *infants were members of the church then*, from the spiritual import of circumcision?

From the analogy between circumcision and baptism?

From the penalty pronounced on the uncircumcised?

(2.) How may it be proved that *infants have not been excluded from the church under the New Testament?*

What is the argument from the silence of the New Testament?

What, from the command of Christ to make disciples, as interpreted by the apostles?

What, from the usage of the early church, as recorded in the New Testament?

What, from the practice of the church, since then?

What, from the analogy between the covenant of grace and the covenants in which by divine command children have been included with their parents?

2. OBJECTION.—How is the objection to be answered, that baptism implies confession of faith, which children cannot make?

§ 2. WHOSE CHILDREN ARE ENTITLED TO BAPTISM?

1st. *Romish Usage.*

What is the Romish usage as to the baptism of children? and on what principle is it founded?

2d. *Protestant Usage.*

What answer is given to this question in the standards of Protestant churches?

1. FIRST EXTREME.—What is the principle on which many churches baptize the children of all baptized parents?

What is meant by the “halfway” covenant? and to what practice did it lead as to this point?

2. SECOND EXTREME.—What is the Puritan doctrine and practice?

3. THE TRUE ANSWER.—What is the doctrine of the Reformed church?

How is that doctrine sustained against the lax European practice?

How, against the Puritan?

III. THE LORD'S SUPPER.

I. SCRIPTURE ACCOUNT OF THE ORDINANCE.

What are the passages of Scripture which relate to the Lord's supper?

What are the different designations which it has received in the church?

§ 1. ITS PERPETUAL OBLIGATION.

How is the perpetual obligation of this sacrament proved?

§ 2. ELEMENTS USED.

Why are the bread and wine called elements?

What kinds of bread do different churches use?

What is the Scripture meaning of the word *οἶνος*? and what is the usage of the church as to the kind of wine?

On what ground do the Romish church withhold the cup from the laity?

§ 3. HOW ADMINISTERED.

1. CONSECRATED.—What is the import of the words *εὐχαριστω* and *εὐλογεω*, as used in connection with this ordinance?

2. BREAKING BREAD.—How does it appear that breaking the bread is an important part of the service?

3. DISTRIBUTION.—How does the importance of the distribution of the elements appear?

On what grounds do Romanists so often omit the distribution of the elements?

What does our church teach as to the communion of the sick?

§ 4. ITS DESIGN.

What is the design of the Lord's Supper?

How does it signify, seal, and apply the benefits of redemption?

§ 5. THE PARTICIPANTS.

(1.) In the early church, who were admitted to the Lord's Supper?

- (2.) What is the practice among those who regard the Lord's Supper as a converting ordinance?
 (3.) What is the true doctrine on this subject?

II. DOCTRINE OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

What was the doctrine of impanation?

What other forms of doctrine as to the nature and efficacy of the Lord's Supper are found in the early church?

III. ROMISH DOCTRINE.

1. STATED.—(1.) What was the gradual development of the Romish doctrine during the middle ages?
 (2.) How is the Romish doctrine exhibited in the canons of the Council of Trent?
 (3.) What is the distinction which the Church of Rome makes between the efficacy of the institution as a sacrament and as a sacrifice?
 2. REFUTED.—What are the objections to this doctrine?

IV. LUTHERAN DOCTRINE.

- (1.) How is this doctrine presented in the symbols of the Lutheran church?
 (2.) In what points does the Lutheran agree with the Romish doctrine?
 (3.) In what does it differ?
 (4.) What is the peculiar doctrine of the Lutheran church as to the ubiquity of Christ's body?

V. REFORMED DOCTRINE.

What are the sources of difficulty in determining the true doctrine of the Reformed churches on this subject?

What are the three forms of opinion which prevailed in the Reformed churches, on this subject?

What documents represent these several forms?

§ 1. CHRIST'S PRESENCE.

What are the different answers to the question, in what sense is Christ present in the Lord's Supper? (1.) The Zwinglian? (2.) The Calvinistic? (3.) The Compromise?

§ 2. RECEIVING CHRIST.

What are the different answers to the question, what is meant by "receiving Christ" in the Lord's Supper?

How do believers receive Christ?

What is it that believers do receive?

§ 3. EFFICACY OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

What is the efficacy which the Reformed churches attribute to the Lord's Supper?

How may it be shown that the peculiar views of Calvin were not those of the Reformed churches, either generally or permanently?

FINIS.

I N D E X .

INTRODUCTION. NATURE, FORMS AND SOURCES OF THEOLOGY.

| | PAGE |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| <i>First. Its Nature,</i> | 5 |
| I. Theology, | 5 |
| II. Religion, | 5 |
| III. Relation between Religion and Theology, | 5 |
| 1. Schleiermacher's Theory, | 5 |
| 2. The True View, | 6 |
| <i>Second. Its Forms,</i> | 6 |
| I. Natural Theology, | 6 |
| II. Revealed Theology, | 6 |
| <i>Third. Its Sources,</i> | 7 |
| I. Rationalism, | 7 |
| 1. Rationalistic Theories: Deism, Partial Revelation, Accommodation, | 7 |
| 2. The True Office of Reason, | 8 |
| II. Enthusiasm, | 8 |
| III. Romanism, | 10 |
| 1. Roman Catholic Rule of Faith, | 10 |
| 2. Examination of the Romish Theory, | 11 |
| IV. Protestantism, | 12 |
| Inspiration—Plenary Inspiration, | 13 |

BOOK FIRST:—THEOLOGY PROPER.

PART I. DEUS EXISTENS.

I. God Considered as One.

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|----|
| I. THE BEING OF GOD. | |
| I. Origin of the Idea of God, | 15 |
| II. Proof of the Existence of God, | 16 |
| 1. The Ontological Argument, | 16 |
| 2. The Cosmological Argument, | 16 |

| | PAGE. |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 3. The Teleological Argument, | 17 |
| 4. The Moral Argument, | 17 |
| 5. The Argument from Consent, | 18 |
| III. Systems opposed to Theism, | 18 |
| 1. Polytheism, | 19 |
| 2. Atheism. (1)Hylozoism. (2)Materialism. (3)Pantheism, 19 | |
| II. THE NATURE OF GOD. | |
| I. The Knowledge of God, | 19 |
| 1. Can God be known? | 19 |
| 2. How may God be known? | 20 |
| II. The Definition of God, | 21 |
| III. THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD. | |
| I. What is an Attribute? | 21 |
| II. How do Attributes differ? | 21 |
| III. Classification of the Attributes, | 21 |
| 1. Spirituality, | 22 |
| 2. Infinitude, | 22 |
| 3. Eternity, | 23 |
| 4. Immutability, | 23 |
| 5. Omniscience, | 24 |
| 6. Will, | 24 |
| 7. Omnipotence, | 25 |
| 8. Holiness, | 26 |
| 9. Justice, | 26 |
| 10. Goodness, | 27 |
| 11. Truth, | 27 |
| 12. Sovereignty, | 27 |

II. God Considered as Triune.

THE TRINITY.

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. The Biblical Statement, | 28 |
| II. The Ecclesiastical Statement, | 28 |
| 1. History of Error, | 28 |
| 2. Council of Nice, | 28 |
| 3. Church Doctrine, | 29 |
| 4. Eternal Generation. Sonship of Christ, | 30 |
| 5. Procession of the Spirit, | 30 |
| III. The Philosophical Statement, | 31 |

III. The Second and Third Persons of the Godhead considered separately.

I. CHRIST. HIS DIVINITY.

| | |
|---------------------------------------------|----|
| I. Proof from the Old Testament, | 31 |
| II. Proof from the New Testament, | 32 |

| | |
|----------------------------------------|------|
| II. THE HOLY SPIRIT. | PAGE |
| I. The Doctrine, | 34 |
| II. History of the Doctrine, | 35 |

PART II. DEUS VOLENS.

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|----|
| I. THE DECREES OF GOD. | |
| I. The Doctrine Stated and Proved, | 36 |
| II. Objections Refuted, | 37 |
| II. ELECTION. | |
| I. The Doctrine Stated and Proved, | 37 |
| II. Objections Refuted, | 38 |
| III. History of the Doctrine, | 38 |
| III. REPROBATION. | |
| I. The Doctrine Stated and Proved, | 38 |
| II. Objections Refuted, | 39 |
| IV. ORDER OF THE DECREES. | 39 |

PART III. DEUS AGENS.

I. God's Ordinary Works.

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. CREATION. | |
| I. The Doctrine Stated, | 40 |
| II. Proof of the Doctrine, | 40 |
| III. Objections Refuted, | 40 |
| IV. The Design of Creation, | 41 |
| V. Mosaic Account of the Creation, | 41 |
| II. PROVIDENCE. | |
| I. Preservation, | 41 |
| 1. The Fact, | 41 |
| 2. Nature of the Divine Efficiency in Preservation, | 42 |
| II. Government, | 42 |
| 1. The Fact, | 42 |
| 2. Universality of the Divine Government, | 43 |
| 3. Nature of God's Providential Government, | 43 |
| (1.) The Mechanical Theory, | 43 |
| (2.) Theory of Occasional Causes, | 43 |
| (3.) The Harmonic Theory, | 44 |
| (4.) The Doctrine of Concursus | 44 |
| (5.) The Scripture Doctrine, | 45 |

II. God's Extraordinary Works.

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|----|
| MIRACLES. | |
| I. What is a Miracle? | 45 |
| II. Are Miracles possible? | 46 |
| III. Can a Miracle be known? | 46 |
| IV. Value of Miracles as Evidence, | 46 |

THE LAW OF GOD.

| | PAGE |
|------------------------------------|------|
| I. In General, | 47 |
| II. The Decalogue, | 48 |
| III. The Ceremonial Law, | 52 |

BOOK SECOND:—ANTHROPOLOGY.

PART I.—ORIGIN, NATURE AND PRIMITIVE STATE OF MAN.

I. CREATION OF MAN.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| I. The Scripture Account, | 53 |
| II. False Theories, | 53 |

II. NATURE OF MAN.

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. Dualism, | 54 |
| 1. The Scripture Doctrine, | 54 |
| 2. Opposing Errors. (1.) Materialism and Idealism; (2.) Pantheism; (3.) Trichotomy, | 54 |
| II. Realism, | 55 |
| III. Origin of the Soul, | 56 |
| 1. Preëxistence, | 56 |
| 2. The Traducian Controversy, | 56 |
| IV. Unity of the Race, | 57 |
| 1. The Zoölogical Argument, | 57 |
| 2. The Philological Argument, | 58 |
| 3. The Moral Argument, | 58 |

III. ORIGINAL STATE OF MAN.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| I. The Protestant Doctrine, | 58 |
| II. The Romanist Doctrine, | 59 |
| III. The Pelagian Doctrine, | 60 |

PART II. MAN'S PROBATION AND APOSTASY.

THE COVENANT WITH ADAM AND THE FALL.

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. The Covenant with Adam. (1.) The Fact; (2.) The Promise; (3.) The Condition; (4.) The Penalty; (5.) The Parties; (6.) Perpetuity of the Covenant, | 61 |
| II. The Fall. (1.) The Scripture Account; (2.) The Tree of Life; (3.) The Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil; (4.) The Ser- pent; (5.) The Temptation; (6.) The Immediate Effect, | 62 |

PART III. NATURE OF SIN, AND OF ADAM'S TRANSGRESSION.

I. METAPHYSICAL THEORIES.

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|----|
| I. The Dualistic Theory, | 63 |
| II. The Limitation Theory, | 63 |
| III. Leibnitz's Theory, | 63 |
| IV. Theory of Action and Reaction, | 64 |

| | PAGE |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| V. Schleiermacher's Theory, | 64 |
| VI. The "Flesh" Theory, | 64 |
| VII. The "Selfishness" Theory, | 65 |
| II. THEOLOGICAL THEORIES. | |
| I. Patristic Theories, | 66 |
| II. Pelagianism, | 66 |
| III. Augustinianism, | 67 |
| 1. The Speculative Element, | 67 |
| 2. The Experimental Element. (1.) Augustine's Experi- ence; (2.) His Inferences; (3.) The Scripture Solution, | 67 |
| IV. Semi-Pelagianism, | 68 |
| V. Romanism, | 68 |
| 1. Anselm, | 68 |
| 2. Abelard, | 68 |
| 3. Aquinas, | 68 |
| 4. Duns Scotus, | 69 |
| 5. Council of Trent, | 69 |
| VI. Protestantism, | 70 |
| PART IV. EFFECT OF ADAM'S SIN ON HIS POSTERITY. | |
| I. IMPUTATION. | |
| I. Immediate Imputation, | |
| 1. The Doctrine Stated. (1.) The Fact, and (2.) The Ground of Imputation, | 72 |
| 2. The Doctrine Proved, | 73 |
| 3. Objections Answered, | 73 |
| II. Mediate Imputation, | 73 |
| III. "Propagation" Theories, | 74 |
| 1. Preëxistence, | 74 |
| 2. Realism, | 74 |
| II. ORIGINAL SIN. | |
| I. Its Nature, | 76 |
| 1. Erroneous Views, | 76 |
| 2. The True View, | 76 |
| II. Proof, | 76 |
| 1. That Depravity is Universal, | 76 |
| 2. That Depravity is Total, | 76 |
| 3. That Depravity is Inborn, | 77 |
| III. Objections Answered, | 77 |
| III. INABILITY. | |
| Symbolic Statements, | 78 |
| I. The Nature of Inability, | 78 |
| 1. Negatively, | 78 |
| 2. Affirmatively, | 78 |
| II. Proof of Inability, | 78 |
| III. Objections Answered, | 79 |
| IV. FREEDOM OF THE WILL. | |

BOOK THIRD:—SOTEROLOGY.

INTRODUCTION. THE COVENANT OF GRACE.

| | PAGE |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| I. The Remonstrant Theory, | 80 |
| II. The Reformed Doctrine, | 80 |
| 1. First Form. One Covenant, | 80 |
| 2. Second Form. Two Covenants. (1.) Redemption. (2.) Grace, | 80 |
| 3. Identity of the Covenant of Grace, | 81 |

PART I. THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. CHRIST'S MESSIAHSHIP. | |
| I. The Messiah has come, | 82 |
| II. Jesus is the Messiah, | 82 |
| II. CHRIST'S PERSON. | |
| I. The Doctrine, | 82 |
| 1. Christ's Two Natures, | 82 |
| 2. Christ's One Person, | 83 |
| II. Symbolic Statements of the Doctrine, | 83 |
| III. History of Error, | 83 |

PART II. THE WORK OF CHRIST.

| | |
|------------------------------|----|
| Christ a Mediator, | 85 |
|------------------------------|----|

I. Christ's Offices.

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. CHRIST'S OFFICE AS PROPHET, | 85 |
| II. CHRIST'S OFFICE AS PRIEST, | 85 |
| I. In what sense is Christ our Priest? | 85 |
| 1. Definition of a Priest, | 85 |
| 2. Christ a Real Priest, | 86 |
| 3. Nature of Christ's Priesthood, | 86 |
| II. How does Christ Execute the Office of Priest? | 86 |
| [I.] The Satisfaction of Justice, | 86 |
| Definitions, | 86 |
| 1. Nature of the Atonement, | 87 |
| 2. Necessity of the Atonement, | 88 |
| 3. Perfection of the Atonement. (1.) Its Intrinsic Value. (2.) Its Application, | 88 |
| 4. Extent of the Atonement. (1.) Lutheran View. (2.) Arminian. (3.) Governmental. (4.) Reformed, | 89 |
| Classification of Theories of the Atonement, | 91 |
| History of the Doctrine, | 91 |
| [II.] Intercession, | 91 |
| III. CHRIST'S OFFICE AS KING. | |
| I. Extent of Christ's Kingdom, | 92 |
| II. Present or Future, | 92 |
| III. Its Spirituality, | 92 |

| | PAGE |
|----------------------------------|------|
| IV. Its Only Head, | 92 |
| V. Its Administration, | 92 |
| VI. Its Duration, | 92 |

II. Christ's Estates.

| | |
|---------------------------------|----|
| I. Humiliation, | 92 |
| 1. The Lutheran View, | 92 |
| 2. The Reformed View, | 93 |
| II. Exaltation, | 93 |

III. Vocation.

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. The Call of the Gospel, | 94 |
| II. Effectual Calling, | 94 |
| 1. Pelagian View, | 94 |
| 2. Semi-Pelagian View, | 94 |
| 3. Reformed View, | 94 |
| (1.) It is Internal, | 95 |
| (2.) It is common and efficacious, | 95 |
| (3.) It is Congruous to the Nature of God, <i>Man</i> , | 96 |
| (4.) Objections to the Doctrine of Grace, | 96 |

HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE.

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. Prior to the Pelagian Controversy, | 96 |
| II. The Palagian Controversy, | 96 |
| III. The Scholastic Age, | 97 |
| IV. The Reformation, | 97 |
| V. The Arminian Controversy, | 97 |
| VI. Modern Views, | 97 |

PART III. APPLICATION OF CHRIST'S WORK.

I. REGENERATION.

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| I. Its Nature, | 98 |
| 1. Rationalistic Theory, | 98 |
| 2. Ritualistic Theory, | 98 |
| 3. Evangelical Theory, | 98 |
| II. Its Necessity, | 99 |

II. FAITH.

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| I. Protestant Doctrine, | 99 |
| 1. Elements of Faith. (1.) Knowledge. (2.) Assent. (3.) Trust, | 99 |
| 2. Object of Faith, | 100 |
| 3. Effects of Faith, | 100 |
| II. Romish Doctrine, | 100 |
| 1. Nature of Faith, | 100 |
| 2. Object of Faith, | 100 |
| 3. Ground of Faith, | 100 |
| 4. Effects of Faith, | 101 |

III. REPENTANCE.

- I. The Protestant Doctrine, 101
 - 1. Nature of Repentance. (1.) Definitions. (2.) Analysis. 101
 - 2. Evidences of Repentance, 102
- II. The Romish Doctrine, 102

IV. JUSTIFICATION.

- I. The Common Protestant Doctrine, 102
 - 1. Nature of Justification. (1.) It is a Forensic ~~Imputa-~~ *Act-*
tion. (2.) It includes Imputation of Righteousness, 103
 - 2. Ground of Justification, 103
 - 3. Means of Justification, 104
- II. Protestant Doctrines, 104
 - 1. Piscator, 104
 - 2. Arminianism, 104
 - 3. Rationalism, 105
 - 4. New-school Theology, 105
 - 5. Governmental Theory, 105
 - 6. Dr. Emmons' Doctrine, 105
- III. The Romish Doctrine, 105
 - 1. Nature of Justification, 105
 - 2. Ground of Justification, 105
 - 3. Means of Justification, 105

V. SANCTIFICATION.

- I. Nature of Sanctification, 106
 - 1. Pelagianism, 106
 - 2. Arminianism, 106
 - 3. Romanism, 106
 - 4. Protestantism, 106
 - (1.) The Author of Sanctification, 106
 - (2.) The Subject of Sanctification, 106
 - (3.) Sanctification not mere Reformation, 106
 - (4.) The Means of Sanctification, 106
 - (5.) The Fruits of Sanctification, 106
- II. Perfectionism, 107
 - 1. The Doctrine Stated, 107
 - (1.) Pelagianism, 107
 - (2.) Romanism, 107
 - (3.) Arminianism, 108
 - (4.) Oberlin Theory, 108
 - 2. Arguments for Perfectionism, 108
 - 3. Arguments against Perfectionism, 108

Eschatology.

I. STATE OF THE SOUL AFTER DEATH.

- I. Immortality of the Soul, 108
- II. Intermediate State, 109
 - 1. The Scripture Doctrine, 109
 - 2. Erroneous Views. 109

| | PAGE |
|---------------------------------------------|------|
| II. THE RESURRECTION. | |
| I. The Doctrine. | 110 |
| 1. The Fact, | 110 |
| 2. Universality of the Resurrection, | 111 |
| 3. Identity of the Resurrection Body, | 111 |
| 4. Nature of the Resurrection Body, | 111 |
| 5. Time of the Resurrection, | 111 |
| II. History of the Doctrine, | 111 |
| III. THE END OF THE WORLD. | |
| I. The Second Advent, | 112 |
| 1. The Fact, | 112 |
| 2. Time of the Advent, | 112 |
| II. The Millennium, | 112 |
| 1. Jewish Doctrine, | 112 |
| 2. Early Christian Opinions, | 112 |
| 3. The Alexandrian View, | 113 |
| 4. Modern Opinion. Restoration of the Jews. | 113 |
| 5. The Kingdom of Christ, | 113 |
| III. The Final Judgment, | 113 |
| 1. Erroneous Views, | 113 |
| 2. The True View, | 113 |
| IV. The Destruction of the World, | 114 |
| IV. HEAVEN AND HELL. | |
| I. Everlasting Life, | 114 |
| II. Eternal Death, | 114 |
| 1. Nature of Hell, | 114 |
| 2. Duration of Future Punishment, | 115 |
| <i>The Sacraments.</i> | |
| I. THE SACRAMENTS. | |
| I. Nature of a Sacrament, | 115 |
| II. Number of Sacraments, | 115 |
| III. Efficacy of the Sacraments, | 116 |
| 1. Romanism, | 116 |
| 2. Lutheranism, | 116 |
| 3. Reformed Doctrine, | 116 |
| 4. Remonstrant Doctrine, | 116 |
| IV. Necessity of the Sacraments, | 116 |
| V. Validity of the Sacraments, | 116 |
| II. BAPTISM. | |
| I. The External Form, | 117 |
| 1. Mode of Baptism, | 117 |
| 2. Formula of Baptism, | 117 |
| II. Design and Efficacy of Baptism, | 117 |
| 1. The Reformed Doctrine, | 118 |
| 2. The Lutheran Doctrine, | 118 |
| 3. The Romish Doctrine, | 118 |

| | PAGE |
|--------------------------------------------------|------|
| III. Subjects of Baptism, | 118 |
| 1. Adult Baptism, | 118 |
| 2. Infant Baptism, | 118 |
| (1.) Are Infants proper Subjects of Baptism? . | 118 |
| (2.) Whose Children are entitled to Baptism? . | 119 |
| a. Romish Usage. b. Protestant Usage, . | 119 |
| III. THE LORD'S SUPPER. | |
| I. Scripture Account of the Ordinance, | 120 |
| 1. Its Perpetual Obligation, | 120 |
| 2. Elements Used, | 120 |
| 3. How Administered, | 120 |
| 4. Its Design, | 120 |
| 5. The Participants, | 120 |
| II. Doctrine of the Early Church, | 121 |
| III. Romish Doctrine, | 121 |
| IV. Lutheran Doctrine, | 121 |
| V. Reformed Doctrine, | 121 |
| 1. Christ's Presence, | 121 |
| 2. Receiving Christ, | 122 |
| 3. Efficacy of the Lord's Supper, | 122 |

Open