

LECTURES

ON

THEOLOGY,

BY THE LATE

ABRAHAM ANDERSON, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIDACTIC THEOLOGY AND HEBREW, IN THE SEMINARY OF THE ASSOCIATE PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCH, AT CANONSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA.



PHILADELPHIA:

WM. S. YOUNG, 373 RACE STREET, OR 50 NORTH SIXTH STREET.

1857.

7

2090

BT 75
A5

230.

P R E F A C E .

THE following work embraces, in the form of a Catechism, the substance of the Lectures delivered by the late Dr. ANDERSON, as Professor of Didactic Theology, in the Seminary of the Associate Presbyterian Church, at Cansonsburg, Pa. Such was the estimation in which these lectures were held by the students, that some years before his decease, they had urgently requested their publication. Having consented to their request, he had carefully transcribed the whole work, making many additions and corrections; but still not leaving the manuscript in such a condition that it could go as it was into the hands of the printer. It was written, as he usually wrote, with many abbreviations and contractions. In some instances it could not be deciphered without much difficulty; indeed, in one or two cases, the transcriber was unable to ascertain the words, and was obliged to supply their place with brackets. The work, however, was so far completed by the author, that, in the opinion of his friends, no injustice will be done to his memory by giving it to the public.

As *Markii Medulla* was the text-book employed in teaching the students, the lectures will be found generally following the same arrangement with that author. The numbers and titles of the chapters, and the numbers of the sections are retained as in Mark. The reader will also find the subjects divided according to the lectures delivered by Dr. ANDERSON. This two-fold division will probably appear unnecessary; especially as the latter class of divisions was not made so much to suit the subject, as the amount proper for each lecture. But these divisions are so slightly marked, that they will hardly occasion any perplexity to the reader. As the Dr. did not always follow the order of Mark, and passed over some of the topics treated by him, the numbers of the sections are sometimes transposed, and some of them are omitted.

In treating of different topics, the author has borrowed many of his remarks from the larger work of Mark, called his *Compend*. Such things in that work as were approved, he has imbodyed in his lectures, with little alteration, except changing them into the form of questions and answers. In some cases, he has omitted things which appeared to be of inferior importance; and in cases where the work appeared defective, he has added or enlarged. In other cases, where he disagreed with the opinions of Mark, he has substituted his own views of the subject.

The lectures are not published by his friends, nor would they ever have been published by Dr. A. himself, as a work purely original; yet they are not on this account less valuable. Mere compilations, if judiciously made, will be found of great use; but the following work has a value beyond a mere compilation. It imbodyes the results of the author's own investigations, together with a selection of the best things of one of the ablest theologians of a former age. The concise, clear, and convincing manner in which the great truths of the Scriptures are here exhibited in a systematic form, it is hoped will be of great service, not only to students of Theology, and ministers of the gospel, but to all readers who desire instruction in divine things.

It seems proper also to add, as most of the lectures are brief, that the author did not limit himself to what he had written, but often enlarged on different topics, especially when the answers given by the students, or the questions proposed by them, appeared to call for a more full exposition. These unpremeditated remarks were much valued by the students; as he was distinguished, not only for the soundness of his judgment, and the accuracy of his discrimination, but for a happy talent to exhibit difficult subjects in a clear light. These remarks would no doubt have added, in many instances, to the value of the work, but they cannot now be recovered. That these lectures, though making their appearance under some disadvantages, may be blest as the means of prolonging and extending the usefulness of a much esteemed brother, and fellow-labourer in the gospel of Christ, is the prayer of the subscriber,

THO. BEVERIDGE.

XENIA, O., Nov. 1st, 1856.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.		
OF THEOLOGY.		
LECTURE I.	Definitions, &c.,.....	68
	II. Natural Theology,.....	72
	III. Natural and Revealed Religion,.....	76
	IV. Inferences—The Scriptures the only and Infallible ground of our Theology, &c.,.....	28
CHAPTER II.		
OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.		
	V. Names—Extent of Inspiration, &c.,.....	35
	VI. The Scriptures God's inspired word,.....	38
	VII. Evidences continued,.....	43
	VIII. Evidences continued,.....	47
	IX. Original Text—Versions, —Penmen,.....	50
	X. Divisions of the Scriptures.....	55
	XI. Authority, Integrity, and Subject of the Scriptures,.....	58
	XII. Mysteries of Scripture,.....	61
	XIII. The Scriptures a perfect rule,.....	64
	XIV. Translations—Right of	
	all to read—Interpretation of Scripture,.....	68
	XV. Interpretation, continued,	72
	XVI. Interpretation, continued —Design of the Scriptures,.....	76
CHAPTER III.		
OF RELIGION.		
	XVII. What it includes—Its nature,.....	81
	XVIII. Division of its Articles, &c.,.....	86
CHAPTER IV.		
OF GOD.		
	XIX. Names of God,.....	92
	XX. Being of God,.....	95
	XXI. Spirituality and Attributes of God,.....	98
	XXII. Independence and Simplicity of God,.....	103
	XXIII. Immutability, Immensity, and Eternity of God,.....	107
	XXIV. God's Knowledge,.....	112
	XXV. God's Goodness and Justice,.....	116
	XXVI. Justice of God, continued,.....	122

PART II.

CHAPTER V.		
OF THE TRINITY.		
LECTURE I.	Three Persons in one Essence,.....	127
	II. Distinctions of the persons,.....	131
	III. Same, continued,.....	134
	IV. That there are Three Persons,.....	138
	V. Same, continued—Divinity of the Son,.....	142
	VI. Divinity of the Son, continued,.....	146
	VII. Divinity of the Spirit, &c.,.....	151
CHAPTER VI.		
OF THE DECREES OF GOD.		
	VIII. Their Evidence and Nature,.....	156
	IX. Their Properties,.....	158
	X. Same, continued,.....	162
	XI. Contingent events—Sinful actions, &c.,.....	165

CHAPTER VII.	
OF PREDESTINATION.	
XII. Definition and Properties,.....	170
XIII. Properties, continued—Objections,.....	173
XIV. Immutability, and Particularity of Predestination,.....	178
XV. End of Predestination—Election,.....	182
XVI. Election, continued—Reprobation,.....	187
XVII. Reprobation, continued,	191
XVIII. Reprobation, continued, Summary,.....	194
CHAPTER VIII.	
OF CREATION.	
XIX. Definition, &c.....	199
XX. Order, End, and Period of Creation,.....	204
XXI. Period and Duration of Creation.—Geology and the Mosaic Record,....	209
XXII. The Work of each day,	219
CHAPTER IX.	
OF ANGELS.	
XXIII. Their names and Nature,.....	226
XXIV. Their office—Good and Evil angels, &c.,.....	231
XXV. Good and Evil Angels, continued,.....	235
CHAPTER X.	
OF PROVIDENCE.	
XXVI. Its Evidence, Author, and Acts—Preservation,.....	239
XXVII. Co-operation—Government—Extent of Providence, &c.,.....	244
XXVIII. Extent, Distinctions, Properties, and Usefulness of Providence,.....	248
CHAPTER XI.	
OF THE WORSHIP OF GOD, AND HIS LAW.	
XXIX. Definition, Obligation, Motives, &c.....	254
XXX. Object and Rule of Worship,.....	259
XXXI. Of the Law of God,.....	262
XXXII. Divisions of the Law,...	266
XXXIII. The Ceremonial Law,...	271
XXXIV. Ceremonial and Moral Law,.....	274
XXXV. Moral Law, continued,...	278
XXXVI. Same, continued,.....	284
XXXVII. Same, continued,.....	289

PART III.

CHAPTER XII.	
OF THE DECALOGUE.	
LECTURE I. Preface and First Precept,.....	296
II. The Second Precept,....	299
III. The Third Precept,.....	303
IV. Same, continued,.....	306
V. Same, continued,.....	309
VI. The Fourth Precept,....	312
VII. Same, continued,.....	317
VIII. The Fifth and Sixth Precepts,.....	322
IX. The Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Precepts,...	327
CHAPTER XIII.	
OF MAN.	
X. Creation of Man and Woman—Unity of the races—Constituents of the Human Person,...	334
XI. Immateriality, Subsistence, and Faculties of the Soul,.....	338
XII. The Soul not generated—Union of Body and Soul—Immortality of the Soul,.....	343
CHAPTER XIV.	
OF MAN'S STATE OF INTEGRITY.	
XIII. Man's Happiness and Holiness—The Image of God,.....	347
XIV. The Image of God, continued—The Covenant of Works,.....	353
XV. Covenant of Works, continued,.....	358
CHAPTER XV.	
OF THE SIN OF MAN.	
XVI. Its Object, Subject, Cause, Effects, and Division,	364
XVII. Adam's First Sin,.....	368
XVIII. Sin arising from Adam's,	374
XIX. Human Depravity,.....	379
XX. Depravity, continued,—Actual Sin,.....	384
XXI. Actual Sin, continued,	389
CHAPTER XVI.	
OF THE PUNISHMENT OF SIN.	
XXII. Its Nature, Design, Duration, &c.,.....	395

CHAPTER XVII.

OF THE COVENANT OF GRACE, THE GOSPEL, AND THE VARIOUS ECONOMY OF IT.

XXIII. The Term, *Covenant*,—the Parties—their parts, &c., 402

XXIV. Nature and Revelation of this Covenant,..... 409

CHAPTER XVIII.

OF THE MEDIATOR.

XXV. Definition, Nature, Necessity, and Means of Christ's mediation—Constitution of his Person—Proofs of his Messiahship—Subjects, duration, &c., of his mediation, 417

PART IV.

CHAPTER XIX.

OF THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST.

LECTURE I. His Names and Natures, 428

II. Natures of Christ, continued, 431

III. Union of the Divine and Human Natures,..... 434

IV. Effects of this Union, ... 438

XXII. Faith and Repentance; and particularly, of Faith, 504

XXIII. Faith, 508

XXIV. Same, continued, 512

XXV. Same, continued, 514

XXVI. Same, continued, 517

XXVII. Same, continued, 520

XXVIII. Repentance, 525

CHAPTER XX.

OF THE OFFICES OF CHRIST.

V. General Remarks—Prophetical Office, 440

VI. Prophetical Office, continued, 444

VII. Priestly Office, 449

VIII. Same, continued, 452

IX. Same, continued, 456

X. Same, continued, 460

XII.* Same, continued, 465

XIII. Same, continued, 470

XIV. Kingly Office, 473

XV. Same, continued, 477

*A mistake in the numbering.

CHAPTER XXIII.

OF EFFECTUAL CALLING.

XXIX. External and Internal Call,—Union to Christ, &c. 530

XXX. Means, Author, and Subjects of Effectual calling, 535

XXXI. Work of the Spirit in Effectual Calling—This Calling never lost—Addenda, 540

CHAPTER XXIV.

OF JUSTIFICATION.

XXXII. Its General Nature, &c., 543

XXXIII. Same, continued, 546

XXXIII. Ground of Justification—Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, 553

XXXIV. Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, continued—Subjects, evidences, and permanency of justification, 557

CHAPTER XXV.

OF SANCTIFICATION.

XXXV. Its Nature, Author, Means, Effects, &c., ... 564

CHAPTER XXI.

OF THE TWO-FOLD STATE OF CHRIST.

XVI. His Humiliation, 480

XVII. Same, continued, 484

XVIII. Same, continued,—His Exaltation, 488

XIX. His Exaltation, continued, 492

XX. Same, continued, 495

CHAPTER XXII.

DUTIES OF THE COVENANT OF GRACE.

XXI. Nature of these duties, .. 501

PART V.

CHAPTER XXVI. Part 5

OF PRAYER.

LECTURE I. Definition, Object, Rule, Parts, Kinds, and Subjects of Prayer, 574

II. Matter, Manner, Warrant,

and Circumstances of Prayer, 577

III. Necessity and Utility of Prayer—The Lord's Prayer, 582

IV. The Lord's Prayer, continued, 586

V. Fasting, Watching, and Alms,.....	587	XVIII. Same, continued.—Sacraments of the New Testament,.....	637
VI. Of Vows,.....	592		
CHAPTER XXVII. OF PERSEVERANCE.		CHAPTER XXX. OF BAPTISM.	
VII. Definition, Author, Means, Source, and Subjects of Perseverance,.....	597	XIX. Name—John's Baptism, &c.,.....	643
VIII. Nature and Grounds of Perseverance—Objections, &c.,.....	600	XX. Mode of Baptism,.....	647
CHAPTER XXVIII. OF REGENERATION, ADOPTION, RECONCILIATION, AND REDEMPTION.		XXI. The Thing signified in Baptism,.....	650
IX. Regeneration,.....	604	XXII. Subjects of Baptism.....	653
X. Same, continued.....	606	XXIII. Baptism of Christ—Baptism not essential—General mode of administering,.....	662
XI. Adoption,.....	610		
XII. Reconciliation,.....	613	CHAPTER XXXI. OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.	
XIII. Liberation, or Redemption,.....	618	XXIV. Name—Time of Institution—Sacramental elements and actions—Who may administer? 668	
CHAPTER XXIX. OF THE SACRAMENTS.		XXV. Meaning of the Sacrament,.....	673
XIV. Their General Nature,....	622	XXVI. Worthy Partakers—Time and Place—Obligation—Frequency—Purity—and Design of this ordinance,.....	677
XV. General Remarks, continued,.....	625		
XVI. Old Testament Sacraments—Circumcision, 628		PART VI.	
XVII. The Passover,.....	635		
CHAPTER XXXII. OF THE CHURCH.			
LECTURE I. Definition and Name—Church Visible and Invisible—Militant and Triumphant,.....	683	under the Old Testament,.....	715
II. Church Visible and Invisible, continued,—Marks of a true church,.....	687	XI. Officers of the Church, &c.,.....	718
III. Marks, continued,.....	691	XII. Qualifications of Church Rulers,.....	722
IV. Same, continued.—Perpetuity and Enemies of the Church.....	695	XIII. Same, continued.—Ordination,.....	724
V. Antichrist.—The Millennium,.....	698	XIV. The Form of Church Government,.....	728
VI. Millennium, continued.—Periods of the Church, 701		XV. Same, continued,.....	734
CHAPTER XXXIII. OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.		XVI. Civil Government,.....	737
VII. Christ has given his church a Government—What is Church Government? 705		XVII. Same, continued.—Capital Punishment,.....	742
VIII. What is Church Government? continued,.....	709	XVIII. Civil Government, continued.—Magistrate's Power <i>Circa Sacra</i> ,... 746	
IX. Church Discipline,.....	711	XIX. Same, continued.—Marriage, &c.,.....	750
X. Power of Order.—Authority not from civil Magistrate—Institution of Church Government		CHAPTER XXXIV. OF GLORIFICATION.	
		XX. General Remarks.—Purgatory, &c.,.....	755
		XXI. Heaven and Hell.—The Resurrection,.....	759
		XXII. The Resurrection, continued.—The Judgment.—The Eternal State,.....	763

continued.—Sa-
s of the New
ent,..... 631

R XXX.

TRISM.
hn's Baptism, 645
ptism..... 641
signified in
..... 650

Baptism..... 653
hrist—Bap-
ential—Ge-
of adminis-
..... 662

XXI.

PPER.
f Instita-
ental ele-
tions—
inister? 668
Sacra-
..... 673
—Time
igation
Purity
f this
..... 677

esta- 715
rch, 718
ch 722
i- 724

728
734
737

742

746

50

LECTURES ON THEOLOGY.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.—OF THEOLOGY.

LECTURE I.—DEFINITIONS, &C.

SECTION I. Quest. 1. Should not any science, divine or human, have an appropriate name? Ans. Yes.

2. What is this ordinary name of that science which treats of divine things? Ans. Theology.

3. From what is this name derived? Ans. From the Greek words *Theou, God, and Logos, a word, or discourse.*

4. Why is this science called *Theology*? Ans. As it treats of God—a word or discourse about God as the object. Also as it is revealed by God, or is his word.

5. Does not the name *Theology*, as it is used by Christians, include both these ideas? Ans. Yes. Its leading idea is a discourse or treatise about God; but it is a treatise drawn from his own word.

§ II. 6. Is this word used in Holy Scripture? Ans. Not precisely.

7. Is it not of heathen origin? Ans. Yes. They had their doctrines about their gods, and they called them *Theology*.

8. Did the word, in their use of it, signify both the doctrine respecting their gods, and the doctrine revealed by their gods? Ans. No. Although they sometimes pretended to give the words of their gods, uttered on certain occasions, they did not pretend, in general, that they derived their systems of doctrine from their gods by revelation.

9. Is it then lawful to employ a heathen name, and one not precisely found in Holy Scripture, to designate the system of divine truth? Ans. Yes; when that name is appropriate: because, (1.) The name is no part of the doctrine, but is used for convenience: (2.) Heathen words are freely used in Scripture to convey divine truth; as the Greek language: (3.) The name is warranted by Scripture.

§ III. 10. Are there Scripture expressions that do warrant this use of the name? Ans. Yes: as "*logia tou Theou,*" oracles

of God, Rom. iii. 2; 1 Pet. iv. 11; also, "*logos Theou*," word of God, 1 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 23.

11. Is not the expression, "*the word of God*," sometimes used to designate Christ the Son of God? Ans. Yes: as John i. 1, 14; Rev. xix. 13; but more generally to signify God's revealed will; as 1 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 23.

12. Do we use the word *Theology* in precisely the same sense as the Scripture expression, *the word of God*? Ans. No: not according to the strict use of that expression in Scripture, which properly means the very word of God given by him; while we mean a treatise concerning God, according to his word.

13. But is not the preaching of the gospel, by uninspired men, sometimes in Scripture called the word of God? Ans. Yes: in an improper sense; as Heb. xiii. 7; Titus ii. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 2; which seems to justify the use of our word *Theology*.

14. But how are we to understand the name given to the apostle John, in the inscription of the book of the Revelation? Ans. As given by the divines in the ancient New Testament church.

15. Is not the expression, *word of God*, used in Scripture, to signify both the word directly spoken by God, and that written by the prophets and apostles by inspiration? Ans. Yes: and in each of these ways it is equally entitled to the name.

§ IV. 16. Should then the name *Theology* be rejected, as either improper, or unwarranted in Scripture? Ans. No: it is warranted and proper.

§ V. 17. Are there not many expressions in Scripture equivalent to or synonymous with the name *Theology*? Ans.—Yes: as "*doctrine of God*," John vii. 16; "*doctrine of Christ*," 2 John 9; "*good doctrine*," 1 Tim. iv. 6; "*sound doctrine*," Tit. i. 9; "*doctrine according to godliness*," 1 Tim. vi. 3; "*form of doctrine*," Rom. vi. 17; "*form of sound words*," 2 Tim. i. 13.

§ VI. 18. Is the name *Theology* given to false religion as well as the true? Ans. Yes; because it is a doctrine concerning God, or professes to be so.

19. How many kinds of false Theology are there, or what distinctions of it are usually made? Ans. Four. (1.) False Christian Theology; as Popish, Unitarian, Universalist, &c. (2.) Modern Judaism; a rejection of the Saviour Jesus Christ. (3.) Mohammanism; held by the followers of Mohammed. (4.) The Gentiles; of former and latter times.

20. How is the Gentile Theology divided? Ans. Into that of the poets, which is fabulous; of the priests and people, which was the civil theology; and of the philosophers, which was natural Theology.

21. What is the Theology of the poets generally called? Ans. Mythology.

§ VII. 22. How is the true Theology generally divided? Ans. Into Archetype and Ectype.

23. What is the Archetypal Theology? Ans. It is divine truth as known to God, and which he has denied to make known to man. Matt. xi. 27; 1 Cor. ii. 7.

§ VIII. 24. What is the Ectypal Theology? Ans. It is Theology as known to created intelligences by divine revelation.

25. Is not the Theology, or doctrine of God, the same under both divisions? Ans. Yes: the distinction refers only to the subjects of the Theology, or the knowledge of it.

26. What then is the difference between the Archetypal and Ectypal Theology? Ans. The doctrine being the same, the knowledge of it in God is perfect and original, therefore called Archetypal; in man it is imperfect and derived, and therefore called Ectypal.

27. Can it be true Theology among men, if it be not derived from the revelation which God decreed to make? Ans. No; 1 Cor. ii. 7—14.

28. How is the Ectypal Theology divided? Ans. Into the Theology of *Union*, of *Vision*, and of the *race*, or of *travellers*.

29. Whether is this a division of Theology, (the doctrine,) or of the subjects in whom the knowledge resides? Ans. It is not a distinction properly of Theology, but of modes of knowledge, and of the subjects or persons in whom it is found.

30. What is the subject or recipient of the Theology of *Union*? Ans. Christ in his human nature.

31. Is this knowledge of Theology residing in Christ's human nature, or as possessed by the human nature, infinite, or Archetypal, as it is in God? Ans. No: it is necessarily finite and derived.

32. But does it not, in his human nature, excel the knowledge of all men, glorified saints, and holy angels? Ans. Yes.

33. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) On account of the peculiar relation of the human nature of Christ to the person of the Son—a personal union. (2.) The peculiar communion which consequently occurs between the two natures in the person of Christ. (3.) On account of the supply of the Spirit to Christ's human nature, fitting it for its work and office; *Psa.* xlv. 7, "anointed with the oil of gladness above thy fellows," *John* iii. 34, "God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him," that is most abundantly.

34. Might not Christ's knowledge, in his human nature, be called the Theology of *Unction*? Ans. Yes; since given by the Spirit's unction; but this unction belongs to all believers; 1 *John* iii. 20; only it is in Christ in a more excellent degree, and absolutely infallible.

§ IX. 35. What is the theology of *Vision*? Ans. That which holy angels and glorified saints enjoy; *Matt.* xviii. 10; 1 *Cor.* xiii. 12.

36. Wherein does this knowledge differ from that enjoyed by believers in this world? Ans. Although we cannot fully declare it, yet we are warranted to say, (1.) It is more extensive; (2.) More perfect and intimate; 1 *Cor.* xiii. 12; (3.) It is immediate and satisfactory; and not by means, nor by faith, but by vision; 1 *Cor.* xiii. 12, 13; 1 *John* iii. 2.

37. Does this vision mean the seeing with the bodily eye literally? Ans. No: it is no doubt true that, at the resurrection,

and forever after, the saints shall see Christ with the bodily eye; Job xix. 26, 27; 1 John iii. 2; but this is inapplicable to the *soul* of the believer in heaven, and to the greater part of that knowledge and enjoyment of which the glorified saint shall be a partaker to eternity. But the true meaning of *vision* in heaven is that the knowledge shall be immediate, intimate, satisfactory, sensible, and perfect, according to the saints' capacity of knowledge and enjoyment: 1 Cor. xiii. 10—12; 2 Cor. v. 7; 1 John iii. 2.

§ X. 38. What is the theology of *Stadii*, or of *travellers*?
 Ans. It is theology as known by men in this life, derived from the word of God; by means of study, reading, hearing; received by faith, and internally by the Spirit; and by experience, under the use of means, and the Spirit's influence.

39. Is it not the most imperfect mode of true knowledge of theology? Ans. Yes: but it is sufficient to salvation; 1 John ii. 20, 21, 27.

§ XI. 40. Is there any degree of true theology or knowledge of God in man naturally? Ans. Yes; Rom. i. 19, 20.

41. Does it appear, from natural and moral evidence, as well as from Scripture, that such theology is natural to men, or that men have, even without a divine revelation, some knowledge of God? Ans. Yes.

42. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From experience—the belief of the existence of a Supreme Being, and of his power and justice, producing fear, a tormenting conscience, and some restraint. (2.) From the universal consent of mankind. All nations acknowledge a Supreme Ruler, powerful and holy. (3.) From the readiness of all who are unsophisticated, to receive instruction as to the being, power, and holiness of God, and governing impressions of these things, proving it natural. (4.) The success of politicians, in all ages, when they covered their schemes with a pretence of religion. (5.) The natural inference from creation and providence that there is a Creator and Ruler, to whom intelligent creatures are accountable.

43. But it is objected that all this seeming natural knowledge of God is communicated by tradition of parents, and the arts and cunning of priests and politicians? Ans. (1.) If there were no natural sense of a God of power and holiness, tradition and natural cunning could not make so strong nor so universal an impression, as history and experience teaches there is in men. (2.) The sense of a God, and of our accountability, is too deep and strong to be derived wholly from tradition and human instructions. (3.) The evidence of a God of power and authority, from his works, is strong and conclusive; and must be so, independent of human instruction.

44. But it is objected that some heathen nations are found utterly destitute of any notion of a Supreme Being? Ans. (1.) If the greater part of nations possess such a belief of a God, it proves our doctrine. (2.) The objection is, however, false; for later travellers, obtaining more knowledge of the language of those barbarous nations, who were said to have no ideas of God, have found the statement respecting them incorrect.

§ XII. 45. As our subject is the *Theology of Stadii*, or Theology known by man in this life,—how is it divided? Ans. Into *Natural and Revealed*; or *Natural and Supernatural*.

46. How is Natural Theology divided? Ans. Into *Innate and Acquired*.

47. What is Innate natural theology? Ans. It is that knowledge of God which is inseparable from the use of reason; or those ideas of God to which the rational mind necessarily assents, as soon as it understands the terms in which they are proposed.

48. Does the Holy Scripture sustain this doctrine? Ans. Yes: Rom. i. 19, teaches that God manifests it in man, and shows it to him; which is the foundation of the knowledge spoken of in the following verse. It is the power or capacity of inferring God's existence and attributes from his works.

LECTURE II.—NATURAL THEOLOGY.

§ XIII. 49. Are we to understand by an innate idea of God, that the mind, in its first existence, or in early infancy, has actual knowledge of God, or even an actual idea of him? Ans. No; but that it has the faculty of knowing the existence of God when capable of reflection; and the idea of a God is natural to the rational mind when capable of reasoning.

50. Are we to understand by innate knowledge of God an adequate or sufficient knowledge of him? Ans. No; but such a capacity of knowledge, and, in maturity of mind, such an actual knowledge of God, as renders man accountable, under the light of nature, and a proper subject of instruction and belief.

51. Is there any utility in possessing this innate idea of God? Ans. Yes. (1.) It renders men accountable under the instruction of nature's light; Rom. i. 20. (2.) It restrains vice, and benefits society. (3.) It renders man a proper subject of faith, under the instructions of divine revelation; and the Scriptures often appeal to this faculty; Acts xvii. 28: Isa. xlv. 9—20. (4.) It gives force to divine truths on the conscience.

52. How does the reality of this innate faculty or knowledge appear from reason and fact? Ans. (1.) From the universal sense in man, of dependence on something superior to him. (2.) From a universal sense of accountability, proved by fear under consciousness of guilt. (3.) From the universality of belief in a Supreme Being, and the acknowledgment of it.

53. Is not the Atheist an exception to this universal belief? Ans. Not properly. His denial of a God is not a settled disbelief; it is an effort to throw off belief without entire success. It is not the natural and unsophisticated idea or impression of man.

54. But might not that universal impression or belief be an effect of man's weakness or depravity? Ans. No; since, (1.) the belief is susceptible of the clearest proof, when knowledge and faculties are improved and increased; and, (2.) since this belief is not contrary, but agreeable to both the interest and duty of man; which cannot be said of depravity or weakness.

55. Does the fact of an individual's possessing an idea, prove that the idea is correct, or that the thing of which he has an idea does really exist? Ans. No: an individual may have ideas which are mere chimeras, and most absurd.

56. How then does the idea of a God prevailing among men, prove the being of a God? Ans. (1.) When the idea is universal, or even general, it must have a cause as universal or general. (2.) A universal cause must be a reality, and not a chimera, which is not universal to man. (3.) This universal idea is fully sustained by the works of God, and thus proved to be correct.

57. It appears to be the universal idea or belief of men, uninstructed, that the sun moves round the earth. Will not this prove that there may be a universal belief the ground of which is a falsehood? Ans. No. The ground on which this error is based is a reality—the light of the sun advancing gradually around the earth. The idea is only a false inference from a manifest fact, which maturer knowledge corrects; but maturer knowledge only confirms the belief of a God.

§ XIV. 58. Though there is naturally in man as fallen, an idea of God, yet was not this idea and knowledge much more perfect in Adam, in his state of innocence? Ans. Yes; because he was not blinded by sin; he had a spiritual discernment of God and of divine truth, being in God's image; and he had a revelation sufficient for his duty and happiness; and his formation in the image of God included all necessary knowledge of God.

59. Did his formation in the image of God, and his knowledge of God, include the doctrine of the Trinity? Ans. Yes; because this knowledge was necessary to his faith, his happiness in God, and the right worship of him.

§ XV. 60. What is *acquired* natural theology? Ans. It is knowledge of God obtained by reasoning and inference from the creatures or the works of God.

61. In how many ways is this knowledge acquired by reasoning from the works of God? Ans. In three ways; as, (1.) Of causality, inferring that dependent facts and things must have a cause; (2.) The cause must be greater than the effect, (*eminence*, as Mark has it,) as, the power must be great to produce great effects—the design manifested in those works proves wisdom, &c. (3.) By negation. When, from the manifestation of powers in the creature, we infer powers in the Creator to which those in the creature bear a resemblance, we exclude from the idea of the Creator all the imperfections found in the creature.

62. Do the Scriptures give any examples of such reasoning? Ans. Yes; as Psal. xix. 1, 2, proves a cause; Psal. xciv. 9, 10, proves the cause greater than the effect, and free from imperfection; so Isa. xl. 26; so Job xii. 7—10.

63. Do the works of nature teach only the being of a God, or do they also teach something of his perfections, and of our accountability? Ans. They teach his perfections and our accountability also, Rom. i. 20; ii. 15.

§ XVI. 64. Is universal doubt necessary in order to knowledge and sound conviction of natural theology, as some have taught? Ans. No; it is useless, impossible, sinful, and dangerous.

65. Wherein useless? Ans. Doubt gives no light, removes no bias of mind or affections, and does not dispose the mind to a thorough investigation.

66. Why or wherein impossible? Ans. We cannot at pleasure remove all convictions.

67. How is it sinful? Ans. It rejects the love, fear, reverence, obedience, and worship, due to God, for the time, and trifles with light and evidences already received.

68. How is it dangerous? Ans. It trifles with light and conviction, refuses duty for the time, and God may judicially harden and blind us; Isa. vi. 9, 10; xlv. 18, 19.

§ XVII. 69. The Socinians object that there is no natural theology innate, and sometimes deny that there is any acquired, and [affirm] that it must be all drawn from special revelation; and moreover plead that there is a universal grace given to man, and a universal, though obscure, revelation of Christ; and therefore object that the fool does not believe in a God at all, as proved from Psal. xiv. 1.—How answer? Ans. That passage does not mean that man cannot by natural light discover that there is a God; not an actual disbelief of his existence and perfections; but, (1.) His wish that there were no God; (2.) Choosing to live without any regard to him; (3.) Endeavouring to flatter himself that there is no accountability; and (4.) That there is no overruling Providence.

70. It is objected that Heb. xi. 6 requires us to believe that there is a God, and that this implies that, without revelation, or by nature's light, men do not believe this truth. How answer? Ans. (1.) The text contains an important truth—that every acceptable worshipper must believe in the existence of God; and in his revealed will; but (2.) It does not imply that there is no belief of God's existence, from nature's light, but that we need a more full instruction, and a faith on the ground of a divine testimony.

71. It is objected that infants have not the knowledge of God. How answer? Ans. This is admitted; but they have that power by which they assent to the evidence, when the mind becomes capable of such knowledge and belief.

72. Is the infant mind a *tabula rasa*, or destitute of powers, principles, and inclinations, and dependent on circumstances and education for these powers and principles? Ans. No. Though it may not be said to have knowledge, it has powers, principles, and inclinations, as is shown by the universality of certain powers and principles when developed.

§ XVIII.—73. To what objects does natural theology extend? Ans. To the existence of God,—his essence—his perfections—his works of creation and common providence—his lordship over us and all things—to man's guilt and misery—and to God's law, in part; Rom. i. 19, 20; ii. 15.

74. Does it teach anything of the Trinity—of Christ—of redemption—of justification, sanctification, &c.? Ans. No.

75. Why does it not extend to these? Ans. (1.) Because these are not taught by nature's light; they are supernatural. (2.) Because the human mind has no innate principles to apprehend what is not naturally revealed, and what is not necessary to its existence, and to its natural relation to God? Matt. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. ii. 12.

§ XIX.—76. But is natural theology sufficient to salvation? Ans. No. Psal. cxix. 1—7.

77. Why is it not? Ans. (1.) It does not give a sufficient knowledge of God; John xvii. 3. (2.) It cannot exhibit Christ the Mediator, and there is no salvation without him, without knowledge of him and faith in him; John xvii. 3; Acts iv. 12. (3.) Because the heathen are without God, and without hope; Eph. ii. 12. (4.) Because there is no salvation by works, and no other way is known by nature's light. (5.) Because there is no fitness for duty or happiness, without union to Christ, and faith in him; Rom. vii. 4, 6; Heb. ix. 13, 14.

LECTURE III.—NATURAL AND REVEALED RELIGION.

§ XX. 78. But Socinians and Arminians plead that man may attain salvation by living according to the light of nature, and perhaps some supposed obscure revelation of Christ given to all; and they object, (1.) that Rom. i. 19, 20, teaches that the heathen have a knowledge of God which renders them inexcusable? Ans. (1.) Though the light of nature teaches so much of God as to leave men inexcusable; yet this does not imply that it teaches enough for salvation; Psal. cxix. 7; (2.) None live according to the natural light which they have, and are therefore inexcusable; and none can live even according to that light, without the knowledge of Christ, as they are of the works of the law, and under the curse; Gal. iii. 10.

79. They object, (2.) that Rom. ii. 4, teaches that God's goodness leads to repentance; and therefore his natural goodness, or goodness in common providence, leads to saving repentance? Ans. (1.) It is not the heathen alone that is here spoken of, but also the Jew or Christian; verse 1. (2.) God's goodness in natural things may lead to some kind of repentance, without a saving repentance. But, (3.) The meaning of the apostle is not to teach that God's goodness actually leads sinners to repentance, but to reprove abusers of both judgments and goodness, whom these considerations should lead to repentance, instead of encouraging them in sin. He reproves them for indulging sin on account of divine goodness, when that goodness should lead them to repentance.

80. They object, (3.) that Rom. ii. 15, teaches that the heathen have a conscience excusing them, and therefore the light of nature is sufficient to salvation? Ans. It is not the apostle's object to teach that the heathen can have a clear conscience, but that they have sufficient light of nature to discern good and evil, to have a

conscience reproving for sin, and approving of virtue; but not that they have a full approval. On the contrary, with this power and light, they are conscious of guilt, and deserve damnation.

81. They object, (4.) That the apostle teaches (Acts xvii. 27,) that the heathen may find the Lord? Ans. If no other manner of finding the Lord than a gracious discovery of him, and communion with him, could be here meant, it might seem at least to favour the doctrine of the objector. But if there be another manner of finding him, then it is a weak foundation on which to build a doctrine so contrary to plain passages of Scripture. The apostle means, that by God's works the heathen may discover the being and perfections of God, and so much of his character and their accountability as might lead them to seek for further knowledge, and to embrace the gospel.

§ XXI. 82. Do natural and revealed theology disagree? Ans. No.

83. Why not? Ans. (1.) Because both are God's revelation, though [in each case] by a different medium. (2.) Therefore the lesser light of nature, though in some essential points defective as an instruction for salvation, will not disagree with the greater light of divine revelation in the Scriptures.

84. But as natural theology is in fallen man, does it not often disagree with supernatural revelation? Ans. Yes; but then it is theology founded not on the light of nature, but on imagination and false inferences from nature's light. But natural theology in the abstract, i. e. as the light of nature truly teaches, as a holy, intelligent being would perceive it, does necessarily agree with supernatural revelation.

85. But would not the light of nature teach that a holy and righteous God could not justify, pardon, accept, and dwell with a sinner? Ans. It does indeed teach that God could not deal in mercy with the sinner, by any method revealed by nature's light; but it cannot deny that God might adopt a method by which he could do so, nor deny that he has adopted such a method.

86. But is natural theology in the abstract, i. e. founded with perfect correctness on nature's light, ever found in fallen man? Ans. No: as found in man it is always mixed with errors, oversights, and darkness.

87. If then a disagreement is found between natural theology, as man perceives it, and supernatural revelation, which should be held superior, and decisive of the question? Ans. Supernatural revelation.

88. But if the light of nature be unquestionably clear against some meaning attributed to supernatural revelation, ought we not to follow its indications, in contrariety to that assumed meaning of the Scriptures? Ans. Yes; so our Lord teaches, in the case of divorce; Matt. xix. 7—9; and respecting the Sabbath; Mark ii. 27, 28; Luke xiii. 15, 16.

§ XXII. 89. Is man's salvation the end and design of natural theology? Ans. No: it cannot reach this end to fallen man.

90. What is its design? Ans. (1.) Conviction of God's existence, character, and dominion, and of our duty, guilt, wretchedness, and necessities. (2.) To render sinners inexcusable, and to justify God to their conscience; Rom. i. 20; ii. 1. (3.) To restrain and improve society. (4.) To shut the mouths of infidels. (5.) To corroborate the faith of believers, under the gospel; as it is supposed and recognised in supernatural revelation.

91. Do not the Scriptures often appeal to the principles of natural theology? Ans. Yes: as Isa. xliv. 9, 19; Acts xvii. 23, 29; Rom. i. 20; ii. 1, 15; &c.

§ XXIII. 92. Does not the insufficiency of natural theology to salvation show the necessity of a supernatural revelation? Ans. Yes.

93. Did not the Gentiles see the necessity of a supernatural revelation? Ans. Yes: they complained of darkness, and doubt, and expressed their expectation of a teacher from God, and a Saviour. The eastern wise men seeing the star, and coming to Jerusalem to inquire of the Saviour, proved their expectation.

94. What are the evil tendencies of the doctrine that natural theology is sufficient to salvation? Ans. (1.) It leads to a low estimate of a supernatural revelation. (2.) It leads to neglect it. (3.) It leads to a trust in our own wisdom, strength, and righteousness, &c. (4.) It is calculated to produce indifference about sending the gospel to the heathen.

95. Is there not need, therefore, of the church's testimony on this point? Ans. Yes.

§ XXIV. 96. Under what distinct views may *Revealed Theology* be considered? Ans. As *Habitual and Systematic*.

97. What is *Habitual Theology*, or *Theology of Habit*? Ans. *Theology*, either *Habitual* or *Systematic*, is the same in itself, but under this distinction it is considered in different aspects. *Theology of Habit* is rather the conviction or impression that it makes on the mind. (1.) *Habitual Theology* is *theology* understood correctly and practically. Under this view, it is in Scripture called *science* or *knowledge*; as 2 Pet. i. 3; iii. 18. (2.) It governs and persuades the heart. It is then called *wisdom*; James iii. 17; Col. iii. 16. (3.) It regulates the life and conduct; and is then called *wisdom* or *prudence*; Deut. iv. 6.

98. Is it then a simple or a compound habit? Ans. It is compound—of knowledge, persuasion, and practice.

99. Is it not then properly the effect of the Holy Spirit on the heart, by means of the word? Ans. Yes.

100. At the same time, is it not acquired by the diligent use of means of knowledge and of faith? Ans. Yes; with the Spirit accompanying.

101. Does not this habitual theology, as in believers, differ from that of Adam, in his state of innocence? Ans. Yes; both in degree, and in the manner of attaining it.

102. May there not be said to be an habitual natural theology, of some kind, in man? Ans. Yes; so far as man lives under the

governing impression of theology, as he derives it from the light of nature; Rom. ii. 14, 15.

§ XXV. 103. What is *Systematic* Theology? Ans. Digesting the truths of the Bible into a connected system, showing the connexion of one truth with another, and the harmony of the whole.

104. To what does it extend, or what does it comprehend?— Ans. It extends to all divine truth respecting God, his perfections, his will, his revealed purposes, and works, man's condition, his duties, accountability, &c.

105. Is Systematic theology useful? Ans. Yes.

106. Wherein? Ans. (1.) As all divine truths agree, when compared together they mutually cast light on one another. (2.) Therefore, without comparing one truth with another systematically, we cannot understand them separately, or see their full meaning and evidence. Our knowledge of any one truth is limited and defective, unless we know it in its connexion with other truths. We cannot understand its importance, unless we compare it with others. Nor can we find the meaning of some texts of Scripture, without comparing them with others.

107. Is systematic teaching opposed by errorists? Ans. Yes; by many of them.

108. Why do they oppose it? Ans. Because their favourite errors will not bear the test of system, or the comparison of their errors with admitted truths.

109. What do they propose instead of system? Ans. The simple reading of the Scriptures, and the explanation of insulated texts.

110. But can they explain a text without assuming some system, or some principle according to which they will determine its meaning? Ans. No. Instead of comparing the text which they explain, with the whole system of truth, or keeping the analogy or "proportion of faith" (Rom. xii. 6,) they explain it according to some principle which they have assumed, or according to the letter of some other text unexplained in its connexion with the context.

111. Is not want of system irrational? Ans. Yes; the rational mind will inquire into the connexion of doctrines, and their consistency one with another.

112. What is the only safe method of explaining any Scripture text, or any Scripture doctrine? Ans. Comparing Scripture with Scripture, and each text with the ascertained system of divine truth found in the Bible; Rom. xii. 6.

113. Do not the Holy Scriptures, however, deliver divine truths in an insulated manner, and without systematic arrangement? Ans. They generally do; and therefore the need of system with us in investigating and teaching them; as the supernatural gifts, under which the Scriptures were delivered, are not now afforded for the study or the teaching of their meaning. But yet some parts are delivered systematically.

114. Do the Scriptures themselves require us to study and teach them systematically? Ans. Yes; as (1.) Rom. xii. 6, expressly

requires this—that we acquire the analogy or “proportion,” or the connexion and harmony of the whole Scriptures, and teach accordingly. (2.) Paul to the Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews, follows system, and sets us the example. (3.) The Scriptures reprove our blindness in not inferring one truth from another, and thus enjoin systematic study; as Matt. xxii. 29–32; Luke xxiv. 25–27.

115. Though all systems of divine truth should agree, is it necessary that they all be conducted in the same method? Ans. No.

116. In how many ways may theology be treated? Ans. The treating may be *Exegetical*; i. e. explanatory, or *Didactic*, simply teaching what the truth is—or *Polemic*; by arguing for the truth and against error—or *Casuistical*; as applied to the conscience; answering questions of conscience, &c.—or *Historical*: setting forth the histories or facts, on which the doctrines of divine truth are founded, or by which they are illustrated and proved.

117. How is systematic theology distinguished, as to its arrangement, or method of conducting it? Ans. Into *Positive and Scholastic*.

118. What is the Positive? Ans. Such as commentaries on the Scriptures, following the order of the Scriptures, and not the connexion of doctrines—and insulated discourses.

119. What is the Scholastic method? Ans. A method conducted according to the rules of logic, setting forth the doctrines of divine truth in their connexion of matter, and dependencies of one part on another.

120. Is the Scholastic method to be approved? Ans. Yes; it is properly the systematic method, the method of schools, and is commended to us by the schools of the prophets, the creeds and collections of the Fathers, and by the example of the apostle Paul, to the Romans, Galatians, Hebrews, &c.

§ XXVI. 121. What is commonly meant by scholastic theology? Ans. A Popish theology, which was begun about the twelfth century, by Peter Lombard. They divided into sects, called Thomists, Scotists, Realists, Nominalists, &c. They had some good philosophical speculations and expressions, and some clear testimonies to divine truth; but they are justly blamed for the use they make of the authority of the Fathers and Philosophers, leading to neglect the Scriptures, and for their errors, curious and useless questions, barbarous terms, and darkening of the Scriptures by their explanations.

LECTURE IV.—INFERENCES, &C.

§ XXVII. *Definition*. The points included in a definition of true theology, and which is the subject of which we propose to treat, are—that *it is a doctrine—derived from the word of God—the object of which it treats, true religion—the subjects for whom it is intended—and the end, supreme and subordinate*.

§ XXVIII. Quest. 122. Why is theology called a *doctrine*? Ans. Because it is *taught* by God, in his word, to be *learned* by

the church, and by the church to be *taught* to her children; John vii. 16, 17; Tit. i. 9.

123. Is it not a practical doctrine, as well as theoretic? Ans. Yes; it is taught in order to practice, and not for speculation; James i. 22; 1 Tim. i. 5; vi. 3; John xiii. 17, "Happy are ye if ye do them."

124. But it is objected that the Scriptures require knowledge, and that knowledge is sufficient to eternal life; as John xvii. 3; Isai. liii. 11. How answer? Ans. The knowledge there spoken of, and elsewhere, is saving, practical knowledge. Knowledge itself is not sufficient; 1 Cor. viii. 1.

125. It is objected that God is the chief object of theology, and therefore the doctrines respecting him cannot be practical? Ans. It is true theoretical knowledge is necessary to practice, and the theoretic knowledge of God is taught us in order to direct our practice in heart and life.

§ XXIX. 126. Does the doctrine of theology include inferences and consequences deduced from Scripture by reasoning, as well as the express ideas of Scripture? Ans. Yes.

127. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From examples in Scripture, designed to teach us to draw inferences; as Matt. xxii. 31, 32; 1 Cor. xv. 12. (2.) From the injunction to search the Scriptures, John v. 39, which is more than merely reading. (3.) From reproofs for neglect to learn the doctrine of the Scriptures by reasoning from them; as Matt. xxii. 29; Luke xxiv. 25, 26. (4.) From the use of the Scriptures, as for reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, which cannot be fully attained without inference. (5.) It appears also from the comprehensiveness of the Scriptures, adapted to all cases of all men; which will require inference from the Scriptures, in order to find something suited to every case.— (6.) The Scriptures take it for granted that the reader has reason and common sense, to apply Scripture principles to practical and doctrinal uses; as Matt. xvi. 11, 12; Acts xvii. 22, 29; Luke xxiv. 25, 26. (7.) From the connexion between a science and its conclusions.

128. It is objected that the Scriptures condemn reason and philosophy in religion, or in connexion with religious doctrine; as 2 Cor. x. 5, "casting down imaginations, &c.;" Col. ii. 8. How answer? Ans. Those passages refer, (1.) to false philosophy, as appears from 1 Tim. vi. 20, "oppositions of science, falsely so called," and (2.) to reason and philosophy set in opposition to divine revelation.

129. Who have the right to draw these inferences? Ans. Every one for himself, as well as the church, and particular teachers. This right is as extensive as human interest in the Scriptures, and as extensive as the command to search the Scriptures.

130. But the Papists object that private or individual men have no right to judge for themselves, of the meaning or application of the Scriptures; and refer to 2 Pet. i. 20. How answer? Ans. (†) The church may err; as well as an individual, as facts prove.

(2.) While a sound interpretation by the church is useful in aiding the investigations of individuals, it cannot excuse the individual from his obligation to examine for himself. (3.) A faith, in even the doctrines of truth, on the church's testimony, is no divine faith, and cannot be saving. We must believe them on the divine testimony, and know them for ourselves. (4.) The text in 2 Pet. i. 20, does not forbid private investigation; it rather requires it, as the preceding verse shows, requiring our attention to the sure word of prophecy. And this text declares the divine and not the human source of Scripture doctrine, and may also mean its universal application.

§ XXX. 131. It is objected, (1.) That the consequences or inferences are not revealed in Scripture, and therefore they rest on the principles of reason? Ans. (1.) If the inference be just, the truth which it contains is revealed; though revealed implicitly, yet really. And, (2.) Our faith in the doctrine so revealed, is on the divine authority teaching it, and not on reason discovering that truth in the word, no more than on simple perception of that truth which is expressly revealed. Reason may discover the truth contained by implication, in the Scriptures, as clearly and certainly as the understanding and perception can discover the truth which is expressly revealed.

132. May we not be absolutely sure of a truth, without being infallible? Ans. Yes: we may attain the full assurance of understanding; Col. ii. 2; but infallibility signifies the impossibility of erring. It is a divine perfection, or at least a divine communication.

133. It is objected, (2.) That natural reason is blind in divine things, and therefore we should not trust on inferences? Ans. (1.) In mere logic on a plain subject, reason is not blind. In the natural man it is blind as to spiritual, saving views of divine things; and this blindness, and the depravity of heart accompanying, may pervert the reasoning powers in some things. But, (2.) Our reason is no more blind than our understanding and perception, of an expressly revealed truth. And (3.) The Holy Spirit heals our blindness, and engages to guide us into the truth. (4.) A clear view of the truth, as expressly revealed, compels us to draw or admit inferences, as unavoidable.

134. It is objected, (3.) That the people are not capable of apprehending inferences or consequences, and therefore the Scriptures would be a sealed book, to them, so far as inferences are concerned? Ans. (1.) It is true that some inferences they may not be able to draw, without assistance, and yet see them with perfect clearness, when drawn for them. (2.) It is generally as easy to see a legitimate and immediate inference, as the direct meaning of a text of Scripture. (3.) The objection is, therefore, false, as common sense and correct understanding of a truth, easily and irresistibly lead the ordinary mind to plain and legitimate inferences.

§ XXXI. 135. What do Papists mean by *theological conclusions*, and *the conclusions of faith*? Ans. (1.) By the first, they mean inferences deduced from Scripture; and by the latter, the perception or belief of express doctrines of Scripture. And (2.) They

sometimes mean, by the former, inferences drawn by the individual for himself; by the latter, inferences drawn by the church, and thus the object of faith.

136. What use do they make of this distinction? Ans. (1.) That theological conclusions, or inferences from Scripture, are only matters of opinion, not of faith, and so of those drawn by individuals for themselves; but, (2.) That conclusions of faith, the express doctrines of Scripture, or inferences drawn by the church, are matters of faith.

137. Is this distinction admissible? Ans. No.

138. Why not? Ans. (1.) An inference fairly drawn from Scripture is divine truth, and divine teaching, as well as the express doctrines. (2.) Because an inference drawn by an individual fairly is a ground or matter of saving faith, as well as if drawn by the church. (3.) Because to make it an object of faith on account of its being drawn by the church, is to place our faith on a human ground, and not on that which is divine.

§ XXXII. 139. What is the sole ground and authority for our theology? Ans. The word of God alone; Isa. viii. 20; 2 Pet. i. 19.

140. Is true theology, in any measure, founded on anything else? Ans. No.

141. Are not Decrees of Synods, sayings of the Fathers, testimony of the senses, and human reason, by many pleaded as grounds of faith and of true theology? Ans. Yes; by many; as the Papists, Universalists, Unitarians, Arminians, &c.

142. Although none of these are the grounds of faith, or of theology, yet may they not all be useful in their place? Ans. Yes.

143. Of what use are decrees of synods, creeds, or confessions? Ans. (1.) They may be used as assistants to the understanding of the Scriptures, and a discovery of their meaning. (2.) They are a means of unity in the church, in her sentiment, profession and practice. (3.) They are a united testimony of the church to the truth, and demand a careful examination of the truth. But they are not authority for our faith.

144. Of what use are the sayings of the fathers? Ans. They may be assistants in our investigations of doctrine, and demand our serious examination of the Scriptures.

145. Of what use is the testimony of our senses? Ans. (1.) The senses were of use, under some dispensations, in trying the truth of miracles; and are still of use in trying false or pretended miracles. (2.) They are still useful in trying some false doctrines; as that of Transubstantiation.

146. Of what use is reason in theology? Ans. (1.) Illative; drawing inferences from Scripture, as we have seen. (2.) Collative; comparing passages and doctrines one with another, thus increasing our knowledge, enlarging our views, and strengthening our faith in divine truth. (3.) Illustrative; explaining one text or doctrine, by the assistance of another, by science, or by historic facts. (4.) For confirming our faith in divine truth, and obtaining a fuller

understanding of it, and corroborating evidence of it, when we, in any case, see it agree with the undoubted dictates of nature's light, and when we see errors, which are denounced by Scripture, also condemned by the light of nature. And, (5.) When reason sustains the probability and possibility of even the higher mysteries of faith.

147. Do not such uses of reason abound in Holy Scripture? Ans. Yes; as Isa. xl. 12-14; xlv. 9-20; Acts. xvii. 24-29.

148. What further evidence have we that reason is of use in investigating the Scriptures, and building our system on them? Ans. Many other considerations; as, (1.) From the gift of reason itself. It was not given in vain. (2.) Because God addresses us as rational beings, and holds us accountable as such. (3.) Because the Scriptures cannot be understood at all without the use of reason. (4.) From the commands given to search the Scriptures, and censures for neglecting reason; as Isa. xlv. 19; Luke xxiv. 25. (5.) From the practice of teachers of divine truth in every age; and from the advantages that have resulted from a suitable application of reason.

149. But as reason may be put out of its proper sphere, in matters of theology, when, or wherein is it so? Ans. (1.) When we found our theology on reason, or the light of nature, and not on Scripture. (2.) When reason claims to originate a gospel mystery, or to reject it, even contrary to the teachings of Holy Scripture. (3.) When it pronounces a doctrine of Scripture false, even when reason must admit that the doctrine is taught in Scripture. It is then making itself, and not Scripture, the ground of theology or faith. (4.) When we believe Scripture only because reason teaches the same things.

150. When or wherein is reason lawfully used in Theology?— Ans. (1.) When it examines, humbly, seriously, submissively, and in a spirit of obedience and prayer, the evidence that the Scriptures are divine. (2.) When, in the same spirit, it searches into the meaning of Scripture. (3.) When, in the same spirit, it examines into the application of Scripture. (4.) When, in the same spirit, it examines into the reasonableness of Scripture doctrine. (5.) When, having found sufficient evidence of the divine original of the Scriptures, it admits and maintains that the Scriptures are the sufficient and the true ground of faith.

ADDENDA TO §§ 26, 30, 32.

Quest. 1. May reason judge of contradictions in matters of faith, or judge whether explanations of texts of Scripture, or statements of doctrines, made by men, are contrary to one another? Ans. Yes.

2. May reason judge that an erroneous explanation of a scripture is contrary to other texts, and to the analogy of faith? Ans. Yes; otherwise we could not examine the Scriptures, or detect error, even by Scripture.

3. If a false dogma be professedly drawn from Scripture, may reason judge and condemn it, on the ground of its contrariety to reason and nature's light? Ans. Yes.

4. May sense and reason judge in divine things, so far as those things fall within their proper sphere? Ans. Yes.

5. Are there not many things in supernatural religion, about which sense and reason may judge, as well as faith? Ans. Yes: there are three kinds of objects, sensible, rational, and supernatural. Sense, reason, and faith, respectively, are occupied about these. And as far as any of these are connected with theology, so far these respective faculties can act on them.

6. But may reason judge and condemn a doctrine which it has correctly ascertained is taught in the word of God? Ans. No: this is to set reason above God, and above his word.]

§ XXXIII.—151. Is it necessary that the ground or principle of theology be of absolute infallibility? Ans. Yes.

152. Why so? Ans. (1.) The matter of it is too important to be decided by a lower standard. (2.) Without this there cannot be undoubted faith. (3.) Nothing less can be an adequate arbiter in questions of dispute in matters so important.

153. Should it be of independent authority? Ans. Yes.

154. Why so? Ans. (1.) To render the heart and conscience submissive. (2.) To silence all opposition, and to justify the friends of truth in standing for it under all opposition.

155. Can absolute infallibility, or independent authority, be found in any teaching but that of the Scriptures? Ans. No: except so far as the light of nature conspires with the Holy Scriptures, in teaching the same truths. No human teaching has infallibility, or independent authority, claiming the universal submission of man.

156. As a revelation from God possesses these high claims, might we not expect that it would be imitated, and a revelation be pretended as coming from God? Ans. Yes: as Satan and his emissaries have, on the one hand, endeavoured to invalidate the evidence of a divine revelation from God, or the evidence of its purity and perfection, so, on the other hand, they have offered to the world pretended revelations, in order to overthrow the true theology.

157. How was a divine revelation made known to the church? Ans. Mediatly, by prophets and apostles.

158. How was it made to prophets and apostles? Ans. In various ways; as by the *ministry of angels*; Dan. ix. 21; Luke i. 30; Rev. xvii.—by *bodily appearances*; Gen. xviii. 17;—by an *audible voice*; Exod. xx.—1 Sam. iii. 10:—by *vision*; as to Ezekiel, —by *dreams*; Gen. xxviii. 12;—by *internal illumination*; 2 Sam. xxiii. 2, 3; Matt. x. 19;—and by *Urim and Thummim*.

159. Can we comprehend or apprehend how the prophets or apostles were supernaturally illuminated, and persuaded of the truth communicated to them by inspiration? Ans. No: It is no part of our experience.

160. But how was the church persuaded to receive the communications from the prophets and apostles as divine? Ans. (1.) By signs or miracles; Num. xvi. 28—30; Jer. xxviii. 16, 17. (2.) By

the character of the prophets, &c. ; 1 Sam. iii. 20. (3.) By the matter of the prophecy or revelation; Deut. xiii. 1—3; and internal evidence.

161. By what means are we convinced of the divine truth of that revelation now? Ans. By the same evidence coming down to us,—of miracles—character of the prophets and apostles—by the matter of the revelation itself, and internal evidence—and by its coming home to the conscience.

§ XXXIV.—162. What is the object of true theology? Ans. True religion.

163. What does true religion include? Ans. The knowledge and worship of God, and our hope in him.

164. Is God, as God, the only, or the leading object of theology? Ans. No; but God as in Christ.

165. Does not theology include all divine things, as the way of salvation, man's duty, and his condition under God's law and government, and even man himself, as a work of God? Ans. Yes.

§ XXXV.—166. What is the subject of theology; or who are intended to be instructed by it? Ans. Man.

167. In what character does theology view man? Ans. As fallen, guilty, depraved, and impotent; and it is made known to him as such.

168. Under what prospect does it present man? Ans. As liable, by nature, to eternal death, but as under hope of restoration and salvation; Psa. xix. 8; 1 Tim. iii. 17.

169. What is the end and design of theology? Ans. God's glory and man's salvation; Prov. xvi. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 9; John xx. 31; Tit. i. 2.

170. Wherein does it tend to the glory of God? Ans. As it sets forth his perfections.

171. Can that theology be true, which does not truly represent the perfections of God? Ans. No; 1 Cor. i. 31.

172. Of this complex end, God's glory and man's salvation, which is the highest object? Ans. God's glory; Prov. xvi. 4.

173. Is it attainable, through grace, for man to make the glory of God his highest object? Ans. Yes.

174. Is this consistent with lawful self-love and lawful pursuit of our best interests? Ans. Yes: God has united these two objects.

175. Can we successfully seek our own salvation, if we make it our highest object? Ans. No; we can be saved only in conformity to God's will.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

LECTURE V.—NAMES, ETC.

§ I. Quest. 1. Was a special and supernatural revelation necessary to fallen man? Ans. Yes.

2. Why? Ans. (1.) Because the light of nature could not teach the nature and character of God, nor man's condition, duties, and privileges, as fully as is necessary to salvation. (2.) Because it could teach nothing of God's gracious will towards sinners—nothing of Christ, or the plan of salvation through him. (3.) Because the knowledge of God, of Christ, and of the provisions of grace is necessary to faith and consent, and to a child-like obedience.

3. Is there anything unreasonable in the idea of God's communicating knowledge to man in a supernatural way? Ans. No. Although nature's light could not show that he would do so, it does not pronounce it either impossible or unreasonable. It teaches that God who communicates knowledge by his works, might also do it by more direct and supernatural means.

4. Has God given a supernatural revelation to man? Ans. Yes; and committed it to writing—called the Scriptures—Holy Scriptures; (2 Tim. iii. 15)—Scriptures of truth; Dan. x. 21; &c.

5. Why are they called Scriptures? Ans. Because written; and they are *the writings* by way of eminence.

6. Why are they called *Holy*, or *Sacred* Scriptures? Ans. Because of the veneration due to them; (1.) Because of their subject—a revelation of the will of God; (2.) Because of their end—the glory of God and man's salvation; and (3.) Because of their Author—the Holy Spirit.

7. Are they not also called the *Bible*? Ans. Yes.

8. Why so called? Ans. They are *the Book*, by way of eminence.

9. Should this name be restricted to the Old Testament? Ans. No; it should always be used as including both Old and New Testaments, as equally belonging to the Bible, or book of God.

10. Are not the Holy Scriptures called by other names also in the divine record, as well as *Scriptures* and *Bible*? Ans. Yes; as Prophets and Apostles, the Law, Oracles of God, Testimonies, Word of God, &c.

§ II. 11. What is the name given to the Scriptures as the most general description of them? Ans. The word of God, (see Quests. 21, 22.)

12. What does this name signify? Ans. That the Holy Scrip-

tures are God's own word, delivered by himself, whether mediately or immediately.

13. Was the matter of the present Scriptures called the word of God when not written, as well as when written? Ans. Yes.

14. When did the writing of it begin? Ans. In the time of Moses, and by him.

15. How are we to understand the prophecy of Enoch, mentioned by Jude, verses 14, 15; as written, or not written? Ans. As not written, till Jude recorded it; but, till that time, probably handed down by tradition.

16. How was the word of God preserved when not written? Ans. By tradition: Gen. xviii. 19.

§ III. 17. Why was the writing of the word of God delayed so long? Ans. What the whole design of Infinite Wisdom might be, we do not know; but we may observe, (1.) Letters, and the art of writing were not invented till near the time of Moses, and God did not interpose to lead to this invention supernaturally. (2.) The longevity of the ancient patriarchs rendered the writing of the divine word less necessary, as the steps of succession among them were few. (3.) Visions were more common then than now; and there is reason to believe that in every period of that age, some of those patriarchs were inspired men; as Enoch, Noah, Abraham, &c. (4.) Satan had perhaps less cunning than now, or was restrained from corrupting the word of God.

§ IV. 18. Was the writing of the word of God by his command, or was it the suggestion of human reason or prudence? Ans. It was commanded of God; as Exod. xvii. 14; xxxiv. 27; Isa. xxx. 8; Rev. i. 19; with many other passages of similar import. It appears also that the inspired penmen wrote by a divine impulse; as 2 Tim. iii. 16; Jude 3. Also the command to read the Scriptures proves that the writing was by the appointment of God; John v. 39; Deut. xxxi. 11.

19. The Papists object that the Scriptures were written by the mere will of man, because, the penmen sometimes assigned the occasion of writing, intimating that their writing was suggested to them merely by circumstances? Ans. (1.) It is true, they sometimes stated the occasion; as Luke i. 3; Jude 3; but God provided those occasions, and led the writers by means of them. (2.) This is not inconsistent with the divine command to write.

20. The Papists object that the written word is not necessary, as the church had been without it for ages, and some have been converted by preaching, who never had read the Scriptures? Ans. (1.) True, God could have preserved his word, and have made it as useful without writing; but it is now necessary, by his appointment. (2.) It is necessary by the dispensation in which he has placed us, that it may be in the hands of all, that it might be better studied, that it may be preserved without a miracle, and that the rule of faith may be one, and uniform throughout the church. (3.) If some have been converted by preaching, without having read the word, yet it was by the word of God preached, that they were

converted, and they would need the word of God in their hands afterwards.

§ V. 21. Why is the Holy Scripture, or written word, called the *word of God*? Ans. (1.) Especially because it is given by inspiration of the Spirit. (2.) Because he commanded to write it, and led to the writing of it, by the impulse of his Spirit. (3.) On account of his example in writing it; Exod. xxxi. 18. (4.) Because of his preserving it.

22. Though human discussion of the word, or preaching it, is called *the word of God*, yet is not Holy Scripture called *the word* in a higher sense? Ans. Yes. The preaching of the word, is giving the meaning of the word, but Holy Scripture is the very word given by God.

23. Who were the persons by whose instrumentality the word of God was communicated to the church? Ans. Both those who wrote; as Moses, Isaiah, &c., and those who spake it on certain occasions without writing; as Elijah, Zechariah, Simeon, Mary, &c.

24. Should we always consider the speeches of men, introduced into the Holy Scriptures, as the word of God, in their matter? Ans. No; many of those speeches were false and even wicked.

25. How, or wherein, are they the word of God to us? Ans. The narrative of them, or the record of them is the word of God, a divine, authentic history, but such things recorded are not the divine law. They are divine history, not a divine rule.

26. How are we to understand or view the speeches of Job's friends, whose doctrines God condemns; Job xlii. 7? Ans. The record of their speeches is divine, but the matter not inspired.

27. To what things does inspiration extend, or what in the Scripture does it include? Ans. All things in the Scripture, whether doctrines delivered as approved, or historic accounts.

28. Are the Scripture histories of facts known to the writer by tradition, as, in Genesis, accounts of the creation, fall of man, &c., to be considered inspired? Ans. Yes.

29. How can we understand them as inspired, if known, by tradition, to the writer? Ans. (1.) These accounts might have been given to the fathers by inspiration, and acknowledged and handed down, by the church, as inspired accounts; and Moses so wrote, or recorded them, only changing them from an oral to a written form. (2.) The Spirit guided Moses and other writers to an unerring narration, to the selection of such things as should be written; John xx. 20, 21; and the Holy Spirit then confirmed or corrected tradition.

30. How far are the deeds recorded in Scripture a rule to us? Ans. Only so far as they are recorded with approbation, or agree with the divine law; but the record of them is divine.

31. Are the smaller matters of doctrine, law, or history, which are recorded in Scripture, of the same authority and authenticity as the more weighty? Ans. Yes; 2 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Pet. i. 21; Psal. xii. 6.

32. What would be the consequence of denying the authenticity

of these lesser matters? Ans. (1.) It would be rendering doubtful what is authentic, and what is not, and therefore unsettling faith in the whole. (2.) It would lead to the denial of the divine inspiration of the whole, as these lesser matters constitute part of the sacred oracles. (3.) It would be making human reason and opinion the umpire on which the whole authority of the Scriptures would depend, and utterly deprive the church of an infallible and independent rule.

33. But then how understand Paul, (1 Cor. vii. 12,) "but to the rest speak I, not the Lord?" Ans. The apostle was filling up the canon of Scripture, on this point, expressing what the Lord Jesus Christ had, for the time, left unexpressed. The apostle repeated some things expressed by the Lord Jesus Christ, and by his authority added others.

34. But may we not allow that the Holy Spirit allowed a loose expression, in mere circumstantial matters, on purpose? Ans. Yes; he gave expressions which were not perhaps strictly and scientifically true, but were true in the common acceptance of the words; as, Matt. iii. 5, "All Judea went out," &c.; Deut. i. 35, 36, "Caleb only excepted." And by these God would try the sincerity and honesty of inquirers after truth, who can, on an honest search, find the truth in these matters. And even if misapprehensions arise, by means of these expressions, they are not such as to affect the matter of our faith.

35. When we meet with apparent contradictions in Scripture, which sometimes arise from the use of words in their then common acceptance, how are we to treat them? Ans. (1.) If practicable, demonstrate their agreement, by the connexion of the passages, or by allowing the common acceptance of the words at the time of writing; or, (2.) If this cannot be done, show the probable or possible agreement, consistent with the analogy of faith, which may stop the mouths of those who charge contradictions on the Scriptures; or throw the burden on them to prove that the contradiction is real. (3.) A real contradiction should be ascribed to the transcribers; as 2 Kings viii. 26, Ahaziah is said to be twenty-two years old when he began to reign; and in 2 Chron. xxii. 2, he is said to be forty-two. [See § 23, Quest. 203.]

LECTURE VI.—THE SCRIPTURES GOD'S INSPIRED WORD.

Quest. 36. Did God give the *words* of Holy Scripture by inspiration, as well as the ideas? Ans. Yes. This is what is called *plenary* inspiration.

37. How shall we prove this? Ans. (1.) By texts; 2 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Pet. i. 21; Psal. xii. 6. (2.) Because the writers did not always understand their own prophecies, and therefore could not express them in their own words; as Dan. viii. 27, "Astonished at the vision, but none understood it;" xii. 8, 9, "I understand not—the words are closed up and sealed;" 1 Pet. i. 10, 11, "The prophets inquired and searched," &c. (3.) Human understanding is liable to fail in expressing what it does understand; and therefore, if

the expressions had been left to the writer, we might be led inevitably into error, and be always doubtful of the Spirit's meaning.

38. But it is objected that the variety of style in the divine writers proves that they were left to the selection of their own words? Ans. (1.) God prepared the writers with their respective styles. (2.) He accommodated his communications in expressions to their respective styles, and gave them expressions suited to their styles, just as he employed the natural voice of the prophets in speaking.

39. Does Paul's confession of his ignorance of the High Priest, (Acts xxiii. 5) prove error in the expression in Holy Scripture? Ans. No; because, (1.) That expression may be taken ironically, as if to say the command given was not becoming a High Priest; or (2.) Perhaps he did not know Ananias personally, and his ignorance of this did not affect his doctrine or reproof; and he might have been left in ignorance of the man and his office, that a suitable reproof might be given by Paul, without sin; or rather, as the word may mean, (3.) Paul confesses that he had not adverted to the fact that he was the High Priest, and that by his oversight, he had fallen into an impropriety of expression. But the divine record of these circumstances is not invalidated by Paul's confession; for, (a.) Even an inspired apostle was not inspired in everything he said and did, but only in delivering the mind or revelation of God; (b.) He might have even given that reproof by inspiration, authorized by God to act above the law in that case, but giving warning that it is not to be violated by man's will.

§ VI.—40. Have the Holy Scriptures an intrinsic authority in themselves, independent of the testimony of the church, or of the opinions of the learned and wise? Ans. Yes.

41. On what does that intrinsic authority depend? Ans. On inspiration; or [the fact] that they are given by God himself.

42. But in order to our faith in the Scriptures, and subjection to them, is it not necessary that we have evidence that they are the very word of God by inspiration? Ans. Yes.

43. How may we be led to know the divinity of the Scriptures, and to a solid belief in their inspiration? Ans. In three ways; as (1.) By the *illumination of the Spirit*; (2.) By *evidences*, external and internal, of their divinity; and (3.) By the *ministry of the church*.

I. THE ILLUMINATION OF THE SPIRIT.

44. Do we mean that the *Illumination of the Spirit* is an evidence of the truth of the Scriptures, or a ground on which we believe them divine? Ans. No; but that he is the author of our faith in them; that, by his influence, we see the evidence of the truth of the Scriptures, and believe them.

45. It is objected by the Papists, who wish to lay the testimony of the church as the foundation of faith in the Scriptures, that our doctrine is illogical, reasoning in a circle, making our belief of the Scriptures depend on the Spirit, and our belief of the Spirit de-

pend on the Scriptures? Ans. The objection is unfounded, as we do not hold that the illumination of the Spirit is the evidence of the truth of the Scriptures, or the ground of our faith, but that he is the author of our discovery of the grounds of faith, and the cause of faith itself, on those grounds.

46. Is the work of the Holy Spirit necessary to our solid faith in the truth and divinity of the Scriptures? Ans. Yes; Psal. cxix. 18; John xvi. 13; 2 Cor. iv. 6, 13; 1 John v. 6.

47. But might not a man, by the rational evidence of the truth of the Scriptures, believe them, without the Spirit's special illumination? Ans. Yes; but not thoroughly nor savingly.

48. Why is the special work of the Spirit necessary to this faith? Ans. (1.) Because of our natural blindness. (2.) Natural enmity, opposing the peculiar truths of the gospel. (3.) The peculiarity and sublimity of the subject, being above the discernment and the natural apprehension of reason; 1 Cor. ii. 14.

49. When the Holy Spirit convinces and persuades us of the truth of the Scriptures, does he do it by secret suggestions without reason? Ans. No: he does it by presenting rational evidence, opening the eyes to see it, and persuading the heart; John xvi. 13, 14; Psa. cxix. 18.

50. How does it appear that when the Spirit convinces us, he presents rational evidence? Ans. From John xvi. 13, 14, "He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you;" John v. 36, "The works that I do, they testify of me," &c.; showing that he gives rational grounds of faith.

II. EVIDENCES.

51. Having now seen that the Spirit presents us evidence of the truth of the Scriptures, and opens the eyes to see it, we next inquire, What *Evidence* does he present in general? Ans. It is of two kinds, *External* and *Internal*.

52. What is the general nature of *External Evidence* for the truth of the Scriptures? Ans. Evidence drawn from a comparison of Scripture narratives and prophecies with facts otherwise known, whether by history, philosophy, or observation: or, in other words, it is the evidence arising from Miracles, Prophecies, and concurrent Histories, or Facts.

53. What is the general nature of *Internal Evidence*? Ans. It is that discovered in the Scripture itself.

1. OF EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

(1.) MIRACLES.—Quest. 54. Do *miracles* prove the truth of divine revelation? Ans. Yes; and so our Lord himself appeals to them; John v. 36; x. 38.

55. How do miracles prove the truth of the Scriptures? Ans. (1.) They were wrought in confirmation of the character and office of Christ—of the divine mission of prophets and apostles, and of their doctrines. (2.) Miracles are necessarily of God, the Creator and Ruler of all things. (3.) Miracles are therefore God's attes-

tation of the character of those whom he employs, and of their doctrines; Num. xvi. 28-30; xvii. 10.

56. But how know that these miracles actually did occur? Ans. (1.) They were generally open and public, and always plain and unquestionable. (2.) The record was uncontradicted in the age in which the miracles were wrought. (3.) The records were frequently read in the hearing of all the people. (4.) All would not have submitted to the imposition, if the statements were false. (5.) The statements must have been universally acknowledged, or clearly supported, to be unanimously received by the succeeding ages.

57. But what evidence have we now that the miracles recorded were real at the time, and not impositions on the credulous? Ans. (1.) They were generally public; and in a public assembly, if some are credulous, others are not. (2.) They were always plain and unquestionable, perceived by several of the senses at once, and connected with other concurrent facts; as the plagues of Egypt, dividing of the Red Sea and Jordan, appearances on Mount Sinai, the engulfing of Dathan and Abiram, &c. (3.) Of such miracles, when the facts are attested, we can judge of the evidence now, as well as those could to whom they occurred; and of the bearing of attendant circumstances on them.

LECTURE VII.—EVIDENCES OF THE TRUTH OF THE SCRIPTURES.

(2.) FULFILMENT OF PROPHECIES.—Quest. 58. What evidence does the *fulfilment of prophecy* afford for the truth of the Scriptures? Ans. (1.) Exact fulfilment cannot uniformly attend, and but seldom attends a conjecture, or a false prophecy. (2.) God alone can foretell his works and providence. (3.) Many of the prophecies were very improbable in themselves. (4.) All earthly powers were against some of them; proving both that God foretold the events, and accomplished them. (5.) The prophecy proving to be of God, proves the prophet delivering it to be employed of God, and all his messages to be of God. (6.) The book which is honoured with the original record of those prophecies, is evidently a book avowed of God to be his word.

59. What are some of those prophecies which are already fulfilled, in whole, or in part? Ans. (1.) Noah's flood. (2.) Abraham's posterity to be in bondage in a strange land 400 years, though under the promise of Canaan. (3.) That they should come out of that bondage, under God's judgments, with great riches, and inherit Canaan. (4.) That they should be 70 years in Babylon. (5.) That they should return to their own land, after the destruction of Babylon. (6.) That the sceptre should be in the hand of Judah and continue till Christ should come. (7.) Many things about the advent of Christ. (8.) The rise of Mohammed and of Antichrist.

60. Were not these prophecies made to sustain the faith of the church in the doctrines, laws, and ordinances, given to her in Scripture? Ans. Yes.

61. Is not the fulfilment of these prophecies in order to carry on

the work of grace in the church, and steps in accomplishing the work of redemption, as revealed? Ans. Yes; and thus they prove the truth of the whole Scriptures.

62. But it is objected that those prophecies, so exactly fulfilled, were written after the fulfilment? Ans. (1.) They purport to be written before; and in many cases the Scriptures, on the fulfilment of a prophecy, refer to the prophecy as well-known to have long existed; as Matt. i. 22, 23; ii. 5, 6, 15, 17, 18, 23. But a pretended prophecy referred to would not have been submitted to by all. (2.) Enemies (as the unbelieving Jews) acknowledged the previous existence of these prophecies. (3.) Those prophecies were so interwoven with circumstances and facts of those times in which they were delivered, that there could be no question of their existence previous to the fulfilment. (4.) If the prophecies were spurious, and written after the fulfilment, anachronisms would have occurred, none of which appear in these prophecies. (5.) Many of those prophecies were acknowledged, and quoted by other than the divine writers, as existing before the event foretold. (6.) The introduction of a spurious prophecy, after the event, pretending to be ancient, could not have been submitted to without detection, as there were always enemies to those prophecies and the events predicted.

CHRIST'S APPEARANCE AND RESURRECTION, AS A FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY.—63. If Christ really appeared in our world, answering to prophecy, and sustained his character by word and works—if he arose from the dead also, does not all this prove the divinity of the Scriptures? Ans. Yes.

64. How do his appearing in the world, and his resurrection, prove it? Ans. (1.) All divine revelation makes him the great centre of Scripture doctrines, histories, laws, &c. (2.) His coming, the circumstances of it, his character, his works, and his resurrection, fulfil prophecies. (3.) His appearance in the flesh, his life, death and resurrection, sustain all Scripture doctrines, promises, and histories, as divine. These things sustain the whole plan of redemption.

65. How are his actual appearance, his character, his works, and his resurrection, proved? Ans. (1.) The Evangelists record them. (2.) These records, as to the facts, are uncontradicted by bitter enemies. (3.) The record coming down to us, not only among believers, but among unbelievers and open enemies; none pretended to detect the introduction of such a narrative in their time.

66. Does not the virulent opposition of enemies who admitted the facts recorded, although they gave them other constructions than Christians do, even aid in the proof of Christ's appearance, character, works, death, and resurrection? Ans. Yes; because (1.) They admit the facts recorded, which their cause would have led them to deny, if possible, as their most effectual method of success. And further, (2.) We can judge, as well as they, what construction to put on the facts recorded, and thus admitted by them.

67. Did not Christ's enemies deny one important fact—his resurrection? Ans. Yes; but (1.) Their denial was self-contradictory.

(2.) It had no weight with others, nor did it prevent the persuasion of multitudes.

68. What weight has the testimony of the first and eye-witnesses in this matter? Ans. (1.) They acted against their worldly interests in maintaining those facts; and thus proved their full conviction of their truth. (2.) Their whole testimony tended to promote holiness, and therefore we have assurance that they were not governed by carnal motives. They had no end to serve, of a worldly nature. (3.) They were competent witnesses.

69. Although we have all these solid external evidences for the Scriptures, as divinely true, are they sufficient to produce a divine and saving faith, by their own power? Ans. No; 2 Cor. iv. 13.

70. What further evidence, besides external, is necessary? Ans. *Internal Evidence.*

71. May not, however, the external evidence be blessed, in connexion with the internal, for producing a divine faith in us? Ans. Yes.

72. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) God has given it as a ground of our faith in the Scriptures. (2.) It coincides with, and is supported by internal evidence.

73. Does external evidence ever come home to the heart with saving power, without opening the eyes on the internal evidence? Ans. No.

74. Are not the internal evidences necessary in order to a satisfactory view of the external? Ans. Yes.

2. OF THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE SCRIPTURES.

Quest. 75. State some of the *internal* marks? Ans. Besides the truth of prophecies proved by the events, their confirmation by miracles, and the preservation of the Scriptures from destruction by enemies, as partly external, and partly internal, and already considered under the head of external evidence, we notice, (1.) The characters of the *penmen* more particularly; (2.) The character of the *doctrines* of the Scriptures; (3.) The *simplicity of style*; (4.) The *harmony* of all the parts; (5.) The *effects* of the Scriptures; (6.) Their *antiquity*; (7.) Their *agreement* with the natural and unavoidable convictions of the *conscience*, and the *experience* of the heart.

(1.) THE PENMEN.

76. What was the character of the *penmen*? Ans. Holiness, candour, decision, and honesty.

77. What evidence may we gather for the truth of the Scriptures from the character of the penmen? Ans. (1.) Their character was manifestly above that of impostors, and even above nature. (2.) Their spirit and their lives were contrary to the natural spirit and disposition of man, with reference to godliness. (3.) Their character was conformable to their doctrine, and the fruit of it. (4.) Such a character was an assurance, to the church, of their sincerity and honesty in declaring the truth. A holy character would not wilfully deceive. (5.) A holy man would not falsely profess special communications from heaven, if he did not receive them.

78. What evidence for the truth of the Scriptures may be drawn from the honesty, openness, and candour of the sacred penmen, and their avoiding the use of cunning and policy to effect their object, or produce persuasion? Ans. (1.) It proves their own full persuasion of the truth of what they delivered. (2.) It proves their dependence on the influence of the truth and of the Holy Spirit, to persuade, and not on policy. (3.) It proves the holy effect of their doctrine on their own hearts, and therefore its heavenly origin.

79. What evidence for the truth of the Scriptures from the firm and unwavering adherence of the penmen to the truth which they delivered? Ans. (1.) Their belief of the doctrine which they delivered. (2.) Their knowledge of its value. (3.) Their knowledge of its divine origin. (4.) That they were supported by the power of God, through the instrumentality of that truth which they delivered.

(2.) DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURES.

Quest. 80. What are the leading characteristics of the doctrine of the Scriptures? Ans. Sublimity and sanctity.

81. Wherein does the sublimity of the doctrine appear? Ans. In many things: (1.) Respecting God. Divine writers exclude all imperfections from God; heathen writers did not. Divine writers present God to us as infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth. The divine writers could obtain these views from God only, as heathen writers always failed here. Such characters of God, natural men and deceivers would rather conceal or deny. Yet reason shows that such characters alone can accord with the AUTHOR of all things. (2.) This sublimity of the doctrine appears respecting the creation:—ascribing this stupendous work to the power and even the word of God; and even Longinus, a heathen Rhetorician, notices this as a special exhibition of sublimity. (3.) It appears in the Scripture doctrine respecting sin against God, its enormity, and its consequences. (4.) Respecting man's redemption, and the way of it, as it is redemption from the claims of divine justice, and from depravity, to peace with God, and holiness: and by the Son of God, in our nature, satisfying justice, and magnifying the law. (5.) Respecting heaven, its glory, its happiness, and its employment, &c.

82. May not reason itself see that these ideas, when set forth, are consistent with the nature of both God and man? Ans. Yes.

83. Is there a holiness in Scripture doctrine, and in its ends and aims, that never was found in doctrines set forth by infidels and heathens? Ans. Yes.

84. What evidence for the truth of Scripture arises from this? Ans. (1.) No heathen or infidel ever set forth such holy doctrine. (2.) As the blindness of man could not do it, so the depravity of man could neither discover nor relish it. (3.) Therefore, the inspired penmen received it from God.

(3.) SIMPLICITY OF STYLE.

Quest. 85. Is simplicity of style, and of the exhibition of the truth, manifest in the Holy Scriptures? Ans. Yes.

86. What evidence for the truth of the Scriptures appears from this? Ans. (1.) On sublime subjects men are apt to become pompous, showing no proper reverence for the matter discussed; while simplicity of style shows sincerity, belief, and reverence. (2.) No artfulness is shown by the writers, as they depend on the truth to carry its own evidence with it.

87. Is not the style simple, even when delivering the most incomprehensible doctrines? Ans. Yes.

88. But does simplicity of style exclude figures? Ans. No: the figures used are simple, impress by their directness, and are used without any suspicion of doubt.

(4.) HARMONY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

Quest. 89. Is there not a remarkable harmony among all the sacred writers, whether in history, morals, or doctrines of the gospel? Ans. Yes.

90. But are there not some apparent contradictions? Ans. Yes.

91. How does this consist with harmony and simplicity? Ans. (1.) The contradictions are only apparent, not real, except what may be ascribed to copyists, in history especially. (2.) Most of the apparent contradictions vanish, when we attend to the immediate object of the writer. (3.) Deceivers artfully attend to discrepancies, so far as they observe them, in order to avoid detection; but simple honesty often neglects apparent discrepancies, through consciousness of the truth, and dependence on intrinsic truth to remove the difficulty. (4.) A divine writer makes a faithful statement of a doctrine or a narrative, in connexion with one circumstance, in which it appears different from the statement made of the same truth, in its connexion with another, and yet the statements perfectly agree. And the Holy Spirit suffers these stumbling-blocks to fall in the way of the proud, and carries his own children, in their humiliation, over them. And if discrepancies in doctrine appear, those doctrines are so fully and unequivocally taught elsewhere in Scripture, that the humble believer need not stumble. The whole aim of the whole Scripture is most manifestly uniform.

92. What are some of those leading aims of Scripture, in which its harmony is so manifest? Ans. The glory of God—the holiness and happiness of man, by restoring him to the image and the favour of God—and the plan of accomplishing this, by Jesus Christ.

93. What evidence for the truth of the Holy Scriptures arises from this harmony of the whole? Ans. (1.) Truth is but one; error is manifold. The truth must harmonize; error cannot. And truth, as the character of the whole Scriptures, and coming from God, the infallible Source of truth, can alone account for this. (2.) All other systems and theories of doctrines and morals differ, in different ages, by increasing light, or by change of taste or fancies. If divine truth were not from God, the infallible source, it also would have varied in different ages. (3.) The sacred writers were of very different ages of the world—under very different circumstances—and of very different natural talents, tastes, and acquire-

ments; all which produce discord in human theories, but they produced none in the doctrines, or narratives, or morals of the Bible. (4.) Although the early ages of the world were necessarily less intelligent, of less experience, and less opportunity of enlarged and correct views, yet the first writers are fully sustained by the latter. Now, nothing but Infinite Wisdom, as the source of Bible revelation, can account for this. Therefore, the writings of the early ages were communications from God, and not the discoveries of human wisdom; and the latter also were from the same God, to sustain and approve the first writers. (5.) The chief subject of Bible doctrine was wholly above nature's light, and even contrary to human conception and taste, in many points, and yet all the sacred penmen agree fully, from first to last, on those points on which human minds, when left to themselves, cannot agree; and they pursued the same great ends, and maintained the same means of attaining these. Nothing can account for this but inspiration by the same Spirit of infinite and eternal wisdom. (6.) No other book in the world was ever produced as the Bible, or produced under so many disadvantages for attaining unity, if it had been the production of man, composed piece by piece, by many different men, through a period of about 2,000 years of writers, and 4,000 of inspired communications. Nothing, therefore, but its coming from the same divine Author, can account for this. (7.) The doctrines which the sacred writers deliver have been, and are evidently against the opinions, the feelings, inclinations, propensities, and practice of mankind; and nothing but their origin from God could account for the agreement of all the divine writers.

(5.) EFFECTS OF THE SCRIPTURES.

Quest. 94. What are some of those *effects* of the Scriptures which prove their truth and divinity? Ans. (1.) Convincing and converting sinners. (2.) Comforting and strengthening believers under trials, which other doctrines cannot do. (3.) Leading men to holiness, which no other system has effected or can effect. (4.) Bringing some of all nations to professed and real subjection to Christ, and continuing this influence, not for a short time, but in every age of the world, as it was promised that the gospel would do; Ps. ii. 8; lxxii. 17; lxxxix. 4. (5.) Gaining firm and permanent advocates from its bitterest enemies.

(6.) ANTIQUITY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

Quest. 95. What evidence for the truth of the Scriptures arises from their *antiquity*? Ans. (1.) They go farther back than any other history; giving a minute account of things occurring before any other writing existed, and those accounts, in their minuteness, agreeing with later discoveries, while they did not agree with the earlier conceptions of things. (2.) Other writings pretending to go back to some of the early ages of the world, are manifestly fabulous, puerile, silly, and useless. (3.) Parts of the Scriptures were written before any other writing existed, and yet no mistakes are found in those early parts.

LECTURE VIII.—INTERNAL EVIDENCE, CONTINUED.

7. AGREEMENT WITH CONSCIENCE AND EXPERIENCE.

QUESTION 96. Do not many Scripture doctrines *agree* with the natural and unavoidable convictions of the natural *conscience*, and the *experience* of the human heart? ANSWER. Yes.

97. What are some of those dictates of conscience with which the Scriptures agree? Ans. (1.) That man is mortal. (2.) That he is sinful. (3.) That he is accountable. (4.) That there is a God to whom we are accountable. (5.) That he is true, holy, just, omniscient, almighty. (6.) That we are dependent and impotent. (7.) That this world is not our eternal home, nor sufficient for our happiness; and that its pursuits should not be our chief concern.

98. What evidence for the truth of the Scriptures arises from this? Ans. (1.) That man, when left to himself, has either not adverted to these things, or he has denied many of them; and these, when brought to view by the Holy Scriptures, are necessarily admitted, even though reluctantly. (2.) Therefore, the Holy Scriptures are proved to be true, at least so far as they maintain these doctrines. (3.) As man is averse to all these truths, in his affections and will, and his conscience condemns his heart and practice, according to them, so to teach and maintain them as prominently and zealously as the Scriptures do, proves their origin to be higher and holier than of man—that this origin is from God. (4.) To teach these things only, would be comparatively a useless labour, rendering man unhappy, without a hope or means of relief; and, therefore, the Scriptures present to us a hope adapted to all these teachings of the word, and of man's conscience, and teach these sad and terrible truths to show the need of redemption. (5.) Reason cannot deny either the possibility or the truth of the scheme of hope presented in the Scriptures. (6.) Reason must even admit that the plan of redemption is adapted to man's necessity, and suitable to the divine perfections.

99. But it is objected that, even according to the doctrine of Holy Scripture, man's conscience is not his ultimate rule or guide; and how then prove the truth of the Scriptures from it? Ans. (1.) Conscience, including our understanding and judgment, is man's ultimate guide, while without divine revelation. (2.) It is a guide to him in investigating the claims of Scripture to be a divine revelation, and may and ought to be used. (3.) Though conscience is not a guide contrary to the Scriptures, or in things in which its knowledge is not adequate, or in things in which its views and dictates are perverted, yet it is a guide under the instruction and guidance of Holy Scripture. (4.) Its dictates, in natural things, and in things to which its light is adequate, and in which it cannot be biassed even by depravity, are true, and cannot be denied or disregarded; and to these dictates the Scriptures often appeal as correct; Isa. xlv. 9—20; Acts xvii. 24—29. (5.) When the Scriptures declare or teach those things which the conscience knows,

by experience, to be undoubtedly true, but which no other records ever did reveal or detect, they do prove themselves to be of God, "quick and powerful, piercing to the dividing asunder of the soul and spirit, a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." (6.) The Scriptures sometimes come home to the conscience in such a manner as no other word comes home, and carry with them divine authority and power, proving themselves divine, both when convincing of sin, and when converting the heart.

100. But it is objected that the Scriptures require us to believe them on their own authority, and not on the ground of conscience, reason, or experience; and how then draw evidence of their truth from conscience or reason? Ans. (1.) It is true we must believe the dictates of the Scriptures on their authority alone, but the conscience must be exercised in this belief; and we cannot believe the doctrines of the Scriptures aright without believing them divine, and we cannot believe them divine but on evidence, and much evidence is afforded by internal characters and a natural conscience. Thus, we must obey God because he commands; but we must have evidence that it is he that commands. So the woman of Samaria was convinced of Christ's word being divine by its bearing on her natural conscience; John iv. 29; so Paul teaches us; 1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25. (2.) When the Holy Spirit convinces, enlightens, or persuades, by the word, he causes us to see and know the truth; and he works on our understanding, and our rational and moral powers. The person enlightened, convinced and persuaded, is enabled rationally to apprehend it.

101. Is there, then, a manifestation of divine truth in the Scriptures, that the conscience must admit, which has appeared in no other systems? Ans. Yes; as, (1.) These divine truths are consistent with one another; as the necessary existence of God, with his absolute perfection—the necessary existence and perfection of God, with the necessary dependence of creatures—and the whole plan of salvation, with the perfections of God, &c. (2.) These divine truths of the Scriptures are consistent with the necessary dictates of conscience. (3.) The Scriptures have corrected ethic systems. (4.) They have elevated man's character, capability, and enjoyment, where their influence has reached. (5.) They fill a void in man's knowledge which nothing else can fill—respecting man's hope, in the fact, and the ground of it. (6.) They have stood the test of ages, under the keenest scrutiny of friends and enemies; when other systems have fallen and changed from age to age. (7.) They still exercise a similar influence in the world; convincing, converting, sanctifying, guiding, and comforting many. (8.) And they do this for a portion of mankind, leaving a part unenlightened, and unpersuaded, as they predicted that they would do; John xv. 18—26.

III. INSTRUMENTALITY OF THE CHURCH.

QUESTION 102. May the testimony of the church be useful as a means of leading us to believe the Scriptures? Ans. Yes; 1 Tim. iii. 15.

103. Is her testimony a ground of our faith in the Scriptures?
Ans. No.

104. Why is it not? Ans. (1.) She is fallible, and cannot be the foundation of saving faith. (2.) She, as each of her members, depends on the Scriptures for light and evidence. (3.) She has no knowledge of the truth of the Scriptures, but as each member obtains that knowledge.

105. Ought we not to believe the Scripture, independently of the church's authority? Ans. Yes; and on the same ground on which the church should believe it.

106. Of what use, then, is the church to us individually, in attaining a belief of the Scripture? Ans. (1.) She calls our attention to it and its evidences. (2.) She should keep the truth, in profession and practice; 1 Tim. iii. 15. (3.) She should explain and enforce it.

§ VII.—OBJECTIONS. Having now seen that we attain to the belief of the Scriptures, as the word of God, by the illumination of the Spirit—by evidence, external and internal, when the Spirit opens our eyes to see, and our hearts to receive the Scriptures—and by the ministry of the church, and her testimony, as a means of instruction on this point, and by laying the evidence before us, and by using the means of grace—yet objections have been urged against all these positions.

QUESTION 107. It is objected that it is enthusiasm to believe the Scriptures by the influence of the Spirit, or to suppose that we are led to this belief by him? Ans. (1.) We do not hold that the Holy Spirit helps our faith independently of, or unconnected with, the Scriptures, as enthusiasts do; but that he opens our eyes to see the truth in the Scriptures; Psa. cxix. 18. (2.) We do not pretend that the believer, individually, has any secret revelation, beyond or besides the Scriptures, as enthusiasts do; but that this guidance of the Spirit is according to divine revelation in the Scriptures, and is enjoyed by all believers, in the measure which he is pleased to afford to each one. (3.) We do not hold that the Holy Spirit's testimony, or operation on our hearts, is any evidence to others, as a proof to them of the truth of God's word; but that it enables the believer to apprehend, to understand, and to believe divine truth. (4.) It is no more enthusiasm to believe the Holy Spirit's supernatural work, enlightening the believer in the Scriptures, than to believe that God sustains our natural persons, and enables us, by his common influences, to apprehend natural things. The one is as easy to him as the other, and as reasonably to be expected, since the Holy Scriptures declare this provision of grace, and promise his assistance; John xiv. 26; xvi. 13.

108. The Papists dispute against internal evidence, as a means of faith in the Scriptures, in order to deny the right of private judgment, and to exalt the church, as the only ground of this faith: and they object that such internal evidence cannot convince the infidel? Ans. (1.) Neither can the testimony of the church convince infidels; nor can it rationally demand their belief, unless the rea-

sons of the church's belief be laid before them as the reason of their faith. (2.) These internal marks do convince infidels when brought home to their consciences by the Spirit, while the testimony of the Church alone cannot. (3.) Many of the internal marks are even better calculated to convince the infidel than the external, as they come home more directly to his conscience.

109. They object, further, that no one can give testimony in his own case which can command our belief—that it is not valid testimony—and, therefore, that the testimony of the Scriptures, in their own favour, cannot command our belief; and that the internal evidence of the Scriptures is not valid evidence? Ans. (1.) The objection is a misstatement of the question, as though the Scriptures simply testified to their own truth; whereas the true state of the matter is, that the Scriptures, by internal marks, *furnish* evidence. In our plea, we do not refer to express or direct testimony of the Scriptures, in their own favour, but to real arguments drawn from the Scriptures themselves. (2.) Such arguments are solid and convincing, and, above comparison, better than the testimony of man.

110. The Papists contend for the testimony of the church, as giving authority to the Scriptures, because the Church is more ancient than the Scriptures? Ans. (1.) The church, if more ancient than the writing of the Scriptures, is still not so ancient as the divine oracles themselves, which began to be delivered before the church existed. (2.) It is only the ancient church that is older than the writings of the Scriptures. The modern church is not. (3.) Mere antiquity does not give superior credit or authority; as Christ's authority was greater than John the Baptist's. (4.) The church is the subject of the law of the Scriptures, and cannot give it authority. She is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets; Eph. ii. 20. And when she received the divine oracles, she received, kept, and handed them down to future generations, as the law by which she was bound, and the foundation on which she was built.

111. The Papists object that the testimony of the church gives to the Scriptures their authority, because the apostle (1 Tim. iii. 15,) calls her "the pillar and ground of the truth?" Ans. The church is so called because she is the depository of the Scriptures—taking care of them, defending, maintaining, and holding them forth; and so called in allusion to the placing of civil edicts on pillars.

LECTURE IX.—ORIGINAL TEXT, VERSIONS, AND PENMEN OF THE SCRIPTURES.

§ VIII.—QUESTION 112. What text of the Scriptures is the authoritative and authentic text, to which we should have recourse on disputed points, or questions of difficulty? Ans. The originals—the Hebrew of the Old, and the Greek of the New Testament.

113. Why are they to be preferred? Ans. (1.) They are the most ancient. (2.) They are the originals, given, in their very words, by the Holy Spirit himself.

. 114. Is not a faithful translation the Word of God also? Ans.

Yes; but its faithfulness is to be tested by the very words chosen by the Holy Spirit.

115. Why were the Scriptures delivered and written in those languages? Ans. Because they were the vernacular languages, or at least the languages best understood by those to whom the Word of God was originally addressed.

116. Do not the writings of Daniel and Ezra in Chaldee, and of the New Testament in Greek, prove that this was the reason why those languages were chosen? Ans. Yes: showing that no language was more sacred than another, but these languages were chosen in order to suit those to whom the Word of God was originally addressed.

117. Has there been any dispute about the original language of any part of the New Testament? Ans. Yes; some plead that the Gospel of Matthew, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the First Epistle of Peter, were written in Hebrew; and the Epistle to the Romans, and the Gospel of Mark, in Latin.

118. What reasons are given for this opinion? Ans. Tradition, conjecture, and the fact that some of these were found in the Hebrew and in Latin.

119. Is there any importance in this question? Ans. Yes.

120. What is it? Ans. If true, it follows, (1.) That our Greek is not the original language; and, (2.) That there is doubt whether we have the Holy Spirit's meaning.

121. What evidence have we that all the books of the New Testament were originally written in Greek? Ans. (1.) The ancient fathers quoted from the New Testament in Greek. (2.) In Matthew, and in Paul's writings, we find Greek interpretations of Hebrew words, as in the other books which are confessedly written originally in Greek; as Matt. i. 23; xxvii. 46; Heb. vii. 2. (3.) The care of the church preserving the Greek, and the providence of God overruling this care of the church, to give us the Greek copy. (4.) There is no account of a contest in the early ages of the New Testament church, about the origin of those books, nor about the introduction of their substitutes in Greek. (5.) The reasonableness of the thing, that all and every part should be written in Greek, as well as the greater part, as the language best and most universally known to those to whom those Scriptures were originally addressed. (6.) The preservation of those parts of Daniel and Ezra, written in the Chaldee dialect, instead of a Hebrew translation of them; shows that if those books of the New Testament involved in the present question, had been originally written in Hebrew and in Latin, we would have them now, instead of the Greek translation.

122. Is there any weight in the argument that those books in question were written in Hebrew and Latin, because some copies of them were found in those languages? Ans. No; no more than the finding Latin or English texts now of the whole Scriptures, would prove that they were originally written in Latin and English.

123. Is there any weight in the argument for Matthew, Hebrews, and 1 Peter, being originally written in Hebrew, that Hebrew idioms are often found in them? Ans. No; for nearly all the sacred writers of the New Testament employ Hebrew idioms through their acquaintance with that language.

§ IX.—124. The Papists object that the original texts, as we now have them, are corrupted, by the Jews making alterations; and, therefore, we cannot depend on them? Ans. (1.) Our Lord and his apostles did not accuse the Jews of this. (2.) After the time of our Lord, the Christians had those original texts, and would have detected any changes. (3.) The special providence of God faithfully preserves his word; Psa. xii. 6, 7. (4.) The multitude of copies dispersed abroad rendered the universal corruption impracticable without detection. (5.) The consistence of the whole, one part with another, proves the integrity of the original text. (6.) The examples cited as corruptions are no proof of corruptions; as, Psa. xix. 5, קוֹם, *Ka-vahm*, "their line," or *delineation*, is as good as, קוֹל, *Ko-lahm*, "their voice," verse 4; Psa. xxii. 17, כָּהָרִי, *Kah-aree*, from כָּרָה, *Kah-rah*, "he digged," or *pierced*, they suppose it signifies "as a lion;" Isa. ix. 5, יִקְרָה, *yik-rah*, they suppose should be Niphal. But this is its ordinary use in Kal for the passive, or as impersonal.

125. But may not some copies be corrupted by accident or design? Ans. Yes: but these can be corrected by other copies, as in our translations.

126. The Papists object that these originals are fountains of contention, on account of the variety of readings, arising from accident or design? Ans. (1.) This variety is calculated to exercise our industry, patience, and study, which will be useful. (2.) There is generally little difficulty in deciding between the readings, by the great multitude of independent copies coinciding against a few, or against many known to have come from one source, and by the context, and parallel passages. (3.) When the difficulties occur, they do not affect the sense, or the analogy of faith. (4.) Such different readings occur in translations, and produce no doubt or difficulty; and a translation is no more safe from corruption than the originals.

127. It is objected that the autographs are lost, and therefore confidence is diminished? Ans. (1.) Copies may be as good as the autographs. They are not like translations, giving the meaning of the words. They give the words themselves. (2.) Copies were allowed and required to be made and used; Deut. xvii. 18. (3.) One autograph could not supply the whole church, and therefore God allowed and required copies. (4.) Our Lord and the apostles allowed copies in their day.

128. The Papists further object to the originals as the authentic and authoritative text, because we are dependent on the Jewish Rabbis for our knowledge of the Hebrew? Ans. (1.) Although we

do not take the exposition of the sense of the Old Testament Scriptures which the Rabbis give, we may take their definitions of words, which apply to all texts, and on every subject in which they occur. (2.) A language, in its words, idioms, and construction, is public property, and we have as original and fundamental knowledge of the Hebrew, and as independent means of studying it as the Jews.

129. As these objections are so frivolous, why do the Papists plead them? Ans. (1.) To destroy our confidence in the originals of the Scriptures, and lead us to acknowledge the authority of their church in giving authenticity to the Scriptures, and the exposition of their meaning. (2.) To restrain the exercise of private judgment.

§ X.—THE VULGATE.

Quest. 130. What do the Papists hold to be the authentic copy of the Scriptures? Ans. The Latin Vulgate.

131. What arguments do they use for this? Ans. (1.) That it is the most ancient version. (2.) That the dignity of the Latin church requires that the authentic text be in their language. (3.) That heretics were confuted by the use of this text.

132. Although these arguments are futile, and their pretensions absurd;—how shall we answer their argument from the antiquity of their version? Ans. (1.) It is not known when the Vulgate was made, nor by whom; some supposing it to be a collection from various translators, and the whole not earlier than the sixth century. (2.) It is clearly not so ancient as the Septuagint, or the Syriac. (3.) It is, of necessity, more recent than the original text. (4.) Antiquity, in this case, is of no weight.

133. What answer may we give to their argument from the dignity of the Latin church requiring that the authentic text should be in their language? Ans. (1.) This is a mere Popish assumption respecting their dignity. (2.) This honour belongs rather to the Jews. (3.) The dignity of the church has nothing to do with the language of the sacred text.

134. What are some of the grounds on which we should deny the claim of the Vulgate to be the authoritative text? Ans. (1.) It has many errors in doctrine; Heb. xiii. 16; Luke ii. 14; Gen. iii. 15; in history, chronology, and topography. (2.) It is absurd that a translation should supplant the original, in authority and authenticity.

§ XI. THE SEPTUAGINT.

135. May the Septuagint be held as authentic, and of equal authority with the Old Testament? Ans. No; (1.) Because it is but a translation, and made by uninspired men, between the prophecy of Malachi and Christ. (2.) Because it has many inaccuracies in translation.

136. Though the fathers in the New Testament church, and even our Lord and his apostles, used it, does this prove it divine, or the most authentic? Ans. No; because, although it was imperfect, it

was, upon the whole, good, and our Lord and his apostles used it as the only text with which the people were acquainted.

137. But did the apostles always use it, and follow it precisely? Ans. No; not always; as, Acts xiii. 41, referring to several texts of the Old Testament, particularly Isaiah xxix. 14; Septuagint:—"Wherefore I will proceed to remove this people," &c. So Acts xv. 17; so Matt. ii. 15, compared with Hos. xi. 1, "Out of Egypt have I called his children;" so Matt. viii. 17, compared with Isa. liii. 4, Septuagint:—"He bare our sins, and was in pain for us." See also Psal. xiv. interpolated from the New Testament in the Septuagint; also Heb. i. 6, compared with Psal. xcvi. and Deut. xxxii. 43.

138. Was the Septuagint made by seventy men, as the name seems to intimate? Ans. It is uncertain. It was said to be at the request of Ptolemy Philadelphus; and more probably, at the request of the Hellenist Jews.

139. Was there any miraculous interposition in favour of the Septuagint, as some have asserted? Ans. No: the report that the seventy men were shut up in separate cells, and brought out each his translation, even in the very same words, is a mere fable.

§ XII. THE PENMEN.

140. Whom did God employ in committing his word to writing? Ans. Men; called, in general, prophets and apostles; Eph. ii. 20.

141. Were not the sacred historians included in these names? Ans. Yes.

142. Why so? Ans. Because, by inspiration, they committed to writing those facts, and made those observations and reflections which they recorded.

143. Is it necessary to our faith in the Scriptures that we know the author or penman of each book? Ans. No; as those books whose writers are not made known, were included by the church in the sacred canon; and because such books of the Old Testament are acknowledged in the New; and because they contain matter which carries with it its own evidence of its truth and divinity.

144. Is it any evidence that Moses was not the penman of the Pentateuch, that it closes with an account of his death; or that it testifies to his good character; or that it speaks of him in the third person? Ans. No: another sacred writer has added the closing words. Moses did not speak boastingly. Others write in the third person.

145. Is there good evidence that Paul was the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews? Ans. Yes; (1.) From 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16,—“hath written unto you;” *i. e.* to “strangers scattered,” &c., whom Peter addresses; *i. e.* Jews. Paul wrote no epistle directly to them, but the Hebrews;—“and speaking of these things,” &c., some of which are included in this epistle; as chap. xii. (2.) The concluding salutation is like Paul. (3.) His notice of Timothy, (xiii. 23,) is like Paul. (4.) The place where written, (Italy, xiii. 24,) suits Paul. (5.) His reference to his imprisonment, (xiii. 19,) suits to Paul. (6.) The whole reasoning is like Paul’s.

LECTURE X.—DIVISIONS OF THE SCRIPTURES.

§ XIII.—Quest. 146. Why are the books of Holy Scripture called *canonical*? Ans. Because they are the canon, or rule, of faith and practice; and they are, by way of eminence, so called, as exclusive of other canons, and in order to assert their divine authority.

147. Do the Scriptures warrant this appellation? Ans. Yes; as Gal. vi. 16; Phil. iii. 16, “As many as walk according to this *rule*, &c.” And the general design of the Scriptures, and their divine authority justify it.

148. Do the Scriptures authorize the division into Old and New Testaments? Ans. Yes; as 2 Cor. iii. 14, “reading of the Old Testament;” and Eph. ii. 20, “apostles and prophets.”

149. Why called *Old and New Testaments*? Ans. *Testament* signifies *covenant*; and they are so called, (1.) From the different dispensations of the covenant of grace under each. (2.) Because Christ gave his *Will* or *Testament* to the church, in the former and latter documents—substantially the same, but plainer in the latter.

150. Do the Scriptures anywhere tell us how many books of Holy Scripture, or canonical books, there are? Ans. No.

151. How then shall we know what are the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments? Ans. (1.) Each one carries its own evidence in itself. (2.) The Old Testament books were collected, under the prophets, into a book, or body, to be read in the church, as the word of God, and sealed by Malachi; and that collection, well known, was recognised by our Lord and his apostles. (3.) The New Testament books were received by the New Testament church, under the administration of the apostles; 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16; Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

152. How does it appear that our Lord recognised all the books of the Old Testament? Ans. (1.) The Jews having received and recognised certain writings as divine, and given them various names peculiar to them, and designated them by various divisions, our Lord recognised them by the same names and divisions, and made no exception.

153. What were some of the names given by the Jews to their collection of the sacred books, by which our Lord and his apostles recognised them? Ans. Scriptures; John v. 39. Holy Scriptures; 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16. Prophecy; 2 Pet. i. 19, 21. Oracles of God; Rom. iii. 2.

154. What divisions of the sacred oracles had the Jews made, which our Lord recognised? Ans. (1.) The Law and the Prophets; Matt. v. 17, “Destroy the law or the prophets;” by which was signified the writings of Moses, and all the rest of the Old Testament; Luke xvi. 29, “They have Moses and the prophets.” (2.) The Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms; Luke xxiv. 44; *i. e.* the books of Moses—certain books which in this division they call *prophets*, as Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, and the three greater and twelve lesser prophets—and certain other books which they called *holy*

writings, as the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Ruth, Job, Esther, Lamentations, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles; of which, the *Psalms* being the most prominent, this division was called by their name.

155. Was this division, in every respect, judicious? Ans. It appears not. Why Ruth, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, all historical, should be classed with the Psalms, does not appear. But since the whole of the sacred books were included in this division, our Lord used the division, as that which was known by the people, and sustained the authenticity of the books.

NOTE.—The Jews made other divisions, not so important to us. They divided the prophets into *former* and *latter*. By the *former*, they meant chiefly the historical books, as relating to things preceding the time in which they made the division. By the *latter*, they meant those which were more properly called prophets; beginning with Isaiah, and ending with Malachi, but excluding from this division the Lamentations. Again; they divided the latter prophets into four *greater* and twelve *lesser*. The four *greater* are Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. The whole Old Testament being 39 books. The New has 27.

156. How may we divide the books of the New Testament? Ans. Five historical; Matthew to Acts—Fourteen Epistles of Paul—one of James—two of Peter—three of John—and one of Jude; *dogmatical*—and Revelation of John, *prophetical*.

157. How many of the epistles are called *General*? Ans. Seven; the last seven are commonly so called. Some copies of the Bible make only five, justly excluding the second and third epistles of John from the number.

158. What is meant by *General* or *Catholic* epistles? Ans. Those which were not written to any described, or defined, person, church, or class of people.

159. Should all these seven, or even five epistles be designated *General* or *Catholic*? Ans. No; perhaps none of them but the 1st epistle of John, and Jude. For James writes to the twelve tribes; the first epistle of Peter is to the Jews, in their dispersion; the second, to the same; iii. 1; the second of John, to a particular lady; and the third to Gaius.

§ XIV.—160. Is the order of the books, or the division of chapters and verses, by inspiration? Ans. No: the books were all written separately, and each book continuously, without divisions of chapters or verses. The Jews, however, through time, for convenience, had their *Parashas*, or large divisions, or paragraphs—their *Haphtoraths*, or endings of portions—their *Sederim*, or large sections, marked by three *Samechs*—and their *Passookim*, or verses. So we have our chapters and verses, said to have been invented about 500 years ago.

161. Are the inscriptions of the books, or the subscriptions to the Epistles, divine? Ans. No; and they are often erroneous.

162. If the books of the Old Testament were arranged, either

according to the time to which they refer, or to the matter they contain, would not the arrangement be very different from what we have, either in Hebrew or English? Ans. Yes.

163. But it is objected, (1.) That the law and the prophets were or continued till John; Luke xvi. 16, implying that they should then be laid aside? Ans. (1.) That dispensation limited gospel privileges to the Jews, but the new dispensation took its place, giving these privileges to all the world. (2.) The means of dispensing the blessings of salvation were changed from the time of John, but the blessings of the covenant themselves were not changed, nor the instructions given by that plan of dispensation.

164. It is objected, (2.) That believers are not now under the law, but under grace; Rom. vi. 14; and, therefore, we are not under the Old Testament as a rule of faith or practice? Ans. It is not the Old Testament that is here meant, but the law as a covenant of works. For believers, under the old dispensation, were under grace, and therefore were not under the law, in the sense of this text; though they were under the ceremonial law, and bound to practise it. And besides, all who enjoy the new dispensation are not under grace, though set free from obligation to practise the ceremonial law. Therefore, it is the law of works that is here meant.

165. It is objected, (3.) That the doctrines of the Old and New Testaments are different and opposite, and therefore the Old is not our rule? Ans. The assertion is false. Old and New are given by inspiration of God, and must agree; 2 Tim. iii. 16; and we are required to follow the faith and practice of the Old Testament saints, Heb. vi. 12; which implies that the doctrines are the same.

166. It is objected, (4.) That Old Testament practices and institutions are now abrogated, and how then is the Old Testament our rule? Ans. (1.) Even Old Testament ceremonies, now abrogated in practice, teach gospel doctrines, and direct our faith and our practice, in those things which have taken their place. (2.) Those ceremonies directed the faith of that church to Christ, Gal. iii. 23; and the use of them is laid aside only because they are fulfilled.

167. It is objected, (5.) That the New Testament is fully sufficient, as our rule of faith and practice, without the Old? Ans. It is false. The New Testament was not given as the full rule of faith and practice, but only as containing plainer instructions, in connexion with the Old. The Old contains much instruction only alluded to in the New. The New refers us to the Old for such instructions.

168. It is objected, (6.) That salvation was obtained on different principles under the Old Testament, from those on which it is obtained under the New; and, therefore, the Old cannot be our rule? Ans. This assertion is false, and proves ignorance of both the old and new dispensations, and of the grace of God dispensed under them; as appears from Heb. vi. 12, requiring us to follow the faith and practice of believers under the old dispensation; also

from 2 Peter i. 19, referring us to the Old Testament, as guiding our faith to the obtaining of salvation; also, from the whole tenor of the Old Testament, directing the faith of believers to Christ and his salvation, which is more clearly set forth in the New. And though that dispensation was darker, it preached the same gospel as the new; Gal. iii. 8.

169. But it is objected, (7.) That the apostle teaches (Gal. iv. 1—4; v. 1—4; Heb. viii. 7, 8.) that under the old dispensation, the people were in *bondage*—that *being circumcised, Christ profited them nothing*—and that the old dispensation was *faulty*? Ans. (1.) The apostle did not teach, in these texts, that circumcision, under the old dispensation, was a rejection of Christ; nor that the believing were under a bondage of a legal service and condemnation; nor that the Old Testament taught faulty doctrines. But, (2.) That if people, under the new dispensation, were circumcised, it was on the principle of rejecting Christ, and trusting in their circumcision, the very thing which circumcision, under the old dispensation, taught them not to do; Gal. iii. 8, 23, 24. They thus rejected the proper use, and misunderstood the true meaning of the old ceremonies. (3.) The faultiness of the old dispensation, (Heb. viii. 7, 8,) was not that it taught different or contrary doctrines from the new, or indicated a different or defective way of salvation, but that it was less clear, and that its observances could not save, of themselves, as the Jews, in the apostles' time, too often thought they could.

LECTURE XI.—AUTHORITY, INTEGRITY, AND SUBJECT OF THE SCRIPTURES.

§ XV. Quest. 170. Are all the parts of the Scriptures of equal authority? Ans. Yes.

171. What would be the effect of holding that their authority is unequal? Ans. The effect would be, (1.) To deny that absolute authority of some parts which is an essential character of the divine word, and essential to a divine faith. (2.) To place the obligation of the word on us, or our obligation to believe and obey it, on the weight of its matter, and not on the authority of God. (3.) And, therefore, to teach that not God's authority, wisdom, or will, but our judgment of the importance of the doctrine or command, should be the reason of faith and obedience.

172. Do the Scriptures make any distinction in the authority of different parts of the Scriptures? Ans. No.

173. Is it equally obligatory, whether God uses the form of a command, or condescends to use entreaties? Ans. Yes.

174. What distinction do the Papists make in the authority of different parts of the Scriptures? Ans. They hold that some parts are *Proto-canonical*, and others *Deutero-canonical*. Accordingly, they hold that Mark xvi., the first part of John viii., the Hebrews, James, 2d Peter, 2d and 3d John, Jude and Revelation are, *Deutero-canonical*. This is their characteristic trifling with the Scriptures.

§ XVI. Quest. 175. Is it not of the utmost importance that we have the sacred canon both *pure* and *entire*? Ans. Yes.

176. Would it not be criminal and dangerous either to acknowledge uninspired books as canonical, or to exclude any that are given by inspiration? Ans. Yes: In the one case it would be adding to God's word, and in the other it would be taking from it.

177. Are there not several books, written since the introduction of the new dispensation, which some plead for as canonical, which nevertheless the church rejects? Ans. Yes: as *spurious gospels, apostolical canons and constitutions, epistles, and the apostles' creed.*

178. How are we assured that these should be excluded? Ans. (1.) They were not acknowledged by the church in early times. (2.) John, in the Revelation, closed the canon of Scripture, while these were either not written, or not acknowledged by the church. (3.) We may believe that John gave his approbation of the church's reception of the canonical books. (4.) The fathers do not quote them as divine.

179. Why do the books commonly called *Apocrypha* receive this name? Ans. They were so called by the fathers, because they had no evidence of inspiration; and perhaps received the name from the practice of the Jews of burying in the earth copies of the Bible condemned for errors of the transcriber.

180. How does it appear that we should reject those books commonly called Apocryphal? Ans. Because, (1.) They were always excluded by the Jewish church, to which were committed the oracles of God; Rom. iii. 2; Ps. cxlvii. 19. (2.) Malachi closed the canon of Scripture, till the time of Elias, i. e., John the Baptist. These books were written after Malachi, and before John the Baptist. (3.) Our Lord and his apostles recognise the canon of Scripture received by the Jews, in which, therefore, they approve of the rejection of those apocryphal books. (4.) The known fidelity of the Jews in preserving the sacred canon pure and entire. (5.) No quotations are made, in the New Testament, from those books, as of divine authority. (6.) They contain many errors and fabulous stories. (7.) The authors of some of these books acknowledge the want of prophets; as 1 Maccab. ix. 27; they confess themselves to be only interpreters; and they admit their liability to errors; 2 Mac. ii. 24, 27; xv. 39.

§ XVII. Quest. 181. Do the Papists themselves acknowledge all those books to be canonical? Ans. No; they are divided in opinion on this point; and even their famous council of Trent only acknowledged six of them as canonical, besides the additions to Esther, Jeremiah, and Daniel. These six are, *Tobit, Judith, The Book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and 1st and 2d Maccabees.*

182. What reasons do they give for receiving these as canonical? Ans. (1.) They say that citations are made from these books, in the New Testament; as, Rom. ii. 11; xi. 34; xiii. 1; Heb. xi. 5; James i. 11; 1 Peter i. 24, are citations, they say, from Wisd. vi. 7; ix. 13; vi. 3; iv. 10; Eccl. xiv. 18. (2.) That the early church had acknowledged them canonical.

183. How refute these arguments? Ans. (1.) Though there is

some likeness in expression, this does not prove it a citation. We deny that they are cited in the New Testament. (2.) If they were a citation, this would not prove their divinity, unless cited as divinely authoritative. For Paul cited heathen poets, not as divine, but as admissions of truth by the heathen; Acts xvii. 28; Tit. i. 12. (3.) That the early church acknowledged any of these books as canonical, we utterly deny. For if the early fathers quoted from these books, they did not acknowledge them as divine; nor did such quotations prove that the church acknowledged them. And the council of Trent is no authority.

§ XVIII. Quest. 184. What is the grand *subject* or *matter* of Holy Scripture? Ans. True religion; that is, the *doctrine* of true religion, to guide our faith and hope; its *laws* and *institutions*, to guide our practice; Ps. xix. 8, &c.; 2 Tim. iii. 15—17.

185. Are not many things, however, taught in Scripture besides the immediate rules of faith and practice? Ans. Yes.

186. Are these things in Scripture, which do not directly affect our faith in God, our morality, or religious worship, the principal subjects of the Scriptures, or only subordinate? Ans. They are subordinate; taught on account of the chief subjects of divine revelation.

187. What are some of those subordinate things taught in Scripture? Ans. (1.) Histories of the church of Israel, as a nation, and of the surrounding nations. (2.) Chronological accounts. (3.) Topographical statements. (4.) Genealogical accounts, &c.

188. But are not all these useful, as connected with the great and primary subjects of divine revelation? Ans. Yes: Histories display the wisdom, goodness, holiness, justice, and faithfulness of God; chronology and genealogies show us how certain things were brought about, and the fulfilment of prophecies and promises; and many of these things inculcate faith and other graces, by examples.

§ XIX. (*See* § V. *Quest.* 31.) Quest. 189. Are all those subordinate instructions in natural things to be accounted divine truth, and to be received in faith? Ans. Yes; because they are given by the Spirit of truth—they have a connexion with other truths; and, however unimportant any of them may be, of themselves, and compared with others, the Holy Spirit delivered them for a useful purpose; and therefore he was not indifferent to their truth. Besides, “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God;” 2 Tim. iii. 15:—“All his words are pure;” Ps. xii. 7.

190. If it were admitted that in natural things, the Scriptures do not always deliver the truth, would it not both diminish reverence for the Scriptures, and render it uncertain what is true, and what is not? Ans. Yes.

191. But it is objected that the Scriptures sometimes give appellations to things, and narrate occurrences, according to appearances, and not according to actual fact? Ans. (1.) The Holy Spirit often gives appellations figuratively, which are designed to be understood according to the figure, and are therefore true; as *thunderbolts*, a figurative name given to *electricity*. (2.) He some-

times narrates things according to appearances, because the thing designed to be taught in these cases, is best understood in this way; as Joshua x. 12, 13, which was literally true of the light of the sun and moon, which was the thing intended. He was not teaching the actual motions of those bodies. (3.) The context and the subject will, in all such cases, show the meaning. The Spirit teaches no falsehoods in these matters.

192. It is objected, further, that it is not the object of the Spirit to teach natural things in the Bible, and, therefore, he may state things of this nature, or allow them to be stated, which are not true? Ans. (1.) It is true, natural things are not his principal object, but they are his subordinate object, and useful. (2.) For whatever object they are taught, the truth of them is necessary to that object. The Holy Spirit can never teach a falsehood to gain an end.

§ XX. (*Considered, in substance, before; but add.*) Quest. 193. Is there not a necessary distinction between *diversity* and *contradiction*? or, between different and contradictory statements? Ans. Yes: different circumstances may agree, and one writer omit what another asserts.

194. What things are necessary to constitute a contradiction? Ans. (1.) That the things stated be opposite and inconsistent. (2.) That this opposition belong to the same subject. (3.) That they be both stated of the same subject in the same respect. (4.) And (in general) that they speak of the same time. Thus Ahaziah, when he succeeded his father Jehoram, according to 2 Chron. xxii. 2, was 42 years old; but according to 2 Kings, viii. 26, he was 22 years old. Now, here is opposition referring to the same subject, speaking of that subject in the same respect, and referring to the same time; therefore, we conclude that there is an error of the transcriber, in 2 Chron. xxii. 2. But Rom. iii. 28, and James ii. 24, are not contradictory; for, although the same subject, *justification*, is spoken of, it is not spoken of in the same respect. Paul speaks of *legal* justification, and its proper grounds. James speaks of the reality of that faith which receives the true ground of justification, as proved by works. (See § V., Quest. 35.)

LECTURE XII.—MYSTERIES OF SCRIPTURE.

§ XXI. Quest. 195. Are not many parts of revealed truth mysterious and dark to the finite mind, and especially to man as depraved? Ans. Yes: 2 Peter iii. 16.

196. Yet do not the Scriptures state all divine truths unequivocally, so that the meaning, even on the most mysterious subjects, may be understood clearly and with assurance? Ans. Yes; in one place or another, this is done, and especially in reference to the most necessary truths.

197. Does it follow from this that these divine truths are so plainly revealed that there is no need of our industry, and prayerful search for the truth? Ans. No: we are required to search the Scriptures, and to compare one portion with another; Rom. xii. 6.

198. Whence arises that measure of difficulty in learning the doctrines of Scripture, which requires industry and prayerful search? Ans. (1.) Partly in the nature of the subjects, as they are spiritual and supernatural, and, therefore, not adapted to the natural conceptions of man; 1 Cor. ii. 14. (2.) Partly in the manner of stating these truths—by histories, by types and figures, by insulated declarations, made at one time in connexion with certain subjects and circumstances, and at another in connexion with subjects and circumstances that are different.

199. Why (may we suppose) did the Holy Spirit adopt this method of teaching divine and necessary truths? Ans. (1.) To exercise our industry and application, which will be useful to us. (2.) To make us sensible of our blindness and need of guidance. (3.) That these things might be easy of apprehension to the weak and ignorant who humbly seek the truth in faith and obedience. (4.) That the proud and rebellious heart, that is unreconciled to truth, and leans on its own powers, may receive its just reward, by falling into error and remaining in darkness.

200. But how can the method of teaching divine truth by histories, by types and figures, and by insulated declarations in connexion with different circumstances, render the truth easy of apprehension to the weak, when it may occasion the learned and shrewd to stumble? Ans. (1.) The need of study and search and easiness of apprehension, are perfectly consistent; and the matter may become plain, on examination. (2.) This variety of method presents the same subject in different lights, which, when perceived, illustrate and confirm one another. (3.) Types and figures illustrate the truth by comparison. (4.) Histories illustrate the truth by example. (5.) Insulated statements, in connexion with various circumstances, show the application of divine truth to various circumstances.

201. May not man, in his natural state, and by outward favourable circumstances, attain a correct doctrinal knowledge of divine truth? Ans. Yes; when God is pleased to restrain his sinful propensities, and to cause outward circumstances to operate favourably to this end. (See § VI., Quest. 46.)

202. But can he know the truth savingly without the saving influences of the Spirit? Ans. No.

203. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From natural blindness; 1 Cor. ii. 14. (2.) From Scripture prayers for light; Ps. cxix. 18; Eph. i. 17, 18. (3.) From the promise of the Spirit for this purpose; John xiv. 26; xvi. 13.

204. But it is objected that the supernatural influence of the Spirit is not necessary, because it is asserted that the Scripture is *light*; Ps. cxix. 105. Ans. (1.) The Scripture itself is light, but we are blind; so the sun is light, but the blind do not see. And, therefore, (2.) The Scriptures assert that they are to some a sealed book; Isa. xxix. 11; John xii. 40, compared with Isa. vi. 9, 10.

205. It is objected, further, that man's power of understanding and judging still remains unimpaired? Ans. It is false, in reference to spiritual things; 1 Cor. ii. 14.

206. It is objected, further, that if man were not able, without supernatural influence, to understand divine things savingly, he would not be accountable? Ans. (1.) This would have been true in his primitive state, but not as fallen. His spiritual blindness is his sin—his rebellion. (2.) He cannot but know that the doctrines of his inability and of gospel provision for saving instruction, are taught in Scripture. If he would believe these doctrines, and accept the offer, he would be enlightened. He is accountable for not believing these, because his unbelief flows from his enmity to God and his truth.

§ XXII.—207. The Papists, to sustain their pretensions that the people must not exercise their private judgment, in using the Holy Scriptures, and that they must depend on the church for their knowledge and faith, contend that the Scriptures are not plain and clear. How then prove that the Scriptures are perspicuous? Ans. (1.) The Scriptures expressly assert their perspicuity; as Deut. xxx. 11—14; 2 Cor. iv. 2—4; Rom. xvi. 26; Psal. xix. 8, 9. (2.) They show their perspicuity by comparison; Psal. cxix. 105; 2 Pet. i. 19. (3.) It may be proved from the wisdom and goodness of God, who is both able and willing to teach clearly. (4.) The law and gospel are several times summarily declared with all possible plainness. (5.) Divine truths are repeated in different forms, and in different applications. And, though this requires study, still it makes these doctrines plain to the believing, humble inquirer. (6.) Because God's word is intended for the weak, and he has provided that the weak shall acquire sound knowledge.

§ XXIII.—208. The Papists object, against the plainness of the Scriptures, and their adaptation to the common people, (1.) David's prayer for the opening of his eyes on the truths of the word; Psal. cxix. 18? Ans. David does not pray for a clearer Scripture, but for sight to perceive the truth. He does not complain of the darkness of the word, but of his own darkness.

209. They object, (2.) The testimony of Peter; 2 Pet. iii. 16? Ans. (1.) Peter says, "*some things hard to be understood*;" and we agree that there are some things of this character in the Scriptures; and yet everything is plainly stated somewhere in them; and even in those things, though hard, not impossible, as the original word plainly implies. (2.) The difficulty of which Peter speaks is in the matter, not in the expression of it, as his words especially intimate;—"εἰς οὐσίαν," in the *things*, or *matter*, not "εἰς αἰτίαν," in the *epistles*. (3.) Again, the darkness is not in the Scriptures, but in the persons misunderstanding them;—"the unlearned and the unstable wrest the Scriptures."

210. It is objected, (3.) That many passages are confessedly difficult? Ans. (1.) It is true, there are such passages, yet these do not render the doctrines or laws of Scripture doubtful. It is only doubtful which of the well ascertained doctrines of Scripture is expressed in such a passage; or in what application it is to be taken in the passage. (2.) Though difficult, they can generally be explained; and it can be shown that they do not contain any doctrine

contrary to the rest of the Scriptures—nor even a doctrine which is not taught elsewhere in the Bible.

211. It is objected, (4.) That if the Scriptures were plain, there would be no need of expositions, as the Scriptures require? **Ans.** (1.) We admit that some passages are obscure, and need to be explained; *i. e.* that the people be assisted in their inquiries. (2.) The people should be assisted in the comparing of one Scripture with another, in order to a larger and clearer view of divine doctrine; Rom. xii. 6. (3.) The plainest passages should be further illustrated and applied. (4.) The preaching of the gospel, and exposition of the Scriptures, are not so much on account of darkness in the Scriptures, as on account of darkness in the people's minds, and their indolence in searching the Scriptures.

212. It is objected, (5.) That the Scriptures themselves declare their own darkness; as Isa. xxix. 11; 2 Cor. iii. 15; iv. 3, 4? **Ans.** All these passages speak, not of the darkness of the Scriptures, but of the judicial blindness of the people.

LECTURE XIII.—THE SCRIPTURES A PERFECT RULE.

§ XXIV.—Quest. 213. Is the Holy Scripture the only *rule of faith and manners*, needing no addition in any case, or a supply of defects from any other source? **Ans.** Yes.

214. But does not this assertion include what is implied in Holy Scripture, as well as what is expressly taught? **Ans.** Yes; and what is implied is the Scripture teaching.

215. How does it appear that the Scriptures of truth are perfect as a rule of faith and practice, in reference to salvation? **Ans.** From many considerations; as, (1.) Direct Scripture declarations. (2.) The fruits of them. (3.) From interdiction of all additions. (4.) From their appointed use.

216. How does their perfection appear from direct Scripture declarations? **Ans.** Psal. xix. 8, "*God's law is perfect;*" 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

217. What are those fruits or effects of them which prove their perfection? **Ans.** Many; as, (1.) The communication of all necessary wisdom to the believer; 2 Tim. iii. 15—17. (2.) Holiness; John xvii. 17; 2 Thess. ii. 13. (3.) Consolation; Rom. xv. 4; John xiv. 26. (4.) Conversion; Psal. xix. 8, 9, &c. (5.) Eternal life; John xx. 30, 31.

218. Is every addition to the Scriptures, as the rule of faith and practice, strictly forbidden? **Ans.** Yes; as, Deut. iv. 2; xii. 32; Prov. xxx. 5; Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

219. Do such texts forbid us to write, to prescribe, or to receive anything besides the Scriptures, as part of our rule of religious faith and practice? **Ans.** Yes: because, though not added to the book, the Bible, under a pretence that it is a part of the word of God, it is, in such case, added to it as a rule.

220. Does this prohibition forbid the church to prescribe rules which are founded on, or implied in the Scriptures? **Ans.** No; for such things are no addition; they are the teachings of Scripture.

221. Would such interdicts of additions have been made, if the Scriptures were imperfect as our rule? Ans. No; imperfections would have made such additions necessary.

222. What proof of the perfection of the Scriptures is drawn from their appointed use? Ans. They are appointed to be the sole standard of doctrine and practice; Isa. viii. 20. This end they could not answer, if not perfect.

223. Does the perfection of God's word allow us to add anything of our own, in religious doctrine or practice, which is not taught or prescribed in Scripture, expressly or implicitly, under the plea that it is not expressly forbidden? Ans. No; because the word of God, being perfect, prescribes all in religion that it is our duty to believe or practise, and all that is necessary. And, therefore, everything not commanded is forbidden.

224. But many, wishing a liberty to follow the guidance of their own judgment or taste, oppose this doctrine of the perfection of Scripture; and they object, (1.) That Christ both said and did many things which are not written; John xx. 30? Ans. Christ delivered many things in his oral teaching which were the pure word of God, and which answered an important purpose, as unwritten, giving them line upon line, which he thought proper, by the Spirit, to condense into a brief form, as a written word; and he selected such of his deeds, for record, as he judged sufficient for the instruction of the church, in a written form; John xx. 31.

225. The objection that many books of Scripture are now lost, we considered before, and showed to be false; but it is moreover objected that the several parts are imperfect, otherwise the other parts would be superfluous? Ans. (1.) The Psalmist (xix. 8.) asserts that the word of God, in his day, was perfect, although the canon of Scripture was not completed. (2.) Each part has a perfection of authority, of holiness, and of goodness, while it has not a perfection of comprehension, expressly comprehending everything that was to be revealed, nor a perfection of clearness.

226. It is objected, (3.) That Christ professed that he had many things to say which he had not then declared; John xvi. 12? Ans. (1.) It is true he had not then completed his instructions to his disciples. (2.) What he had further to reveal were not things novel, or unrevealed before, but a fuller declaration of things revealed before. (3.) What he did not reveal or declare then, he declared, after his resurrection, to his disciples; Acts i. 3; or by inspiration, to his apostles, after his ascension; to which he refers, John xiv. 26.

§ XXV.—227. What appears to be the object of the Papists, in denying the perfection of the Scriptures? Ans. (1.) To introduce the Apocrypha and traditions. (2.) By this means to find something to support their doctrine and practice.

228. May we not justly call the Scriptures traditions? Ans. Yes; since tradition is something *handed down*. Therefore, the Scriptures are God's tradition to us—the tradition of the prophets and apostles, as inspired penmen—and traditions of the church, as

handing them down from one generation to another; 2 Thess. ii. 15, "Hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle;" iii. 6, "Not after the tradition," &c.

229. And may we not use traditions of history, for their appropriate purpose? Ans. Yes.

230. But why may we not receive traditions, as the Papists contend, to supply defects in the Scriptures? Ans. (1.) Because there is no need of them, the Scriptures being perfect. (2.) Because to receive them in this sense is a sinful charge against the Scriptures as imperfect. (3.) Because they do deny or pervert God's word; Matt. xv. 6; Col. ii. 22. (4.) Because, from their uncertainty, they cannot be a ground of faith. (5.) Because a liberty of such a kind would introduce unlimited innovations. (6.) Because additions to the Scriptures are absolutely forbidden; Rev. xxii. 18, 19; Deut. iv. 2.

231. But if we do not actually add them to the Scriptures, are they forbidden? Ans. Yes; anything else than the Scriptures, used as a guide to faith or religious practice, whether written or oral, is in fact an addition. It is in fact adding something to the divine rule.

§ XXVI.—232. But the Papists object to the exclusion of tradition, (1.) That tradition was used before Moses? Ans. Before Moses, the tradition used was the word of God, and tradition was then the only form in which it was kept in the church; but that tradition excluded what was not the word of God, as it was just as much prohibited then as now to add to his word.

233. They object, (2.) That after Moses, tradition was used; as appears from Ex. xiii. 8, requiring parents to tell their children the meaning of the Passover; Deut. xxxii. 7, referring to the report of fathers for accounts of God's mighty works; and Psal. xlv. 1, 2, referring to the same? Ans. These passages only require of parents the duty of teaching their children from the word of God, and of children to learn.

234. They object, (3.) Paul's reference to tradition; 2 Thess. ii. 15? Ans. Answered already. That was the tradition of the word of inspiration.

235. They object, (4.) That nations have their unwritten law? Ans. It does not follow that God leaves his church under such defects. He declares his word is perfect.

236. They object, (5.) That there are several points of doctrine not taught in Scripture; as infant baptism, the Trinity, perpetual virginity of Mary, Purgatory, &c.? Ans. (1.) It is not true that infant baptism and the doctrine of the Trinity are not taught in the Scriptures. (2.) Things not taught in Scripture, as Mary's virginity, Purgatory, &c., ought not to be taught, as they are useless or untrue.

§ XXVII.—237. What other scheme, besides tradition, has been pleaded or invented to add to the Scriptures? Ans. Private revelations of the Spirit.

* 238. How prove that they ought to be rejected? Ans. (1.) The

universal prohibition of adding anything to the Scriptures; and private revelations of the Spirit, as a ground of faith, is adding to them; Rev. xxii. 18, 19; Gal. i. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 1. (2.) The uncertainty of those private revelations. (3.) They are delusive, because the Holy Spirit does not give them, since he forbids additions to the Scriptures. They are pretended and deceptive; Satan transforms himself into an angel of light; 2 Cor. xi. 14. (4.) Because there is no need of them, the Scriptures being complete. (5.) It tends to the subversion of all order—to skepticism—and to destroy all ground of assured faith. (6.) They have always proved to be delusive, erroneous, and sinful—used by errorists who deny some Scripture doctrine.

§ XXVIII.—239. But enthusiasts object, (1.) in favour of private revelations, That Paul calls the Scriptures a dead letter; 2 Cor. iii. 6? Ans. Paul is there speaking of the Jewish law, taken literally, and without its gospel meaning. And his assertion includes, indeed, the whole Scriptures, as not apprehended in their spiritual meaning. They are not to be aided by additional revelations, which to the blinded mind would be as dead as the Scriptures. The Holy Spirit makes the Scriptures, and not new revelations, a living word, by his saving influences.

240. They object, (2.) That the Holy Spirit is promised to be given in New Testament times; as Joel ii. 28? Ans. That passage did apply to the extraordinary gift of the Spirit, to be bestowed on the apostles and others, till the canon of Scripture should be completed; but, by John's closing the canon, the Spirit is no more to be expected in that manner. Any further application of the text, signifies only the Spirit's saving influences, as common to believers.

241. They object, (3.) That 1 John ii. 20, shows that the Spirit is given, in New Testament times, for special revelation still? Ans. That unction promised is not new revelations, but saving instructions out of the Scriptures; because the Spirit is promised to teach in this manner; John xiv. 26, &c., and because additions are forbidden.

§ XXIX.—242. For what purpose was the Scripture given? Ans. To be a fixed and unchangeable rule of faith and practice.

243. Are the Scriptures to be accounted merely a good rule, and useful? Ans. No: they are not only good and useful, but the *perfect* rule, the *only* rule, the complete warrant for our faith, and obligatory on our faith and practice.

244. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the declaration of their perfection; Psal. xix. 7. (2.) Of their sufficiency; 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. (3.) Of our obligation to be guided by them; Isa. viii. 20; Luke xvi. 29; 2 Pet. i. 19.

245. Have the Holy Scriptures all the requisites, rendering them fit to be such a rule? Ans. Yes.

246. What are those requisites? Ans. (1.) Plainness. (2.) Harmony. (3.) Perfection of matter. (4.) Infallibility. (5.) Divine authority.

247. Is it any objection to the Scriptures, as the only and au-

thoritative rule, that the apostle commends them as *useful and profitable*; 2 Tim. iii. 16? Ans. No: as a perfect and authoritative rule, they certainly are useful. The apostle was not giving that commendation as exclusive; and in verse 17, he also asserts the sufficiency of the Scriptures, and in verse 15, their origin, implying authority.

248. It is objected, That the Scriptures are not written systematically. Is this any objection to their sufficiency and authority, as the only rule? Ans. No; because, (1.) The Scriptures contain all the instruction we need, though not arranged systematically. The Spirit did not need system on his part. (2.) Infallible truth being given by the Spirit, it is our part to study it, and learn its meaning and application. (3.) The teachings of the Scripture possess a perfect consistency, and such a clearness, that a systematic and sure knowledge of them can be obtained.

LECTURE XIV.—TRANSLATIONS—RIGHT OF ALL TO READ—INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.

§ XXX. Quest. 249. Since the Holy Scriptures were written in languages understood by comparatively few, is it not necessary that they be translated into the vernacular language of the people, in order to answer fully their purpose as a rule of faith? Ans. Yes.

250. Although this measure appears to be necessary, yet have we direct evidence that God approves, or requires it? Ans. Yes; this appears, (1.) From the fact that the Scriptures were first given in the vernacular language of the people to whom they were delivered; implying that they ought to be in a language that the people understood. (2.) When a translation could not be prepared in due time for the people, the apostles were endowed with the gift of tongues. (3.) God, in his providence, has still provided such a translation where the gospel comes. (4.) The Septuagint was used by our Lord and his apostles. (5.) 1 Cor. xiv. 9, 11, "Except ye utter words easy to be understood," &c. "If I know not the meaning of the voice," &c., necessarily implying a translation. (6.) A translation is still the word of God, as really as the original; and the work is competent to man.

251. But on what ground shall people who do not know the original languages of the Scripture, believe it, in a translation, to be the word of God? Ans. (1.) They have the moral evidence of the general consent of the learned. (2.) The original language is not the ground on which we believe the Scriptures to be the word of God. We need other evidence, which appears in a translation as well as in the original language,—as the various external and internal evidences.

§ XXXI. Quest. 252. Is it not incumbent, then, on teachers in the church to provide translations of the Scriptures? Ans. Yes.

253. May not magistrates take measures for this? Ans. Yes;

it is proper that they should encourage such an undertaking, and even assist by furnishing means, so far as this is necessary.

254. But have magistrates authority to dictate translations, or to compel adherence to them? Ans. No.

255. Are teachers bound to sustain the commonly received translations, right or wrong? Ans. No; conscience must not be ruled in this, any more than in a profession or practice of religion.

256. But should they indulge in light or unnecessary censures of these translations, before the people? Ans. No: it is calculated to produce irreverence and unnecessary doubts.

§ XXXII.—Quest. 257. Should the Scriptures be read by all privately? Ans. Yes.

258. Should they be read publicly by the people? Ans. Yes; Neh. viii. 2, 3; Acts xiii. 15.

259. How prove that the whole Scriptures should be read by all? Ans. (1.) All are commanded to search the Scriptures, which implies reading; John v. 39. (2.) Those who do so are commended; Acts xvii. 11. (3.) Ignorance of the word is reproved; Matt. xxii. 19; and consequently, neglect of reading. (4.) A blessing is pronounced on those who read, and meditate on the Scriptures; Psa. i. 2; Rev. i. 3. (5.) They are given for the use of all, without exception; and they are given for the purpose of direction, comfort, &c. (6.) Every man is held accountable for himself, for his knowledge, faith, and obedience.

§ XXXIII.—Quest. 260. But the Papists object to the reading of the Scriptures by the common people, by supposing it prohibited, Matt. vii. 6.? Ans. (1.) Believers of the common people are not dogs. Infidels and the ungodly are meant, who may be found among those in sacred orders. (2.) Nor is the Bible, or even preaching the word, to the ungodly, prohibited by this text; but our counsels and reproofs, privately given, when we know they will be mocked, and the use of such sacred things as belong, by Christ's appointment, only to the professed Christian.

261. It is objected, (2.) That according to Heb. v. 14, solid food is not for the weak; and therefore the Scriptures are not for the common people? Ans. (1.) Though, in Holy Scripture, there is solid food, or strong meat, there is also milk for the babes; 1 Pet. ii. 1. (2.) It is not the Bible that is spoken of in Heb. v. 14, but the discussion of the deep matters of theology, before the people know the plainest doctrines.

262. It is objected, (3.) That there is an obscurity in the Scripture, which the common people do not understand, and which produces heresies, and other evils? Ans. (1.) There is much of it plain, and a sufficiency of plainness to direct their faith and conduct. (2.) It is not the obscure parts that produce error, but men's depravity and blindness, even in plain things. (3.) Heresies do not generally begin with the people, but with the teachers, the priests, &c., whom the Papists allow to have the Bible. (4.) The people are more liable to be led into error and heresies, by their teachers, when they have not the Bible, than when they have

it. (5.) It is a reproach on God's word to suppose it dangerous to the people.

263. It is objected, (4.) That Matt. xiii. 11, "To them it is not given," &c., forbids the Bible to the laity? Ans. (1.) That passage does not speak of the reading of the Scriptures, but of the understanding of their truth. (2.) It expresses a judicial judgment, not a duty. (3.) This withholding of knowledge does not refer to the common people, in contradistinction from the ministry; but it refers to all, both ministers and people, who are given up to judicial blindness.

§§ XXXIV. XXXV.—Quest. 264. Is there any benefit by the Scriptures, unless we ascertain their true sense? Ans. No.

265. How is the sense of Scripture generally divided, or distinguished, by sound divines? Ans. Into *literal*, and *mystical*.

266. May a passage of Scripture be understood, in some cases, as containing both a literal and a mystical signification? Ans. Yes; as Ex. xii. 46, compared with John xix. 36; applied both to the type and to the antitype; and Hos. xi. 1, compared with Matt. ii. 15; applied as above.

267. Is such a two-fold application to be considered as a double sense; or is it rather a compound sense? Ans. It is not double, but compound.

268. Is there a double *literal* sense in the Scriptures? Ans. No; it is one.

269. What would be the consequence of admitting such a double sense in Scripture? Ans. There would be uncertainty of meaning, and a liberty given to the imagination to forge anything out of the Scriptures, which ingenuity could make plausible. It would be making the Scriptures ambiguous, and therefore obscure, and a source of contention and division.

270. What rule should we follow, in ascertaining the one, true, literal sense of any passage? Ans. The common sense of the words, as used in Scripture, and the analogy of faith; Rom. xii. 6.

271. Should we take a mystical sense out of Scripture, instead of the literal, or besides it, without a good reason? Ans. No.

272. What should be our rule on this point? Ans. Take the mystical sense only when the Holy Spirit, in the passage itself, or elsewhere, points it out; as Ex. xii. 46, compared with John xix. 36.

273. What would be the evil of taking a mystical sense out of a passage of Scripture, which the Holy Spirit had not intended, if we would limit and guide ourselves by the analogy of faith, and teach or adopt no untruth? Ans. (1.) The instruction would be human, not divine. (2.) It would turn our attention from the Spirit's teaching, to our fancies. (3.) It would tend to diminish reverence for the Scriptures, and to cherish a spirit of curiosity, and human invention. (4.) There is danger of losing the analogy of faith, in our ardour of fancy. Examples:—Some, from the narration of the bunch of grapes, carried on a pole between two men, (Num. xiii. 23,) have imagined that the grapes signified *Christ*

—the pole or staff, the *gospel*—the foremost man, *the Jewish dispensation*—and the hindmost, *the new dispensation*. A similar use has been made of the parable of the man fallen among thieves; Luke x. 30.

274. If the words of Jonathan to the lad, (1 Sam. xx. 37.) in which he said, "Is not the arrow beyond thee?" be proposed as an instance of a double sense in Scripture, how shall we explain it? Ans. (1.) To the boy, the words were literal. (2.) To David they conveyed a conventional meaning, before determined and agreed on; but, (3.) This Scripture, to us, conveys but one meaning, as agreed on between David and Jonathan,—Saul's determination against David—and the words may be said to have a compound sense—literal, and figurative or conventional.

275. In what parts of Scripture does the allegorical or mystical sense most abound? Ans. In types and parables.

276. But is it not found in historic accounts; as of Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Hagar, and Ishmael; Gal. iv. 22, &c.? Ans. Yes; but these were typical persons.

277. Is there not danger of carrying the mystical or allegorical sense, in parables and types, beyond truth and sound doctrine? Ans. Yes.

278. What rule should be observed to avoid this? Ans. (1.) Ascertain the object of the parable or type, and apply the figure no further; unless there is otherwise, in Scripture, an indication of an additional meaning. (1.) Allow the remainder of the parable or type as intended only to make out a consistency, and a full natural case. As, for example, Matt. xiii. 44—46, The merchant *must* literally *buy* the field, to obtain the treasure. This is the literal case. The object of the parable is—the enlightened sinner's preference of Christ to everything else, and his earnestness to obtain an interest in him. This is shown by his discovery of the treasure, by his joy, by selling all, and buying it. But, in the spiritual application, there is no actual selling, actual purchasing, or actual hiding, &c.

279. Is there a *tropological* sense in Scripture, distinct from type or allegory? Ans. No.

280. What is meant by a tropological sense? Ans. A sense conveying moral instruction from a literal expression on another subject.

281. How then shall we avoid allowing a tropological sense to Deut. xxv. 4, when the apostle (2 Cor. ix. 9, 10,) applies it as a trope? Ans. (1.) That law respecting oxen was properly a type or allegory. (2.) A trope is not so much the sense of Scripture, as a use of it, an inference from it, or the application of the principles which it contains.

282. How are we to view the Proverbs of Solomon, which contain instruction beyond their literal expression? Ans. As expressing a principle, in literal terms, which may and ought to be applied to other things.

283. What is meant by an *anagogical* sense? Ans. A sense

conveying some idea respecting heaven, by the expression of something earthly; as Psa. xc. 11, compared with Heb. iv. 3, 9.

284. Is, then, an anagogical sense, in Scripture, distinct from the mystical or allegorical? Ans. No: the anagogical sense, if not typical or mystical, is rather the use of the Scripture, and the application of its principle, than the sense of Scripture itself. Thus, Psa. xc. 11, refuses, to the rebels, admission into the earthly Canaan; and on the same principle, according to the apostle, (Heb. iv. 9.) will refuse, to the unbelievers, admission to heaven.

285. Should we pay any regard to the *Cabalistic* sense given to Scripture words or letters? Ans. No: it is mere fancy and folly. No use is made of such a sense of Old Testament words in the New Testament. The Cabalists gave meanings to the great letters, unequal letters, inverted letters, &c., found in the Bible, which are no doubt the accidents of transcribers.

286. Should we consider every citation of the Old Testament made in the New, as giving either the literal or the mystical sense of the passage? Ans. No: sometimes the citation is made by way of accommodation, using the same words on a different subject, but possessing some similarity or resemblance to it; as Rom. x. 6, 7, compared with Deut. xxx. 11, 12; Rom. x. 18, compared with Psa. xix. 4.

LECTURE XV.—INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE, CONTINUED.

§ XXXVI.—Quest. 287. Who are to judge of the sense of the Scriptures? Ans. Every man for himself.

288. What kinds of judgment are there? or how are they to be distinguished? Ans. Three kinds;—(1.) Judgment of *discretion*. (2.) Judgment *definitive* or *ministerial*. (3.) Judgment *directive* and *authoritative*.

289. What is the judgment of discretion? Ans. It is each man's private judgment for himself, as accountable to God, and on such grounds as he can ascertain.

290. What is the definitive or ministerial judgment? Ans. It is a judgment given by a gospel minister, or a church court, explaining or setting forth, as an assistant to the people, the meaning of God's word; and this originates in or is founded on their judgment of discretion, individually.

291. What is the directive and authoritative judgment? Ans. The decision given by the Spirit of God, in and by the Scriptures themselves.

292. It is objected, (1.) against the private judgment of discretion, that Heb. xiii. 17, requires obedience to those who are set over us? Ans. (1.) The obedience there required is not a blind, implicit, or universal obedience, but an obedience in the Lord; *i. e.* enlightened by the word, and subordinate to its authority. (2.) Therefore, even this obedience requires and implies a judgment of discretion, or every man to judge for himself; yet, (3.) This obedience still must be yielded, not only for the agreement of public instructions [or instructors] with the word, but also because they are delivered by the ordinance of God.

293. It is objected, (2.) That 2 Pet. i. 20, declares that no Scripture is of any private interpretation? Ans. That passage does not speak of private judgment for ourselves, or of making up our own minds on Scripture teachings, in contradistinction to the public teaching of the church; but, (1.) It primarily teaches that the Scripture itself is not the result of private or human conceptions or knowledge, but is the inspiration of God himself. (2.) That it is not to be explained by human conceptions, or by ideas of human inventions, nor in any meaning but that of the Holy Spirit himself; and therefore, (3.) That it equally condemns such explanations, on human invention, whether done by an individual privately, or by the church collectively. And, (4.) It especially condemns the church in giving such false explanations, and imposing them on the people, as authoritative, and the people for receiving them on human or church authority.

294. What direct proof have we that every man should exercise a judgment of discretion for himself? Ans. (1.) Various commands and exhortations amount to this; as John v. 39; Rom. xiv. 5, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind;" 1 Thess. v. 21, "Prove all things," &c., and, (2.) Approved examples; as Acts xvii. 11. (3.) Inference from duties enjoined; as 1 John iv. 1, "Try the spirits," &c., which cannot be done but by comparing them with the Scriptures for ourselves. (4.) From our accountability under privileges; and because that accountability cannot be borne by the church, so as to relieve the private person. (5.) From the promise of the Holy Spirit to individuals, with the word; as John xiv. 26; xvi. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 13.

295. Does it follow, then, that the private person judging for himself, is safe, and his judgment profitable to himself, and acceptable to God, whether he judges right or wrong? Ans. No; he must exercise his private judgment under accountability.

296. Does this right and privilege of judging for himself allow him to trust in his own understanding and heart in the judgment? Ans. No: he is bound to seek the guidance of the Spirit, and to judge under his influence, which is promised to him.

297. Although it is the duty and privilege of every man thus to judge for himself, does this justify a private person in assuming a ministerial or definitive judgment publicly for others? Ans. No; this is to be done only by those who are tried, approved, and commissioned to do so.

298. To whom does such a judgment belong? Ans. To gospel ministers and church courts; Mal. ii. 7; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xiv. 29—33; Acts xv. 2—31; Matt. xviii. 17; Rev. ii. 3; so all the epistles to the churches.

299. How far have ministers and church courts authority to explain and determine the sense of Scripture? Ans. Only so far as they determine according to Scripture.

300. How far are they to be obeyed? Ans. Only so far as they agree with Scripture.

301. What or who is the authoritative judge of the truth or

meaning of the Scriptures? Ans. The Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures; *i. e.* the Scriptures themselves; Rom. xii. 6. In other words, the Scriptures are the standard by which all controversies are to be determined; Isa. viii. 20.

§§ XXXVII. XXXVIII.—Quest. 302. Is there any supreme or infallible judge of divine truth on earth? Ans. No.

303. What have been, by errorists, held as supreme judges? Ans. Several; as, (1.) An enthusiastic spirit within. (2.) Reason and Philosophy. (3.) The church.

304. Why may we not admit an *enthusiastic spirit* to be judge? Ans. (1.) Because, if not governed by the word, it is of Satan, or of human depravity; 1 John iv. 1. (2.) Because it would introduce a confusion, contradiction, and an impossibility of attaining certainty and agreement.

305. Why not acknowledge *reason and philosophy* to be such a judge? Ans. (1.) Because they are not adequate to judge of the mysteries of faith. (2.) Because in man they are depraved, and must err in matters of faith; 1 Cor. ii. 14.

306. But it is objected, (1.) Reason must be used to ascertain the sense of Scripture? Ans. (1.) Reason is only employed as an instrument of ascertaining what the Scriptures teach,—the doctrines which the Scriptures convey. (2.) It is only reason sanctified, or under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, that can safely judge of the meaning of Scripture. (3.) Reason is not the judge determining the truth, but the receiver of the truth from the judge—the Spirit speaking in the Scriptures. Our belief founded on reason is not faith.

307. It is objected, (2.) That every man has a judgment of discretion, which must be directed by human reason? Ans. (1.) The judgment of discretion is the using of reason in subordination to the Scriptures—submission to their authority, and as the means of ascertaining the meaning of the Scriptures. (2.) Even the judgment of discretion should be the use of sanctified reason. (3.) In no case is it an infallible judge.

308. Why should not *the church* be acknowledged such a judge? Ans. (1.) Because she is fallible, being composed of fallible men. (2.) Because every man has a right of private judgment, which would be taken away by the infallibility of an earthly judge. (3.) Because God has established no ultimate and infallible judge on earth. He holds every man individually accountable to him, and dependent on his teaching.

309. Would it be an advantage to the church to have an earthly judge? Ans. No: (1.) For otherwise we may believe God would have given one. (2.) By having such a judge, men would not feel their accountability, nor the necessity of judging for themselves, and thus they would be led to trust in that judge, and not in God. (3.) The Scriptures may be considered as accessible and as plain, and as unambiguous as the sentence of the judge.

§ XXXIX. Quest. 310. The Papists object, (1.) That the church is the supreme and infallible judge; from Deut. xvii. 8—13? Ans.

There must be an umpire for the decision of controversies in church and state, for sake of order and peace, for determining rights and punishments; and in the visible church a judge is appointed for such a purpose, not to be a lord of our faith. And of such a judge, the passage in question speaks. This does not take away the right of private judgment, but only the right of persons to claim privileges in the church, against the judgment of others, on their own private judgment. Nor are these courts and judges infallible.

311. They object, (2.) That God has granted infallibility and superior authority to the church; Matt. xviii. 17? Ans. (1.) In this passage Christ did not commit to the church infallible authority, nor authority to take away the right of private judgment, as accountable to God; but authority to regulate outward communion. (2.) The church has no promise of guidance infallible, nor any promise of guidance in taking away the right of private judgment, and substituting her own in its place. (3.) The church has the promise of guidance in her proper duty of regulating outward communion.

312. They object, (3.) Necessity requires that there be some ultimate judge in ecclesiastical things, as well as civil? Ans. (1.) There is a judge appointed by Christ, for the application of law to outward things, and to regulate outward fellowship, as there is in civil things, for outward order; viz., church courts. (2.) But courts are not an infallible judge, either in civil or ecclesiastical matters. (3.) Neither in civil, nor in ecclesiastical matters, does the judge interfere with private judgment, nor assume the responsibility of moral obligation for the people.

§ XL. Quest. 313. But must there not be some infallible judge of the truth, by whose decision we are bound, in our judgment, faith, and practice? Ans. Yes.

314. Who is this infallible judge? Ans. The Holy Spirit speaking in the word.

315. Do the Scriptures ever ascribe this judgment to the word? Ans. Yes; as Isa. ii. 3, 4; John xii. 48, "The word that I have spoken shall judge him," &c.; Heb. iv. 12; Isa. viii. 20.

316. May not the Holy Spirit give judgment by his written word, as well as a living judge give it orally? Ans. Yes.

317. If in some cases his word appears dark or doubtful, should we not apply to other expressions which he has given, as explanatory of his mind in these? Ans. Yes; and therefore our present application to this great Judge is, to refer to his word, and to explain one Scripture by another; Rom. xii. 6.

318. Objection 1. The judge should be different from the rule. How then make the Scripture both rule and judge? Ans. (1.) In reference to this distinction, it is only necessary to consider the Scripture in different lights. As a rule, we look at its authority—as a judgment, we look at its meaning. (2.) In the question before us, the Holy Spirit is the living Judge, and the Scripture rule is his sentence or judgment delivered. (3.) In this question the

case is different from ordinary human laws and courts. The Holy Spirit is both Lawgiver and Judge. (4.) Although men would wish to have a living visible judge, who would adapt his expressions of judgment to questions as they arise, God has not granted this, but referred us to the words of the Spirit, giving the law or rule, requiring study, humiliation, and prayer, and promising light and guidance.

319. Objection 2. No one should be a judge in his own cause? Ans. (1.) If he may not among men, it cannot be denied to God. (2.) The objection misrepresents the case. It is not the cause which is in question in this case, but the meaning of the expressions, and even man should be allowed to explain his own meaning. If a human lawgiver were also the judge, it would be his perfect right to explain his meaning; and so the Holy Spirit does, in one part of Scripture or another.

320. Objection 3. That the meaning of Scripture is not clear, and there is need of a judge to make it plainer? Ans. (1.) God has not, however, granted such a provision. He has given means, but not a supreme judge besides himself. (2.) The difficulty here complained of is owing to man's blindness, perversity, and indolence. (3.) Men will find the Scriptures clear, by humble, prayerful search. (4.) They do not find it so difficult to *ascertain* the meaning, as to *receive* and submit to it. The plainest sentence of a visible, infallible judge would not produce persuasion; Luke xvi. 31.

321. Objection 4. That, on this plan of making the Scriptures the ultimate judge, we cannot expect an end of strife or of heresies? Ans. (1.) God designs the existence of heresies, for trial of the church, and for the exercise of his people; 1 Cor. xi. 19. (2.) The assumption of infallible judgment by men, never has, and never can prevent heresies, or secure harmony.

LECTURE XVI.—INTERPRETATION OF THE SCRIPTURES, CONTINUED.—
THEIR DESIGN.

§ XLI. Quest. 322. Should not every part of Scripture be expounded? Ans. Yes.

323. Is not the Old Testament still necessary? Ans. Yes; Rom. xv. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

324. Is the restriction of public reading or expounding of the Scriptures to certain "Lessons for the day," selected from the gospels or epistles, as is done by Papists and Episcopalians, allowable? Ans. No; It was a Popish invention, and is a hinderance of instruction and progress, in teacher and people.

325. Ought the prophecies to be explained? Ans. Yes; so Matt. xxiv. 15, referring to Daniel's prophecy; Luke xvi. 29, referring to Moses and the prophets for instruction; Rev. i. 3, commending the study of prophecy.

326. But is there not a necessity for prudence and caution in explaining prophecy? Ans. Yes; and especially in explaining what is not yet fulfilled.

327. Should we seek prophecies in plain histories, parables, or doctrinal discourses? Ans. No; it is human fancy, except where the Holy Spirit has shown us that prophecy was intended.

328. Is it not dangerous to assume hypotheses, and to explain all prophecies in accordance with them? Ans. Yes.

329. Is it proper, as some plead, to omit the explanation of Scripture passages that bear on contradicted topics? No; it is shunning to declare the whole counsel of God, and to watch over the flock; and it is neglecting to obey the divine command; 2 Tim. ii. 25; Tit. i. 9, "In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves," &c.

§ XLII. Quest. 330. Is not the interpretation or explanation of Scripture a solemn and important work? Ans. Yes; it is a work of high responsibility. Let us notice, (1.) The spirit; (2.) The means; and (3.) The rules; by which we should be guided.

331. In what *spirit* should it be performed? Ans. (1.) With reverence for the authority and wisdom of God in the Scriptures; Isa. lxvi. 11; 1 Peter iv. 11, "Speaking as the oracles of God," &c. (2.) With a deep sense of our accountability, whether for understanding the Scriptures ourselves, or explaining them to others; with a sense of the danger of error, and of benefit by the truth. (3.) Setting a higher value on the truth than on any other end to be gained. (4.) With an humble sense of our blindness, weakness, and depravity; Ps. xxv. 9; James iv. 6. (5.) With resolution to embrace, obey, and maintain what God teaches. (6.) With faith, leaning on promised light. (7.) And all in the spirit of prayer.

332. What *means* should be used? Ans. (1.) Prayer; Ps. cxix. 18; James i. 5. (2.) Spiritual meditation; Ps. cxix. 99. This will be a means of bringing the heart into conformity with the Scriptures, and into a right apprehension of them. (3.) Outward helps or means.

333. What are some of the outward helps which should be used? Ans. (1.) The original languages, which often present an emphasis and energy not found in the translation. (2.) Commentaries, or interpretations, given by others, as these belong to the variety of gifts with which God has favoured us. (3.) Translations into other languages, which may be classed with commentaries. (4.) The various resources of human learning, so far as they tend to cast light on the Scriptures. (5.) And especially the comparing of one Scripture with another, in which we attend to the analogy of faith.

§ XLIII. Quest. 334. What help to the understanding of the Scriptures do the Papists chiefly recommend? Ans. The harmonious expositions given by the fathers. And they even make this the criterion and test of interpretations.

335. What objections do we, or should we, set up to this criterion or test? Ans. (1.) There is no such unanimous consent of the fathers, as they pretend. (2.) Many parts of their exposition of Scripture are now lost. (3.) The fathers were no more infallible than we; therefore, it is absurd to make them the test

of sound interpretations. (4.) Our Lord forbids such deference to men; Matt. v. 21; xxiii. 9. (5.) The fathers were ignorant in many things on which God has now given more light, in the course of his providence. 6. The fathers were, in many things, fanciful and frivolous, according to the errors and fancies of the times in which they lived.

§ XLIV. Quest. 336. The Papists object, from Job viii. 8, "Inquire of the former age," &c., that we should submit to the instructions and interpretations of the fathers, or of a former age? **Ans.** (1.) That passage may refer to the divine oracles formerly given. (2.) It may mean,—Take assistance from their counsels, or judgment,—which we certainly approve of doing, while we would not idolize them, and implicitly submit. But, (3.) That passage seems more directly to mean, that since our lives are short, and our personal experience small, we should take into view the experience of the fathers, of which we have knowledge by history, and form our opinions under the combined experience of the fathers and our own.

337. How shall we understand, 1 Cor. xiv. 32—36, "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets?" Does it mean that the latter teachers must implicitly follow the doctrines of the former? **Ans.** The passage refers to prophets or teachers living at the same time, and exercising an humble submission to their mutual counsels.

338. Is there any weight in the argument for the authority of the fathers, that they had a better knowledge of divine truth than we, by personal acquaintance with the apostles, or by tradition? **Ans.** No; for, (1.) There is no proof that the early fathers had any such tradition from the apostles. (2.) Oral tradition by the apostles was not God's method of guiding his church; but he does it by his written word, by the Spirit, and by providence. (3.) If the fathers had immediate instruction by the apostles, it would, in a few generations, be adulterated, if it remained oral.

339. Objec. That the early fathers were not excited or biassed by the present controversies, and therefore were more equitable and better qualified judges than we? **Ans.** (1.) Their views could not be so clear on these points now controverted, nor so extensive, as they were not led to such special examination of them. (2.) Through want of minute investigation, their expressions on subjects now controverted were loose and unguarded; as some of the fathers, after the Arian controversy, acknowledged had been the case with their expressions on that subject, before the controversy.

§ XLV. Quest. 340. What are some of the chief *rules* to be observed in interpreting the Scripture? **Ans.** (1.) The analogy of faith. (2.) A comparison of one Scripture with another. (3.) Attention to the scope and object of the writer. (4.) Attention to the text and context. (5.) Consider the circumstances under which the passage to be interpreted was spoken or written. (6.) Let the interpretation be, as much as possible, in the words of Scripture, if plain and precise in their meaning. (7.) Take the

words in their proper and ordinary signification, unless there be special reasons for taking them in a different sense.

341. What is meant by the *analogy of faith*, as our rule? Ans. Giving a text a meaning, not merely agreeable to another text, but agreeable to the well ascertained doctrines of Scripture in general.

342. In comparing one Scripture text with another, is it sufficient to find another text apparently teaching the same doctrine which we ascribe to the first, or which can, with plausibility, be so explained? Ans. No; but to find our explanation of a text agreeing, not only with the *true meaning* of another text, apparently the same, but also with all texts apparently different.

343. Why is it necessary to attend to the *scope* and *object* of the writer, in the text which we explain? Ans. Because, without this, we may apply his expressions on one subject to another so different, that we utterly pervert his meaning, and misrepresent his doctrine.

344. If the words of Scripture which we use in explanation be as dark as the text we explain, would it answer any good purpose? Ans. No.

345. Is there not danger that, in using the very words of Scripture, in interpretation, we might, by the application which we make of them, give an unsound meaning? Ans. Yes; and many glory in using the words of Scripture in an unsound sense—in a sense contrary to the analogy of faith, and to the design of the Spirit.

346. How is this done? Ans. (1.) When errorists have used a text of Scripture in a sense contrary to the analogy of faith, and to the scope and design of the passage, to quote the very words without an explanation of their true meaning, may convey a false idea. (2.) When we give a false meaning to a text, and quote another text to support it, and the words, unconnected with the context, seem to sustain our doctrine, we pervert the truth by our use of the words of Scripture, because we use them in a perverted sense.—Examples; Matt. xxviii. 15, "They (the Roman soldiers) took the money, and did as they were taught;" Luke x. 37, "Go and do thou likewise." Or: text, 1 Peter iv. 8, "Charity shall hide a multitude of sins." Doctrine, Christian love forbids reproof for sins, by testimony against them, or discipline for them: proof, Eph. iv. 2, "Forbearing one another in love."

347. What rule must we observe, then, in explaining Scripture by Scripture, or proving the doctrine of one text by the quotation of another? Ans. Quote the proof text in its well ascertained meaning.

348. Although it is a general rule to adhere to the proper and literal signification of the words of a Scripture text, must we not, in some cases, depart from this? Ans. Yes.

349. In what cases should we depart from it? Ans. (1.) When the Holy Spirit has elsewhere shown that the words must be taken in a mystical or figurative sense; as Ps. xvi. 10, compared with

Acts ii. 29—36; Isa. lv. 3, compared with Acts. xiii. 34. (2.) When the analogy of faith clearly requires a figurative sense; as “God repented,” Gen. vi. 6. (3.) When something in the text or context forbids the literal sense; as (a.) when the literal use would be absurd; as, “He that eateth my flesh,” &c., John vi. 56; and (b.) when it would utterly change the subject treated of by the writer, as, “Christ is the door,” &c., John x., or, “He that soweth to the flesh,” &c., Gal. vi. 8; (c.) when something in the text or context requires a mystical sense; as, Matt. xxiv. 3, compare with the rest of the chapter; Isa. lxvi. 18—23, where the prophet shows that he is speaking of a future dispensation, in language of his own time. (4.) When the use of the words in a figurative sense, on the same or a similar subject, is general or habitual with the inspired writers; as, *flesh, spirit, soul, world, &c.*

350. Is there not a danger of perverting the Scriptures, on the other hand, and turning our faith to fancy, by lightly, or on imaginary grounds, giving a mystical sense to Scripture texts? Ans. Yes.

§ XLVI. Quest. 351. Should the words of Scripture be reckoned hyperbolic, and be restricted in their meaning, when we explain them? Ans. No: so long as the analogy of faith and the context will sustain their most extensive meaning. Therefore, we must not restrict their meaning, unless the analogy of faith, the scope of the passage, or the context, clearly requires it.

352. Why may we not venture to restrict the meaning of Scripture words, unless God has taught us to do it, by scope, context, or the analogy of faith? Ans. (1.) Because we then make our depraved judgment, or conceptions, our guide, instead of the Spirit speaking in the Scriptures. (2.) Because the wisdom of God alone is able to teach divine truth, and knows what words to use for this purpose. (3.) Because the goodness and faithfulness of God would not have used words calculated to lead us astray, without giving us intimation of the meaning in which they should be taken. (4.) And because, by such liberty, the Socinians, the Arminians, the Papists, and others, have perverted the truth, even on the most fundamental points, in denying the Godhead of Christ, the Trinity, Christ's incarnation, his satisfaction, the justification of believers, and the total depravity of man.

353. Is it not a safe rule to allow that the words of Scripture mean to teach *all* that they *can* mean, agreeably to the text, context, scope, and the analogy of faith? Ans. Yes; as the Spirit of God was able to use words with infallible accuracy, and with brevity, he gave a fulness of meaning. Thus, forbidding one sin, he forbids all sins of the same nature; and so of duties commanded, and privileges afforded and promised, &c.

354. But does such a rule warrant us to explain a text of Scripture as authoritatively teaching every thing, on a variety of subjects, that the words could mean, when applied to that variety of subjects? Ans. No: this would be foolish. This would be the

double sense of Scripture, which we have already shown cannot be allowed.

§ XLVII. Quest. 355. What is the end and design of the Scripture? Ans. The salvation of the elect; John xx. 31; 2 Tim. iii. 16; and the glory of God.

356. Is the Scripture ever saving of itself, however correctly explained, or theoretically understood? Ans. No; 2 Thess. ii. 13. It is saving, only when applied by the Holy Spirit, and employed by him as his instrument.

357. But is it ever savingly applied by the Spirit, unless the mind be led to understand it correctly? Ans. No; 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4.

358. Does the saving effect of the word depend, in any measure, on the grace of the preacher, or the power of his preaching? Ans. No; 1 Cor. iii. 7; 2 Cor. iv. 7; Phil. i. 15—18.

359. But although the saving effect depends on God alone, yet is not the word more likely to be blessed of God for salvation, when dispensed by those who experience its power on their own hearts? Ans. Yes.

360. Why is this so? Ans. (1.) Because it is likely to be preached more faithfully and more fully. (2.) Because, by such a one, it will be more closely applied to the people's case, and a seasonable word be more profitably presented. (3.) As these are God's appointed means, they are more likely to be blessed.

361. Wherein are the Scriptures designed to promote the glory of God? Ans. (1.) By making known his true character. (2.) By making known his will and grace. (3.) And they are the means of salvation and sanctification to men.

CHAPTER III.

OF RELIGION.

LECTURE XVII.—WHAT IT INCLUDES.

§ I. RELIGION, being a name given to that sacred profession and practice required in Holy Scripture, may be very briefly considered, as the particular doctrines which it embraces must be examined separately. But,

Quest. 1. What does the word *Religion* signify? Ans. *A binding*—applied to sacred obligations. Derived from *religo, religare, to bind fast*.

2. Is this name found in Holy Scripture? Ans. Yes; as Acts xxvi. 5; James i. 26, 27.

3. Who are represented as bound by religion? Ans. Men.

4. To whom is man bound by religion? Ans. Properly to God only.

5. Is he not bound, by religion, to his neighbour, and to his own interest and duty? Ans. Yes; but it is to God that he is bound to perform these duties.

6. Does the term *religion* refer to God, as though he were bound by it? Ans. Not properly. He is pleased to bind himself by promises to man; but religion properly signifies man's obligation to God.

7. By what is man bound, in religion? Ans. By God's authority and grace, set forth in his whole word.

§ II.—Quest. 8. What equivalent terms are used in Scripture to signify religion? Ans. *Knowledge of God—Love of God—Fear of God—calling on God—ways of God, &c.*

9. Is not the term *religion* used in Scripture both for the divine system of truth and laws by which we are bound, and for the practice of religion according to that system? Ans. Yes; as Acts xxvi. 5—for the *system*; James i. 26, 27, for the *practice*.

§ III.—Quest. 10. What is true religion, viewed as practical; or in what does it consist? Ans. A sense of God and of our obligation to him, on our minds, founded on the knowledge of him, and manifested by a practice prescribed by him as our duty.

11. May not the word *religion* equally apply to a true, and a false religion? Ans. Yes: even a false religion is a practical bond on the mind, and at least imagined to be a bond to God. And generally, at least, it contains some real bond to God. Almost all false systems contain some truths.

§ IV.—Quest. 12. How may true religion be defined? Ans. It is the right manner of knowing and serving God, for the salvation of man, and the glory of God.

§ V.—Quest. 13. How may the exercises of religion be divided? Ans. They are either *elicit* or *imperative*.

14. What do we mean by *elicit*? Ans. Those duties which flow immediately from the nature of religion itself, or from the nature of God, and man's relation to him; and may be called *natural-moral*.

15. What do we mean by *imperative*? Those things which are duties only by command, and may be called *positive-moral*.

16. Does true religion include both the internal exercise of the heart, and the external duties of outward action? Ans. Yes.

17. Which of these include chiefly the natural-moral exercises of religion? Ans. Chiefly the internal, referring immediately to God.

18. To which of these classes do the positive-moral exercises of religion belong? Ans. To the external; as outward acts of worship, &c.

19. But still are not outward duties of a mixed character, including the internal duties of religion? Ans. Yes; and so far these internal exercises, belonging to the right observance of outward duties, are of a natural-moral nature.

20. How does this appear? Ans. Any act of outward worship must be performed in *faith, love, reverence, fear, &c.*, and thus the exercise is both external and internal, and the internal is natural-moral.

21. May not some outward duties, such as prayer and praise, be

considered as natural-moral, even in the outward action? Ans. Yes; these are natural expressions of internal duties.

22. Which are the most important—the natural-moral, or those which are duties only by divine command? Ans. The natural-moral.

23. Why account them most important? Ans. Not as though the authority were greater for the one than for the other; the authority is the same; but because God commands the external, or positive-moral, in order to promote the internal, or natural-moral. And thus he has made the external subordinate to the internal; Isa. i. 10—17; Jer. vii. 21—23.

24. But can the internal exercises of religion be performed in the neglect of the external? Ans. No: The neglect of the external proves the neglect of the internal. The performance of the internal will lead to the observance of the external.

§ VI.—Quest. 25. Does true religion include hope in the promises, as well as obedience to commands? Ans. Yes; “This is his commandment,” &c.; 1 John iii. 23; Ex. xx. 1, 2.

26. Are faith and obedience, or hope and obedience, all that true religion includes? Ans. No: it includes all that God requires.

27. Does it include knowledge of God and of what he has revealed? Ans. Yes.

28. Obj. (1.) That the Scripture teaches that mere knowledge is not sufficient, and is not saving? Ans. We admit all this; and yet knowledge is necessary.

29. Obj. (2.) That the work of righteousness is acceptable to God, in whomsoever it is found; (Acts x. 34, 35,) and therefore knowledge is not necessary? Ans. None can work righteousness without knowledge, nor entertain a true fear of God without it.

30. Obj. (3.) That if knowledge be necessary to true religion, it would necessarily imply that a great multitude will perish? Ans. Though this is a sad conclusion, it is a just one. It is the doctrine of Scripture. The heathen are “without God, and without hope, in the world.”

31. How prove that knowledge belongs to religion, and is necessary? Ans. (1.) God requires it; Hos. vi. 6. (2.) He has given us doctrines to be known. (3.) He commends knowledge; 1 Tim. ii. 4; and reproves ignorance; Hos. iv. 6. (4.) God has promised knowledge; Jer. xxxi. 33, 34; John xvi. 13. (5.) Ignorance is ruining to the soul; Eph. iv. 18; true knowledge is saving; John xvii. 3. (6.) It appears from the necessity of regeneration; John iii. 3; and knowledge is included in this gracious work; Col. iii. 10. (7.) And from the necessity of knowledge in order to duties, either internal or external.

32. What is the evil of denying the necessity of knowledge in true religion? Ans. (1.) It contemns the goodness of God in giving instruction. (2.) It rejects Christ as Prophet. (3.) It virtually denies human depravity, and implies that if we follow our own views and propensities, we are acceptable to God. (4.) It denies the necessity of the Spirit in our instruction and sanctification, who

works only by his truth; or it supposes he will sanctify us by means of our own false notions. (5.) It tends to render men careless in seeking knowledge. (6.) It takes away all means of unity in the church.

§ VII. The question of the utility or necessity of universal skepticism or doubt, we considered before; but we may here say, (1.) It is unnecessary in order to investigation. (2.) It is trifling with gifts bestowed. (3.) It is unbelief and rebellion. (4.) We do not so in natural things. (5.) God requires us to use the knowledge we have, in order to attain more; Hos. vi. 3; John vii. 17. (6.) It provokes God to leave us to darkness.

Quest. 33. Can a man, who has received a religious education, bring himself to doubt of all divine truth, and to an equal indifference to Christianity, Mohammedanism, and infidelity, without sin and danger of judgment? Ans. No.

34. Is not this doctrine, of the necessity of doubt, calculated to arrest or prevent the education of children? Ans. Yes: they plead that children get ideas by prejudice, and that even if correct, they cannot be useful, because their ideas are not knowledge, but prejudice.

35. Has not the Scripture clearly decided this question, of the duty of the religious education of children? Ans. Yes; Deut. vi. 7; Prov. ii. iii. iv. v.; Eph. vi. 4.

36. May not a child obtain correct, soul-sanctifying knowledge and saving belief of a truth, by parental instruction, though not able to investigate the foundation of his faith? Ans. Yes; Eph. vi. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 15.

37. May not a person be persuaded of the truth, by the Spirit, when presented to the mind, though not able to examine the external evidences of it? Ans. Yes; and this is the persuasion of saving faith, when the truth is brought home, and the internal evidence presented to the mind, by the Holy Spirit.

§ VIII.—Quest. 38. Should anything be believed as divine, which is not discovered to be in the word of God? Ans. No.

39. But is it a sound rule that we should believe nothing, unless our perception of it in the Scriptures is clear and freed from all darkness and doubt? Ans. No; we may have darkness, and even doubts, which do not justify unbelief. We may see that a thing is revealed and true, although we see difficulties that we cannot yet surmount; Phil. iii. 15.

40. Is it a sound rule that whatever we have a clear conception of, is to be admitted as a truth? Ans. No; we may very distinctly conceive of a thing which is but an imagination.

§ IX.—Quest. 41. How extensive are the articles of true religion? Ans. They include everything found in the word of God.

42. Why does it include all these things, if they be not all essential to salvation? Ans. (1.) Our salvation, individually, is not the only end that the truths of religion are intended to subserve. (2.) All points of revealed truth are useful, and are necessary to some holy end. (3.) Divine authority and wisdom enjoin the acceptance of all. (4.) Faith, fear, humility, and love, require us to receive all.

43. How are the articles of true religion divided? Ans. Variously; as, into *Positive* and *Negative*—*Theoretic* and *Practical*—those of *principle* and *conclusion*; or *direct* and *inferential*; but especially into *Fundamental* and *Circumstantial*.

44. Is there ground for a distinction between fundamental and circumstantial articles of divine truth? Ans. Yes; Matt. v. 19; 1 Cor. iii. 11, 12.

45. What are we to understand by a *fundamental* article, in this distinction? Ans. It is an article, the ignorance or rejection of which excludes from salvation.

46. Are there any articles of this description in the system of divine truth? Ans. Yes; as that in 1 Cor. iii. 11, "the foundation, Jesus Christ;" Gal. v. 4, justification by Christ's righteousness; &c.

47. Are there, then, some articles, the ignorance of which may consist with a state of grace? Ans. Yes; Phil. iii. 15.

48. Are we then to conclude that articles not fundamental are useless, and may be neglected, rejected, or contemned with impunity? Ans. By no means.

49. What utility or importance is in them, if the knowledge of them be not essential to salvation? Ans. (1.) They are God's truth, and his teachings, and therefore they cannot be neglected with impunity; Matt. v. 19; 1 Cor. iii. 11—15. (2.) What is not essential may be highly useful. (3.) What is not fundamental to the salvation of the individual, may be fundamental to other very important ends. Those articles not fundamental to the salvation of an individual, are necessary to the maintenance, illustration, and proper use of fundamental truths; and they are useful and necessary for the benefit of the rising generation, and important to the promotion of God's glory.

50. May articles of divine truth, not fundamental, be dropped from the profession or testimony of the church, for sake of union or peace? Ans. No; because, (1.) It is forbidden; Matt. v. 19; Deut. iv. 2. (2.) God's wisdom and authority, and not our conception of their value, nor the temporary accommodation of the church, are the reasons why we should know, believe, and maintain such truths. (3.) To drop them from the testimony of the church, is to cast contempt on them, and will moreover bring the fundamental truths, which these are intended to sustain, into contempt and rejection. (4.) To drop them, is to act on the principle that our final salvation is the only object of divine revelation, or of the profession and testimony of the church.

51. Can the truth—even the fundamental truths of the gospel—continue long in that church, which drops and neglects any truth, because, in her judgment, it is not fundamental? Ans. No.

52. Why not? Ans. (1.) Because she provokes God to give her up, for rejecting his truth and authority. (2.) Because she proceeds on the principle of rejecting divine wisdom and authority, and following her own—on the principle that our interests are the highest object, and the glory of God, and the sanctification of the soul, un-

important. (3.) Because the lesser truths sustain the greater, and if dropped, the latter will drop. (4.) And because fundamental truths will soon be esteemed circumstantial.

LECTURE XVIII.—DIVISION OF ITS ARTICLES, ETC.

§ X.—Quest. 53. Should the importance of an article of truth be the whole, or the chief reason why it should be received and maintained? Ans. No: the authority of God is the primary reason; its utility is secondary.

54. Which should have the precedency in our investigations—the importance, or the truth of the doctrine? Ans. The truth of it.

55. Why so? Ans. (1.) Because the truth of it is the more simple question—the plainest matter generally. (2.) Because if it be not a truth, the importance of it is not worth discussion. (3.) Because, though less important than some other truths, it is important, and the contrary error should be avoided. (4.) Because, though less important, it is not only useful, but obligatory, as a revealed truth of God. (5.) Because, to make the importance of the truth the primary question, implies that its importance is the only reason why we should receive it, and leads us to overlook the authority of God as unimportant, and encourages the idea that our judgment or conception is the ultimate ground of decision.

56. May it not be proper, however, in discussing a subject, to introduce it with some exhibition of its importance? Ans. Yes; to excite attention.

§ XI.—Quest. 57. Upon whom does the burden of proof lie—on him who affirms, or on him who denies? Ans. On him who affirms.

58. Why so? Ans. Because a positive belief cannot be reasonably demanded, unless a ground or reason for that belief be given.

59. But if a reason of faith be given, are we not bound to believe, or else show the fallacy of that reason, or its insufficiency? Ans. Yes.

60. Did not the divine writers proceed on the principle that he that affirms should give a reason for his faith? Ans. Yes; 2 Cor. iv. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 15.

§ XII.—Quest. 61. How may we know those articles which are fundamental? Ans. (1.) By Scripture declarations that such an article is essential to salvation; as John xvii. 3; Gal. v. 4; &c. (2.) By its necessary connexion with our salvation.

62. Is the universal consent of professing Christians to receive and believe a truth, a just criterion on the question whether a truth is fundamental or not? Ans. No.

63. Why not? Ans. (1.) Because scarcely any one divine truth has been universally believed and received by all professing Christians. Therefore such a criterion would scarcely leave us any fundamental truths. (2.) The agreement of professing Christians is not the test of divine truths, nor of their importance, since man is depraved, since all men, even professing the Christian name, have not faith; 2 Thess. iii. 2. (3.) Because the apostle asserts certain points of doctrine to be fundamental, though denied by many: Gal. iii. v. 2—4.

§ XIII.—Quest. 64. What general heads might justly be called fundamental? Ans. Without pretending to enumerate all, we might state as specimens, (1.) The truth and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures. (2.) The correct knowledge of God and his worship. (3.) Man's utter misery by the fall. (4.) The person, offices, and salvation of Christ. (5.) Our salvation wholly of grace; &c.

§ XIV.—Quest. 65. Is an enumeration of fundamental articles necessary? Ans. No.

66. Why not? Ans. (1.) God has not made such an enumeration, which he would have done, had it been necessary. (2.) Such an enumeration is of no practical use, since all articles ought to be believed, are useful, and are necessary in their place; and if all be believed, the fundamental articles will, of course, be embraced. (3.) Because such an enumeration would be calculated to bring other truths into contempt and neglect, and to encourage unbelief and ungodliness in the neglect of them.

67. Is it even practicable to make a correct enumeration? Ans. No; (1.) Because of the connexion of one divine truth with another—the fundamental truths comprehending the less fundamental, and the less sustaining the greater. (2.) Because an error not damning to one, may be fatal to another. (3.) Because, although a truth may not be essential to salvation of itself, when we have correct views of fundamental truths, yet it may be fundamental to some of those truths, so that the rejection of it may pervert our views of them. And therefore, the Scriptures give in different places, different statements of fundamental truths; as Acts viii. 37, of believing in Christ; Rom. x. 9, confessing and believing; 1 Cor. ii. 2, faith in Jesus Christ and him crucified; Gal. v. 4, &c.

68. How does it appear that an error, not fatal to one person, may be fatal to another? Ans. One may reject a truth through ignorance, and hold, and savingly understand the fundamental truths connected with it. Another may reject it through enmity, and that enmity extend to the fundamental truth which it sustains or illustrates. Or, one may be savingly enlightened in the fundamental truths of the gospel, and not see the connexion of a certain lesser truth with them, and reject it. Another, in his state of nature, may hate and reject a lesser truth, and, on discovering its connexion with other and fundamental truths, reject them for its sake.

69. Does not a solicitude to enumerate the fundamental articles arise from a desire to exclude all others from the profession of the church, as though they were unnecessary? Ans. Yes.

70. Is not this both sinful and dangerous? Ans. Yes.

71. Wherein sinful? Ans. (1.) In treating the truth of God with contempt. (2.) Laying aside divine truth from its proper and appointed use. (3.) Making our own notions our guide, instead of God's wisdom and authority.

72. Wherein dangerous? Ans. (1.) It endangers the very fundamentals themselves, by laying aside the doctrines which sustain and illustrate them. Experience proves that when such a step is

taken, one fundamental after another is dropped. (2.) The church, by setting the example of substituting our taste and judgment for the wisdom and authority of God, encourages a spirit of levity about divine truth, and even a spirit of infidelity. (3.) The Spirit of God will withdraw from a church which, in this manner, trifles with his truth. Practical godliness declines, and the church falls under divine judgments.

73. Is not every article of divine truth both obligatory and useful? Ans. Yes: it is necessary to the entire character of the Christian, to full practice of practical godliness, to maintaining the glory of God, to the sustaining of all the fundamental articles of divine truth, and to the continued purity of the church.

§ XV.—74. Would it not be an error to say that ignorance of any one divine truth, or error respecting it, was necessarily damning? Ans. Yes: because, (1.) Believers are defective in knowledge, as well as in grace. (2.) Even Christ's disciples, when actual believers in him, were ignorant of many things. (3.) Believers should be progressing in knowledge; Phil. iii. 15; which implies ignorance, or error in part.

75. What would be the evil, then, of making fundamental articles too numerous? Ans. It would teach what God has not taught; it would destroy charity; it would restrict church communion to those who are perfect; and be a sinful assumption of perfection on the part of some.

76. What would be the evil of making an enumeration of a few articles of divine truth, as the only fundamental truths of God's word? Ans. It would produce contempt for other truths, and misrepresent the design of Scripture teachings, as though it were only to secure our salvation, without regard to our sanctification, our comfort, the glory of God, and our whole duty.

§ XVI. (See § XX.)—77. Is our faith in the word of God of any use to us, if we do not know it in its proper sense and meaning? Ans. No: it is given for our instruction, and its meaning is necessary to be known.

78. If we attain the knowledge of the Scriptures in their true sense and meaning, is our knowledge particular, respecting its several articles, or only general? Ans. It is particular.

79. Is it not possible to hold a sound doctrine in words, and as a general doctrine of truth, and deny it in particular? Ans. Yes; we may hold particular sentiments that utterly subvert that general truth:—as salvation by Christ, and yet deny his justifying righteousness, his regenerating and sanctifying Spirit, &c.

80. Is it, then, any profit to us to hold a sound general expression of truth, when we deny or reject it in particulars? Ans. No: in that case we cannot believe or obey the word, or serve God acceptably.

81. Do the Scriptures require a *profession* of faith in the articles which are believed? Ans. Yes; Rom. x. 10.

82. Should not our profession be as full and particular as our

faith? **Ans. Yes:** our faith should be the word, in all its particulars, and we should profess the truth believed.

83. Is, then, a general profession of faith sufficient? **Ans. No:** there may be a general profession of the truth, with much error in the particulars, and such error as utterly subverts the truth held in the general profession.

84. Do not the Roman Catholics make a sound general profession, when they profess a belief in the Bible, in the Decalogue, and in the Apostles' Creed? **Ans. Yes.**

85. But yet do not the Scriptures charge them with apostacy, notwithstanding that sound general profession? **Ans. Yes;** 2 Thess. ii. 3, 10, 11, 12.

86. Is their belief or profession sound, unequivocal, and honest, who are willing to subscribe a sound general profession, but refuse a sound particular one? **Ans. No:** they prove that they do not hold the general profession soundly.

87. If we forsake a sound particular profession for one that is more general, is it not apostacy, and decline from a faithful profession or testimony? **Ans. Yes.**

88. Is it any justification of such a step, that, by such a particular profession, true Christians are excluded from our communion, who cannot agree with us in every particular of our profession? **Ans. No.**

89. Why may we not adopt a more general profession, in order to admit Christians who oppose some particulars? **Ans. (1.)** The authority of God in his word, and not the opinions of men, nor even the outward visible unity of the church, is our rule of religious profession. **(2.)** The instruction of men in divine things, and the correction of their errors, are objects of the church's profession, and not merely their enjoyment of outward communion. **(3.)** There is no limit that can be set by Scripture, reason, or expediency, to this measure, if once adopted; and one generation after another would extend the limits, till no particular error, however great, would be counted a sufficient ground of exclusion from church communion. **(4.)** It is a sufficient accommodation of those who find a difficulty of expressly adopting some particulars of a profession, to admit them, on their engagement to lie open to further light, and to give no opposition to the church's profession. **(5.)** If they cannot conscientiously do this, it is because they are settled in their opposition to that point of profession, and intend to oppose it.

90. May not persons be found who honestly hold a truth, and yet, by mistake, hold an error which overthrows that truth? **Ans. Yes.**

91. Although we may not call such persons apostates, or graceless, should not their error be condemned and opposed, and a particular profession of the truth be required, in order to communion? **Ans. Yes.**

92. **Obj.** But if an individual, or a number of individuals, may be admitted to communion, who cannot expressly adopt some par-

ticular of the church's profession, why may not the whole church drop it? Or is it any greater evil in the whole to drop it, than in the few who cannot fully accede to it? Ans. We suppose the matter in question to be a divine truth, and that the church knows it to be the truth; therefore, (1.) It would be a sin in the church to drop what she has attained and knows. (2.) If the church drops the article in question, there is no testimony then held for that truth; while the church still keeps up her testimony in profession and practice, even though she admits to communion any number on the terms set forth above.

§ XVII.—93. What are the opposites of true religion? Ans. Impiety, religious superstition, infidelity, and heresy.

94. What is infidelity? Ans. Unbelieving rejection of the Christian name; as Atheists, Deists, Mohammedans, and modern Jews.

95. What is heresy? Ans. False religion, retaining the Christian name.

96. If a person or people fall away to infidelity, heresy, or impiety, what is their conduct called? Ans. Apostacy.

97. What is Schism? Ans. A breach of the union of the church, without sufficient cause.

98. If a part separate from the church, for sufficient cause, and thus a breach of union occur, is it schism on their part? Ans. No: but the charge of schism lies against those who make that separation necessary.

99. May not our religion be the true religion, although some errors be mixed with it? Ans. Yes: every error does not destroy the Christian character of the church.

100. But is that error therefore harmless? Ans. No; it is sinful, injurious, and dangerous.

§ XVIII.—101. What are the general marks by which the true religion may be distinguished from the false? Ans. (1.) The views of God drawn from the Scriptures agreeing with the known and necessary perfections of God. (2.) The worship of God prescribed by his word, suitable to his necessary perfections. (3.) The worship of God and our hope pointed out in his word, answering to our actual state of sin and misery. (4.) The revealed plan of reconciliation and salvation, suited to the nature of both God and man.

§ XIX.—102. What are some special marks by which the Protestant religion is proved to be true? Ans. (1.) Conformity to Holy Scripture, in doctrine and worship, and making the Scriptures our only rule. (2.) Its tendency to promote godliness, as proved from the nature of its doctrines, from facts and experience. (3.) The satisfaction which it affords to the intelligent conscience. (4.) Its giving all the glory to God; Isa. xlv. 25, compared with 1 Cor. i. 29, 31.

103. But would not the legal doctrines of Papists and Arminians, which suspend our salvation and hope on our own works, better promote practical godliness? Ans. No: (1.) Because this system turns the thoughts and hopes from Christ; views God as an angry Judge,

and not as the object of love and delight. (2.) Because it leaves man to labour in his own strength, and not in communion with God, and with gracious supplies from him. (3.) And, besides, facts show that, in proportion as men believe the doctrine of free grace, and live under its influence, they are practically godly.

104. But do not the grossly erroneous, the Papist and the Legalist, often enjoy great consolation from their religion? Ans. They may, for a time, enjoy a kind of consolation, but it is not well founded or permanent; nor is it decidedly satisfying.

105. What solid criterions may distinguish the true and the false consolations? Ans. (1.) A correct and clear view of God's character, of our true condition, and of our accountability. (2.) A clear discovery of our safety before God, answering to these discoveries of God and of ourselves; while a false consolation occurs under ignorance and insensibility of our condition and of the character of God. (3.) Gracious consolation is soul-humbling and sanctifying; the other puffs up, and renders its possessor careless and negligent.

§ XX. (*See* § XVI.)—106. As a profession of the truth belongs to the true religion, is there necessity for prudence in making it? Ans. Yes; Matt. vii. 6; x. 16.

107. Should our profession be made in company with others? Ans. Yes; because God has required his people to unite, as a church, in religious duties.

108. Does the prudence which we ought to exercise, in making our profession, allow us to neglect it, in order to escape persecution, or in order to conciliate an ungodly world? Ans. No; Matt. x. 32, 33.

109. Does it allow us to omit, drop, or keep back some point of divine truth from our profession, for the sake of peace with others? Ans. No; Matt. x. 32, 33; Rev. iii. 10.

110. Does it not require that our profession be *sincere*, *consistent*, and *constant*? Ans. Yes.

111. Can we make this profession as we ought, in ecclesiastical communion with those who profess different and contrary doctrines? Ans. No: we cannot make a public and ecclesiastical profession different from that which the church makes, with which we associate. So Christ requires separation on account of error; Tit. iii. 10; Rev. ii. 14, 15, &c.

112. Does true religion, then, require or allow us to unite ecclesiastically with all who bear the Christian name? Ans. No; nor with any heretics; because it requires a full and open profession of the truth, which cannot be done ecclesiastically with those who profess error.

113. Is it not contrary to the spirit and duty of true religion, and inconsistent with a full profession of our faith, to remain in ecclesiastical communion with those who openly deny, or practically reject any doctrine of divine truth, even through ignorance and weakness, after due dealing with them? Ans. Yes.

§ XXI.—114. Does true religion require us to tolerate men of

all religions, and even infidels, in the enjoyment of civil privileges? Ans. Yes.

115. Is false religion, as such, the proper object of the magistrate's cognizance? Ans. No.

116. Why not? Ans. (1.) He is not qualified, by civil qualifications, to judge in such matters. (2.) He is not appointed by Christ for such judgments. (3.) A man does not lose his civil rights by a false religion. (4.) He has a natural right to liberty of conscience.

117. But if a false religion infringes on the civil rights of others, should it be tolerated by the civil magistrate? Ans. No; but then it is suppressed as a civil offence, not as a system of religious error.

118. Might not civil punishments be inflicted for blasphemy, and breach of the Sabbath, and such crimes? Ans. Yes; (1.) Because such crimes are injurious to civil society. (2.) Because no one can plead conscience for these crimes.

CHAPTER IV.

OF GOD.

LECTURE XIX.—NAMES OF GOD.

§ I.—Quest. 1. What is the use of a name given to anything? Ans. For our accommodation in distinguishing one thing from another, in our inter-communication.

2. Though God be perfectly distinct from all his creatures, yet do we not need a name for him, in order to communicate our ideas intelligibly to one another? Ans. Yes.

3. Do the Scriptures give but one, or do they give many names to God? Ans. They give many.

4. Why give many names? Ans. (1.) For our instruction respecting his nature and character. (2.) Because no one name can fully and expressly exhibit what he is.

5. Are not all God's names significant? Ans. Yes; they all signify something respecting him.

6. How does it appear that no name can fully and expressly set forth what God is? Ans. (1.) From the fact of the Scriptures giving him many names. (2.) From Scripture; Gen. xxxii. 29; Judges xiii. 18; Prov. xxx. 4.

§ II.—7. What are the Hebrew, Greek and Latin names for God? Ans. אֱלֹהִים (*Elohim*), θεός (*Theos*) and *Deus*. *Deus* is most probably derived from *Theos*.

8. Whether does the name *God* express his nature, or some office, or relation? Ans. His nature.

9. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From Gal. iv. 8, condemning service to those who are not by nature gods; therefore the true God is by nature God. (2.) From Col. ii. 9, ascribing Godhead to him in the abstract, signifying a nature, it teaches that the name *God* signifies his nature. (3.) From the epithets *living* and *true* (Jer. x. 10, 11,) applied to the name *God*, which shows that it signifies his nature. Applied to office, they would be unmeaning. (4.) From Psal. xc. 2, showing that the name God belongs to him eternally and absolutely, without relation to any other being—he was God before creation.

10. But is not the name *God* expressive of a covenant relation to his people; as when he promises to be *their* God? Ans. Yes; when God either promises himself to his people as their possession, or they claim him as such, the *expression* signifies his covenant relation to them. But the relation is signified by the accompanying words, *their, thy, my, &c.*; and the expressions mean that he who is God by nature will be his people's possession; that he will be all to them that his nature and sufficiency warrant them to expect.

11. Does the application of the name *god* to Satan, to angels, and to magistrates, militate against our doctrine respecting this name? Ans. No.

12. But if angels and magistrates are called *gods* on account of their office and dignity, why should not the name *God* signify office also, as applied to Jehovah? Ans. (1.) Although the name *God* signifies the nature of God, it necessarily implies that he has authority and dignity. (2.) Angels and magistrates are called *gods* improperly, not as expressive of their nature, but of their office and dignity, bearing some resemblance to the authority and dignity of him who is God by nature. (3.) Satan is called *a god* because he does exercise authority. (4.) Idols are called *gods* because their worshippers esteem them as such.

§ III.—13. Since the name *god* is sometimes given to the creatures, how shall we know when it is applied to God in its proper sense, and not to a creature; or that, when it is applied to Christ, it is applied in its proper sense, expressive of the divine nature? Ans. (1.) When it is given to him accompanied by some notice of his divine character, as the subject of narrative or doctrine; as Rom. ix. 5, “over all, God blessed forever;” or, (2.) When some epithet is added, as exegetical; as 1 John v. 20, “This is the true God, and eternal life;” Ex. iii. 6, “the God of Abraham;” Deut. x. 17, “God of gods.”

14. What are the Greek names given to God? Ans. θεος, (*Theos*) from θεομαι, or Τεθημι; Δεσποτης, (*Despotes*) as Luke ii. 29,—*Absolute Master*; Δυναστης, (*Dynastes*), 1 Tim. vi. 15,—*of high authority*; Κυριος (*Kurios*), *having authority*, from Κυρος, (*Kuros*), *authority*.

15. What are the Hebrew names of God? Ans. The most frequent are, 1. אֱל, (*El*), from אֱל, (*strength*); 2. אֱלֹהִים, (*Eloah*), and אֱלֹהִים, (*Elohim*), from אָלַה, *to swear*; (3.) שַׁדַּי, *Shaddai*, from יָרַ, *sufficiency*, and שׁ, *who*; (4.) אֱלִיִּן, (*Alion*), from אָלַה, *he ascended*; (5.)

אֲדֹנָי, (*Adon*), from אָדָן, *basis—sustaining*; (6.) יה, (*Jah*), or יהוה, (*Jehovah*), from יהוה, or יהוה, *to be*; signifying *essence—self-existence*.

§ IV.—16. Has the Greek language letters to express the name *Jehovah*? No; not perfectly. *Zeus* was their imitation. And besides, their letters, in any form expressing the name, could not mean the same with *Jehovah*.

17. How did they express the name, or convey the same idea? Ans. (1.) By the word *kurios*, signifying *authority* or *lordship*; and (2.) By a periphrasis; as Rev. i. 8, “who is, who was, and who is to come.”

18. What was the superstition of the later Jews about this name? Ans. They thought it should not be pronounced; and that the written name had a magical influence.

19. What did they use instead of it? Ans. *Adonai*.

20. How does it appear that it was pronounced by the Jews in their purest times? Ans. (1.) From its being used in the public benediction; Num. vi. 24. (2.) From its frequent use in the Psalms, and in prayers. (3.) From *Jehovah* and *Adonai* being often used together; Josh. vii. 7.

21. Was this name, *Jehovah*, known to the fathers before the time of Moses, and the deliverance of Israel from Egypt? Ans. Yes; as appears from recorded instances of their using it; as Gen. iv. 1, used by Eve; Gen. xv. 2, Abraham’s prayer; Gen. xxviii. 13, God’s promise to Jacob.

22. How then understand Ex. vi. 3, “By my name *Jehovah* was I not known to them”—(Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob?) Ans. No doubt that passage signified that they had not so clear a manifestation of God’s character, as expressed by this name, as the church should afterwards have.

§ V.—23. What is the peculiar signification of this great name? Ans. *Self-existence*, which necessarily implies *self-sufficiency*, *all-sufficiency*, *independence*, and consequently, *infinity*, *eternity*, *immutability*, and all perfection.

24. Is this name ever given to any other being than the true God? Ans. No.

25. Why not? Ans. Because of its peculiar meaning, on account of which it cannot be given to a creature, without absurdity and profanity.

26. How does it appear from Scripture that it was given to none other than God? Ans. (1.) Because God takes it as his peculiar name; Isa. xlii. 8; Hos. xii. 5; Psa. lxxxiii. 18, “Thy name alone is *Jehovah*.” (2.) From its being always taken as a proper name—never taking the article ה, nor affixes, nor plural.

27. Is this name ever given to Christ? Ans. Yes; frequently; but particularly Isa. vi. 3, 5, 9, 10, compared with John xii. 40, 41; Isa. xli. 6, compared with Rev. i. 8, 11.

28. But the Unitarians, perceiving that this name is given to Christ, deny that it is incommunicable to a creature; and assert, (1.) This name is given to an angel, Gen. xviii. 1; also Judges xiii.

19, and Zech. iii. 2? Ans. Christ, as Mediator, is called an angel or messenger; and in the passage cited, it is Christ that is intended, and called *angel*. Or, if in Judges it was a created angel, Manoah offered to the Lord, and not to him.

29. Obj. 2. That this name is given to the altar raised by Moses; Ex. xvii. 15; and to the city of Jerusalem; Ezek. xlvi. 35; Jer. xxxiii. 16? Ans. (1.) Neither the altar nor Jerusalem could in any proper sense be called *Jehovah*: but, (2.) They are denominated from him who dwells in them. *Jehovah* being his peculiar name, they are called his dwelling or habitation—not Jerusalem is *Jehovah*, but *Jehovah* is her righteousness.

30. Obj. 3. That the ark of the covenant was called *Jehovah*; Num. x. 35, 36? Ans. It was not the ark, but *Jehovah* himself, that Moses addressed on such occasions.

§ VI.—Noticed already; but we may add, that the superstition of the Jews about this name, as possessing a magical virtue, either as written or spoken, no doubt induced the Gentiles to transfer it to their idols; as Jupiter (in its oblique cases, as *Jovis*) is evidently an imitation of this name.

§ VII.—Quest. 31. As to the names of God being given to Satan, to idols, and to magistrates, we have spoken, (§ 2;) but we may add, are all divine names given to each of the divine persons in the Trinity? Ans. Yes.

32. Are these names given to each of the divine persons in their proper sense, and in the same meaning, (univocally?) Ans. Yes; as to the Father, 1 Cor. xii. 6; to the Son, 1 Tim. iii. 16; and to the Holy Spirit, Acts v. 3.

33. Why are they given to each of these persons? Ans. Because each person is truly God, and possesses the whole divine essence.

LECTURE XX.—BEING OF GOD.

§ VIII.—Quest. 34. From the *name* of God, we proceed to consider his *being* and *essence*; and inquire, is not the doctrine, that there is a God, a first principle in religion? Ans. Yes; all religion is nothing without this.

35. Do not the Scriptures rather assume this truth, than assert, or prove it? Ans. Yes.

36. Why so? Ans. Because there is a witness of the truth of it in every man's own conscience.

37. What is the reason that every man's conscience testifies to this? Ans. Because the light of nature so clearly shows it, that the evidence cannot be resisted.

38. What evidence does the light of nature give of this truth? Ans. (1.) By the dependence of all things on an unseen hand; even our own dependence, which we necessarily see. (2.) By the beauty and elegance of things in nature. (3.) By the evident order and connexion of things, showing wisdom, design, and will. (4.) Great uniformity, even in continual changes. (5.) By the wonderful direction of things seemingly fortuitous, still bringing about the ex-

pected end. (6.) By extraordinary events; as judgments on the openly wicked.

39. What effects do such things produce on the minds of men, even with all the wickedness of man, and the efforts of Atheists? Ans. (1.) The view of these things produces a sense of dependence. (2.) A fear of judgment. (3.) A consciousness of guilt and accountability. (4.) A belief in the existence of God, in mankind universally.

40. And do not the records of miracles, references to Providence, and records of prophecies and their fulfilment, in Scripture, clearly sustain the general idea that there is a God? Ans. Yes; and the natural conscience assents to the Scripture assumption of the truth of this doctrine, because the natural evidence is irresistible.

§ IX.—Quest. 41. Can a perfect definition of God be given? Ans. No.

42. Why so? Ans. (1.) Because we cannot comprehend him. (2.) Because he has not a genus in common with creatures which can be explained, and therefore not a specific difference. (3.) Because his perfect simplicity does not admit of constituent parts.

43. Do not the Scriptures maintain the impossibility of a perfect definition of God? Ans. Yes; Job. xi. 7; Psa. cxxxix. 6; 1 Tim. vi. 16.

44. Is it a perfect definition of God to say that he is the most perfect Being? Ans. No; as this is only comparative, and therefore utterly fails of being a perfect definition.

45. Since, then, we cannot define God, what measure is adopted in Holy Scripture, for the purpose of communicating a true and intelligible idea of him? Ans. They describe him in his *nature*, *manner of subsistence*, and *attributes*, in language adapted to man's capacity; and exclude every imperfection.

§ X.—Quest. 46. Should our description of God include the assertion of the Trinity? Ans. Yes; our knowledge of God must include his manner of subsistence, as well as his nature; and this is revealed.

47. Assuming the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity, would we have a true knowledge of God without the knowledge of this doctrine? Ans. No; because it is not enough to know his nature and Godhead, in the abstract, but to know God as he is, and as he is revealed.

48. What brief description may be given of God, comprehensive of all we know about him? Ans. That he is a Spirit,—of infinite or absolute perfection—and subsisting in a Trinity. We thus describe his nature, perfections or attributes, and manner of subsistence.

49. Is this description applicable to each of the persons, as well as to the Godhead? Ans. Yes; because each of the persons is truly God, possessed of the whole essence of God; and each of them is that God who is Triune, or Three in One, although that person is not Triune.

§ XI.—Quest. 50. Is *essence*, or *being*, to be ascribed to God? Ans. Yes; this is the grand, fundamental truth—that *God is*.

51. How do the Scriptures express this truth? Ans. In several ways; as, (1.) In Hebrew, יהוה, (*Jehovah*), and Exodus iii. 14, אהיה, (*Eheyeh*), and in Greek, 'ο 'ων, (*Ho ōn*);—*the being*, or *existing one*. Also, in Hebrew, Prov. viii. 14, יהוה, (*Thu-shi-yah*), *essence or substance*, from יהי, or וי, *to be*. (2.) So, also, Acts xvii. 29, the Godhead, or essence, is called θεῖον, (*Thei-on*). In Rom. i. 20, it is called θεϊότης, (*Thei-o-tes*); and Col. ii. 9, θεοτης, (*The-o-tes*). In Gal. iv. 8; and in 2 Pet. i. 14, it is called φῦσις, (*Phu-sis*).

Our author, [*i. e.* John Mark] thinks that *Spirit* expresses the nature of God more definitely than the word *being*, *substance*, or *entity*. And we agree, but we incline to speak of entity and nature distinctly and separately. Some deny that a spirit is a being, entity, or substance; and hold that it is just a succession of thoughts. A most absurd idea.

52. Can thoughts exist without an actual being to exercise them? Ans. No.

53. Can we conceive of, or is it possible that there should be, a succession of thoughts, eternal, immutable, independent, and almighty? Ans. No.

§ XII. Quest. 54. As, then, God is a *being*, or *existence*, possessed of all perfection, what is his proper nature? Ans. *A Spirit*.

55. What are the necessary consequences of this doctrine of the spirituality of God? Ans. (1.) That he is absolutely incorporeal. (2.) Invisible to the bodily eye. (3.) Inimitable by likeness or figures. (4.) That he has understanding, or will.

56. Do not the Scriptures unequivocally describe God as a Spirit, and sustain all these consequences? Ans. Yes.

57. As some deny the absolute spirituality of God, how shall we answer their objection to our doctrine, drawn from the Scriptures ascribing to God bodily members, as eyes, hands, feet, &c.? Ans. Such Scriptures represent God's perfection and operations by figures taken from man's body.

58. But it is objected, that man was made in the image of God, and therefore he has something corporeal? Ans. The image of God in man consists in the soul, in its nature and powers, and in no respect in the body.

59. How understand the frequent appearances of God to man, of old? Ans. (1.) In some instances actual bodies were assumed, for instruction or impression; as Gen. xviii. 1, &c. (2.) Some were with bodily shape; as the visions of John. (3.) Some visions were entirely mental; as those of Ezekiel.

60. But the Scriptures represent that the saints in heaven shall see God; as Job xix. 26. How understand this? Ans. (1.) Some passages represent this vision in reference to Christ, the God-man Redeemer; as Job xix. 26; 1 John iii. 2. (2.) None will ever see the essence of God with the bodily eye, but with the eye of understanding and faith here, and with the eye of the understanding in heaven.

61. Does not reason itself teach, from the revealed perfections of God, that he is not corporeal? Ans. Yes; as he is omnipresent,

which body cannot be; and his perfections cannot admit of bodily extension or composition.

§ XIII. Quest. 62. Has God utterly forbidden images, paintings, or likenesses of himself? Ans. Yes; as the 2d commandment, Deut. iv. 15, 16; and by representing such images as the lowest degree of degradation of man in apostacy from God; Rom. i. 23, 24.

63. Is not every painting, or material representation of God, foolish, absurd, useless, sinful, and dangerous? Ans. Yes; as it is impossible to give a material likeness of a spirit; and a visible representation is calculated to destroy our faith in God's spirituality, and to prevent our ideas of God's perfections.

64. Obj. 1. Angels of old were represented by pictures? Ans. (1.) Angels are not infinite, and therefore we may not infer, from visible representations of angels, that God should be so represented. (2.) The figures for angels were not even pretended likenesses of them, but figures to be emblems of them; as hieroglyphics do not pretend to be likenesses.

65. Obj. 2. Man may be painted, who is made in the image of God? Ans. Man's soul cannot be painted, in which alone the image of God consists.

66. Obj. 3. God often appeared to man in a bodily shape, and therefore may be painted? Ans. (1.) When God appeared to man in bodily shape, it was God in the person of the Son, not therefore a picture of God, but a representation of Christ in human nature. (2.) These appearances were not as likenesses of God, but as emblems of his majesty and perfections.

67. But it may be objected, if God represented himself by emblematic appearances, would not this warrant us to paint representations, not as likenesses of God, but as instructive and impressive emblems? Ans. No; because, (1.) What God was pleased to do does not warrant us to imitate him, when not commanded to do so; and much less, when expressly forbidden. (2.) Even an emblematic representation of angels, in a ceremonial worship, does not warrant us to use such emblems now.

LECTURE XXI.—SPIRITUALITY AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

§ XIV. Quest. 68. As God is a Spirit, is he a real substance, or being? Ans. Yes.

69. Is not thought, or mental action, a necessary exercise of spirit, so far as we can understand it? Ans. Yes.

70. Is it correct to say that God is thought, or a succession of thoughts? Ans. No; succession cannot be ascribed to God in any case.

71. Why is it incorrect to say that God is thought, or an act? Ans. (1.) Because it denies the idea of being. (2.) The idea of an act is distinct from the agent, and must be the act of an agent. (3.) The Scripture ascribes thought as belonging to God; as Isa. lv. 8; Ps. xcii. 5; cxxxix. 17. (4.) There are other attributes ascribed to God than thought; as power, holiness, justice, &c. (5.) It would be absurd to say that mere thought is independent—almighty.

72. Yet do not the simplicity and perfection of God require us to believe that his attributes and internal operations, and himself, are one, so that they are indivisible? Ans. Yes.

73. Yet is it not necessary, in our conceptions and discussions, that we consider them distinctly? Ans. Yes.

74. Is not every spirit, by its nature, a living being? Ans. Yes.

75. As the Scriptures ascribe life to God, wherein does life in him differ from life in created spirits? Ans. (1.) In him it is original; in them derived. (2.) In him it is independent, in them dependent. (3.) In him it is infinite; in them finite. (4.) In him it is necessarily eternal; in them dependently eternal.

76. As a Spirit, and living, he has faculties. What are these? Ans. (1.) Understanding; Psal. cxlvii. 5; Isa. xl. 28. (2.) Will; Isa. xlvi. 10; Psal. cxv. 3. (3.) Power.

77. Does not will, as ascribed to God, sometimes signify his volition, or the acting of his will; and sometimes the object or thing willed? Ans. Yes; Psal. cxv. 3, Rev. iv. 11, signify his volition; Isa. xlvi. 10, Matt. vi. 10, signify the object willed.

78. With respect to the object willed, or taking the will of God in this sense, how is it usually divided, or distinguished? Ans. Into *secret* and *revealed*; or will of *good pleasure*, and of *the sign*.

79. Is there not a seeming opposition, in some cases, between the secret and the revealed will of God? Ans. Yes.

80. Is the opposition real, however? Ans. No.

81. Whence arises the seeming opposition? Ans. (1.) In the fact that God reveals but a part of his will, and men mistake it for the whole. (2.) From our ignorance and weakness of apprehension respecting both his secret and his revealed will.

82. Does not God's will of good pleasure include his revealed will? Ans. Yes; his revealed will is the expression of his secret will, so far as it goes; in nothing does it go beyond that secret will, and in nothing is it contrary to it.

83. What does God's revealed will include, as to the matter of it? Ans. His *promises*, *commands*, and *threatenings*.

84. Do his secret will and purposes include these, and always agree with them? Ans. Yes.

85. But it is said, (1 Tim. ii. 4,) that God "will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth," while it is his purpose that many shall remain in ignorance, and perish. How reconcile? Ans. The two seeming opposites do not refer to the same thing. (1.) His revealed will refers to our privilege and duty; the other to God's wise and comprehensive purpose of what he will do. (2.) The revealed will refers to God's nature, as good and gracious; the other to his wisdom, justice, and holiness, as what all his perceptions require in the case. (3.) The one refers to what he approves respecting our duty and interests, and what he delights in for our sake; the other refers to the sustaining of justice, truth, and holiness, and the greatest good upon the whole.

86. Viewing God's power as a faculty—when operating on things

without him, is it active or passive? Ans. Always active; Matt. vi. 13; Eph. i. 19. (Of this faculty, as an attribute, again.)

‡ XV.—OF THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

Quest. 87. Are not many things ascribed or attributed to God in Scripture, as expressive of his perfections or properties? Ans. Yes.

88. For what purpose are these attributes or properties ascribed to God? Ans. (1.) To convey some just idea of him to us, adapted to our weakness. (2.) As a means of distinguishing him from the creatures.

89. Are these attributes to be considered as distinct from the divine essence, and different from God himself? Ans. No.

90. Or are these attributes different from one another? Ans. No.

91. Why should we not say they are different from God himself, or from one another? Ans. Because such distinctions would deny the divine simplicity of God, his eternity, immutability, and independence. His perfections are himself.

92. But do not the Scriptures warrant us to take distinct views of God, under the consideration of his several attributes? Ans. Yes; as, under one attribute, they represent him as just—another, as almighty—another, as wise, &c.

93. Does not the distinction made between the divine attributes, refer to the objects and effects of these attributes, and to our manner of apprehending them? Ans. Yes: we see these perfections as distinct in their objects and effects, while we are to consider them as one in God who produces these effects, and as one with his essence. And as we consider them distinctly, in objects and effects, so we reason that these perfections are in God, though one with his being. (And therefore our distinction has been called *reason reasoned*. Some call it a *formal* distinction; some, *modal*, or *mode of considering*.)

§ XVI.—94. Does *infinity* belong to God, as the characteristic of all his attributes? Ans. Yes.

95. What does infinity mean? Ans. All perfection; or without measure, bounds, or limits.

96. Does not infinity comprehend all God's perfections? Ans. Yes; to be infinite, necessarily implies all perfection.

97. Do the Scriptures ascribe infinity to God? Ans. Yes.

98. How, or in what manner do they ascribe it? Ans. (1.) Expressly; Psal. cxlvii. 5. (2.) By expressions which necessarily imply it; as all-sufficiency, Gen. xvii. 1; blessedness, 1 Tim. vi. 15; greatness, Psal. cxlv. 3; without comparison, Isa. xl. 25; incomprehensibility, Job xi. 7—9.

99. What may we understand by the *singularity* of God? Ans. That he is beyond comparison with all other beings; and that he is uncompounded of parts, or of substance and qualities—his qualities being himself.

100. Is infinity comprehending all divine attributes, inconsistent

with the divine singularity? Ans. No: God possesses all perfections eminently, but not formally, or as properties distinct from his essence or being.

101. Is the divine perfection merely negative, or free from the imperfections of creatures? Ans. No; it is absolute and positive, as the perfections ascribed to God in Scripture necessarily imply; and as is necessarily implied in freedom from all imperfection.

§ XVII.—102. How have the divine attributes been divided, in treating or discussing them? Ans. (1.) Into proper and metaphorical. (2.) Into negative and positive. (3.) Into absolute and relative. (4.) Into internal and external. (5.) Into communicable and incommunicable. The first four divisions we judge useless, or improper; but we may consider their meaning, and why we reject them.

103. What is meant by *metaphorical* attributes? Ans. Those things ascribed to God metaphorically, in speaking of him after the manner of men; as anger, joy, delight, &c.

104. Why is this division improper? Ans. Because it is only a different manner of Scripture expressions of the same thing otherwise expressed in simple and literal language; as anger is an expression of justice or holiness; joy and delight, of goodness, &c.

105. What are we to understand by the distinction into *positive* and *negative*? Ans. Negative is only another way of expressing the positive. All God's perfections are positive; and to sustain this, the Scriptures deny all imperfection. The denial of imperfection is the declaration of positive perfection.

106. What are we to understand by *absolute* and *relative*? Ans. The absolute are those which are in God absolutely, without relation to his creatures; as power, wisdom, goodness, &c. The relative, those which are exercised only in relation to his creatures; as mercy, pity, compassion, &c.

107. Why is this division improper? Ans. All God's perfections are absolute. It is only certain exercises of these absolute perfections that are called relative. The latter are founded in the former. Thus mercy is the exercise of essential goodness towards the miserable, &c.

108. What may we understand by the distinction of *internal* and *external* attributes? Ans. By the internal, they mean what we call faculties; as intellect and will: and by the external, such as simplicity, eternity, immutability, viewed as qualities, and not properly belonging to the nature or essence of God.

109. Wherein is this distinction improper? Ans. What they call *internal* are properly faculties; and by calling the other *external*, they virtually deny them to belong to the essence of God, and hold them to be mere denominations, relations, or negations, respecting God; whereas they belong to his nature or essence.

110. What are we to understand by the distinction of *communicable* and *incommunicable* attributes? Ans. (1.) By communicable, we understand those attributes of which there is some resemblance

in the intelligent creature. (2.) By the incommunicable, those of which there can be no resemblance.

111. Wherein is this distinction proper? Ans. (1.) Because there is plainly such a distinction in the divine attributes ascribed to God in Scripture. (2.) Because it presents the nature of God in a clearer light, by showing wherein man is made in the image of God, and what imperfections of man or angel must be excluded from the idea of God.

112. Are we, by communicable attributes, to understand that the intelligent creature is actually made a partaker of those divine attributes; or that God communicates his own attributes to us? Ans. No; but that God communicates to us certain powers or qualities that bear a resemblance to his own—that there is an analogy between those properties found in the intelligent creature, and those found in God.

113. Is there any resemblance of God's incommunicable attributes found in the intelligent creature? Ans. No: from the very nature of them, they can belong only to God. They can, by their very nature, admit of no degrees, and therefore no resemblance of them can be found in the creature.

114. Do the Scriptures represent that there is a resemblance of the communicable attributes of God found in man? Ans. Yes; by declaring that man was made in the image of God; Gen. i. 26:—that man, though fallen, has still the image of God; Gen. ix. 6;—that believers are renewed in the image of God; Col. iii. 10; which implies that there are in man some properties or powers which can be brought to bear that spiritual image;—and by the Scriptures calling some attributes in God, and properties of man, by the same name; as power, wisdom, justice, &c.

115. Do not all the communicable attributes of God partake of his incommunicable attributes? Ans. Yes; God possesses all his communicable attributes in an incommunicable manner; and in this respect, all his communicable attributes differ from those in man which, in any respect, resemble them.

‡ XVIII.—OF INCOMMUNICABLE ATTRIBUTES; AND PARTICULARLY OF INDEPENDENCE.

Quest. 116. What are the incommunicable attributes of God? Ans. Five are commonly enumerated; as, *Independence*, *Simplicity*, *Immutability*, *Eternity*, and *Immensity*. Or more briefly, *Infinity*, *Eternity*, and *Immutability*, which include *Independence*, *Simplicity*, and *Immensity*. Or still more briefly, *Infinity*; which is the comprehensive characteristic of all the divine attributes, and it includes all the others. But to follow our author.

117. What do we understand by the *Independence* of God? Ans. (1.) God's Self-sufficiency. (2.) The Supreme Cause of all things without himself—Therefore, he originated from none, and consequently, depends on no other, in any respect.

118. How prove God's *Self-sufficiency*? Ans. (1.) From direct Scriptures; Gen. xvii. 1, "God Almighty,"—which name implies

self-sufficiency; Exod. iii. 14,—self-existence implies it; Acts xvii. 25, “as though he needed,” &c. (2.) From his being the sole cause of all things; Neh. ix. 6; Rom. xi. 36, “For of him,” &c.

119. Is God’s independence a positive perfection? Ans. Yes; he is not merely not dependent, but he is absolutely and perfectly sufficient to his own being, happiness, and purposes.

120. Is it proper to say that God is *of himself*? Ans. No: (1.) Because nothing can be the cause of itself. (2.) It would be inconsistent with his immutability. (3.) It would be inconsistent with his necessary existence. (4.) No scripture asserts it; and therefore it is a rash and unwarrantable expression, casting no light on the nature of God, and uttering words without knowledge.

LECTURE XXII.—INDEPENDENCE AND SIMPLICITY OF GOD.

§ XIX. Quest. 121. Wherein is God *Independent*; or to what does his independence extend? Ans. As God’s independence is absolute and positive, so it extends to his *existence*, his *happiness*, his *faculties*, and *all his attributes*.

122. Would it consist with God’s independence to say that he can receive instruction, increase in knowledge, or be uncertain of any future event? Ans. No: any of these suppositions would make him dependent on creatures or events, and deny him to be the absolute First Cause of all things.

123. What is meant by *Scientia media*, or *middle knowledge*, which some have advocated? Ans. That of some future things God has no definite or infallible knowledge; or that, of these things, his knowledge is conditional, and the precise result is uncertain—an ignorance and a sinful denial of God’s perfection and independence. (*See on Knowledge.*)

124. Is God absolutely independent in his will? Ans. Yes.

125. What would be the evil of denying his independence of will? Ans. (1.) It would deny God to be the First Cause of all things. (2.) It would make creatures, in some respects, independent of him, and themselves the original source of some powers and actions. (3.) It would deny God to be the sole and sufficient ground of trust to his intelligent creatures.

126. Would it then consist with God’s independence to say that his will is conditional, antecedent or consequent? Ans. No.

127. What is meant by an antecedent or conditional will? Ans. A choice depending on future conditions or events.

128. What is a consequent will? Ans. A choice to which we are led or compelled by circumstances, arising in consequence of events.

129. What would be the error of asserting that God’s will is antecedent, conditional, or consequent? Ans. It would deny God’s independence, his infinite perfection, his being the First Cause of all things, the absolute dependence of the creature, and our warrant for an assured trust in God.

130. Does it then follow from God’s independence that his will

is absolute? Ans. Yes; it must be so, as all the supposed conditions are so many steps of accomplishing his will, which are absolutely under his control.

131. Is God's power absolutely independent? Ans. Yes.

132. Does it follow that God's power is absolutely inexhaustible, irresistible, and unlimited, as to objects? Ans. Yes: to hold that his power can be exhausted, resisted, or that it is limited as to objects, would be to deny God's independence, his perfections, and that he is the First Cause of all things; and it would ascribe to something else a superiority over God.

133. Do the Scriptures ascribe to God absolute and unlimited power? Ans. Yes; Jer. xxxii. 17, "There is nothing too hard for thee;" Matt. xix. 26.

134. How is God's power usually divided? Ans. Into *actual* and *absolute*.

135. What is meant by God's *actual* power? Ans. That which he actually puts forth, or exercises, in the things which take place; as Psal. cxv. 3.

136. What is meant by God's *absolute* power? Ans. God's power to do whatever he pleases, whether he does it or not; Matt. iii. 9. "Is able of these stones," &c.; so Matt. xxvi. 53.

137. Does God's absolute power extend to all possible things? Ans. Yes.

138. Is God's absolute power limited? Ans. No.

139. What is the true foundation of God's absolute power? Ans. His own independence or sufficiency.

140. But is not God's actual power, or the actual exercise of it, limited by his will and purpose? Ans. Yes; Psal. cxv. 3.

141. Are we warranted to believe that a thing will take place, merely because we know it to be possible, or an object of God's absolute power? Ans. No; because many possible things he will not do. We have no warrant to believe that a possible thing will be done, unless he make known to us, in some way, by word or work, his *will* that it shall be done.

§ XX.—142. Are there any things of which it may be said that God cannot do them? Ans. Yes.

143. Of what things, or classes of things may this be said? Ans. (1.) Anything which is contrary to his decrees he cannot do, Isa. xlvi. 10; Psal. xxxiii. 11. (2.) Anything contrary to his perfections he cannot do—as to deny himself; 2 Tim. ii. 13; to lie, or deceive; Heb. vi. 13; Tit. i. 2. (3.) To give infinity or incommunicable perfections to the creatures. (4.) To do things which are real contradictions; as that a thing should be, and not be at the same time.

144. Are these things limitations of divine power? Ans. No.

145. Why not? Ans. (1.) They are not objects of power at all, or true and real effects of power. (2.) Because it is owing to divine perfection that he cannot do them—as to break his purposes or deny himself.

146. Why could not God give infinity to the creature? Ans. To do so would be to destroy his own unity, and also his perfection.

147. Why could not God do things which imply a real contradiction? Ans. (1.) Because it would be an absurdity, and therefore not an object of power. (2.) It would imply a contradiction in himself, which cannot be.

‡ XXI.—OF DIVINE SIMPLICITY.

Quest. 148. What is the *Simplicity* of God? Ans. The perfect unity of essence and of attributes.

149. Is God compounded of parts as to his essence? Ans. No.

150. Are his faculties of intellect, will, and power, and his attributes of wisdom, justice, &c., not distinct component parts of his being? Ans. No; they are one with God himself—his essence possessing these faculties and attributes.

151. Is not the unity of God fully asserted in Scripture? Ans. Yes; as Deut. iv. 4; Eph. iv. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 5; Isa. xlv. 6.

152. How might it be proved from reason that there is but one God? Ans. (1.) The works of God prove that he must be perfect. (2.) Two or more Gods would plainly forbid the idea of absolute supremacy, and of infinite, unlimited power. (3.) If God were not one, his government could not be supreme or steadfast, nor uniformly tend to one end.

153. May we not suppose that the Gentiles, having once known the true God by revelation, and learning that he had many attributes, and falsely apprehending that these attributes were component parts of God, came to adopt the idea of many gods? Ans. Yes.

154. Did they not, nevertheless, generally admit that there was one supreme God? Ans. Yes; thus, if we acknowledge one God, and yet imagine his attributes to be component parts of God, and thus deny his simplicity, we may progress in error, till we believe in a God utterly imperfect, and unworthy of our worship.

155. Would it be a correct and sufficient idea of the unity of God, to believe that his essence was specifically one, while it might be numerically many? Ans. No: the essence is one numerically, as well as specifically.

156. Does the doctrine of the Trinity disagree with the doctrine of the Unity of God? Ans. No; he is one in essence, and three in person.

157. As there are three persons in one essence, are we to suppose that the essence of God is compounded of the three persons? Ans. No; the persons are three in person, but one in essence; and each person possesses the whole simple and undivided essence.

158. Are God's thoughts compounded of perception and judgment, or premises, judgment, and conclusion? Ans. No; these processes belong to imperfect and dependent creatures.

159. Is it any objection to these truths that we are incapable of comprehending such a mode of existence? Ans. No; as God is necessarily perfect and independent, so his mode of existence and his nature must be incomprehensible to us.

160. Is there not danger in imagining God to be like ourselves? Ans. Yes; and therefore our thoughts of him ought to be consistent with all that perfection which the Scriptures ascribe to him.

§ XXII.—Quest. 161. As we have seen that God is a being of perfect simplicity and unity of essence, is this true of him physically, logically, and metaphysically? Ans. Yes.

162. What do we mean by his simplicity *physically*? Ans. That he is without composition of integral parts, such as of matter and form, or composition of powers or attributes.

163. What do we mean by his simplicity *logically*? Ans. That God is without genus and specific difference, and that he is not compounded of subject and accident, or subject and quality.

164. What do we mean by his simplicity *metaphysically*? Ans. That he is not compounded of acts and power, or of essence and existence. His essence and existence are one.

165. How does this perfect simplicity of God appear? Ans. (1.) From the unity of God and of all his perfections. (2.) From his independence, which the supposition of composition denies. (3.) From his perfection, admitting of no addition. (4.) From his eternity and immutability.

166. Is this view of God merely a metaphysical conclusion; or does the Holy Scripture sustain it? Ans. Holy Scripture sustains it; as when it attributes perfections to God in the abstract, and not as qualities, or simply as perfections of his nature; as 1 John i. 5, "God is Light;" John iv. 8, "God is Love;" 1 Sam. xv. 29, "Strength of Israel;" &c.; and the name *Jehovah* signifies the same—the simplicity of God.

167. It is objected, against the simplicity of God, that the persons of the Trinity are distinguished from the essence? Ans. The persons do not compose the essence of God. Personality is a mode of existence. The distinction is not of things, but of modes in the same essence. The persons do not differ in essence, or from the essence.

168. Obj. 2. That the decrees of God are many, implying that God is not perfectly simple? Ans. God's decrees are many, as to objects and effects, but not as acts of the divine mind. In God, all these decrees are one act. Therefore, as objects or effects, the decrees are rather *from* God, than God himself.

169. Obj. 3. There are many distinct attributes in God? Ans. All divine attributes are one divine perfection. They cannot be separated from one another, even in our minds, although, through our weakness, we must consider them distinctly, according to their objects and effects.

§ XXIII.—Quest. 170. Can any part of the divine essence be communicated to the creature? Ans. No.

171. Why not? Ans. On account of his simplicity.

172. Though man was made in the image of God, was any part of the divine essence communicated to him? Ans. No; he was created; and therefore, a different essence from God, though created in a resemblance of God.

173. Are even the two natures in the person of Christ compounded into one essence? Ans. No; the infinite essence of God cannot be one essence or substance with a created essence.

LECTURE XXIII.—IMMUTABILITY, IMMENSITY, AND ETERNITY OF GOD.

§ XXIV.—Quest. 174. What is the *Immutability* of God? Ans. His absolute constancy, or sameness, in himself, and freedom from all actual or possible change.

175. From what does his immutability flow? Ans. From his *simplicity* and *infinite perfection*.

176. How does it flow from his simplicity? Ans. What is perfectly simple must either wholly remain, or be wholly taken away. God's existence and essence must, therefore, be unchangeable.

177. How does it flow from his infinite perfection? Ans. Any change must be either for the better, or for the worse, and infinite perfection must necessarily exclude both.

178. Is God's immutability, then, a necessary and essential perfection? Ans. Yes.

179. Do the Scriptures also assert this perfection of God? Ans. Yes; Mal. iii. 6; Jas. i. 17; Psa. cii. 27.

180. Does God's immutability apply to his *understanding and will*, as well as to his essence? Ans. Yes.

181. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Because his understanding and will do not differ from his essence. (2.) Because a change in understanding or will would necessarily imply imperfection and dependence, ignorance and weakness; and it would deny his self-sufficiency.

182. Does immutability apply to all God's perfections? Ans. Yes; because all his perfections are himself; they are not different from his essence.

183. Does the immutability of God apply to his *word* also? Ans. Yes.

184. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From Scripture; Psa. cxix. 89, 90, 152, 160. (2.) Because of his infinite perfection of truth and knowledge. (3.) Because of his immutability in himself, and his independence. He has no need to change.

185. Is God a subject of affections or passions? Ans. No; these would be changes in God, which are impossible. Affections and passions cannot occur but from weakness and dependence. The subject of them must suffer from the influence of things without him.

186. How then are we to understand such Scripture expressions as ascribe to God affections of anger, joy, repentance, &c.? Ans. (1.) As describing the nature of God in language adapted to man, while all the weakness which belongs to creatures must be excluded. (2.) As describing God's dispensations, flowing from his immutable perfections, and such as would be expected from such affections in man.

187. Are we then to suppose that, because God is not the subject of passions, he is therefore indifferent? Ans. No: but the in-

terest which he takes in things, described by love, joy, anger, &c., is perfect, and of an infinitely higher order than our passions and feelings: an interest which is real, but above our comprehension.

§ XXV.—Quest. 188. What is the *immensity* of God? Ans. That he is not bounded by any measure of things created, or that might be created.

189. What is the *Omnipresence* of God? Ans. It is God's ubiquity, or his presence at all times with all his creatures.

190. What is the difference between the immensity and the omnipresence of God? Ans. (1.) There is no difference between these perfections in God himself; but omnipresence means his presence as far as creation extends. Immensity means that he infinitely exceeds its limits. (2.) Therefore, immensity includes the omnipresence of God, and applies to him before creation.

191. Is it only the knowledge and operations of God that are omnipresent, or also his essence? Ans. His essence also is omnipresent or immense.

192. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From Scripture; Jer. xxiii. 23, 24; Psa. cxxxix. 7—9; Acts xvii. 27; which texts represent God himself, and not merely his knowledge and operations, as every where, at all times. (2.) Divine knowledge and operations are inseparable from the divine essence. (By *operations* we here mean, not effects, but God operating.) (3.) The texts quoted warrant us to infer, from God's operations, that he is himself present.

193. Is the Scripture representation of God being in heaven inconsistent with the doctrine of his omnipresence or immensity? Ans. No; because he is represented, at the same time, as on earth; Isa. lxvi. 1.

194. What is meant by representing God as in heaven, seeing he is equally everywhere present, and at all times? Ans. (1.) Because heaven is the place where he gives the special manifestation of his presence and glory. (2.) Because there he places holy angels and glorified saints, as their home. (3.) Because Christ is there, in human nature, from whose throne all blessings are dispensed, and all government proceeds.

195. Is God's special presence, in Christ, with saints on earth or in heaven, or his presence in ordinances, inconsistent with his immensity? Ans. No; (1.) That special presence of God, with Christ or his people, is a peculiar mode of his presence—his presence for special purposes—which he does not extend to all creatures, and which does not deny the immensity of his essential presence. (2.) This special presence of God with the blessed in heaven, and with all his saints on earth, necessarily implies his essential immensity; as that special presence could not be granted unless God were essentially immense.

196. Is not the objection that God's omnipresence would expose him to defilement by the creatures, silly and absurd? Ans. Yes; because he is a Spirit, holy, and perfectly distinct from all other beings; and because he upholds and sustains all things, and can be mixed with none.

197. Is not the doctrine of God's omnipresence necessary to godliness? Ans. Yes.

198. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) To restrain men from sin; Jer. xxiii. 23, 24. (2.) When men indulge in sin, they endeavour to persuade themselves that God is not present, nor a witness; Ezek. viii. 12; ix. 9. (3.) The doctrine is necessary to the support of faith and comfort in God's people.

§ XXVI.—Quest. 199. Does the immensity of God mean the extension of his essence? Ans. No; extension is utterly inapplicable to God.

200. Why so? Ans. Extension would imply that God is material, capable of being divided—a part in one place, and part in another.

201. Is then the divine essence wholly everywhere, at all times? Ans. Yes; otherwise he would be extended.

202. Can one thing, which is capable of extension, be in the same place with another, at the same time? Ans. No.

203. Can a part of a body, or of anything capable of extension, be in the same place with parts of other bodies, at the same time? Ans. No.

204. But is not God wholly present in the same place where extended bodies are, and at the same time? Ans. Yes.

205. Is it proper to say that God pervades all things—meaning that he flows through or among the particles of bodies? Ans. No; this, a created subtle fluid may do, (as caloric) and yet is not in the place of the particles.

206. Yet may it not be justly said of God, as of material things and created spirits, that he is in a place? Ans. Yes; since he fills all places.

207. How might the presence of God, of created spirits, and of material things, in a place, be discriminated and defined? Ans. (1.) Material things occupy a place as circumscribed by measures and bounds, excluding other *material* things from the same bounds at the same time. (2.) Finite spirits, being intangible, are in a defined place, and not elsewhere, at the same time. (3.) God fills any place, and all places, at the same time, not by pervading other beings, which would not be filling the place, but by occupying and filling the place, and yet not excluding other beings by his presence.

§ XXVII.—Quest. 208. Can any creature, then, be omnipresent? Ans. No.

209. Seeing that omnipresence refers to created things, what would be the error of asserting that the world, taken as an aggregate of all creation, is omnipresent? Ans. (1.) Omnipresence signifies that the whole being is everywhere present at the same time; whereas the world is, on this supposition, everywhere only by parts—one part here and another there. (2.) The world is one, only by aggregation; and could not be wholly everywhere.

§ XXVIII.—Quest. 210. Although God is not extended through every place, yet does he not coexist with every place? Ans. Yes: he is *in* every place, and wholly in every place, and therefore not extended, which is a property belonging to matter.

211. Does God fill all space to infinity? Ans. Yes; that is, his immensity fills all space, beyond the bounds of creation.

212. How does this appear? Ans. Because he is not bounded or limited by the boundaries of the world; 1 Kings viii. 27.

213. As God existed in himself, before the creation, so does he not exist beyond the boundaries of the creation? Ans. Yes; and this is the same as to say that he fills all space.

§ XXIX.—Quest. 214. Is absolute *Eternity* an attribute of God? Ans. Yes.

215. What are we to understand by God's eternity? Ans. (1.) He is perfectly distinct from time. (2.) He is absolutely without beginning, end, or succession.

216. Do not the Scriptures uniformly assert God's eternity? Ans. Yes; as Isa. xl. 28, "the everlasting God," or God of eternity.

217. Wherein does the eternity of God differ from that of angels and of men? Ans. (1.) God is from eternity; they are not; Psa. xc. 2. (2.) His eternity is independent and necessary; theirs is dependent. (3.) Their eternity is carried on by succession; God's eternity is without succession of time.

§ XXX.—218. How does it appear that God's eternity is without succession? Ans. (1.) From Scripture; as 2 Pet. iii. 8, "a thousand years," &c.—not that they *seem*, but that they *are* as one day; so Psa. xc. 4; cii. 26, 27, "thou endurest," &c.—"thou art the same," &c. (2.) Because a succession would be a continued transition from an end to a beginning, and would be a continued change in God.

219. Obj. (1.) That differences of time are ascribed to God; Rev. i. 4, "who is, who was, and who is to come." How answer? Ans. This expression does not ascribe succession to God, but co-existence with the changes of time; and here he speaks of himself after the manner of men. Besides, the expression is a Greek method of pronouncing the name *Jehovah*, which signifies self-existence, from eternity to eternity.

220. Obj. (2.) That God's co-existence with time must be the same as succession of time in him? Ans. It is not the same. Since time progresses by succession, God must co-exist with it, though he has no succession, and might be compared to a stationary point in the centre of a circle, which co-exists with the motion of a body on the circumference, without motion itself.

221. Obj. (3.) That the moments of time are confounded with one another, by God's co-existence with them? Ans. They are not. God's eternity comprehends them, while these moments do not measure God's eternity.

222. Obj. (4.) That we cannot conceive of a being existing without successive moments? Ans. There are many things in God beyond our conceptions, and yet clearly true. As we exist by succession of moments, it is reasonable that we could not form a distinct conception of God's existence, which is absolutely eternal and unchangeable.

§ XXXI.—223. Does proper eternity belong to God alone?
 Ans. Yes; an absolute and an independent eternity, excluding succession of time, can belong to God only.

224. When did time take its beginning? Ans. With creation. Created things began to measure time, and to become old.

225. Could anything have been created in eternity? Ans. No; time would have begun with creation, or the thing produced would have been itself eternal, and therefore necessary and independent, which would be contradictory and impossible. Creation is a beginning, and not eternal.

226. Would the same objection apply to the eternal generation of the Son of God? Ans. No; because no new essence or being then came into existence. The personality of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, is of the same incomprehensible eternity as the essence of God. The mode of subsistence of God in the Trinity is co-eternal with his existence.

227. Could the decrees of God be eternal, when no new existences could take place in eternity? Ans. Yes; because the decrees are not new existences; as they are in God, they are not different from himself, and therefore co-eternal.

§ XXXII. *Of Communicable Attributes.*—According to our Author, *Intellect, Will, and Power*, are faculties in God; (§ XVI.) Besides these, he enumerates, as attributes, three, *knowledge, goodness and justice*. This arrangement we may follow, after remarking, (1.) *Attribute* signifies something ascribed or attributed to God. (2.) Therefore, not only independence, simplicity, immutability, immensity, and eternity, but also being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth are attributed to God. (3.) Of these, some are incommunicable and some are communicable. But of whatever attribute of God man possesses a resemblance, that attribute is possessed by God in an incommunicable manner. Thus every communicable attribute is in God an infinite, eternal, and immutable attribute; and these characteristics of his attributes are incommunicable. (4.) Therefore, we judge that a more simple division would be, to treat the faculties of understanding, will, and power, as well as knowledge, goodness, and justice, as attributes. But, for the present, we shall follow the arrangement of our Author. And first of *knowledge*.

228. Is not this attribute called by various names in Scripture? Ans. Yes; as *knowledge, wisdom, understanding*.

229. Is not Christ himself called *Wisdom and Understanding*? Ans. Yes; as Prov. viii. 1, 14.

230. Are not God's *favour, love, and care*, called *knowledge*? Ans. Yes; as Psa. i. 6; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Matt. vii. 23. But we here take it in its ordinary sense, as an attribute.

231. Is knowledge or wisdom, ascribed to God in Scripture? Ans. Yes; as 1 Sam. ii. 3; Psa. cxlvii. 5; Rom. xi. 33.

232. How may this attribute in God be defined? Ans. The definition includes the following things; (1.) God knows all things absolutely. (2.) He knows them perfectly. (3.) He knows them

in himself, independently. (4.) He knows them by one eternal act. His knowledge is always the same.

LECTURE XXIV.—GOD'S KNOWLEDGE.

§ XXXIII.—233. Is God's knowledge an *act*, rather than a *habit*?
Ans. Yes.

234. Why call it an *act*? Ans. (1.) Because it is active, not passive, or received, or acquired knowledge. (2.) It is independent of things without him. It is dependent on himself.

235. Why define it as *one act*? Ans. Because of God's immutability and eternity. He is always the same, and so is his knowledge.

236. Is God's knowledge a *simple act*? Ans. Yes; most perfectly simple.

237. Why call it *simple*? Ans. (1.) Because it is not obtained by reasoning or reflection. This would imply ignorance, imperfection, and dependence. (2.) It is not successive, which would imply imperfection and change.

238. Does not God sometimes ascribe to himself reasoning, and the acquisition of knowledge? Ans. Yes; as Gen. xviii. 21.

239. How understand such representations consistently with God's immutability and perfection? Ans. He speaks after the manner of men, to show that his judgments are reasonable—to show us the reasonableness of them, and the connexion of things.

240. Is God's knowledge always the same? Ans. Yes.

241. How does this appear? Ans. From his perfection; from his independence and immutability.

242. Is God's knowledge, therefore, eternal? Ans. Yes; as appears. (1.) From Scripture; as Acts xv. 18; Psal. cxxxix. 2. (2.) From his necessary perfections of independence and immutability.

243. Is it any objection to the eternity of God's knowledge, that he represents himself as acquiring knowledge by facts; as Gen. xxii. 12, "Now I know that thou fearest God?" Ans. No; because he presents the evidence as man would perceive it—what would be proof to man—and for our instruction.

244. Is God's knowledge entirely of himself, and independent? Ans. Yes.

245. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From Scripture; as Isa. xl. 13, 14. (2.) Because all things are of his own will and dependent on him. (3.) Because all things are of his operation; Eph. i. 11.

246. How does God know all things; or what is the source of his knowledge? Ans. By his nature and self-sufficiency, and by his will, purpose, and operation. There can be no other source, because he is independent, and because all future things depend on his will, purpose, and operation.

247. What is the character of his knowledge? Ans. It is most perfect.

248. What characteristics are included in this? Ans. (1.) His

knowledge is infinite and perfectly minute. (2.) Because of its source, it is infallible, and cannot err. (3.) It is full and adequate. (4.) It is immutable. (5.) It is immediate and present; Heb. iv. 13.

§ XXXIV.—249. How prove that God knows all things? Ans. (1.) From Scripture; John xxi. 17; Heb. iv. 13; 1 John iii. 20. (2.) All things are of God's own will and purpose, and he created and upholds them.

250. How does it appear that God knows himself? Ans. (1.) From Scripture; Matt. xi. 27. (2.) His own blessedness requires it. (3.) The revelation made of himself proves it.

251. Does God know all possible things, as well as those that do and shall occur? Ans. Yes.

252. How does he know them? Ans. By his self-sufficiency and independence.

253. What kind of knowledge has God of all creatures? Ans. He knows them all universally and individually; and universally not by abstraction, but individually, minutely, and perfectly, as they are.

254. How does it appear that he knows the smallest as well as the greatest? Ans. (1.) From Scripture; Matt. x. 30. (2.) As he created all, and supports and governs them, he must know them; and the smallest are instruments in his government of the world.

255. Does God know even the secret thoughts of the heart? Ans. Yes; 1 Kings viii. 39; Ezek. xi. 5; Job xlii. 2; Psa. cxxxix. 2; Acts i. 24.

256. Are all free and contingent things perfectly known to God? Ans. Yes.

257. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From Scripture; Psa. cxxxix. 2—4. (2.) His predictions prove it; as 1 Kings xxii. 17, 34. (3.) These things belong to God's government of the world.

258. Obj. (1.) God is represented as disappointed in his expectations; Isa. v. 4; and as repenting of what he had done; Gen. vi. 6, 7. How answer? Ans. (1.) We are to understand him as speaking after the manner of men, in order to show the heinousness of man's sin, and the reasonableness of his judgments. (2.) To represent the change of his dispensations.

259. Are such contingent events, though contingent to man, undetermined by God? Ans. No; as is proved by the fulfilment of predictions.

260. Does God's absolute and infallible knowledge take away liberty? Ans. No; There is indeed a necessity of consequence, but not of compulsion. The necessity which God has imposed does not take away the free and contingent manner of the existence of things, and the operation of second causes.

261. Are not the perfection and immutability of God's foreknowledge perfectly consistent with his own perfect liberty? Ans. Yes; and also with ours, leaving us to act on our choice.

§ XXXV.—262. How is the knowledge of God usually di-

vided? Ans. Into the knowledge of *vision*, and of *simple intelligence*.

263. What is the knowledge of *vision*? Ans. The knowledge of future, past, and present things which depend on the will of God. It is otherwise called *free* knowledge.

264. Why called *free*? Ans. Because those objects of knowledge are not matters of necessity, but matters of will or choice.

265. What is God's knowledge of *simple intelligence*? Ans. His knowledge of necessary things; as of himself, and of his nature and perfections, and of things merely possible, which, as merely possible, do not depend on the will or decree of God, but on his nature. This knowledge is otherwise called natural.

266. Why called *natural*? Ans. Because it is a knowledge of things which are in their nature necessary, and not dependent on the will of God, but on his nature.

267. Do all things, as some hold, depend on, or take their existence from the divine will? Ans. No; things existing by the necessity of the divine nature do not.

268. What are some of those things that exist by the necessity of the divine nature? Ans. God's existence, his attributes, all eternal, and necessary truths, and the goodness of several divine commands.

269. What would be the consequences of the doctrine that all things absolutely flow from the divine will? Ans. (1.) That God himself, his nature, and his attributes, are the effects of his will. (2.) That his will pre-existed, as the cause of himself. (3.) That he might or might not exist, or possess his nature or attributes, according to his will. (4.) That nothing exists by necessity. (5.) That God and his will are different existences.

270. Does not this division of God's knowledge refer rather to the distinction of its objects, than to the distinction of his knowledge? Ans. Yes.

271. Are not all the objects of God's knowledge, of either class, equally sure to him? Ans. Yes.

272. Must not every object of God's free knowledge, or knowledge of vision, infallibly take place? Ans. Yes.

273. But is it his knowledge, or his decree and will, that makes their occurrence necessary? Ans. God's decree, and will. On this his knowledge is founded.

274. Is there not at least an apparent inconsistency between God's absolute foreknowledge or decree, and the contingency and liberty of second causes? Ans. Yes; but it is only apparent, for his decree provided for their liberty of action.

275. Is there any such thing as contingency with God, implying uncertainty? Ans. No; it is uncertainty only to man.

276. What are we to understand by contingent things? Ans. (1.) Things uncertain to us. (2.) That there is no connexion between one event and another, by necessity of nature, or by established order, but arising entirely from the divine will, operating by or without second causes.

§ XXXVI.—277. What theory about God's knowledge of future things has been invented by Papists, and embraced by Arminians, to reconcile God's knowledge with liberty and the contingency of second causes? Ans. *Scientia media*, a middle or conditional knowledge. (Which means that, of some future things, God has no definite or infallible knowledge—that he has no decree determining their certainty—but a conditional decree, leaving the precise result uncertain.)

278. What errors does this theory involve? Ans. Many; as, (1.) That God is dependent on events for knowledge, purpose, and operation. (2.) That either creatures, or laws of nature, are independent of God, and that he is subject to them. (3.) That God is not the Author or First Cause of all things, nor the absolute Sovereign. Second causes would be the first, and God only the second cause. (4.) That we cannot have full confidence in his power or promise.

279. How may it be further proved that this doctrine of *middle* knowledge is false? Ans. (1.) The thing is either *certainly* future in God's view, in which case it is God's knowledge of *vision*, according to his purposes, which we hold as true, or certainly future by an intrinsic necessity in things, or *fatal* connexion between second causes and their effects, to which God is himself subject, which we deny, as contrary to the independence of God. Or, (2.) It is doubtfully future, representing God's knowledge as merely conjectural, which profanely denies God to be the Independent, or First Cause, and his will and purposes to be the cause of future events. Or, (3.) This doctrine represents all these supposed uncertain and conditionally future things, as in God's sight merely possible; all which, however, God necessarily knows, whether they will occur or not. And (4.) If they are not future, but are merely possible things, God then knows them by his *simple intelligence*, which knowledge depends on his self-sufficiency and independence.

280. Is there any need of such an absurd doctrine, in order to maintain the liberty or contingency of second causes? Ans. No.

281. Does either the infallible knowledge or absolute decree of God take away that liberty of the intelligent creature which is necessary to his moral obligation, or to his happiness? Ans. No; for everything shall infallibly take place according to the divine decree and foreknowledge: second causes will, by decree, operate accordingly. We feel no constraint on our will, nor any doubt that second causes will operate according to their nature.

§ XXXVII.—282. Obj. (1.) Against infallible and absolute foreknowledge of all things, and in favour of conditional and uncertain knowledge, That several passages of Scripture represent God as acting or speaking from conditional knowledge; as 1 Sam. xxiii. 11, 12, David in Keilah; Ezek. iii. 6, 7, "Had I sent thee to them, they would have hearkened;" Matt. xi. 21, "They would have repented long ago, in dust and ashes." How answer? Ans. In reference to these and all such passages, observe, (1.) God knows not only what will actually occur, according to his decrees, but

also all possible things. (2.) He knows what mode and connexions of things he has established by his will and decree, and what are the necessary connexions of things, in those which he has determined shall not come to pass, as well as all the means, causes, circumstances, and consequences of what he has determined shall come to pass. (3.) All these he knows infallibly and absolutely, with all their causes, means, and effects, by his nature and perfection, and by his absolute decree, as the Independent First Cause of all things. And, therefore, (4.) He may speak of a conditional event without any uncertainty, or any dependence on uncertain conditions; because he has absolutely determined those conditions, while, at the time of speaking, he has not revealed them to man. Therefore, in such cases, he declares the possibility of the event, and the connexion which he has established between cause and effect.

283. May not God assert the possibility of an event, and the established connexion of things, without asserting the futurity of that event, and without implying any uncertainty with him? Ans. Yes.

284. What is God's design in making these conditional expressions? Ans. To lead men to prudent action, according to the established order of things; as 1 Sam. xxiii. 11, 12; to make men's duty or sin plain, by showing its circumstances and connexions.

285. Is the extent of the divine knowledge, (reaching to all things) any argument for a conditional knowledge in God? Ans. No; so far from it, this truth, of God's universal knowledge, utterly condemns the idea of its conditionality.

NOTE. The only appearance of an argument on this ground, is by assuming what we cannot admit, viz., that God knows future things independently of his decree, or that he knows the independent power of second causes, which is not true, nor are they the objects of divine knowledge.

286. Obj. (3.) That the wisdom of God's decrees requires the antecedent knowledge of the sufficiency of the means? Ans. (1.) With dependent man, it is his wisdom to see that the means of effecting his purpose are sufficient, before he determines; but the means and their sufficiency, in accomplishing the divine decrees, depend on the power and will of God. (2.) The objection assumes that God is dependent, like the creature.

[The 4th objection has been already noticed, Quest. 281. Section 38, has also been considered, Quest. 273.]

LECTURE XXV.—GOD'S GOODNESS AND JUSTICE.

§ XXXIX.—287. Is goodness an essential attribute of God? Ans. Yes; Matt. xix. 17.

288. Is not his goodness, then, infinite, and without limitation and degrees? Ans. Yes.

289. Should we not then distinguish between God's goodness as his essential perfection, and the exercise or effects of his goodness to his creatures? Ans. Yes; because his exercise of it is limited

and directed by his sovereign will towards his various creatures, both in manner and degree; Ps. lxxiii. 1.

290. How is this distinction usually denominated? Ans. As his *absolute* and *relative* goodness.

291. What is his absolute goodness? Ans. It is the essential goodness of his nature, and is comprehensive of all his perfections, whereby he is the proper object of love and admiration, to all holy intelligences, and their all-sufficient Portion.

292. What is his *relative* goodness? Ans. His goodness as it relates to his creatures; (1.) In the propensity of his nature to do them good. (2.) And in the actual manifestation of his goodness to them in the communication of blessings.

293. Does not the goodness of God, as spoken of in the Scriptures, sometimes mean his loveliness in the eyes of his intelligent creatures? Ans. Yes; as Ps. iv. 6, 7; lxxiii. 25, 26; Song v. 16.

294. In what sense do we understand the goodness of God as a distinct attribute? Ans. Not his absolute goodness, as comprehensive of all his perfections, nor his loveliness to his people, so properly, as his *benignity* or *kindness*, by which he does good to his creatures, and shows himself lovely to them.

295. Is the love of God an exercise of his goodness? Ans. Yes.

296. Is the love which is between the persons of the Trinity an exercise of God's goodness? Ans. Yes; Prov. viii. 30; Matt. iii. 17. This is natural and necessary, but not the love of which we speak.

297. Is the love which God exercises towards his creatures essential and necessary; or is it voluntary? Ans. It is voluntary; Matt. v. 45; John iii. 16; Rom. ix. 15, 18.

298. Is not the love and goodness which God exercises towards his various creatures, various in its exercises towards them, both in manner and degree? Ans. Yes; as to beasts and men, in general; Ps. xxxvi. 6; to wicked men, or men in state of nature; Matt. v. 45; John iii. 16; and to the elect; 2 Chr. xxx. 18; Ps. lxxiii. 1.

299. Yet is not the benignity or goodness which is in God, and which shows itself voluntarily towards his creatures, an essential or necessary perfection of his nature? Ans. Yes; 1 John iv. 8. The goodness is essential and necessary, but the manifestation of it is voluntary.

300. How is the love of God towards his creatures usually distinguished? Ans. Into the love of *benevolence*, and the love of *complacency*.

301. Which of these is first in order? Ans. The love of benevolence.

302. What is God's love of benevolence? Ans. His good-will, kindness, delight in blessing, &c.

303. When benevolence is exercised by God towards his creatures, in time, bestowing benefits, what is it called? Ans. Beneficence, or doing good.

304. What is God's love of complacency? Ans. It is his taking pleasure in a person; Ps. cxlvii. 11; Prov. viii. 17.

305. May there be a love of benevolence exercised by God towards his creatures, without the love of complacency? Ans. Yes; Matt. v. 45.

306. But does God ever exercise a love of complacency without the love of benevolence towards the same person? Ans. No; Benevolence is always commensurate with the love of complacency.

307. Does God ever love man with a love of complacency till possessed of his image? Ans. No; Prov. viii. 17; John xvi. 27; Ps. cxlvii. 11.

308. Does this warrant us to say that the image of God in us is the cause of God's love of complacency? Ans. No; the image of God in his people is the object of his complacency, but not the cause of it. It is the consequence of his love of benevolence, and the evidence of his complacency; and such passages as Prov. viii. 17, John xvi. 27, show who are the objects of God's complacent love, but not the cause of it.

309. Does the essential benignity or goodness of God lead him to take pleasure in the happiness of his creatures, and to take no pleasure in their misery? Ans. Yes; 1 John iv. 8; Ezek. xviii. 23, 32; xxxiii. 11.

§ XL.—310. Does *grace* emanate from the goodness of God? Ans. Yes.

311. What is *grace*? Ans. Favour to the unworthy.

312. Does it belong to the very essence of grace that it is *free*? Ans. Yes.

313. Is the exercise of God's grace necessary, or voluntary? Ans. Voluntary.

314. Does not grace, in Scripture, sometimes signify gracious dispositions bestowed? Ans. Yes; 2 Peter iii. 18; Heb. xii. 28.

315. Why is it called *grace*? Ans. Because it is the gift of grace.

316. Is not grace in God bestowing, the most proper sense of the word? Ans. Yes; and on the subject of the divine goodness, it is in this sense we use it.

317. Is it proper to say that grace in us makes us acceptable to God? Ans. No; grace in us is pleasing to God, but it is the fruit of that grace of God which makes us acceptable in Christ. It is God's grace in Christ uniting us to him and imputing his righteousness to us, which makes us acceptable; Eph. i. 6.

318. How may grace be further divided? Ans. (1.) Into *internal*, or grace bestowed and infused into the heart; and *external*, divine grace furnishing means of grace to the elect and reprobate. (2.) *Common* grace, which is God's kindness to sinners, without saving mercy, and not in Christ; and *saving* grace, given in Christ, and effectual to salvation. (3.) *Preventing* grace, either common—preserving the sinner from gross sins, or saving—bestowing grace before he seeks it, as in regeneration; and *co-operating* grace, as—

sisting and increasing that grace which is already given; and *subsequent* grace, following regeneration, and grace answering to grace before given.

319. The Arminians distinguish grace into *sufficient* and *efficacious*. What do they mean by *sufficient* grace? Ans. (1.) They mean by it grace sufficient to salvation if rightly improved by the sinner. (2.) That sufficient grace is universally given to all men.

320. Is there any real difference between sufficient and efficacious grace? Ans. No; for if sufficient, it is efficacious; if not efficacious, it is not sufficient to overcome the depravity and enmity of the heart.

321. Is there any such thing as universal grace given to man? Ans. No: the idea was invented, as necessary, as some supposed, to justify God in commanding duty, and in damning the wicked,—a device of man. None have any grace but what is given of God, and when given, it is always efficacious.

322. What is *particular* grace? Ans. Saving grace in Christ bestowed on the church.

323. How manifold is this grace; or wherein is it exercised? Ans. Threefold; as exercised in election, in eternity; in redemption by Christ on earth; and in effectual calling and sanctification of the elect.

324. May not every favour bestowed by God on man be, in a large sense, called grace? Ans. Yes; as it flows from the goodness of God to unworthy man.

§ XLI.—325. Does the goodness of God exercise itself in a way of *mercy* to man? Ans. Yes.

326. What is *mercy*? Ans. The same as grace, only it is so called in reference to misery, or as relieving misery.

327. Is the grace of God called by this name? Ans. Yes; as Ex. xxxiv. 6; Heb. iv. 16.

328. Is not God's goodness to the reprobate in this life justly called *mercy*? Ans. Yes; Luke vi. 35, 36; but the term is most properly used in reference to his goodness as exercised in salvation to the elect.

329. Is it proper to say that misery is the cause of mercy? Ans. No; misery is the object of mercy, and an occasion of its exercise, but divine goodness alone is the cause.

§ XLII.—330. Is God's *patience*, or long-suffering, an exercise of divine goodness? Ans. Yes; Ex. xxxiv. 6.

331. Is God's patience with the sinner inconsistent with justice, or a dereliction of it? Ans. No; delay of punishment is not the remission of it.

332. Is patience exercised towards both the elect and reprobate? Ans. Yes.

333. Why to the elect? Ans. To bring to repentance and salvation.

334. Why to the reprobate? Ans. As a temporary favour,—as a means of repentance—and to render them inexcusable; Rom. ii. 4, 5.

335. What is meant by the long-suffering of God under the Old Testament, mentioned Rom. iii. 25? Ans. Bearing with sin till satisfaction should actually be made by Christ.

§ XLIII.—336. How is the *justice* of God divided? Ans. Into *divine, governmental, and judicial*. (Under the head of *justice*, our author includes *holiness and truth*.)

337. How may it otherwise be divided? Ans. Into *universal* and *particular*, and into *absolute* and *relative* justice.

338. What is God's *divine* justice? Ans. (1.) It is that which he has in himself, or which belongs to him as God, and is the perfection of his nature. (2.) It is the same with his *holiness*. (3.) It makes his own glory the invariable end of all his procedure; Isa. xlii. 8.

339. Are not God's *divine*, his *universal*, and his *absolute* justice the same? Ans. Yes; they are different names for the same thing.

340. Is the *holiness* of God called *righteousness* or *justice*? Ans. Yes; John xvii. 11, 25; yet the one name refers more immediately to his purity, and the other to his rectitude, or equity.

341. What is the *holiness* of God? Ans. (1.) It is his infinite distance from all sin or unrighteousness, in his nature or works. (2.) It includes also his infinite love to all righteousness, and to every determination of his will which is necessarily right.

342. Is then the holiness of God something more than negative; or more than freedom from sin? Ans. Yes; it is the positive perfection of his nature, and includes an infinite abhorrence of all sin.

343. Is God necessarily holy and just? Ans. Yes; as appears from Isa. vi. 3; Rev. xv. 4.

344. Does God put any peculiar honour on his holiness? Ans. Yes; he swears by it; Ps. lxxxix. 35.

345. Is not the holiness of God a special characteristic of all his perfections? Ans. Yes; and all his works; Ps. cxlv. 17.

346. Does not God's universal or absolute justice include the manifestation of it in his word and works? Ans. Yes; the justice of his nature shows itself in his words and actions.

347. Does the absolute righteousness or justice of God include *truth* in his word? Ans. Yes.

348. Is not God's exercise of justice in word and works what may be called his *governmental* justice? Ans. Yes.

349. What is God's *truth*? Ans. It is that essential perfection of his nature by which he is infallibly true in all that he declares, and will infallibly fulfil all that he promises or threatens.

350. Does not the truth of God imply all his perfections? Ans. Yes; as, (1.) His knowledge or wisdom, to perfectly understand the matter of his communications. (2.) His power to accomplish what he says. (3.) His holiness and justice, to promise or threaten nothing but what is right, and to execute what he has said. (4.) His immutability; Job xxiii. 13, "He is in one mind," &c.

351. What is God's truth called, in reference to his declarations? Ans. His *veracity*; Rom. iii. 4; Tit. i. 2.

352. What is it called, in reference to his threatenings, and especially his promises? Ans. His *faithfulness*; Heb. x. 23.

353. Although some object that God is said to repent, (which we noticed before, Quest. 186,) and that some threatenings are not fulfilled, (as against Nineveh;) and although from such circumstances many will not believe that we have ground of firm confidence that all his threatenings and promises will be fulfilled; yet did God ever make a threatening or a promise which has failed, or will fail of its accomplishment in its true sense? Ans. No; because, (1.) The promise or threatening, which the objectors say God has not fulfilled, was conditional—the condition being either expressed or implied. (2.) The truth of a conditional promise is not that the condition shall occur, but that there is such a connexion between the condition and the event suspended on it as the promise implies.

NOTE.—When the promise or threatening includes and secures the occurrence of all those things or conditions on which the fulfilment depends, then it is an absolute promise, and will assuredly be fulfilled. But if the promise or threatening does not include or secure the condition, truth is not impaired if the condition do not take place, nor the consequent which was expressed.

354. How does the justice of God show itself in his commands? Ans. (1.) In commanding always what is right and agreeable to his own holy will, which is always agreeable to his nature, and is, therefore, the immutable rule of right. (2.) In commanding what is suitable to the constitution and circumstances of his accountable creatures; for his nature requires this. (3.) In sustaining the authority and obligation of these commands by his providence.

355. But does not God sometimes dispense with some of his commands? Ans. Yes; as in the case of Abraham, who was commanded to offer Isaac, contrary to the sixth commandment; in the case of labour on the Sabbath, &c.

356. How is the immutable righteousness of God sustained in thus commanding and countermanding? Ans. (1.) Those commands which result from the nature of God, he never countermands; that is, such as his nature requires, which are necessarily unchangeable; as to love and fear God, to obey him, hate sin, &c. (2.) But those commands which are founded only on the positive determinations of his will, he can dispense with, in perfect holiness and justice, when occasion requires it; because, although his will does not change, yet his will adapted these commands to circumstances, so circumstances changing, his will requires change of obligation.

357. But if it be objected, That even commands founded solely on the divine will must nevertheless be given in accordance with the divine nature, and therefore that they can no more be dispensed with than those founded solely or primarily on the divine nature; how shall we answer? Ans. (1.) A command as to the form of a duty, its time, &c., may be in accordance with the divine nature, and yet another form or time may be equally agreeable, if God so will it; and therefore it may be changed by the divine will.

(2.) As by divine justice commands are adapted to the constitution and circumstances of God's rational creatures, so the same justice requires that, on change of circumstances, the law should be changed.

(3.) Therefore, under the same express law of God under which we are, man's circumstances and relations changing, the obligations change accordingly; and this is the spirit and purport of the divine law. Even justice generally requires the change, because it is the part of divine justice to adapt the law to the circumstances of the subject.

358. How does the justice of God show itself in his works? *Ans.* In his truth and equity, whether in creation, providence or redemption.

LECTURE XXVI.—JUSTICE OF GOD.

§ XLIV.—359. We have said that God's justice may be divided into *divine, governmental* and *judicial*; and otherwise, into *universal* and *particular*; and also into *relative* and *absolute*; that the *divine, universal* or *absolute* justice of God is what he is in himself, or that which respects himself; that it includes the infinite holiness of his nature and his truth. We now proceed to consider God's *particular, relative* and *judicial* justice.

360. How may the particular, or relative justice of God be divided? *Ans.* Into *legislative* and *distributive*.

361. What is God's *legislative* justice? *Ans.* His giving laws and ordinances suited to the nature and condition of his creatures; Isa. xxxiii. 22, "The Lord is our Judge," &c.

362. Does it follow, from the above definition of legislative justice, that if man, by sin, be unable to obey the law, the law is therefore unjust or unsuitable? *Ans.* No; for (1.) God could not, by man's sin, lose his right to command, nor man, by sin, set himself free from obligation to obey. (2.) The law, given to man in innocence, is still the law of his constitution, and of his relation to God. (3.) That law is, therefore, still necessary to show man his relation to God, his duty and his sin; and it is therefore the just rule of God's judgment toward him.

363. What is *governmental* justice,—or, what is included in it? *Ans.* *Legislative* and *judicial*; and the same as *legislative* and *distributive* justice.

364. May not distributive justice, among men, include *commutative* justice? *Ans.* Yes.

365. What is *commutative* justice? *Ans.* It is an equality between what is given and what is received, in transferring property from one to another.

366. Can this commutative justice properly apply to God, or be ascribed to him? *Ans.* No; because all we have is his gift. We can give nothing which deserves his reward; Rom. xi. 35.

367. What then is God's *distributive* justice? *Ans.* His rendering to all their due, according to his law, which is always just.

368. Is this distributive justice absolutely perfect in all cases?

Ans. Yes; and any doctrine must be untrue, and every hope unfounded, that assumes any imperfection in God's distributive justice. For God is necessarily just, to render to every one according to his works, and even in justifying the ungodly in Christ; Rom. iii. 26; iv. 5.

369. As, then, God's particular, relative, and judicial justice is distributive, how may distributive justice be properly divided? Ans. Into *remunerative* and *punitive*.

370. What is *remunerative* justice? Ans. Rewarding well-doing.

371. Has God any occasion for the exercise of remunerative justice? Ans. Yes.

372. Wherein? Ans. (1.) In Christ's righteousness, rewarding him for his work. (2.) Holy angels, and Adam in innocence. (3.) Believers in Christ.

373. How was the reward due to Adam in innocence? Ans. By portion, or covenant: not by merit.

374. May we not hold, that even if there had been no covenant-promise to holy Adam, (or to holy angels,) yet both the goodness and justice of God would have rewarded obedience with happiness? Ans. Yes; as it would be repugnant to both the goodness and justice of God to render the innocent miserable.

375. Yet would a reward in such a case be merited? Ans. No; such persons are still "unprofitable servants," Luke xvii. 10.

376. By what ways has God proposed rewards to man? Ans. By two ways; the *legal* and the *gospel* way.

377. How was a reward to be obtained in a *legal* way? Ans. By the covenant of works, granting a reward to man by portion, not by merit, on his perfectly fulfilling the requisitions of that covenant.

378. Is not this way of obtaining a reward shut up to man now? Ans. Yes.

379. How is it now shut up to man? Ans. By man's sin and weakness; Rom. viii. 3.

380. Does that covenant of works still hold out a promise of reward for obedience, even since it was broken by man's sin? Ans. Yes; Rom. x. 5. The way is not shut up by any act of God.

381. How is a reward to be obtained by the *gospel* way, or covenant of grace? Ans. By union to Christ; obtaining blessings on his account.

382. How is a reward obtained through Christ, in strict justice? Ans. (1.) It is strict justice to Christ, who has purchased it for his people? (2.) It is justice as well as mercy to his people, who are now made partakers of his right by imputation.

383. Is the reward, then, not given to believers on account of their regenerated state and the grace that is exercised in their works? Ans. No; their works, though gracious, are still imperfect. It is given for Christ's sake; 1 Pet. ii. 5.

384. While, then, the reward is an exercise of justice to Christ, and on account of His right, is it not still an exercise of divine

goodness and of grace to them? Ans. Yes; 1 Pet. ii. 5; Psalm cxv. 1.

385. Is divine favour, given freely through Christ to his people, called a *reward* in Scripture? Ans. Yes; Ps. xix. 11; Luke vi. 23, 35.

386. But, against the doctrine that the justice and goodness of God will not make the innocent, considered as such, miserable, it is objected, (1.) That God punishes the children for the sins of their parents, Ex. xx. 5. How answer? Ans. (1.) According to this passage, the child is punished for his own sin; "*those that hate me.*" (2.) Therefore, if the child reform from the sin of the parent, and its own, it will not be punished with eternal misery; as it is those children who hate God that are threatened. (3.) The punishment may be of a temporal kind, which is visited from the parent to the child, and be inflicted even if the child be penitent; yet it is then inflicted on account of the common sin of mankind, in which it is involved. (4.) The visiting of iniquities from parent to child, threatened in the second commandment, signifies rather, that on account of the parent's sin God will withhold that enlightening, converting grace, which is due to none, but promised graciously to the faithful.

387. Objec. (2.) God threatens to punish the righteous with the wicked; Ezek. xxi. 3. How answer? Ans. (1.) That passage treats of temporal judgments or afflictions. (2.) The righteous who may be cut off are involved in the common sin of mankind, and therefore liable to affliction. But the cutting off of the righteous is not a judgment on them, but on the wicked.

388. Objec. (3.) That our Lord declares (John ix. 3,) that neither the man born blind nor his parents had sinned, and yet he suffered? Ans. (1.) Our Lord does not mean that neither the man nor his parents were sinners, but that the infliction was not sent as a direct punishment of his sin, although he by his sin deserved it, but for the manifestation of the works of God. And, therefore, (2.) Our Lord means also to deny that either the man or his parents were guilty of any specially grievous sin, as the reason of his affliction, as the question of the disciples implies that they supposed.

389. Objec. (4.) That Adam's posterity are punished for his sin, and, therefore, those who are personally innocent suffer? Ans. Posterity were involved, by covenant, in Adam's sin, and, therefore, are not innocent.

390. Objec. (5.) That a great part of mankind are reprobated, as an infliction of misery on the innocent? Ans. (1.) Reprobation is not the cause of their misery; their sin is the cause. (2.) Reprobation viewed them as sinners, and left them to be punished for their sin. (But note; although sin is the cause of their punishment, it is not the cause of their reprobation. Divine sovereignty alone was the cause of this.)

391. Objec. (6.) God punished Christ who was innocent? Ans. (1.) Christ, though innocent in himself, became voluntarily the

surety of his people, assumed their sin and accountability under the law, and thus became chargeable, in law, with their sin. (2.) In view of sin thus charged on Christ, the Father inflicted punishment. So that, even in his case, the punishment was for sin.

392. Objec. (7.) God has an absolute right to deal with his creatures as he pleases, and therefore a right to punish the innocent? Ans. Although God has that absolute right, yet, through his glorious perfection, he cannot violate justice. The exercise of this right will be always agreeable to his perfection; Gen. xviii. 25.

§ XLV.—393. What is God's *punitive* justice? Ans. It is his punishing sin, according to his righteous law; Gen. ii. 17; and is otherwise called *vindictive* or avenging justice.

394. Is this exercise of justice necessary to God; or is it only the effect of his will? Ans. It is necessary.

395. Could God will any thing contrary to his own nature and necessary perfections? Ans. No.

396. How prove that punitive justice for sin is necessary to God? Ans. (1.) From texts of Scripture; Ex. xxxiv. 7; Ps. v. 6; Nah. i. 2; Heb. i. 13. In this passage God's punishment of sin is associated with his essential perfections. (2.) From the holiness of God; Ps. l. 21; Josh. xxiv. 19. (3.) From the punishment of his own Son, when our sins were imputed to him; 2 Cor. v. 21. (4.) From the fact that remission of sin, without punishment, would be unjust to himself and to his character, and a violation of his truth.

397. But Socinians and others hold that the punishment of sin is the effect only of the free and changeable will of God, and not necessary; and others, not so profane as to say that the will of God is changeable, hold that the necessity of the punishment of sin arises only from God's eternal decree, and not from his nature; and they object, (1.) That the perfect liberty of God in his actions would not consist with the necessity of his nature to punish sin. How answer? Ans. (1.) God's perfect liberty does not consist in indifference, but in acting according to his will, and therefore according to his nature. (2.) As infinite and necessary holiness does not abridge God's liberty, neither does the necessity of his justice. (3.) His liberty is manifested in the creation of man, in the permission of sin, in sovereign delay of punishment, and in the transferring of punishment to Christ, and in the choice of sinners to salvation in him; so that the necessity of punishment is no limitation of his liberty.

398. Objec. (2.) That the infinite power of God, his absolute authority and dominion, and his infinite mercy and goodness, are inconsistent with the necessity of punishment? Ans. (1.) God's power, authority, and goodness, must all be exercised agreeably to his essential perfections of holiness, justice, and truth. (2.) Infinite mercy has full scope in transferring the punishment of sin to Christ, and pardoning and receiving the sinner.

399. Objec. (3.) Men may recede from their own right, and therefore that God, whose authority is absolute, may recede from his? Ans. (1.) If man be acting as a judge, he cannot justly recede from

right and truth; and it is in this capacity that the case of man bears an analogy to God's punishing sin. In this he acts as a judge. (2.) If man may recede from his own personal right, with propriety, the case does not bear an analogy with God's remitting punishment to the sinner; because, (a.) Man has no right but what he receives. (b.) Of these rights he is but the steward, and holds them only at God's will. (c.) If he yields justly, he is but yielding what God, the Proprietor, requires. (d.) If by man's yielding his own rights sin goes unpunished, God is reserving justice in his own hand. But, (e.) God is the only independent possessor of rights. He alone has independent right to punish. And if he remit without satisfaction, justice cannot be sustained.

400. Objec. (4.) That God freely forgives sin? Ans. It is free to us, but on the satisfaction to justice by Christ.

401. Objec. (5.) That God is said not to delight in punishment; Ezek. xviii. 32? Ans. God does not delight in punishment for its own sake, as he delights in mercy.

§ XLVI.—402. Does not our highest conception of God fall infinitely short of his excellence? Ans. Yes.

403. But although God possesses supreme and independent power over all things, ought we not to distinguish between the several exercises of his power and sovereignty? Ans. Yes.

404. Do not some of the exercises of his authority flow from his perfection, so that he can neither do nor command any thing contrary? Ans. Yes; as the exercise of his justice, his commands to love and fear him, &c.

405. What are such determinations of the exercise of his authority called? Ans. His *absolute right*, or authority.

406. Do not some of the exercises of his authority flow entirely from his will, which though agreeable to his nature, are not by the necessity of his nature? Ans. Yes; as the plan of redemption, and most of the positive institutions of his worship revealed in his word.

407. What is the determination of the exercise of his authority, as flowing from his will, called? Ans. His *ordinate right*. The one flows from his nature and perfections, and is natural and necessary; the other flows from his will and is voluntary.

408. Do these exercises ever disagree? Ans. No; His will always agrees with his nature.

PART II.

CHAPTER V.—OF THE TRINITY.

LECTURE I.—THREE PERSONS IN ONE ESSENCE.

§ I.—Quest. 1. Must we not expect that the mode of divine subsistence of the Godhead is an incomprehensible mystery, as well as his nature and perfections? Ans. Yes; it is necessarily so.

2. Can we safely venture to define or explain the divine subsistence by the light of reason, by inference from the manner of human or angelic subsistences, or by comparison of the one with the other? Ans. No; because the divine nature and manner of divine subsistence are infinite and uncreated.

3. Can we then know nothing of the manner of the divine subsistence, because we cannot comprehend it? Ans. No; we may know many facts by revelation which we cannot comprehend.

4. What is the mode of divine subsistence revealed to us in the Scriptures? Ans. *A Trinity*.

5. What is the meaning of *trinity*? Ans. *Tri-unity*; or *three-one*; or *three in one*.

6. Is the name *trinity* used in holy Scripture? Ans. No.

7. Do the Scriptures use any expression equal to it? Ans. Yes; as 1 John v. 7, "*These three are one,*" (*ens, being, thing*.)

8. Before proceeding to prove the truth of the doctrine from Scripture, we shall first endeavour to ascertain what the doctrine is, or its meaning. Since there are in the Godhead or essence three distinctions (1 John v. 7,) should we not, in order to the attaining of intelligent conceptions, and in order to intelligible communications with one another, have some name for these distinctions in God? Ans. Yes.

9. But can any name, employed in human language for distinctions among created intelligences, be adequate to define those divine distinctions? Ans. No; because there are no created distinctions with which they can be compared.

10. Has the word of God given a name to this divine distinction in the Godhead? Ans. Yes; and, therefore, we are warranted to use that name, and, in our language, the name that corresponds to it.

11. What is the name used in Scripture for these divine distinctions in the Godhead? Ans. *דברים* (*Panim*) in Hebrew; Deut. x. 17; *προσωπον* (*prosopon*) in Greek; as 2 Cor. ii. 10; but especially *ὑποστάσις* (*hypostasis*) as expressly applied to the distinction between

the Father and Son; Heb. i. 3; which we translate by the word *person*.

§ II.—12. But can the word *person*, as applied to men, adequately convey the idea of a person in the Godhead? Ans. No; because imperfect creatures cannot be compared with God.

13. How then are we to apply the term *person* to a divine distinction in the Godhead? Ans. As in our discussions of the divine perfections, using names of attributes in man, we remove from the divine perfections all those imperfections which belong to such attributes in man, so we remove from the divine personality every thing connected with human personality which is inconsistent with the unity and simplicity of God.

14. From what is the term *person* borrowed? Ans. From the drama, in which it signifies a distinct character in the performance.

15. How may we define a human or created person? Ans. A distinct, intelligent being, subsisting by itself, and possessing in itself all the powers necessary to its separate existence, action and accountability.

16. Wherein is this definition unsuitable to the divine personality? Ans. A divine person is not a distinct *being*; nor does he exist and act separately from the other persons of the Godhead; all which would be inconsistent with divine unity and simplicity. These ideas must, therefore, be excluded from the divine personality. And he is under no accountability.

17. What does the Scripture name of a divine distinction—the divine *Hypostasis*—mean? Ans. A subsistence or person.

18. Although God is not divided, or separated into persons or subsistences, yet is not a divine person a *real, intelligent, individual, and incommunicable* subsistence? Ans. Yes.

§ III.—19. May not a divine person be considered either in the abstract, as personality, without considering the divine essence, or in the concrete, as in the divine essence? Ans. Yes.

20. Is personality, in the abstract, a real being? Ans. No; but a mode of being.

21. If it were a real being, would it not make four Gods, or essences, or beings; one of the Godhead, and three of the persons? Ans. Yes.

22. Is personality a mere negation of actual communication? Ans. No; although it is not, in the abstract, a real being, it is a *positive mode of being*.

23. What would be the consequence of holding that personality is a mere negation? Ans. (1.) It would then be nothing. (2.) We could not conceive of a distinction of persons by characteristic properties; or a distinction of persons from the divine essence, or from the divine attributes. (3.) The personality of the Son would be lost in his incarnation.

24. How define personality in the abstract? Ans. It is a *positive mode of being, and incommunicable, terminating in a subsistence and completing it.*

25. How define a person of the Godhead in the concrete, or as he is? Ans. A subsistence in the essence of God, related to other subsistences in the same essence, but distinguished from them by an incommunicable property. (*Calvin.*)

26. Wherein does a divine person agree with a human person, according to this definition? Ans. All individual persons, divine or human, are subsistences related to other subsistences of the same nature respectively, and are distinguished from one another by incommunicable properties.

27. Wherein is the difference between a divine and a human person, according to this definition? Ans. The divine person is a subsistence *in the same essence* with the other persons; all human persons possess distinct and separate essences. Thus all the divine persons subsist in the same divine essence, which is one, and common to them all; but all human essences subsist in human persons respectively, and the human essences are as many as the human persons.

28. How does the truth of this doctrine appear—that all the divine persons subsist in the same divine essence? Ans. Because, (1.) The essence of God is one, and simple, and indivisible. (2.) Otherwise, if they did not thus subsist in the divine essence, there would be as many essences as there are divine persons; and, consequently, as many distinct Gods.

29. But every human person has a distinct essence or being, yet they have all the same nature; and why might we not hold that the divine persons all have the same nature, but distinct essences? Ans. (1.) Because this would deny the unity and simplicity of God, who is one not only in nature, but in essence or being—one numerically; while human persons, though one in nature, are many and separate in essences or beings. (2.) Because God is, by way of distinction, (Rev. i. 4,) called ‘*ὁ ὢν*’ (*Ho ōn*) *the being*, in the singular; and so the name *Jehovah* necessarily signifies. (3.) Because (Phil. ii. 6,) the Son is said to be “in the form of God,” which, with the explanatory clause following, “and thought it not robbery to be equal with God,” must mean the one essential being of God. (4.) Because in John xiv. 10, 11, our Lord declares that he is in the Father, and the Father in him; compared with John x. 30, “I and the Father are one;”—(one thing, being, entity;) which teaches the unity of the divine essence, with distinct personality.

30. Although we say a divine person subsists in the same divine essence, yet may we not say that the divine essence is in each of the persons? Ans. Yes; but it is the whole essence which is in each of the persons. Each person is perfectly God. A divine essence does not belong separately to each person, as a human essence to a human person.

§ IV.—31. Can any terms, such as *person*, *substance*, or *subsistence*, fully convey the truth of the Scripture distinctions in the Godhead? Ans. No.

32. Why then use these terms of our own, and not abide by the

Scripture terms, on this subject, entirely? Ans. (1.) Because our terms are as close in meaning to the Scripture terms used as we can attain; as *hypostasis*, a *person*—‘*ο ων*, a *being*, or *substance*, or *essence*. (2.) Because we limit the ideas conveyed by these words, not by their application to human things, but by the well-ascertained doctrines of Scripture respecting the being and perfections of God. (3.) Because errorists use the Scripture terms on this subject in a sense contrary to other Scripture representations of God, denying the very distinctions which the Scriptures make by these names. (4.) We, therefore, use our terms to repel errors which contradict the Scripture doctrine of God, and to establish the Scripture ideas conveyed by Scripture terms.

33. Is it not then highly improper to discard those terms by which we explain the Scripture terms agreeably to the analogy of faith, and limit ourselves to the use of Scripture terms, when we know that these are employed by errorists in a sense contrary to the analogy of faith? Ans. Yes.

34. What are some of the errors which are maintained under the use of Scripture names and terms? Ans. (1.) That the three persons are three distinct essences, or three Gods. (2.) That in the one essence there are not three distinct persons, but only distinct names for distinct operations. (3.) That the names, *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Spirit* are only three distinct offices in which God acts. (Therefore we define as above; Quest. 25.)

35. Notwithstanding all the sublimity and incomprehensibility of the subject, are there not some things revealed, respecting it, plainly and clearly, which are easily known, and useful and necessary? Ans. Yes.

36. How might those points which are clearly revealed, respecting the Trinity, be summed up, or stated? Ans. (1.) That God is one in essence most simple and undivided. (2.) That there are three distinct modes of subsistence in the same divine essence, which we call *persons*. (3.) That these three persons agree in essence, or are one in essence. (4.) That they agree, or are equal, in glory and in all divine perfections. (5.) That they mutually exist in each other. (6.) That they are distinguished from one another in various ways. These points may be considered as the whole revealed doctrine of the Trinity; and these we shall endeavour, first, briefly to explain, and secondly to prove.

37. Is the *unity* of God merely a unity of nature; or is it also a unity of essence? Ans. It is a unity of essence, so that he is one Being.

38. Does the unity of God consist also in simplicity? Ans. Yes; he is most simple and uncompounded.

39. With respect to the three persons in the same essence, are they three only in name or operations; or three in reality, as distinct modes of subsistence? Ans. They are three real and distinct persons, or subsistences, or *hypostases*.

40. With respect to the three persons being one in essence, do

they all possess the whole essence or being of God? Ans. Yes; each person is truly and perfectly God, possessing the whole essence. Each one is *ὁ ὢν, the being*. The essence cannot be divided.

41. With respect to the equality of the divine persons, in glory and perfections, is there any superiority of the Father over the Son, or any inferiority of the Son and Spirit, as God? Ans. No; because each one of the persons is truly and properly God, possessing the whole essence of God, and consequently all the divine perfections.

42. Are necessary existence, or supreme Deity, to be ascribed to the Father alone, as his personal properties? Ans. No; because of the unity of essence in each of the three divine persons, necessary existence and supreme Deity belong equally to them all.

43. Is it any objection to this doctrine that Christ says, "My Father is greater than I?" Ans. No; because he is there speaking of his mediatorial office, in which he is the Father's servant.

44. Do the divine persons mutually exist in one another? Ans. Yes; John xiv. 11.

45. Why do they exist in one another? Ans. On account of the unity of essence in all the divine persons.

46. Do not all these doctrines maintain and imply the proper Deity of the Son and Holy Spirit, as well as of the Father? Ans. Yes.

LECTURE II.—DISTINCTIONS OF THE PERSONS.

§ VI.—Quest. 47. But, while the divine persons are one in essence, are they not distinct as persons? Ans. Yes.

48. How does this appear? Ans. They are, in Holy Scripture, distinguished in various ways.

49. How are they in Scripture distinguished? Ans. In five ways. (1.) By distinct names. (2.) By their order of subsistence. (3.) By their mode of operating. (4.) By their works. (5.) By personal properties.

50. Do not the distinct names of *Father, Son, and Spirit* designate their relation to one another? Ans. Yes.

51. Do the names *Father* and *Spirit* always in Scripture denote personality? Ans. No; they are sometimes used to denote the divine essence absolutely; as, Isa. lxiii. 16; Heb. xii. 9; John iv. 24; Heb. ix. 14. But when used to distinguish one person from another, they are applied personally.

52. Are not the three persons named generally in the same order, as *Father, Son, and Spirit*? Ans. Yes; although sometimes they are named in a different order; as 2 Cor. xiii. 14. Yet they are usually named according to the order of subsistence, as *Father, Son, and Spirit*.

53. How are the persons distinguished in their manner of operating? Ans. The *Father* is represented as working of himself, and by the *Son* and *Spirit*; as John v. 17, 19; xvi. 13—15; 1 Cor. viii. 6; Heb. i. 1, 2; 2 Cor. v. 18.

54. How are they distinguished by their *works*, or operations without themselves, or on things? Ans. By ascribing particular works to the several persons, as peculiarly belonging to them respectively, in the economy of operating. Thus the Father is represented as creating; 1 Cor. viii. 6; the Son as purchasing redemption; Tit. ii. 14; and the Holy Spirit as sanctifying his people; 2 Thess. ii. 13.

55. Are not these works, nevertheless, the undivided work of the Godhead? Ans. Yes; but the Godhead works by or in the persons respectively, in the divine economy; or, as divines say, the operation is represented as terminating in or at such a person, according to the order of persons, and special economy.

56. But are not the divine persons especially distinguished by distinct personal properties, in Holy Scripture? Ans. Yes.

57. Do these personal properties belong to the essence of God? Ans. No; if so, they could not distinguish one person from another; as the divine essence, and the whole essence, belongs equally to each of the persons.

58. Do these personal properties belong to personality in the abstract? Ans. No; they belong to the persons in the concrete; *i. e.* to the respective persons as God.

59. Do these personal properties imply inferiority or superiority of one divine person to another? Ans. No; they imply as much real perfection in one person as in another, even though expressed by words that ordinarily mean something passive.

60. Are they not rather relative perfections than absolute? Ans. Yes; they denote relation, and not an absolute state of the divine persons.

§ VII.—61. What is the personal property of the *Father*? Ans. Unbegotten; and to beget the Son; and that from him proceeds the Holy Spirit.

62. How does the fact of this mystery appear? Ans. (1.) From the name *Father*. (2.) From various declarations respecting the Son and Holy Spirit; as John v. 26, "As the Father hath life in himself," &c.; Psa. ii. 7; Heb. i. 5; John xv. 26.

63. Is it sound doctrine, then, to say that the Father is the Fountain of the Godhead? Ans. No.

64. What error does it imply? Ans. That the Son and Spirit are inferior to, and dependent on the Father, essentially. And it would imply the idea that the essence has been multiplied, and that there are several essences in the Godhead; all which are utterly inconsistent with the divine unity and simplicity.

65. Does not each person possess the whole divine essence in himself, in the highest and most independent sense? Ans. Yes.

§ VIII.—66. What is the personal property of the *Son*? Ans. To be begotten of the Father; and that the Holy Spirit proceeds from him as really as from the Father.

67. Was the Son, in this generation, passive? Ans. No; this would imply imperfection and dependence.

68. How does it appear that He was active? Ans. (1.) From the unity and equality of the Son and the Father. (2.) From Mic. v. 2, "Whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting."

69. Is there any proper comparison between the generation of the Son of God, and that of man? Ans. No; we may neither deny the sonship of Christ, because of imperfection belonging to the human relation of father and son, nor infer any defects in Christ from the human relation.

70. But is there not some resemblance? Ans. Yes; as, (1.) The Father and the Son are of the same nature. (2.) It is a relation of love.

71. Wherein are they unlike? Ans. (1.) The Son of God is not only of the same nature, but the same essence with the Father. He is the same Being. (2.) The Son is co-eternal with the Father. (3.) He is equally independent. (4.) He is equal in glory and all perfection. (5.) He is Son without succession. (6.) He is Son without change, division, or multiplication.

72. Is the generation of the Son supernatural? Ans. It is indeed above the nature of man, and in that sense supernatural.

73. But is it not according to the nature of God? Ans. Yes; and in this sense it is not supernatural. To say it is supernatural is perhaps improper, making our nature the standard with which to compare the generation of the Son of God. Regeneration is supernatural, because it is a change on us above the influence or action of our nature; but the generation of the Son of God is not above the divine nature.

74. Is the generation of the Son of God, a true, real, and proper generation, or is it only metaphorical? Ans. It is not metaphorical, but true and proper, though incomprehensible, and infinitely above human generation.

75. Does this personal property of the Son, as being begotten of the Father, belong to him as God, or only as Mediator? Ans. It belongs to him as God; otherwise it would not be a personal property, but an official relation.

76. Prove the truth of this proper divine Sonship? Ans. It is often asserted in Scripture; as Psa. ii. 7; where we may understand "this day," as eternity with God; Prov. viii. 24, 25; Mic. v. 2; Heb. i. 5.

77. But as many hold the doctrine of a real Sonship of Christ as God, and a true and proper eternal generation, to be false and inconceivable, and imagine that it would imply inferiority, dependence, and a separate essence; and therefore suppose that his sonship only refers to his humanity, or Mediatorial office, and not to him as God; how prove that his generation, or Sonship, belongs to him as God, and is real and eternal, as his personal property? Ans. (1.) Matt. xvi. 16, declares him the Son of the "living God," a confession not taught by nature's light, but by God himself. (2.) In John i. 14, 18, he is said to be the only-begotten of the Father; and that as such he had a peculiar glory, and was able to reveal

God to us. (3.) In Rom. viii. 32, and in John iii. 16, and in 1 John iv. 9, he is called God's "own Son," and "only-begotten Son," in both cases given as the highest evidence of the love and grace of God in salvation. Now, if he were Son only by creation, or appointment to office, to give him as Son, would not have been so high an evidence of love as God's condescension to exercise mercy of any kind; and much less, would it have adequately set forth the greatness of the gift of Christ for us, who is truly God, as those acknowledge with whom we now dispute. (4.) In Matt. iii. 17, and xvii. 5, God calls him "my beloved Son;" and in Luke xx. 13, the same expression is used in the parable to distinguish him from all the servants. (5.) In John v. 17, 18, the Jews perceived that to be the Son of God was to be equal with God; which Christ admits. (6.) *Son* designates the highest character of Christ, who is God over all; Heb. i. 2; iii. 6; and therefore means his Godhead. (7.) In Heb. i. 4, 5, the apostle, quoting from Ps. ii. 7, challenges an equal name for angels; denies that it is ever given to angels in such a manner; and therefore maintains that, as given to Christ, it signifies his Godhead. (8.) In Rom. i. 4, the apostle declares that, as to the divine nature, Christ is the Son of God, contrasting the human and divine natures. Therefore, if Son as God, his sonship is eternal, real, and in the divine essence.

LECTURE III.—DISTINCTIONS OF THE PERSONS—CONTINUED.

Q. 78. But it is objected, That in Acts xiii. 33, the apostle quotes Ps. ii. 7, to show that Sonship means the resurrection of Christ? Ans. Paul there refers to Christ's resurrection as proof that Christ was the Son of God who was promised to the fathers, and in Rom. i. 4, he so explains himself respecting Christ's resurrection and Sonship.

79. It is objected, That the expression in Ps. ii. 7, "This day I have begotten thee," refers to some particular time, and intimates that some transaction, such as the incarnation or resurrection, made him Son? Ans. We reply, "this day," with God, is eternity—a perpetual *now*. So Mic. v. 2, and Prov. viii. 24, 25, declare that Sonship to be from eternity; and the word used in Prov. viii. 24, 25, which we translate *brought forth*, is the same that David uses, Ps. li. 7, for his birth.

80. Objec., That Christ's generation, or Sonship, is metaphorical, and not a proper and real Sonship; as a real generation would involve error and absurdities? Ans. (1.) We do not mean that Christ's generation, or Sonship, partakes of the infirmities and imperfections attached to a human generation; no more than that God's eternity is like our eternity, or his wisdom like our wisdom; but still it is real and proper, because (2.) In Col. i. 15, Christ is said to be "the image of the invisible God," as the son is the image of the person of the father. (3.) In Heb. i. 3, Christ is said to be the express image of the Father's person; that is, the person of the Son is like the person of the Father, as the impression of the seal

is like the seal, as the word there signifies. (4.) That same passage shows that it is Christ in his divine nature that is the Son, and the express image of the Father's person; because, as Son, he is said to be "the brightness of his glory," and "upholds all things by the word of his power." Thus Christ's Sonship, or generation, as God, is proper and real.

81. Object., That in Col. i. 15, Christ is said to be the "first-born of every creature," and therefore that his generation, or Sonship, refers to some act of God in time, and cannot mean a real and proper Sonship as God? Ans. (1.) "First-born of every creature," would be absurd, if taken literally. It would make him who is said (verses 16, 17,) to be "the Creator and Upholder of all things," to be the son of creatures, and the son of every creature. It, therefore, cannot be taken in this sense. But, (2.) The idiom of the Greek is not correctly given in this passage. The adjective, *πρωτος*, (*protos*) in the composition of the original word, bears the comparative sense, and accordingly governs the Genitive, and means "born before all creatures;" that is, he was the Son of God from all eternity. This passage may be compared with John i. 15, 30, where *πρωτος*, though superlative, is used necessarily in a comparative sense; literally, *first of me*, but correctly translated, *before me*. (3.) Therefore, as the expression in Col. i. 15, *first-born of every creature*, cannot mean the son of every creature, it means *born before all creatures*. And as, therefore, it cannot refer either to Christ's incarnation or resurrection, which occurred after creation, so it means *born in eternity*, or an eternal generation.

82. Is it safe to define the eternal generation of the Son, as our author does, to be the communication, by the Father to the Son, of the same numerical divine essence? Ans. We think not; lest it should convey the idea of essential dependence, and make the Father to be the fountain of the Godhead to Christ. It appears to be safer to say, That the generation of Christ, the Son, is the eternal and incomprehensible communication, by the Father to the Son, of personality in the same numerical essence. The Father would then be, not the fountain of Godhead to the Son, but the fountain of his personality. Thus Christ, as a distinct person, would be the express image of the Father's person; and thus the Father would, by giving personality to the Son, give to him to have life in himself; as in John v. 26.

§ IX.—83. What was the Arian notion of the Sonship of Christ? Ans. That he was created before the other things which are recorded by Moses, and that then the Mosaic creation was performed by Christ, as an instrument; and they refer to Col. i. 15, 16, to support this theory.

84. What objections may we urge against this theory? Ans. (1.) It makes Christ to be the *first-created*, and not the *first-born*, as Col. i. 15 teaches. (2.) It denies the Scripture doctrine of the Godhead of Christ, which is taught Col. i. 16, 17. It makes him a creature. (3.) It absurdly assumes that a creature can create.

(4.) It makes the Mosaic history of the creation defective, neglecting to record a transaction in creation which would, if true, be necessary to be known by us.

85. What is the Socinian notion of Christ's Sonship? Ans. That Christ is only an exalted creature, and that his Sonship depends on four causes or grounds—his incarnation, his sanctification to the office of Mediator, his resurrection and his exaltation.

86. To prove that incarnation is the ground of Christ's Sonship, the Socinians quote Luke i. 35, "Therefore, also, that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God." How answer? Ans. (1.) Christ being otherwise proved to be the Son of God by nature, and as God, this text should be explained accordingly. (2.) Christ's extraordinary conception and birth, would manifest that he was more than a creature—that he was the Son of God. As if the angel had said, Therefore, from such a conception and birth, know that he who shall be thus born, is God,—the Son of God. The angel spoke of the birth as a manifestation, not as a cause.

87. To prove that Christ's being set apart to the office of Mediator is a ground of his Sonship, they quote John x. 36, "Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified," &c. How answer? Ans. (1.) Christ argues that he who was thus consecrated to such an office, could be no creature; he must be the Son of God in a higher sense than magistrates, of whom he spoke. His consecration was the evidence of his Sonship as God. (2.) He does not found his Sonship on his consecration, but argues that if magistrates, &c., are called gods, as the Jews admitted, why was it blasphemy, if he, possessing a higher character and office, should be called the Son of God. He adapted his argument to their conceptions of him. It was an *argumentum ad hominem*.

88. To prove that Christ's resurrection is a ground of his Sonship, they quote Acts xiii. 32, 33, "In that he hath raised up Jesus again, as it is written in the second Psalm," &c. How answer? Ans. In Rom. i. 4, the apostle explains himself to mean that the resurrection of Christ was the manifestation of his Sonship, as God, or as to the divine nature; not the cause of his Sonship.

89. To prove that Christ's exaltation is the ground of his Sonship, they quote Heb. v. 5, "So also Christ glorified not himself, to be made a High Priest, but he that said," &c. How answer? Ans. (1.) The apostle does not here say that Christ's exaltation was his Sonship, but declares that he was made a Priest by his Father; by him who had in eternity declared him his Son. (2.) In quoting here the second Psalm, which declares God's appointment of him to authority over the church, the apostle virtually says that he was appointed by him who had authority,—by his eternal Father, and because he was his Son.

90. But some who acknowledge the Deity of Christ, hold that his Sonship refers only to his mediatorial office, and deny that it means his divine and eternal relation to the Father? Ans. (1.)

This would take away the personal distinction in the Godhead, and lead to deny the Trinity; for if there be no eternal personal distinction in the Godhead, there is no Trinity. (2.) It would destroy the great evidence of divine love, in giving us a Saviour, so often adverted to in Scripture; as John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 9. All such passages found the evidence of love on Christ's essential Sonship; and therefore his mission supposes his Sonship, as well as his Godhead; and therefore his Sonship does not arise from his mission. (3.) The name *Son*, on the doctrine we oppose, would not signify Christ's highest character, as in Scripture it does; see Rom. i. 4; Col. i. 13—19. (4.) As Sonship is Christ's highest character given in Scripture, to make it mean only official Sonship, would prepare the way for denying his Godhead.

91. But some, holding that Christ is God, and the Son of God by eternal generation, hold that he is also called Son in an official sense. Is this warranted? Ans. No; for (1.) To apply the term *Son*, which in Scripture signifies his deity and his eternal relation to the Father, to his mediatorial office, would be the same as saying that he is God by office, or that he is Jehovah by office, and we might as well say the Father is the Father by office, and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit by office. (2.) If we admit that one text expresses his official Sonship, adversaries will claim that all texts do so in which this term is found. (3.) There is no need to make such an admission, as the term *Son of God*, in every instance of it in Scripture, will signify Christ's eternal relation to the Father, without any violation of the text; and to understand the text aright requires this signification. (See Quest. 183.)

§ X.—92. Although Christ is the Son of God by nature and eternally, does this oppose the idea that he is the true, supreme and independent God? Ans. No.

93. How prove that he is the true God as Son? Ans. 1 John v. 20.

94. How prove that he is the supreme God? Ans. Rom. ix. 5.

95. How prove that he is the independent God? Ans. John v. 26; Rev. i. 8, 11.

96. Do such texts as Matt. xi. 27, John v. 26, xvii. 8, in which Christ acknowledges gifts from the Father, and generation from him, prove that he is dependent on the Father essentially? Ans. No; for such texts express a giving to him as Mediator, and for mediatorial purposes; as Matt. xi. 27; or refer to his distinct personality, or mode of subsistence, but not to his essence; as John v. 26; xvii. 8.

§ XI.—97. What is the personal property of the Holy Spirit? Ans. To proceed from the Father and the Son; John xv. 26.

98. Does he proceed from the Son as well as from the Father? Ans. Yes.

99. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From his being called the Spirit of the Son; Gal. iv. 6. (2.) Because he is called the Spirit of the Son as well as of the Father; Rom. viii. 9. (3.) From

his being sent by the Son as well as by the Father; John xv. 26; xvi. 7. (4.) From his taking the things of Christ and showing them, &c., John xvi. 13—15. (5.) From the emblem of *breathing* employed by Christ, (John xx. 22,) which is the same emblem used in reference to the Spirit proceeding from the Father; Psa. xxxiii. 6. (6.) From the natural order of the persons.

100. Are we warranted to say that the procession of the Spirit is primarily from the Father, and secondarily from the Son? Ans. No; it appears that he equally proceeds from the Father and the Son. To say that he proceeds from the Father, by or through the Son, even with respect to the order of subsistence, should be considered a doubtful expression and unnecessary.

101. Does the procession of the Spirit imply any inferiority? Ans. No; it only intimates the order of personal subsistence. He is the same true, supreme, and independent God as the Father and the Son.

102. Who have advocated the doctrine that the Spirit proceeds only from the Father? Ans. The Greek church.

§ XII.—103. Are we able to comprehend the difference between the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit? Ans. No.

104. But what difference may be noticed? Ans. (1.) Generation is never ascribed to the Spirit, as being begotten. (2.) The Father alone begets, while the Spirit proceeds from both Father and Son. (3.) Generation admits a farther communication of personality, while the procession of the Spirit does not.

105. Is there any warrant to ascribe generation to the understanding of the Father, and procession of the Spirit to the will of the Father and Son, as some have done? Ans. No; it is curiosity and speculation, and not knowledge.

106. On what grounds did the Schoolmen pretend to found this distinction? Ans. Because the Son is called *Wisdom, the Word*, &c., while the Holy Spirit is the Sanctifier and Comforter. But these considerations lay no foundation for such a distinction; and understanding and willing are rather essential than personal acts. And there are other reasons for the names and offices of the Son and Spirit.

107. Is it the essence of the Godhead which begets, is begotten, or proceeds? Ans. No; it is the person of the Father which begets, of the Son which is begotten, and of the Spirit which proceeds.

108. What did the Nicene fathers mean, when, contending with the Arians, they refused to admit that the persons of the Trinity were merely *ομοιουσιοι*, (*omoiousioi*;) and held firmly that they were *ομοουσιοι* (*omöousioi*?) Ans. They meant that the divine persons were not merely *of like essence*, but *the same essence*.

LECTURE IV.—THAT THERE ARE THREE PERSONS.

§ XIII.—On § IX. we laid down the following six points of clearly revealed doctrine, on the subject of the Trinity; viz., (1.) That God is one in essence most simple and undivided. (2.) That there are

three distinct modes of subsistence in the same divine essence, which we call *persons*. (3.) That these three persons agree, or are one, in essence. (4.) That they agree, or are equal, in glory and all divine perfections. (5.) That they mutually exist in one another. (6.) That they are distinguished from one another in several ways.—These points may be considered as the whole revealed doctrine of the Trinity. And these we have endeavoured to explain briefly, and some of them we have proved in the explanation, especially the last three; and, as the first of these, the unity of God, we have explained and proved elsewhere, there now remain only two to be proved:—viz., (1.) That there are three distinct modes of subsistence in God, or three persons. (2.) That these three are one in essence, *and each one is the true God*. And, (1.) That there are three persons in the one God.

Quest. 109. Can this doctrine be proved from tradition, as the Papists say, or from natural reason? Ans. No; but only from Scripture.

110. Why cannot tradition prove it? Ans. Because, (1.) Any tradition of the doctrine, which is correct, has been obtained from supernatural revelation, and therefore can add nothing to the evidence of its truth. (2.) A false or perverted tradition cannot prove this truth. (3.) God never revealed a supernatural truth to man but what he recorded in the Holy Scriptures.

111. Why cannot natural reason prove it? Ans. Because there is nothing in nature of the same character as the Trinity, from which we may either know the fact or comprehend it. There is nothing in nature's light to point out the peculiar mode of the divine subsistence.—We shall first prove the fact of a *plurality* in God.

112. Do not many passages of Scripture intimate that there is some kind of plurality in God? Ans. Yes.

113. Mention some of these? Ans. Gen. i. 26; iii. 22; xi. 7.

114. But might we not suppose these addresses were made to angels, and that therefore they did not signify a plurality in God? Ans. No; because, (1.) In Gen. i. 26, and iii. 22, the Speaker and those addressed are the Creator—are equal—are of the same image, in whose image man was created; and the person speaking is Jehovah. (2.) In Gen. xi. 7, the person proposing to go down is Jehovah, and those addressed are equally engaged in the same work; and in verse 8, they are called *Lord (Jehovah)* in the execution of the work.

115. But might we not suppose that the Lord, in these passages, uses the plural, in speaking of himself, as many kings and potentates now do? Ans. No; (1.) Because it was not customary then for kings to do so. (2.) God himself does not, in other cases, do so, even when the direct object is to declare his majesty; as Isa. xlii. 8; lvii. 15; lxvi. 1. (3.) The Hebrew idiom does not favour this mode of speaking.

116. And are there not texts of Scripture which distinctly specify a plurality of persons in the Godhead, even though they do not

specify the number? Ans. Yes; as Ps. xlv. 7, compared with Heb. i. 8; Psa. cx. 1, compared with Matt. xxii. 43, and Matt. xxii. 1, 2; Hos. i. 7; here the person *anointing* is distinguished from the person *anointed*; the person *commanding*, from the person *commanded*; the *King* from his *Son*; and the person *saving*, from the person by whom they are *saved*.

117. Does the Hebrew name of God (*Elohim*) intimate a plurality in the Godhead? Ans. It is a vexed question, but we believe it does, although our author argues strenuously against it.

118. How does it appear that *Elohim* is intended to signify plurality in the Godhead? Ans. (1.) The word is sometimes used in the singular; it has a singular form; and, therefore, when used in its plural form so generally, we believe it is intended to express plurality. (2.) It is joined with verbs in the singular, as if to denote unity as well as plurality, and plurality as well as unity. (3.) The name *Jehovah*, expressing the divine essence, is singular, and always singular, while *Elohim*, expressing his Godhead, the proper name of the one God, is plural. (4.) This plural name being used for the one God, agrees with the doctrine of the Trinity elsewhere clearly taught. And, therefore, we believe that the name was intended always to remind the church of the subsistence of three persons in the Godhead.

119. But our author objects, that the plurality is often used for sake of dignity, or in a singular sense, or for a single individual; as Ex. xxi. 4, "If his master," &c., אֲדֹנָי (*Adonai*.) How answer? Ans. (1.) אֲדֹנָי (*Adonai*) is appellative, and not a proper name, in that and such cases; but *Elohim* is a proper name, and proper names are not, in other cases, used in the plural for the singular. If proper names are used in the plural, they are used appellatively; as *Solomons*, (*wise men*), *Neros*, (*cruel princes*.) (2.) God calls himself *Elohim*, Ex. xx. 5; but our author has conceded (§ XIII.) that such a manner of speaking of one's self, in the plural, was not the custom in those ages.

120. He objects, that this plural name is given to idols; Ex. xx. 3: how answer? Ans. The prohibition of idols as God implies that they are assumed by idolaters instead of the true God in Trinity; and therefore the idol is forbidden in language adapted to show what idols are assumed to be; and they are forbidden to be viewed or revered as though they were the true God.

121. He objects, that, in Ps. xlv. 7, 8, this plural form is given to one of the divine persons who, as a person, is singular? Ans. Each person is God, possessing the whole essence, and co-exists with the other persons in the same essence. Each person is that God who is Three in One.

122. He objects, that to translate this name plurally would lead to a plurality of gods rather than of persons? Ans. There would be no propriety in translating it plurally, because other languages than the Hebrew did not sustain this idiom. But, while it should not be translated plurally, it may, in Hebrew, convey the idea of

plurality of some kind in God. But, although we think the plural idea of *Elohim* should be held, we do not argue the matter as if it were a chief or necessary reliance for proof of the doctrine of the Trinity. And, although the proof of a plurality in the Godhead is not the proof of the Trinity, yet it powerfully corroborates the doctrine of the Trinity drawn from other texts.—We shall, secondly, prove that *the number of persons is three.*

123. As it will not be denied that there are three distinctions in the Godhead often spoken of in Scripture, we may ask, Do we ever read of a greater number? Ans. No.

124. As we have seen that the Scriptures of the Old Testament make a distinction of persons in the Godhead, do they ever distinguish the precise number of three? Ans. Yes.

125. Is there any intimation of the Trinity in the appointed benediction; Num. vi. 24—26? Ans. Yes; although it is not of itself decisive proof of the Trinity, it accords with and corroborates more express proof; the name *Lord*, or *Jehovah*, being three times named, and each time with a special expression of a blessing; with which we may compare the apostolical benediction; 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

126. What proof of the Trinity may be gathered from Isa. vi. 3? Ans. (1.) *Holy* is three times repeated, and (verses 8, 9,) the same Lord thus speaks, “Whom shall I send? And who will go for us?”—*I* expressing unity, *us* expressing plurality, and the ascription *holy* three times repeated. (2.) Compare this with John xii. 41, where the passage is quoted and applied to Christ as his expression; and with Acts xxviii. 25, where Paul applies it to the Holy Spirit.

127. Are there any passages in the Old Testament in which three persons in the Godhead are distinctly specified? Ans. Yes; as, (1.) Ps. xxxiii. 6. Here are specified—*the Lord*, who is the Father—*the Word*, who is the Son—and *the Breath*, or Spirit of the Lord; engaged in creating work. (2.) Ps. xlv. 6, 7. Here we have—God the Son addressed—God the Father addressing, (as Heb. i. 8, 9, applies the passage)—and God the Holy Spirit, as anointing; as is shown in John iii. 34; and Isa. lxi. 1. (3.) Isa. lxi. 1. Here we have—the Son speaking—the Spirit, as the unction upon him—and the Father anointing. This passage is so applied by our Lord; Luke iv. 18—21. (4.) Isa. lxiii. 7—14. Here, (1.) We have, not only Jehovah mentioned three times, (ver. 7,) but (ver. 9,) the Father referred to by the pronouns *He* and *His*. (2.) The Son, as the angel of his presence; or the apostle of our profession, Christ Jesus; Heb. iii. 1. (3.) The Holy Spirit, as grieved by their sin; ver. 10; and again, (ver. 11,) *He*, the Father; *the Shepherd*, the Son; and the Holy Spirit. (5.) Haggai ii. 4—7. Here we have—the Father speaking—the Spirit named—and the Son, called the “Desire of all nations.”

§ XVI.—128. Should we account the three angels who appeared to Abraham (Gen. xviii.) as a proof of the Trinity? Ans. No; at least it is not clear. It appears that it was the Lord and two ministering angels; as xviii. 22, it is said, “The men turned and went

towards Sodom, and Abraham stood yet before the Lord;" and **xix.** 1, "two angels came to Sodom."

These proofs of the Trinity from the Old Testament, it is admitted, would be dark by themselves, but under the light of the New Testament, the evidence even from those Old Testament passages, becomes strong and clear. We now refer to the New Testament.

LECTURE V.—SAME CONTINUED.—DIVINITY OF THE SON.

§ XVII.—129. What evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity is found in the New Testament? Ans. The evidence is abundant; and to a few special texts we shall advert; as Matt. iii. 16, 17; xxviii. 19; John xiv. 16, 17; xv. 26; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; Rev. i. 4, 5; 1 John v. 7.

130. What evidence arises from Matt. iii. 16, 17? Ans. In this passage we have—the Father, speaking from heaven; the Son, acknowledged by him; and the Holy Spirit appearing as a dove.

131. What evidence from Matt. xxviii. 19? Ans. The three persons named, and baptism commanded in the name of each one of them, signifying *by their authority*, and we engaged to faith in each, all holy obedience, and divine worship.

131½. What evidence from John xiv. 16, 17, and xv. 26? Ans. We have here, distinctly, the Father and Son sending, and the Spirit sent, &c., and all as possessing the same power and glory.

132. What evidence from 2 Cor. xiii. 14? Ans. We have here the Father, Son, and Spirit, as equally the object of worship and Author of grace.

133. What evidence from Rev. i. 4, 5? Ans. Here we have John's prayer unto, and benediction from the Father, described as Jehovah, "Who was and is and is to come;" the Son, Christ Jesus; and the Holy Spirit, called, "the seven spirits," (according to the figurative representations in this book; called *seven* from the varied perfections of his gifts;) and all the three equally the object of worship.

§ XVIII.—134. What evidence from 1 John v. 7? Ans. Most express and clear; as (1.) The three are expressly named. (2.) These three are referred to by masculine pronouns, participles, and adjectives. (3.) They are not said to agree in one, but are one. (4.) The *one* is neuter, signifying, not one person, but one being, one thing, one essence. And this same form of expression our Lord uses, John x. 30, respecting his unity with the Father; "I and the Father are one;" (*ev.*) But in ver. 8, referring to agreement of testimony, another form is used, "*are into one.*"

135. As heretics pretend that this passage is interpolated, how answer? Ans. (1.) It was found in ancient copies of the original, and in translations. (2.) The early fathers quoted it. (3.) The antithesis of this and the 8th verse requires it. (4.) It perfectly agrees with other Scriptures; as John x. 30. (5.) It agrees with the necessary unity of God and the plurality of persons as often spoken of in Scripture.

136. May we not rather suppose that Anti-trinitarians corrupted or excluded this text from some copies of this epistle? Ans. Yes; The evidence is greater for this than for the interpolation; because, (1.) Believers in the Trinity had the same doctrine fully taught in Scripture elsewhere, and would not feel a temptation to interpolate; while enemies of the doctrine saw that the text was fatal to their cause. (2.) Because the context implies the doctrine of this text; as the antithesis in the 8th verse. The 6th verse introduces a witness, the Spirit revealing the truth; and the 9th declares that this witness is God. And yet the 8th verse does not make the whole witnessing body to be God. Two of the three are things or circumstances. Therefore, the 7th verse is necessary by the context, and is not an interpolation. (3.) Because this same apostle had written in a similar manner, on the same subject, John x. 30, where he had, however, no occasion to speak of the Holy Spirit; and it was altogether likely that when here he had occasion to speak of the three divine witnesses, he would write as we have it in verse 7th. (4.) Because there is historical evidence that opponents of the Trinity, before Arius, did corrupt this epistle and other Scriptures, on the subject of the Trinity. So Socrates and Eusebius record changes of this.

137. Do not our Lord and his apostles speak of the persons of the Godhead as a familiar subject? Ans. Yes; they use it as the received and admitted doctrine always when occasion calls for it, speaking of but three persons and one God, which is the substance of the whole doctrine.

138. But although the Scriptures so often speak of the *three* distinctions in the Godhead, do they represent these *three* as in any respect distinct, so as to warrant us to call them distinct persons, and not merely distinct names of the same person? Ans. Yes; they ascribe to them distinctly personal faculties, attributes, operations, and worship, (of which more in §§ XXI. XXIII.)

§ XIX.—139. Socinians and others object to our doctrine, (1.) The doctrine of the unity of God uniformly taught in Scripture? Ans. (1.) Trinitarians also teach the unity of God; a unity of essence; and it is of the essence that those Scriptures speak, that assert the unity of God. (2.) Many of those texts which assert the unity of God, also assert the plurality of persons; as Eph. iv. 6.

140. They object, (2.) That several texts of Scripture assert that the Father alone is God; as John xvii. 3; Jude iv. &c. Ans. (1.) It is not true that the Scriptures assert that the Father *alone* is God, as exclusive of the other persons; but that the Father is the only God; which can be equally said of the Son and Spirit respectively. Each person is truly God, and therefore the only God in his essence; so John xvii. 3. The Father is the subject; God is the predicate; and to the predicate, in this case and other such, does the word *only* belong. (2.) The texts cited expressly name Christ as the object of faith and worship, along with the Father, and therefore essentially the same, though expressly and separately

mentioned, on account of this office. These texts do not exclude a plurality of persons, but a plurality of Gods.

141. They object, (3.) That some texts ascribe divine attributes to the Father alone; as Eternity, Dan. vii. 9, 13; Supreme Majesty, Rev. iv. 2; Wisdom, Rom. xvi. 27; 1 Tim. i. 17; Goodness, Matt. xix. 17; Independence, John v. 26; 1 Cor. viii. 6. How answer? Ans. (1.) These attributes are ascribed to the Son and Spirit elsewhere; and, therefore, it is not the intention of these texts to exclude them. (2.) Some of these texts expressly include the Son and Spirit; as, 1 Cor. viii. 6; Dan. vii. 13, 14. (3.) In none of these texts are divine attributes ascribed to the Father personally, exclusive of the Son and Spirit, but exclusive of the creatures.

142. They object, (4.) That many texts speak of the Son and Spirit as *the Son of God, the Spirit of God*; and, therefore, they are distinguished from God, or from the Father as God? Ans. (1.) The Son and Spirit are indeed distinguished from the Father personally, but not from him as God; so John iii. 16, is an instance. (2.) For, in other places these persons are directly, and in the Nominative case, called God, as John i. 1; Isa. vi. 5—10, compared with Acts xxviii. 25—27.

§ XX.—143. Can our reason comprehend, sustain, or disprove this doctrine of the Trinity? Ans. No; it must be taught by the Scriptures alone, and subjected to them, 2 Cor. x. 5.

144. When they argue against this doctrine from reason, and plead that there must be as many essences (or beings) as persons; but that, if the essence be one, there can be but one person in the Godhead, how answer? Ans. (1.) This reasoning would be true of finite beings, but not of the infinite God. (2.) The argument assumes that man's subsistence must be the standard by which God is to be measured.

145. When they argue that, if personality be different from essence, there would be four essences, how answer? Ans. (1.) Personality itself is not an essence, but a mode of subsisting. (2.) While our essence subsists in a person, and three finite persons would be three finite essences, yet a divine person subsists in the essence, and the three persons are but one essence—one God.

146. When they argue that, if each person be truly God, and if there are three divine persons, then each person would be three Gods; how answer? Ans. (1.) Each divine person is God, and has the whole essence, and subsists in the same essence; but each person has not all the relative personal properties that are in the Godhead. (2.) This argument of the adversaries is based on the same error with the first, that God must be measured by the standard of man; and on the error that divine persons cannot subsist in the same divine essence.

§ XXI. We next come to speak directly of the *divinity* of the glorious persons of the Trinity, and to prove it. And as the Godhead of the Father is universally admitted by professing Christians, we shall first examine the evidence for the Godhead of the Son.

147. To how many heads is the proof of the Godhead of the several persons of the Trinity reduced? Ans. To four.

148. What are these four? Ans. (1.) Divine names. (2.) Divine attributes. (3.) Divine works. (4.) Divine worship.

149. Does not each one of these, ascribed to a person of the Trinity in its true and proper sense, necessarily prove the Godhead of that person? Ans. Yes; "God will not give his glory to another."—We shall speak first of the names given to the Son in Scripture.

150. Is the name *God* given to the Son in Scripture? Ans. Yes; often.

151. Mention some instances? Ans. (1.) John i. 1. (2.) John xx. 28, "My Lord and my God." (3.) Acts xx. 28, "Feed the church of God," &c. (4.) Rom. ix. 5. (5.) 1 Tim. iii. 16, "God manifest in the flesh." (6.) Tit. ii. 13, "Appearing of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ." (7.) 1 John v. 20, "This is the true God." (8.) Ps. xlv. 6, compared with Heb. i. 8.

152. But as angels, magistrates, and idols are called *gods*, why may we not suppose that this name is given to Christ in the same manner? Ans. (1.) When this name is given to idols, it is always with some mark of condemnation. But in all these instances quoted, the name is given to Christ with approbation and honour. (2.) When the name is given to magistrates or angels, it is generally in the plural, signifying office collectively; but to Christ it is given in the singular. (3.) It is given to Christ with epithets which have no ambiguity and distinguish him as God, and in the way of worship and adoration; as "true God," "God over all, and blessed for ever;" and so also John xx. 28; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Tit. ii. 13. In these ways the name of God could not be given to a creature, however exalted, without falsehood, profanity and absurdity.

153. Is there any other divine name given to Christ, which proves his Deity? Ans. Yes; (not to wait to speak at length of the name *Lord*, translated from *Kurios*, Greek, which, however, is applied to Christ in a manner unequivocally proving his Godhead,) he is called *Jehovah*.

154. What peculiarity is in this name? Ans. It is never given to any but the true God, and can be given to no other without falsehood, blasphemy and absurdity, because it expresses incommunicable attributes; as self-existent, independent, only-living, or essential living Being.

155. Where is this name given to the Son? Ans. (1.) In Jer. xxiii. 6. This is here given to him who, in verse 5, is called *the Branch* raised to David. (2.) Isa. xl. 3, That this is the Son, see Matt. iii. 3, and John i. 23. (3.) Isaiah vi. 5; with this compare John xii. 37—41. (4.) Psa. xxiii. 1; compared with 1 Pet. ii. 25. Although not said of the Son alone, it is inclusive of him. Let us notice, next, the *attributes* ascribed to the Son.

156. What divine attributes are ascribed to the Son? Ans. All divine attributes.

157. Mention some which prove his Godhead? Ans. (1.) Eternity. (2.) Omnipresence. (3.) Independence. (4.) Immutability. (5.) Omniscience. (6.) Omnipotence.

158. Where do we find *eternity* ascribed to him? Ans. Prov. viii. 22, 23, "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way—I was set up from everlasting," &c., Micah v. 2; "Whose goings forth have been of old," &c., John i. 1; viii. 58, "Before Abraham was I am."

159. Prove his *omnipresence*? Ans. Matt. xxviii. 20; John iii. 13, "The Son of Man who is in heaven."

160. Where is *independence* ascribed to him? In Rev. i. 8, 11, 18, "The first and the last—who was, and is, and is to come—and am alive for evermore." On these verses, observe, (1.) That here the speaker claiming these attributes is evidently Christ the Son, as described ver. 12—18. (2.) That these characters, "Alpha and Omega, the first and the last," are precisely those which Jehovah takes to himself; Isa. xlv. 6; xlvi. 12; when expressly declaring his character as the true God, in distinction from all false gods. (3.) Therefore, independent Deity belongs to the Son as well as to the Father.

161. Where is *immutability* ascribed to him? Ans. In Ps. cii. 27, 28, compared with Heb. i. 10—12, "They shall perish, but thou remainest—thou art the same," &c.

162. Where is *omniscience* ascribed to him? Ans. In many places; particularly Rev. ii. 23, "He that searcheth the heart," &c., John xxi. 17.

163. Where is *omnipotence* ascribed to him? Ans. In Rev. i. 8, "the Almighty;" Isaiah ix. 6, "the mighty God;" Ps. xlv. 3, "O most mighty," compared with Heb. i. 8, 9.

164. Do not, in a word, the ascriptions of Godhead to him necessarily imply all divine attributes? Ans. Yes; as divine attributes ascribed to him imply his Godhead.

165. Where is Godhead, or Deity, ascribed to him? Ans. In many places; particularly Col. ii. 9, "fulness of the Godhead bodily;" Phil. ii. 6, "form of God—equal with God;" John x. 30, unity with the Father.

LECTURE VI.—DIVINITY OF THE SON AND SPIRIT.

Q. 166. Are *works* ascribed to the Son in Scripture which are the works of God alone? Ans. Yes.

167. Mention some of them? Ans. *Creation* is one; Ps. xxxiii. 6, compared with John i. 3; Col. i. 16.

168. Is not creation claimed by God as his peculiar work, and as incontestably proving his Godhead? Ans. Yes; Jer. x. 11, "The gods which have not made the heavens and the earth," &c.

168½. Is not *the upholding of all things* necessarily a work of God, yet ascribed to the Son? Ans. Yes; Col. i. 17; Heb. i. 3.

169. Are not *miracles* incontestable evidences of God's power? Ans. Yes.

170. Are miracles ascribed to the Son as wrought by his own

power? Ans. Yes; John v. 21, "As the Father raiseth the dead, so the Son quickeneth whom he will;" and verse 36, "The works that I do bear witness of me;" John ii. 11, "manifest his glory."

170½. What difference was there between Christ's miracles, and the apostles? Ans. They were instruments; he wrought by his own power; Acts iv. 10; ix. 34.

171. Are not all the works of *salvation of sinners* necessarily the works of God, and yet ascribed to the Son? Ans. Yes.

172. Mention some of those works of salvation ascribed to the Son? Ans. (1.) Redemption, as God's work; Acts xx. 28. (2.) Effectual calling, John v. 25, "The dead shall hear his voice and live. (3.) Pardon of sin, Matt. ix. 6, "The Son of man hath power to forgive." (4.) Sanctification, Eph. v. 26. (5.) Sending of the Spirit, John xv. 26; xvi. 7. (6.) Exercising lordship over the church, and giving her ministers, and blessing their labours; Phil. ii. 9—11; Eph. iv. 11, 12; Matt. xxviii. 20. (7.) The preservation of believers; John x. 28, "Neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." (8.) The resurrection—equal to creation; John v. 28. (9.) The universal judgment; John v. 22; Rom. xiv. 10. We shall now speak of *divine worship* ascribed to the Son.

173. What honour is required to be given to the Son? Ans. The same as to the Father, John v. 23.

174. In what manner is that honour to be given? Ans. In every manner in which it is to be given to the Father; as (1.) Divine worship, Phil. ii. 9—11; Psalm xcvi. 7, compared with Heb. i. 6. (2.) Reverential obedience, Psalm xlv. 11; compared with Heb. i. 8, 9. (3.) The same confidence of faith; John xiv. 1. (4.) The same love; 1 Cor. xvi. 22. (5.) Baptism in his name equally as the Father's; Matt. xxviii. 19.

175. How does all this honour to the Son prove him to be God? Ans. (1.) God is a jealous God, jealous of his honour in worship; Exod. xx. 5; while he requires the worship of the Son. (2.) He will not give his glory to another; Isa. xlii. 8; Matt. iv. 10, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God," &c. Therefore the Son is God, and not another. (3.) No creature, however exalted, could receive worship without idolatry, and without dishonour to God; therefore. Christ the Son is God, and the worship of him is the worship of God. Ps. xcvi. 7, which the apostle (Heb. i. 6,) assures us is a demand even to angels to worship Christ the Son, is remarkable. Verse 7th, first forbids the worship of false gods, bringing the second commandment immediately into view, and then commands the worship of Christ the Son: as though he said, in full view of the second commandment, recognised as still binding, I command worship to the Son, to show that he is the true God, and the true object of worship.

176. Was it not the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, that is generally spoken of in the Old Testament as *the Lord Jehovah, the God of Israel*, and the object of fear, of faith, and of worship? Ans. Yes.

177. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Because it is by Him

that God conducts his church, and holds intercourse with them. (2.) Because he is the Prophet and the Lord of the church, and therefore God, as a redeeming God, appears in the person of the Son. (3.) Because of the application of Old Testament passages respecting God to Christ, in the New Testament; Psa. xxiii. 1, and 1 Peter ii. 25; Psa. xxxiii. 6, and John i. 1—3; Psa. xlv. 6, and Heb. i. 8, 9; Psa. xcvi. 7, and Heb. i. 6; Psalm cii. 25—27, and Heb. i. 10—12; Isa. vi. 8, and John xii. 40, 41, &c.

§ XXII.—178. The Socinians object to the Godhead of Christ, and argue that as he is called the Son of God, (Matt. xvi. 16,) and the image of God, (Col. i. 15,) he is thereby distinguished from God? Ans. (1.) The Son is distinguished from the Father *personally*, not *essentially*, or from him as God. Son, signifies that he is of the same nature, and therefore is God, and, as a person, equal with the Father. And so the Jews reasoned justly; John x. 33, 36. (3.) *Image* may signify *likeness*, as a person, Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 3; or even *oneness*, Heb. x. 1.

179. Obj. (2.) That as man and mediator he is different from God? Ans. (1.) It is admitted, that as man and as mediator he is different from the Father, yea, distinguished from God essentially considered; for he is man by *nature*, and Mediator by *appointment*. (2.) We also plead that he is truly man, truly God, and truly Mediator at the same time. Neither his humanity, nor his office, forbids the idea of his Godhead. (3.) His mediatory office even requires that he be God; 1 Cor. xv. 47.

180. Obj. (3.) That Christ was endued with the gifts of the Spirit, and therefore must be inferior to God? Ans. These gifts were bestowed on him in his human nature, and in his mediatorial office, in both of which he was inferior to the Father; but in his divine Nature he is one with the Father. Nay, those gifts flow from the union of the human nature with the divine.

181. Obj. (4.) That various defects are ascribed to Christ, inconsistent with his being God, as want of infinite goodness; Matt. xix. 17? Ans. Christ does not deny goodness, or even infinite goodness, to himself, but he takes the young man according to the false apprehension which he had entertained of Christ, as though he were only a good man. As though he would say, There is none infinitely good but God, and unless you own me to be God, you inconsistently call me good.

182. Again, they object, That Christ denies that he is omniscient; Matt. xiii. 32? Ans. Christ there speaks of his human nature as not knowing that secret of Jehovah; or he speaks of his mediatorial office as not commissioned to reveal it.

182½. Again, they object, That Christ denies his own omnipotence, John v. 19, "The Son can do nothing of himself," &c. How answer? Ans. (1.) In this text Christ refers to his mediatorial office, in which he is the Father's servant, and acts under his authority; but (2.) The same text declares his ability, notwithstanding, to do these very works; and therefore his Godhead, and his unity with the Father.

183. But, although it be admitted that Christ the Son is God, yet by some it is denied, that as God, or in his divine nature, he is a true and distinct person from the Father; and affirmed that all his distinction from the Father is from his office? Ans. (1.) Distinct personal properties ascribed to him as the *Son*, the *only-begotten* of the Father, prove that as God he possesses these distinct personal properties. (2.) Divine understanding, such as belongs to God alone, is distinctly ascribed to him as the Son, and as being distinctly exercised by him; as Matt. xi. 27, "No man knoweth the Father save the Son," &c.; John x. 15, "Even so know I the Father;" Rev. ii. 23, "I am he who searcheth," &c. (3.) A divine will is also distinctly ascribed to him, John v. 21, "The Son quickeneth whom he will." (4.) Divine works are distinctly ascribed to him; John v. 21; i. 3; Heb. i. 2.

184. Could any of these things be ascribed to him as man? Ans. No; because they are divine powers, perfections or works.

§ XXIII.—We shall speak next of the *Holy Spirit*; and first, to show that he is a *person*.

185. How prove that the Holy Spirit is really a *person*? Ans. From the names given to him, pronouns referring to him, and attributes and works ascribed to him.

186. What *names* given to him prove his distinct personality? Ans. *The Spirit*, John xv. 26; *the Comforter*, John xv. 26; *the earnest of the inheritance*, Eph. i. 14. All which intimate that he is a distinct and real person.

187. How do *pronouns* referring to him prove him a real and distinct person? Ans. The name Πνευμα, (*Pneuma*,) in Greek, is neuter, but the pronouns referring to the Holy Spirit are often masculine, referring to his personality; as John xv. 26, *he*, referring to the Spirit, is masculine; John xvi. 13, *He*, emphatic, εκενος, (*ekeinos*,) put in apposition with the Spirit; Eph. i. 13, 14, *who* is masculine.

188. How do *attributes* ascribed to the Spirit, prove his distinct personality? Ans. Attributes are properties of personality, and they are ascribed to the Spirit as distinctly as to the Father and the Son; and ascribed to Him as exercised in his distinct works; as *understanding*, ascribed 1 Cor. ii. 10, exercised in revealing and searching; so John xiv. 26; so also *will* is ascribed to him in his distinct work; 1 Cor. xii. 11.

189. What *works* are ascribed to the Spirit, proving his real personality? Ans. (1.) Teaching, John xiv. 26. (2.) Testifying, John xvi. 26; 1 John v. 6; and witnessing equally with the Father and the Son, 1 John v. 7; Rom. viii. 16. (3.) Bestowing gifts at his own will, 1 Cor. xii. 8—11. (4.) Separating men for the ministry, Acts xiii. 2; xx. 28.

190. Do not the *emblems* under which the Holy Spirit appears, intimate his distinct personality? Ans. Yes; as that of a *dove*, Matt. iii. 16; *cloven tongues*, &c., Acts. ii. 3.

191. Obj.—That the Spirit is not a person, but a power, a virtue,

or a quality of God, and so called Luke i. 35? Ans. (1.) The Holy Spirit may be called *power*, as well as the Son be called *wisdom*, without denying his personality. (2.) In Luke i. 35, the "power of the Highest" is properly the power of the Spirit himself; so in 1 Cor. ii. 4, "demonstration of the Spirit and of power," i. e. the Spirit exercising power.

192. Obj. (2.) That the Spirit is said to be *sent, given, imparted, &c.*? Ans. (1.) He may, though a real person, be sent, as well as the Son. (2.) The very representation of sending him to perform works, implies personality. (3.) His being imparted, signifies, by Metonymy, rather his gifts than himself; as Acts ii. 17, compared with Joel ii. 28; also 1 John iv. 13.

§ XXIV.—To show that the Spirit is a *distinct person*.

193. How does it appear that the Holy Spirit is a distinct person from the Father and the Son? Ans. (1.) From the name *Holy Spirit* being peculiar to him. (2.) From his being distinctly named with the Father and the Son, as the object of worship and of faith, and as a witness, Matt. xxviii. 19; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; 1 John v. 7. (3.) From his being expressly called *another*; John xiv. 16; xv. 26.

194. But, with respect to the peculiar name of the Holy Spirit, the Socinians object, That God is called a Spirit, without distinction of persons; John iv. 24? Ans. (1.) The term is used to designate the nature of God, in this and other cases, while, as a name, it is used to designate a person. (2.) The Father is not personally called *the Spirit*.

195. Is there any weight in the objection, That the Father and Son are sometimes named without the Spirit? Ans. No; as the Father is sometimes named without the Son, &c. But it is sufficient that the Spirit is often named with them.

§ XXV.—To show that the Holy Spirit is *one person*.

196. How does it appear that the Holy Spirit is one, and only one person. Ans. (1.) Because the name is used generally in the singular. (2.) He is expressly said to be one, 1 Cor. xii. 4—11; Eph. iv. 4.

197. It is held by some that *holy angels* are meant by the term *Holy Spirit*, instead of his being a person of the Godhead; and to sustain this idea, they say, (1.) That angels are named with the Father and the Son, instead of the Holy Spirit; 1 Tim. v. 21, "Before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels." How answer? Ans. (1.) The Holy Spirit is often named with the Father and the Son, as equally the object of worship. (2.) In no case are holy angels named as objects of worship. (3.) If the Father and the Son are sometimes named without the Spirit, so, sometimes, the Son and the angels are named without the Father; as Luke xii. 8, "confess before the angel of God." (4.) The divine persons is not excluded when not named; but when not named he is always implied.

198. It is also argued, That the good angels are spirits, and they are holy, and that singular names are often used in a collective sense? Ans. Although good angels are holy spirits, they are never

mentioned as objects of worship, nor as the authors of divine works, nor as possessed of divine perfections, as the Holy Spirit is; nor are they independently or effectively holy, as the Holy Spirit is; and the argument that a singular name is often put in a collective sense, proves nothing on this point.

199. It is also argued, that certain works are sometimes ascribed to angels and to the Holy Spirit, and therefore they are the same? Ans. (1.) The same works are never ascribed to the Holy Spirit and to angels in the same respect. (2.) They may be ascribed to the Holy Spirit as the cause, and to holy angels as instruments.

200. Obj. That, (Rev. i. 4,) the spirits are said to be *seven*, and yet spoken of as the same object of worship as the Father and the Son? Ans. It is the Holy Spirit, the divine person, that is meant, and *seven* is put for perfection of influences and operation.

LECTURE VII.—DIVINITY OF THE SPIRIT.—CONCLUDING REMARKS.

§ XXVI.—OF THE GODHEAD OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Q. 201. How prove that the Holy Spirit is truly God? Ans. By the same grounds of evidence by which the Godhead of the Son is proved, namely, by the *names, attributes, works* and *worship*, which belong only to the true God, being attributed to him.

202. What theories have errorists held respecting the Holy Spirit? Ans. That he is not a distinct person in the Godhead, but merely a *power of God*; that he is a created minister of God, and prince of the angels.

203. What *names* are given to the Holy Spirit in Scripture, proving him to be God? Ans. *Jehovah, God, God of Israel, and Lord.*

204. Give instances of the name *Jehovah* being given to the Holy Spirit? Ans. (1.) In Exod. xviii. 7, it is said, "*they tempted Jehovah,*" &c. And in Isa. lxiii. 10, speaking of the same occasion, it is said, "*they rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit.*" (2.) In Num. xii. 6, it is said, "I, Jehovah, will make myself known to him;" (the prophet,) and in 2 Pet. i. 21, it is said, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (3.) In Isa. vi. 5, 9, 10, Jehovah sends a message; in Acts xxviii. 25, the apostle says this was spoken by the Holy Spirit.

205. Give instances in which the Holy Spirit is called *God*? Ans. (1.) In 1 Cor. iii. 16, "Ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." (2.) In Acts v. 3, 4, 9, he is expressly called God. (3.) In Psa. xc. 6—11, compared with Hebrews iii. 7—11. In the first of these texts God is represented as speaking: in the latter the apostle says it was the Holy Spirit.

206. But why might we not suppose that this name is given to the Holy Spirit in an improper sense, as to angels? Ans. Because these passages represent the Holy Spirit in a divine character, ascribing to him the perfections of Jehovah, and the authority of the true God over us.

207. But why not suppose that, in these passages, the Holy Spi-

rit means only *the power of God*? Ans. Because they represent him as acting personally—as dwelling in us—holding us accountable,—warning and punishing—all which are personal attributes or actions.

208. Where is he called *the God of Israel*? Ans. In 2 Sam. xxiii. 2, 3, where the Spirit of the Lord is called the God of Israel, and the Rock of Israel.

209. Where is he called *Lord*? Ans. In 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18, where he is not only called the *Lord*, but *the Lord the Spirit*, and personal work ascribed to him, of sanctifying the soul.

209½. What divine *attributes* are ascribed to the Spirit? Ans. (1.) Eternity; as inferred from his work of creation; Gen. i. 2; Job xxvi. 13; Psa. xxxiii. 6; Psa. xcv. 5; Heb. iii. 7—11. And from his proceeding from the Father and the Son. (2.) Immensity and omnipresence; Psa. cxxxix. 7—12. (3.) Omniscience; 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11. (4.) Almighty power and infinite wisdom; as inferred from his works.

210. What *works* are ascribed to the Spirit, proving his Godhead? Ans. (1.) Creation; which is the work of God alone; Gen. i. 2; Job xxvi. 13; Psalm xxxiii. 6; xcv. 5. (2.) Upholding and preserving of all things; Psa. civ. 30, “Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created,” &c. (3.) Miracles, as 1 Cor. xii. 4, 11, “gifts of miracles, healing, &c. (4.) The anointing of Christ, Isaiah lxiii. 1, 2, compared with Luke iv. 18. (5.) The mission of gospel ministers; Acts vii. 51, 52; xiii. 2. (6.) Regeneration, called the work of God, John i. 13, compared with John iii. 5, “born of water and of the Spirit;” and called a work of creation, Eph. ii. 10; but ascribed to the Spirit, Tit. iii. 5. (7.) Sanctification; a work of God, John xvii. 17, but ascribed to the Spirit, Titus iii. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 13. (8.) Preservation of the saints; a work of God, 1 Pet. i. 4, 5; Psa. xxxvii. 24; but ascribed to the Spirit’s sealing, Eph. iv. 30; 1 John iii. 9.

211. Where do we find the *worship* of the Holy Spirit prescribed or exemplified? Ans. (1.) In the prescription of baptism, Matt. xxviii. 19. (2.) In consecration of ourselves to him, as temples of God the Spirit; 1 Cor. iii. 16. (3.) Reverential obedience to him as our God; Isa. lxiii. 10, “they vexed his Holy Spirit,” implying our duty to him as our God: Eph. iv. 30; Heb. x. 29, “done despite unto the Spirit of grace;” Matt. xii. 32, “Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit,” &c. (4.) Prayer offered to him; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; Rev. i. 4. (5.) Prayer to him commanded; Matt. ix. 38, “Pray ye the Lord of the harvest,” &c., compared with Acts xiii. 2.

212. It is objected by the Remonstrants, that there is no commanded example, or manifest intimation of praying to the Holy Spirit found in Holy Scripture? Ans. The allegation is false, as appears from the examples adduced.

213. But as it may be admitted that the authority for prayer to the Holy Spirit is not so express or full, as for prayer to the Fa-

ther, why is this so? Ans. (1.) Because of the economy of redemption, in which God, in the person of the Father, is the direct object of prayer, and Christ is the way; so the Holy Spirit is the Author of prayer; Rom. viii. 26; Gal. iv. 6. Therefore there was less occasion to speak of him as the object of prayer. (2.) Because, as he takes an equal part in the economy of redemption, with the Father and the Son, and is therefore evidently one God with them, it is necessarily implied that he is the object of prayer.

§ XXVII.—214. Obj. against the Deity of the Spirit, (1.) That he is represented as not eternal; 1 John vii. 39, "the Holy Spirit was not yet," &c. How answer? Ans. (1.) That passage means that the Spirit was not yet bestowed in that copious manner that was promised after Christ's ascension. (2.) It is scarcely credible that the objectors could seriously believe that the passage quoted means that the Holy Spirit did not yet exist; when in Isa. lxiii. 10, it is said that they vexed him in the wilderness;—when he created the world; Gen. i. 2; Psa. xxxiii. 6,—and when the Spirit was given to Christ at his baptism.

215. Obj. (2.) against his eternity, That he may be quenched; 1 Thess. v. 19? Ans. (1.) That passage cannot mean the annihilation of the Spirit, else a second sinner could not be guilty of quenching him if he did not exist. (2.) That passage means the provoking him to withdraw his gracious operations in our souls, or his sensible influences.

216. To the same purpose they object, (3.) That the Holy Spirit is not omniscient; Matt. xi. 27, "No one knoweth the Son save the Father, and no one knoweth the Father save the Son," &c., thus excluding the Spirit? Ans. (1.) The whole intention of that passage is to deny such knowledge as belonging to the creatures. (2.) When the Spirit is equally the object of worship with the Father and Son, and even "searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God;" and "the things of God knoweth no one but the Spirit of God," 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11, it is manifest that in this passage he is not excluded.

217. To the same purpose they object, (4.) That independence is denied to the Spirit; John xvi. 14, 15? Ans. (1.) Christ there speaks of the order of divine operation in the economy of redemption, and of the perfect unity of the whole work; that the Spirit will not teach, &c., but through Christ. (2.) His independence is asserted, Acts xiii. 2, in sending gospel ministers; and 1 Cor. xii. 8—11, bestowing gifts at his own will.

§ XXVIII.—218. Upon the whole, does not the Scripture doctrine of the Trinity contain a sublimity and mysteriousness such as we might expect in the subsistence of the true God? Ans. Yes.

219. Does it necessarily transcend the comprehension of finite creatures? Ans. Yes.

220. Is it not natural to corrupt man to misapprehend and to disbelieve it? Ans. Yes.

221. Are a right apprehension of it, and a sanctifying faith in

it, attained without the teaching of the Spirit? Ans. No. Matt. xvi. 17, Col. ii. 2.

222. Does not experience prove this as well as Scripture? Ans. Yes; as its denial by many shows also its perversion by many; and even by the weakness of proofs adduced from reason, and of illustrations by similes attempted by some who acknowledge the doctrine.

223. But some object that it is not beyond man's natural knowledge, because it is said that man was created in the image of God; Gen. i. 26? Ans. (1.) Man was not created in the image of the Trinity as such, or in the mode of the divine subsistence. (2.) So far as the image of God in man at first enabled him rightly to apprehend this mystery, that image is now lost.

224. Obj. (2.) That Christ is said to enlighten every man that cometh into the world, and therefore the capacity to understand this doctrine is, by Christ, restored to all men; John i. 9? Ans. (1.) If, in that passage, saving light, given by Christ as Mediator, be meant, then according to other Scriptures, it is not every man absolutely that is enlightened, but all his people; and that Christ is the only saving light for man. (2.) If it mean the bestowal of the natural light of reason, then it represents Christ, as in ver. 3, 10: it is Christ as God, and not as Mediator that is spoken of, and does not mean that he has restored to them the gracious image of God. (3.) As we believe that text speaks of Christ as God, so it does not mean that Christ, giving the light of reason, thereby gives the knowledge of the Trinity.

225. Obj. (3.) That in several heathen writers this mystery is found; and therefore it may be known from nature's light? Ans. (1.) Some of these writings, it is believed, are spurious preparations, or interpolated by Christians. (2.) The sense put on some of them, as if containing this mystery, is evidently foreign to the intention of the writer. (3.) Some ideas of a plurality, or a Trinity in God, found in them, have evidently come from tradition, and not from nature's light. Thus indeed they prove that the doctrine of the Trinity was not unknown to the patriarchal church.

226. Obj. (4.) Rom. i. 19, 20, teaches that heathens have, by the light of nature, a knowledge of God, and, therefore, of this mystery of the Trinity? Ans. This doctrine of the Trinity does not belong to the knowledge of God by nature's light, but God's being and some of his perfections; as "his eternal power and Godhead."

227. Obj. (5.) The Trinity may be inferred from the perfection of God, and proved by various similitudes in nature? Ans. (1.) The inference of the doctrine, from the understanding, the will, the power, the goodness, and the blessedness of God, is made only by those who know the doctrine by divine revelation; and still the inferences are dark and unsatisfactory. (2.) The pretended proof of the doctrine from similitudes, as a triangle of solids, the soul, light, &c., is imaginary, is no proof, even if it were an illustration; but there is no proper similarity, and none would have been conceived, if the doctrine were not known by revelation.

§ XXIX.—228. Is the doctrine of the Trinity necessary to be known and believed, in order to salvation? Ans. Yes.

229. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) It is necessary to the right knowledge of God; John xvii. 3. Here, in order to eternal life, we must know the Father and the Son, and consequently the Holy Spirit, who is one of the persons of the Godhead, and whose special work in our salvation is essentially necessary. (2.) It is necessary to faith in God; John xiv. 1; John iii. 18. To believe on the only-begotten Son of God is necessary to salvation, and therefore the knowledge of him is necessary. (3.) It is necessary in order to our honouring the Son as the Father; John v. 23. (4.) If we deny any one of the persons of the Trinity, we deny and reject the other persons, and the true God; 1 John ii. 23. (5.) It is necessary to our knowledge of the various important doctrines of the gospel, and to our faith in them; as the incarnation of Christ, his satisfaction, our justification, our sanctification, and the several privileges of adoption. (6.) It is necessary in order to our right worship of God; Heb. xi. 6; for we should come to the Father, Matt. vi. 9; 1 Pet. i. 17; through the Son, John xiv. 6; and by the Holy Spirit, Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 26.

230. Should we not infer the necessity of the doctrine from the revelation of it? Ans. Yes.

231. To the necessity of the doctrine it is objected, (1.) That the apostles did not, in their admissions to baptism, &c., expressly mention the Trinity; as Philip and the eunuch, Acts viii. 37; 1 John iv. 15? Ans. (1.) This doctrine of the Trinity was comprehended in these confessions. (2.) Baptizing in the name of the Trinity expressly required it.

232. Obj. (2.) This doctrine is too obscurely revealed in both the Old and New Testaments, to be a necessary article of knowledge or faith? Ans. The facts included in the doctrine, in their sum, are so clearly revealed, that if people were not disposed to reject the doctrine, on account of its mysteriousness, there could scarcely be two opinions about it.

233. Is the difficulty of comprehending the doctrine any objection to its necessity? Ans. No; it is not the comprehension, but the belief of the truth of the doctrine that is necessary.

234. Is the distinct knowledge of the doctrine, in all its details, necessary to salvation? Ans. No; but the substance and truth of the doctrine.

235. What then is the substance of the doctrine? Ans. That God is one, and that there are three persons, Father, Son and Spirit; not three Gods, but three persons in one God.

236. What then is the use of minute discussion of the doctrine? Ans. To assist in the right understanding of it, and to prevent error on the points which we ought to know.

§ XXX.—237. Is this doctrine useful in promoting piety? Ans. Yes; (1.) To convince us of the divine incomprehensibility. (2.) To lead us to humility. (3.) To lead us to the worship of the true God. (4.) To lead us to the right manner of worship. (5.) To show us clearly the way of salvation.

CHAPTER VI.

OF THE DECREES OF GOD.

LECTURE VIII.—THEIR EVIDENCE AND NATURE.

§ I.—Quest. 1. Having considered the nature and perfections of God, and his mode of subsistence, we should, in order to our better knowledge of God, consider his operations. Are not both the things produced by God's hand, and his actions producing them, called, in Scripture, God's *works* or *operations*? Ans. Yes; as Rom. i. 20; Heb. i. 10; ii. 7, referring to things produced; and Luke xxiv. 19; Acts xv. 18, referring to his actions producing those things. We shall first consider God's operations in the latter sense; that is, as his actions.

2. How are these actions of God divided? Ans. Into *transient*, or passing at the time, and *eternal* or *continuous*. That is, he does things in time, in execution of his purpose, and he does things by necessity of his nature, which are internal, permanent and unchangeable. The latter are also called *immanent*.

3. Must not the immanent acts of God be before his transient acts, in the order of nature? Ans. Yes; and therefore it is proper to treat of them first.

4. How may the immanent, internal and eternal acts of God be divided, in our consideration of them? Ans. Into works or acts *terminating on himself*, and acts *terminating on things without him*; on things which are not God himself.

5. Specify, for example, some of those immanent acts of God which terminate on himself? Ans. Such as loving himself, generation, spiration, or the Spirit's proceeding, &c. Of these we have spoken when treating of God in his nature and mode of subsistence.

6. What are the immanent or eternal acts of God which terminate on things without himself? Ans. *Decrees*. These are eternal and essential acts of God, with respect to things without himself, and which he will do or bring to pass in time.

§ II.—7. Is the term *decree*, found in Holy Scripture, in reference to God? Ans. Yes; as Dan. iv. 17, 24, "decree of the Watchers;" "This is the decree of the Most High."

8. Are there other equivalent terms used in Scripture? Ans. Yes; as *will*, *good-pleasure*, *purpose*, *determination*, *counsel*; Isa. xlvi. 10, 11; Eph. i. 9, 11, "Having made known the mystery of his will, according to his good-pleasure, which he hath purposed," &c.—"predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will."

9. Do the terms *decree*, *purpose*, or *counsel*, as applied to God, imply that God was at any period undetermined, hesitating, ignorant, needing instruction or time to deliberate? Ans. No; but

these words are used in adaptation to our weakness, and must be used in a sense agreeable to the perfections of God, to his eternal wisdom and immutability.

10. By the term *decree*, or any of its equivalents, whether are we to understand *the thing decreed*, or *God's act decreeing*? Ans. His act, decreeing; as thus it is God's immanent act.

11. Is, then, God's decree, or counsel, one or many? Ans. It is one in himself,—one act,—though many in respect to objects or effects.

12. May not God's decree be considered as belonging to his operations? Ans. Yes; as it is his acting.

§ III.—13. What general proof have we of the fact of God's decrees, or of the truth of the doctrine that he has decreed? Ans. (1.) The Scriptures rather assume than assert the fact. (2.) Divine perfections necessarily imply it. (3.) The foreknowledge of God implies it. (4.) The certain futuration of things proves it.

14. What evidence for the fact arises from the *Scriptures assuming it*? Ans. (1.) That the thing is true which is assumed. (2.) The assumption implies that reason itself must infer from the perfections of God, that he has decrees or purposes. (3.) That it is not to be supposed that a rational being, soberly and seriously exercising his mind on the manifest doctrines of God's nature and perfections, would deny the fact of divine decrees.

15. How do *divine perfections* imply the fact of divine decrees? Ans. (1.) Divine activity, intelligence and goodness necessarily imply that God has decrees. (2.) His wisdom implies that God has designs, and will effect his designs by the best means. (3.) His immutability implies that all things must come to pass according to the original design. (4.) The independence of God implies that no being can effect any thing without him, and that all things are dependent on God's will and operation. (5.) Divine liberty must act independently of the creature.

16. How does the *foreknowledge* of God prove his decrees? Ans. God must foreknow all things, either by dependence on persons or things, or on second causes which are independent on himself, or he must foreknow them independently, by his own purpose. But he is absolutely independent, and all things are necessarily dependent on him; and therefore he knows them only by his purpose. Therefore, God has decrees.

17. How does the *certain futuration of things* prove decrees? Ans. (1.) Because nothing can come to pass of itself, or without God. (2.) Nothing can come to pass by him without design or purpose.

§ IV.—18. What things are included in a definition of God's decrees? Ans. (1.) They are God's determinations respecting his effecting or permitting all future things particularly, and respecting the ordering of them all to his glory and the salvation of his elect. (2.) These determinations are *eternal, free, wise, absolute* and *immutable*.

‡ V.—ON THE GENERAL NATURE OF THE DECREES.

19. Are decrees, as they are in God, accidents or qualities in God, or distinct from himself? Ans. No; because he is most simple, and perfectly unchangeable.

20. But is not a divine decree an *act* of God? Ans. Yes; it is an act, but not a quality.

21. Are the decrees, as they are in God, many, or only one? Ans. In regard to objects they are many, but as the act of God, it is only one.

22. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the infinity of God, comprehending all things at the same moment. (2.) From the necessary eternity of his decree; while many separate acts of the divine mind would imply that some of them were not eternal. (3.) From the immutability of God; different acts of will would imply change in his knowledge and will.

23. Is the act of willing or decreeing necessary to God? Ans. Yes.

24. How does this appear? Ans. From his spirituality and necessary activity, rendering designs necessary; and from his wisdom and intelligence, in which he cannot be without designs; and from his independence, in that all his designs must be from himself.

25. But as to the things which he purposes or wills, is he not free? Ans. Yes; so far as his nature and perfections did not render them necessary.

26. Are, then, some of God's decrees, as to the things to take place, necessary, and some of them free? Ans. Yes: the creation of man, his fall, redemption, &c., were objects in God decreed freely, or without the necessity of his nature to decree them; but his own happiness, goodness, justice, &c., he decreed by necessity of nature.

27. Would it be correct to say that God's decrees are mere ideas of things? Ans. No.

28. What error would be involved in such a doctrine? Ans. (1.) Ideas existing from eternity without God is absurd; ideas can exist only in mind, and eternal ideas only in an eternal mind. (2.) Mere ideas existing in God without purpose would not insure the futuration of things, but only the possibility of them.

29. Would it be correct to say that the decrees, as they are in God, are simply that abstract faculty of God which we call his *will*? Ans. No; because nothing then could exist but God himself, as it would be a will purposing nothing, and consequently effecting nothing, which is both contrary to fact, and inconsistent with the divine nature in reference to his works.

30. Is then the divine decree the act of the divine will? Ans. Yes; it is the will purposing certain ends, and the existence of things.

LECTURE IX.—PROPERTIES OF THE DIVINE DECREES.

§ VI.—31. What properties must we ascribe to the divine decrees? Ans. Besides others, which none will question who ac-

knowledge the being and perfections of God, we may mention that they are *eternal, free, wise, absolute or independent, and immutable.*

32. Do these properties flow from the fact that the decrees, as they are in God, are one act of God's will, and one with himself? Ans. Yes.

33. How prove that the decrees of God are truly *eternal*? Ans. Both from the nature of God as revealed in the Scriptures, and from express Scriptures respecting the decrees.

34. How prove the eternity of the decrees from the nature of God? Ans. (1.) From the foreknowledge of God, so abundantly maintained in Scripture. On account of God's infinity and immutability, his foreknowledge is necessarily eternal; and on account of his independence, his foreknowledge must depend on his will or purpose. On any other supposition God would be dependent on things for his foreknowledge. (2.) From God's immutability, we see that his decrees must be eternal. He must always know and purpose the same things. To take on new purposes in time, would be a change in God. (3.) From the active energy of God, and the dependence of all things on himself. He is the Author of all things. What he does at any time, he does with design; and being immutable, he must have had the same design from eternity.

35. What Scripture texts will prove the eternity of the decrees? Ans. (1.) 1 Cor. ii. 7, "wisdom which God ordained before the world," &c. (2.) Eph. i. 4, "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world." (3.) Eph. iii. 11, "According to the eternal purpose," &c. (4.) 2 Tim. i. 9, "According to his own purpose—given us—before the world began." (5.) Tit. i. 2, "In hope of eternal life, which God—promised before the world began."

36. What opinion do the Socinians hold on the eternity of the decrees? Ans. That there are only three general decrees eternal, and the rest are temporary. These three are, (1.) That God would create and govern the world. (2.) That he would send Christ into the world and offer him to sinners. (3.) And that he would give salvation to believers.

37. What would be the evil of holding this doctrine? Ans. It would imply that God is imperfect, like man, able to comprehend a few general things, but not all the minutiae of those things, and that his knowledge is defective.

38. Since neither the Scriptures on the subject, nor the nature of God require or allow such a distinction, on what ground do they make it? Ans. On the supposition that it is necessary in order to maintain the liberty of human actions and man's accountability.

39. They object, (1.) against the eternity of all decrees, that God is prior to all decrees, as the cause before the effect? Ans. (1.) We may admit that he is prior in the order of nature, but not in time; but (2.) It is not proper to say that God is the *cause* of decrees; he is the Author. It is God decreeing.

40. Obj. (2.) That order of decrees is inconsistent with their absolute eternity? Ans. (1.) There is an order of priority among

the *things* decreed, but not in the act of God decreeing. (2.) Though we must observe an order in our purposing, and occupy time, it does not follow that God does so.

41. Obj. (3.) That a decree supposes previous deliberation? Ans. Though this is so with man, it is so not with God. It would be imperfection.

42. Obj. (4.) The Scriptures represent God as deliberating in time; as Gen. i. 26; xi. 7? Ans. This is spoken after the manner of men, and was designed to indicate what God's eternal counsel was, or the propriety of its execution.

§ VII.—*Of the Liberty of the Decrees.*—Quest. 43. Was the decreeing act of God in eternity perfectly *free*? Ans. Yes.

44. What are we to understand by the liberty or freedom of God in decreeing? Ans. (1.) Nor that he was free to decree or not decree at all; for by necessity of his nature and activity, he must purpose. (2.) Nor that, in every thing, he could decree indifferently one thing or its opposite; for by necessity of his nature he must purpose justice, holiness, &c. And this is the perfection of his liberty. Therefore, decreeing one thing, he could not decree another thing respecting it which would violate justice or holiness. (3.) Nor that God's liberty would allow him to decree contradictions; as to create man accountable, without rational or moral powers; or, on the other hand, bestow on him powers which belong to God only. (4.) Nor yet to decree a thing and not infallibly execute it. (5.) Nor yet that he should decree without any end in view. He has in view, not only his own glory necessarily, but subordinate ends. But, (6.) The liberty of God decreeing is this:—Of his own free will, or good pleasure, he decreed all things which are to come to pass, without any influence or cause without himself, leading or impelling him so to decree.

45. Are not all God's decrees, then, sovereign and independent, and agreeable to his own holy nature and perfections? Ans. Yes.

46. Was it any limitation of God's freedom, that he could not decree any thing contrary to his nature? Ans. No; this is the perfection of liberty.

47. Would it not have been a limitation of his liberty if his decree had been influenced by things without him? Ans. Yes; and also a want of independence; and therefore he could not have been influenced by such causes.

48. Was not absolute sovereignty and independence essential to God's liberty in his decrees? Ans. Yes.

49. How, then, prove that God's decrees are perfectly free and sovereign? Ans. Both from the revealed perfections of God and direct Scripture.

50. How prove this from God's revealed nature and perfections? Ans. (1.) Because he is absolutely independent, being self-existent, self-sufficient, and the Author of all things, on whom all things are dependent. To deny absolute freedom in the decrees, is to deny God's independence. (2.) Because of his infinite power to make all things subserve his will. Our want of freedom in our

purposes, arises from our want of power. (3.) Because of his infinite wisdom to adapt one thing to another, so as infallibly to attain his purpose.

51. How prove the freedom of divine decrees from direct Scripture? Ans. (1.) Jer. xviii. 6, "Cannot I do with you as this potter?" &c. (2.) Matt. xi. 26, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." (3.) Eph. i. 5, 9, "According to the good pleasure of his will—according to his good pleasure which he purposed in himself," &c. (4.) Rom. ix. 11, 20, 21, "That the purpose of God according to election might stand." "Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" &c.

Further, in reference to the divine liberty in the decrees, we may observe more particularly, according to our author, that the liberty of the decrees does not consist in the following things. (1.) That God was at liberty not to decree at all; for his spirituality, activity, intelligence, &c., require activity and purpose. (2.) That in every thing, without exception, God could decree contradictions; as, for example, to permit sin, and not to punish it. His necessary justice forbids this; although in some things he might do so, as in creating or upholding, where such contradictions or incongruities would not be unjust, unholy, &c. Thus, giving things their proper natures, he could not decree to govern them in an unrighteous manner. (3.) That he could decree contradictions of such a kind as to give to creatures powers and faculties unsuited to their condition; or to make man accountable, without rationality or moral goodness; or that God would not necessarily give to creatures qualities suited to their powers and essential nature. His liberty would not violate this propriety. (4.) That he could decree a thing, and also decree not to execute it. (5.) That though an object without himself could not influence his decree, yet that he should not propose to himself an end or object to be effected by his decree. He necessarily has ends in view, of his own choice—himself the highest.

§ VIII.—*Of the wisdom of the decrees.*—Quest. 52. Is infinite wisdom a characteristic of God's decrees? Ans. Yes.

53. What are we to understand by the wisdom of the decrees? Ans. (1.) That God chose the best ends to be accomplished. (2.) That he chose the best means of accomplishing those ends. (3.) A perfect comprehension of all their complicated mystery; Rom. xi. 33, 34, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom," &c. (4.) That end and means are so chosen, amidst all their complication, that the decree is efficacious and infallibly certain of its accomplishment.

54. How prove the infinite wisdom of the decrees? Ans. Both from the revealed character of God, and from direct Scripture testimony.

55. How prove it from the revealed character of God? Ans. From all his infinite perfections of knowledge, goodness and power.

56. How prove it from direct Scripture? Ans. From Rom. xi. 33, 34; Psa. cxlvii. 5; Eph. iii. 10.

57. May not the wisdom of the divine decrees be seen in their

execution? Ans. Yes; Psa. civ. 24, "In wisdom thou hast made them all; the earth is full of thy riches." The end, means, and causes are so completely adapted to one another, and the frequent occurrence of predicted events, when, to human appearance, they were utterly improbable.

58. Do apparent contradictions and oppositions in the decrees, often occurring in providence, militate against the wisdom of God's decrees? Ans. No; they only appear so to us because of our depravity, or because of their depth and complexity which we cannot comprehend.

59. Is there any ground for the opinion that some of God's decrees are feeble volitions, fruitless desires, and inefficacious purposes, hindered by some unfavourable event? Ans. No; such a doctrine is an irreverent and profane charging of God with weakness and folly, setting up our judgment to correct his wisdom, and an infatuated blindness with respect to our weakness.

LECTURE X.—PROPERTIES OF THE DECREES,—CONTINUED.

§ IX. *Of the independence of the decrees.*—Q. 60. Are the decrees of God absolute, or conditional? Ans. They are absolute.

61. Do we mean, by an absolute decree, that one event is not made dependent on another? Ans. No; God has connected means and end, causes and effects.

62. What, then, are we to understand by an absolute decree? Ans. (1.) That there were no conditions in God's view, in decreeing, which were antecedent to the decreed event, and induced him to decree as he did. (2.) That the decree is not left at uncertainties. (3.) That a final event and the means of effecting it are equally decreed. (4.) That all these are decreed with infallible certainty by the independent God.

63. How prove that the decrees are absolute and unconditional? Ans. From the perfections of God, and direct Scriptures.

64. How prove it from the perfections of God? Ans. (1.) From his power to accomplish his will, and to order second causes and means with absolute certainty to their decreed end. (2.) From his authorship of all things and their necessary dependence on him. He who gave them being and nature, could not render any thing conditional or uncertain to himself. (3.) From his wisdom, which could not mistake the means and their power. (4.) From his foreknowledge, which is necessarily certain on his own purpose and will. (5.) From his independence, against which it is profanity to say that God can be disappointed or frustrated in his designs, when all things are at his disposal, and nothing has power to operate as cause or means, but by his will and power.

65. How prove God's decree absolute from direct Scriptures? Ans. From Rom. ix. 11. Here, the purpose of God is the original cause. Its absolute certainty is asserted, and all conditions of works good or evil are carefully excluded. Also from Isa. xlvi. 10, 11; Rom. ix. 16, "Not of him that willeth," &c.

66. Is it any objection to the doctrine of absolute decrees, that

God has made one event dependent on another, and that, therefore, he had decreed accordingly? Ans. No; because he absolutely decreed both the ultimate event, and that on which its occurrence is suspended. He did not decree one event, and leave undecreed that which was necessary to its occurrence. Those seemingly conditional, and those on which they were suspended, are all decreed with equal certainty, and may be considered as end and means, or second causes.

67. Is it any objection, then, to the doctrine of absolute decrees, as Arminians pretend, that God makes conditional threatenings or promises? Ans. No; the event is established with infallible certainty. Such a threatening or promise does not state the decree, as to the event, but as to the connexion of cause and effect, antecedent and consequent, means and end; and is designed to call man's attention to his duty by presenting that connexion.

68. Is it any objection to absolute decrees, that God expresses a wish with which the event does not agree; as Ps. lxxxii. 13: "O that my people had hearkened to me;" or Isa. xlvi. 18? Ans. No; God is not there declaring his decree, but his good pleasure, or what he would have complacency in, as to man's duty or interests.

69. Obj. If decrees are absolute, it renders all things that occur, necessary, and takes away human liberty? Ans. (1.) We admit there is a necessity of consequence. The thing must infallibly take place. But, (2.) The decree imposes no intrinsic necessity, limiting the moral liberty of the creature. He is left at full liberty to make his choice freely, as circumstances are presented to him. Thus, by the decree, we have not the liberty of doing what Providence absolutely prevents; but we have the full liberty of making our choice, and, when Providence permits, of following out our choice. (3.) If we were not to admit the absolute decree, we then must fall back on the heathen doctrine of *fate*, and we must admit that events will certainly occur. Absolute decrees no more infringe on human liberty, than this necessary fate does. Under either the Christian view of God decreeing, or the heathen view of fate, man exercises his liberty of choice and action, under the circumstances in which he is placed, although entirely ignorant of the future event. The unknown event does not guide him, but the circumstances in which he is placed.

§ X.—*Of the immutability of the decrees.*—Q. 70. Are the decrees of God absolutely *unchangeable*? Ans. Yes.

71. How prove that the decrees are immutable? Ans. Both from the perfections of God and direct Scriptures.

72. How prove it from the divine perfections? Ans. (1.) The wisdom of God is infinite, and gives no occasion to change his purpose. A change of purpose could arise only from defect of wisdom, if his power be adequate to the execution. (2.) The power of God proves it. As he is almighty, nothing can arise to disappoint him, or hinder his wise purposes. (3.) From the independence of God. All things depend on him, and He, the

fountain of all being, wisdom, power and goodness, being absolutely independent, it is even absurd to suppose that any thing can arise to alter his purpose. (4.) His own essential immutability necessarily forbids the idea of a change of purpose.

73. How prove it from Scripture? Ans. (1.) From Scriptures respecting God himself; as Mal. iii. 6, "I am the Lord, I change not, therefore," &c.; and this is said to show his unchangeable will; James i. 17, "With whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." (2.) From Scriptures respecting the decrees themselves; as Isa. xlvi. 10; Psa. xxxiii. 11; Heb. vi. 17, "To show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel," &c.

But men, judging of God by themselves, and imagining that an absolute and immutable decree would deny human liberty and accountability, and require too humbling a view of man's dependence, object to this doctrine; as,

74. Obj. (1.) That God is represented in Scripture as repenting, as though compelled reluctantly to change his purpose; as Gen. vi. 6; 1 Sam. xv. 11, &c.? Ans. (1.) Like many other passages of Scripture, this is spoken after the manner of men, and must be understood consistently with other Scripture representations of God; as Mal. iii. 6; 1 Sam. xv. 29. (2.) Such passages signify that the thing spoken of is contrary to God's will of complacency; as man's depravity and Saul's rebellion. (3.) Such passages refer to God's change of operation, while that change is according to the eternal decree.

75. Obj. (2.) That God makes promises and threatenings which he does not execute, and gives commands which he does not wish to be fulfilled; as Ex. xxxii. 10; Gen. xxii. 2; and the ceremonial law? Ans. Such promises and threatenings were to be understood conditionally, for expressing desert of vengeance on the one hand, and approbation on the other; and such a command was for trial; and the ceremonial law was given as temporal; none of which imply any change of decree.

76. Obj. (3.) That God, by his decree, wills one thing, and yet wills another as contrary; as Ezek. xviii. 32; 1 Tim. ii. 4? Ans. It is God's will of complacency that is set forth in such passages, and not a change in his decrees. It is true God's will of complacency and precept, and of decrees, are not in every respect the same, although they do not conflict. His counsel shall stand, although sinners do not fulfil his will of precept. in which he takes complacency; and though sinners perish under his decree, he takes no pleasure in their misery. These things are plainly taught, maintaining most plainly the immutability of the decree, the duty of the sinner, and the compassion of God, while these ways of God are a depth which we cannot fathom.

77. Obj. (4.) That the immutability of the decree is inconsistent with prayer? Ans. (1.) Prayer is not intended to change the decree or the will of God, but it is an appointed means of obtaining a change of dispensation. (2.) Prayer on our part must be guided by the promise, or revealed will of God, as we know not the de-

cree. Prayer is as unlimited in its objects as if there were no decree. (3.) Prayer to God is a means of obtaining our object as really as a request to a fellow-being, since the object of our prayer to God and of our request to our fellow-man are equally decreed. And if we deny the decree and its immutability, the certain futuration of the thing (which none deny, although they disagree about the cause of its futuration,) presents the same difficulty, and would present the same objection to the use of all means whatever; and therefore the objection is groundless. Means, as well as the end, are decreed.

78. Since the futuration of things is certain, and as this occurrence must necessarily and infallibly take place, to what must their certainty be ascribed, if not to God's decree? Ans. To the blind, imaginary *fate* of the heathen—of those who are "without God in the world."

79. Does not such a doctrine, (ascribing events to *fate*, and denying the decrees of God) deny God's government of his creation, and set the second causes of things above God, and independent of him? Ans. Yes.

80. Does not the denial of God's absolute and immutable decrees amount to the denial of the true God, and lead to infidelity? Ans. Yes.

81. What do opponents of the independent and immutable decrees of God mean by his *antecedent* will, or decree? Ans. A general, inefficacious purpose of God first made, which, on account of some opposing event, God changes to some consequent decree.

82. Is not this most unworthy of the infinitely Wise, the Almighty, and independent Jehovah? Ans. Yes; it makes him a dependent being like ourselves, and ascribes the existence and powers of the creatures to some other source, independent of God.

83. Although the decrees of God are, like himself, incomprehensible, does the doctrine of Scripture respecting them present any barrier or hinderance to faith, comfort, or duty? Ans. No; if rightly understood, it presents none, but on the contrary, it promotes godliness and comfort.

84. How does it tend to promote godliness? Ans. By leading us to ascribe all perfection to God, and entire dependence to the creature; by leading us to godly fear and reverence, and to faith and trust in God.

85. How does it tend to promote comfort? Ans. By sustaining the belief that all our destinies are in the hand of the living God, and not governed by chance; and in the hand of a God of perfect justice, wisdom, power, and goodness; in the hand of our covenant God and Father, who will be infallibly faithful to his promises, which are all based on his infallible decree.

LECTURE XI.—CONTINGENT EVENTS.—SINFUL ACTIONS, ETC.

§ XI.—Quest. 86. Are all things, great and small, necessary and contingent, which take place in time, embraced and secured in the decrees of God? Ans. Yes.

87. How prove this doctrine? Ans. From the perfections of God and direct Scriptures.

88. How prove it from the perfections of God? Ans. (1.) From God's independence. He independently purposes and accomplishes his will; and therefore everything must be ordered by him in accomplishing his purposes. (2.) From God's relation to all creatures, as the Creator and Upholder of all things, great and small. He made and supports them to answer his purpose. (3.) From God's foreknowledge of all things, which, from his independence, must arise from himself.

89. How prove it from Scripture? Ans. From Acts xv. 18; Eph. i. 11.

90. But are things free and contingent, all embraced in the absolute and immutable decree? Ans. Yes; as appears from the evidences already given, and from instances frequently given in Scripture; as, for example, Gen. l. 20, 25, Joseph's advancement in Egypt—God's bringing Israel out of Egypt. Also David's coming to the throne, as foretold, and yet through many vicissitudes, and by means the most uncertain to man.

91. What are we to understand by the liberty of the creature; or things free to him? Ans. Liberty or freedom does not consist in indifference, but in rational choice, or good pleasure: feeling no internal restraint in making our choice among the circumstances, and under the laws under which we are placed.

92. What are we to understand by *contingency*? Ans. (1.) No connexion between second causes known to us, and, (2.) No connexion between them necessary by the laws of nature.

93. Is there, then, any thing contingent with God? Ans. No; things are contingent only to creatures, who do not know God's decree before its execution, except when foretold.

94. But does not God's decree connect these contingent things as surely and infallibly as if connected by the necessity of nature? Ans. Yes; as the fulfilment of prophecy respecting them proves.

95. But does the decree of God connecting these contingent things infallibly, interfere with either contingency, or rational liberty? Ans. No; it even secures both. God has decreed the contingency of things as they appear to man, and also rational liberty, while he perfectly secures his own purposes.

96. Is not, then, every contingent thing, and every free action of the creature, under a necessity of consequence? Ans. Yes; it is so by God's decree, and yet the intelligent creature feels himself as free as though there were no decree.

97. Do we not possess all the liberty that is necessary to our moral obligation or to our happiness, so long as we feel no compulsion or restraint in our choice, by the decree? Ans. Yes.

§ XII.—98. Since the decrees of God embrace every event, and render it infallibly sure, do they not, of course, embrace the limits of our lives and of all our circumstances? Ans. Yes; Job xiv. 5, 6; Matt. x. 29, 30.

99. How then are we to understand those Scriptures which speak

of prolonging life, of shortening days, &c., as Ex. xx. 12; Ps. lv. 24, &c.? Ans. Not in reference to the *decree*, which cannot be changed, and which we cannot know till the event occur, but in reference, (1.) To the ordinary period of human life; (2.) To the natural strength of constitution; or, (3.) To the person's own hopes or calculations.

100. Does the decree, including all things, interfere with our using the means of life, or render our caution and prudence respecting it either useless or presumptuous? Ans. No; God has, by decree, connected the means with the end, and we, ignorant of the decree, are bound to do our duty, and use appropriate means.

§ XIII.—101. In decreeing all things did God decree *sinful* actions as well as those morally good? Ans. Yes.

102. How does it appear from reason that God decreed sinful actions as well as those morally good? Ans. (1.) Sinful actions could not occur without God's foreknowledge. (2.) God could not foreknow them but by purpose, as otherwise he would be dependent, for knowledge and events, on things without himself; and the second causes producing these actions would be independent, which is impossible. (3.) If sinful actions were not decreed they could not be under God's providence, any more than under the decree, and thus God would be excluded from the government of a great part of the world.

103. How prove from Scripture that God decrees sinful actions? Ans. Gen. i. 20, the sinful action of Joseph's brethren; Acts ii. 23, and iv. 27, 28, expressly stating that the sinful actions of the Jews, &c., in crucifying Christ, were by *God's determinate counsel and foreknowledge*—that by *God's hand and counsel they were predestined to be done*.

104. But is God, by his decree and providence, in any measure, the Author of sin? Ans. No; in no respect.

105. What distinction do we make between God's decree respecting sinful actions, and respecting those which are good? Ans. We say his decree is *effective* of good, and *permissive* and *directive* of sinful actions.

106. Do we mean, by a permissive decree, that the decree has no effect in bringing about the result? Ans. No; for thus the immediate causes of the event would have an independence which cannot belong to creatures, and God would then foreknow them only by depending on things without himself.

107. What then is meant by a permissive decree? Ans. It means that God does not cause the wickedness of the action, although he brings to pass the circumstances which depravity uses in committing sin; and he directs both circumstances and actions.

108. Does the permissive decree of God respecting sinful actions secure the futurition of the action? Ans. Yes; otherwise the decree would fail, and means necessary to other ends would not occur.

109. Obj. On this doctrine, God must be the Author of sin? Ans. (1.) If deep mysteries are found in this subject, which we cannot explain or fully comprehend, it is what we must expect in

God's government of his rational creatures. (2.) We must neither, in order to escape from a difficulty, deny the unequivocal testimony of Scripture, nor run into greater difficulties by denying the necessary perfections of God; such as the necessary and independent foreknowledge of God in every thing, in which the denial of the decree involves us. (3.) God assuredly can govern his sinful, fallen creatures, without either violating that nature which he has given them, or divesting himself of his attributes, his holiness, or his supremacy, although we cannot fully comprehend or explain his procedure. (4.) God's decree is effective in the being or fact of the sinful action, but permissive and directive of the sinfulness of it. Thus God decreed to sustain the powers of the sinful creature in performing the decreed action, but left him to act sinfully in the performance, directing, too, his depravity to that action, while the sinner chose freely to act in such a manner. So in the case of Pharaoh, hardening his heart. (5.) The sinfulness of the action lies in want of conformity to God's law, and in the sinner's free choice under that want; and does not lie in the decree, to which, in his action, he had no reference. (6.) God does not make the sinner depraved or sinful, but, according to the decree, he sustains him in his powers of action, and he directs to the sin, and often as a just punishment of his depravity.

110. Is sin, then, made necessary by the decree? Ans. There is, by the decree, a necessity of consequence, but not a necessity of compulsion on the will. But this necessity of consequence would flow from the foreknowledge of God as well as from his decree.

111. But if God decreed sinful actions, is not the sinner, then, doing the will of God, and consequently excusable? Ans. (1.) He is indeed doing God's will of decree, but not his will of precept or complacency, or what God loves, approves, and commands. (2.) His desire to fulfil the decree is not his motive, but his desire to fulfil his sinful will. (3.) The revealed law is his only rule of moral action; the secret decree neither is nor can be his rule. (4.) The apostle takes up and answers this objection, Rom. ix. 19, and answers that it is a reply against God, a rebellion, charging God wickedly.

112. Is it any objection against our doctrine, that God hates all sin? Ans. No; no more than it is an objection against God's providence governing a sinful world.

§ XIV.—113. In treating the subject of decrees, is it a matter of any importance whether we consider them in the order of their execution, of means and end, or in the order of the end and the means necessary to it? Ans. No; if, in our discussion, we still maintain the doctrines, that in God the decree is *one*; and that means and end are equally decreed in that one decree.

§ XV.—114. Is not the connexion of things decreed, such as of cause and effect, as well as end and means? Ans. Yes; God assuredly decreed the connexion of things, without which means would have failed.

115. Does not this connexion of things lay the foundation of the truth of divine promises and threatenings, even when in the case of individuals they are not fulfilled? Ans. Yes; the connexion of faith and salvation is such, and that of unbelief and damnation, that the promise is true, though the reprobate perish, and the threatening is true, though the believer be saved.

116. Are not God's general gospel promises and law threatenings to be understood as referring to this connexion? Ans. Yes; as Rom. ix. 6, "Not as though the word of God hath taken no effect, for they are not all Israel who are of Israel."

117. Might we not admit that there is a decreed connexion between things which are merely possible, but which will never take place? Ans. Yes; as of the king of Israel smiting the ground and his smiting the Syrians, 2 Kings xiii. 19; and so of the people of Keilah delivering up David, 1 Sam. xxiii. 12.

§ XVI.—118. Does not God decree that of some possible things they shall not occur, or become future? Ans. Yes.

119. Whether is it the decree or the all-sufficiency of God that renders them possible? Ans. The all-sufficiency of God alone makes them possible. The decree does not.

120. But whether is the non-furition of some possible things dependent on the all-sufficiency of God or on the decree? Ans. On the decree; i. e. the decree, or the will of God, is the formal reason why they do not take place.

121. Could we, therefore, say, independently of the decree, that they shall not occur? Ans. No; it is the decree alone which distinguishes between the possible things future, and those not future.

122. Should not the all-sufficiency of God be considered as prior to the decree, in the order of nature, though not prior in time? Ans. Yes; as his decree supposes his all-sufficiency.

§ XVII.—123. What is the end of all the decrees? Ans. God's glory and the salvation of the elect.

124. How does it appear that God's glory was the great end of the decrees? Ans. Prov. xvi. 4, "The Lord hath made all things for himself;" &c. Rom. xi. 36, "For of him, and to him," &c.

125. Must not, then, the knowledge and teaching of this doctrine, as revealed in the Scriptures, be to his glory? Ans. Yes; as the denial, the perversion of it, or the keeping of it back is dishonouring him.

126. Is not the true doctrine of the decrees calculated to set forth and illustrate God's independence, his sovereignty, and the dependence of all things on himself? Ans. Yes; and it is chiefly in connexion with these doctrines that the doctrine of decrees is stated in Holy Scripture.

127. But is not the doctrine of decrees especially intended to set forth the justice and the mercy of God? Ans. Yes; and his independence and sovereignty in the exercise of his mercy and justice; Rom. ix. 22, 23, "What if God, willing to show his wrath," &c.; Eph. i. 6, "To the praise of the glory of his grace," &c.

128. Can the freeness and riches of divine grace be sustained

without the doctrine of decrees? Ans. No; This doctrine shows that grace and salvation are wholly of God; of his sovereign will.

129. How does it appear that the salvation of the elect was an object or end of the decrees? Ans. The decrees have special reference to them, and to the whole work of their salvation. See Rom. viii. 28, "All things shall work together for good," &c.

130. Must not the doctrine of the decrees, then, be useful to an elect, and the knowledge of it important? Ans. Yes; it directs their faith, their hope, and their adoration, to the only true object of these exercises.

CHAPTER VII.

OF PREDESTINATION.

LECTURE XII.—DEFINITION AND PROPERTIES.

§ I.—Quest. 1. Does *predestination* belong to the decrees of God? Ans. Yes.

2. What is the peculiar meaning of the word? Ans. To destine or appoint to a certain end; and to do this before the existence of the beings to whom it refers, and even before the existence of the world.

3. Whom does predestination especially respect, or to whom does it apply? Ans. Chiefly intelligent creatures;—men and angels.

4. To what does the word *predestination* chiefly refer, concerning men and angels? Ans. Chiefly to their eternal state of happiness or misery.

5. But is not the word *predestinated* or *pre-appointed* used sometimes in Scripture respecting things or actions of men, and even their temporal circumstances, as well as their eternal state? Ans. Yes; as Acts iv. 28.

6. Does not the word, in these cases, signify much the same as *decree*? Ans. Yes.

7. Do the Scriptures use words signifying predestination in reference to the eternal state of intelligent beings? Ans. Yes; as Rom. viii. 29; Eph. i. 5, &c.

8. Do not the Scriptures use several synonymous words? Ans. Yes; as *to ordain*, Acts. xii. 48; *to set* or *place*, 1 Thess. v. 9.

§ II.—9. Although the word *predestinate*, or its equivalents, are used in Scripture respecting actions and affairs of men in this life, to what does it most generally refer? Ans. Most generally to the final state of intelligent creatures—to their happiness or misery.

10. Obj. The Scriptures use it only in reference to the happiness of intelligent beings, or merely to signify election? Ans. (1.) The word *predestinate* is equally applicable to good and evil, election and reprobation. (2.) It is used for reprobation, Jude 4, "Before of old ordained to this condemnation." (3.) When used

for election, it has generally some other words defining the predestination; as Eph. i. 4, "to adoption;" Eph. i. 11, "Obtaining an inheritance, being predestinated," &c.; Rom. viii. 29, "Predestinated to be conformed," &c.

11. Obj. Decrees that differ, or are opposite in their end, as *election* and *reprobation*, cannot be of the same kind, or be called by the same name? Ans. Predestination to happiness and predestination to misery are indeed different destinies, but the word applies equally to both; and both destinies have the same ultimate end, the glory of God; Rom. ix. 22, 23.

§ III.—12. Is the word applied in Scripture to the final state of angels as well as men? Ans. Yes; as the word is equally applicable to both.

13. Is it applied both to the elect and to the reprobate of angels? Ans. Yes; as 1 Tim. v. 21; 2 Peter ii. 4; Jude 6.

14. What are some differences between the predestination of angels and the predestination of men? Ans. (1.) Though men and angels were alike liable to fall, elect angels were not elected as fallen, while men were. (2.) Elect angels were not elected to salvation through Christ, or to faith in him for their happiness; men were. (3.) Reprobate angels were not appointed to suffer damnation for unbelief in Christ, as reprobate men, under the gospel, are. (4.) Though the election and reprobation of angels was for the demonstration of the goodness and justice of God, yet their election was not the display of mercy as in the case of elect men.

15. Wherein was the predestination of men and angels alike? Ans. (1.) Both were of sovereignty. (2.) Equally intended for the glory of God. (3.) The election of angels and the election of men were of sovereign goodness, though that of angels was not properly of mercy.

§ IV.—16. Give some general proof of the truth of predestination? Ans. (1.) The Scriptures expressly declare it; Eph. i. 4; Rom. viii. 29. (2.) The fact of universal decrees of God proves this particular and important decree of predestination.

§ V.—17. How define *predestination*, as it respects man? Ans. It is God's eternal decree to save some of mankind from their sin and misery, through Christ and faith in him, to the glory of divine grace; and to leave the rest in their sin and misery, to the glory of divine justice; Rom. ix. 22, 23.

§ VI.—18. Whose act is predestination? Ans. God's act.

19. Is it an act common to all the persons of the Godhead? Ans. Yes; (1.) Because it is expressly ascribed to the Son, as well as to the Father; John xiii. 18, "I know whom I have chosen;" John xv. 16, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you," &c. (2.) Because the three persons are the one God; and it is the act of God; Rom. viii. 28, 29.

20. But is it generally ascribed to the Father? Ans. Yes; as Matt. xi. 26, "Even so, Father," &c.; Eph. i. 3, 5, "Blessed be the God and Father," &c.; Rom. viii. 29, "Whom he did fore-know," &c.

21. Why is it generally ascribed to the Father, when it is equally the act of the three persons? Ans. Because, by the economy of redemption, the Father sustains the character of the Godhead, and gives elect sinners to Christ to be redeemed.

22. Is the decree of predestination to be ascribed to God's understanding only, or more formally to his will? Ans. It is ascribed formally to God's will; Eph. i. 5, 9; Rom. ix. 18.

23. What error is favoured by ascribing this decree to the divine understanding only? Ans. (1.) That God did not determine or purpose, but only foresaw the happiness or misery of individuals. (2.) That he was, in this matter, dependent on the creatures.

24. Obj. Predestination is called *foreknowledge*; Rom. viii. 29? Ans. (1.) That God's understanding concurs in predestination, both antecedently and consequently, in the order of nature, we freely admit. But, (2.) God's foreknowledge of his people is founded on his decree. (3.) In Rom. viii. 29, and elsewhere, foreknowledge means *choice* and *approbation*. It is a practical knowledge that is there intended. So 2 Tim. ii. 19. (4.) God necessarily knows all things; but in Rom. viii. 29, and elsewhere, this knowledge is ascribed to God in a different sense from mere knowledge. Compare 1 Peter i. 20, with Acts ii. 23.

25. How may predestination of men or angels be divided? Ans. Into *election* and *reprobation*.

26. Does not the one of these necessarily imply the other, when only a part or portion of men and angels are chosen to happiness and glory? Ans. Yes; election of some necessarily implies reprobation of others.

§ VII.—*Of the properties of predestination.*

27. What are the properties of predestination? Ans. The same as of all the other decrees. They are *eternal*, *sovereign* or *free*, *wise*, *independent* or *absolute*, *unchangeable*, and *definite* or *particular*.

28. How prove predestination to be *eternal*? Ans. By the same evidence as that by which the eternity of the other decrees is proved; as from the nature and perfections of God; and from express Scripture; as Eph. i. 4, 5; 2 Tim. i. 9.

29. Objec. Election is an act made in time, in effectual calling; as Isa. xlvi. 10; John xv. 16, 19, signifying that they were chosen at the time spoken of? Ans. (1.) Isa. xlvi. 10, "Chosen thee in the furnace," &c., does not immediately refer to the choice or decree of God, so much as to the manifestation and fulfilment of it. (2.) Our Lord does not deny the eternity of his choice, but he also refers to his manifestation of it in separating the disciples from the world in time. (3.) Such texts cannot, without violence, be interpreted contrary to the clear doctrine, elsewhere expressed, of the eternity of election; nor contrary to the nature and perfections of God. (4.) That divine choice must have been made in eternity, which is executed and manifested in time; Eph. i. 11.

30. Objec. As salvation is suspended on faith and perseverance,

therefore, election is not eternal, but made and established when the sinner believes and perseveres to the end? Ans. (1.) According to this view, none are absolutely chosen to salvation till death. (2.) Though faith and perseverance are necessary in order to final salvation, yet God's choice of a sinner to eternal life is not suspended on these as conditions of the decree, but these are decreed by the eternal decree; 2 Thess. ii. 13; Eph. i. 4. 5; Rom. viii. 29. (3.) Faith and perseverance are the work of God and not of ourselves. These attainments are, therefore, wrought by God's design, and that design is necessarily eternal.

LECTURE XIII.—PROPERTIES.—OBJECTIONS.

§ VIII.—*Of the freedom of predestination.*—Quest. 31. What do we mean by the act of predestination being *free*? Ans. That God was perfectly sovereign in the act, depending on none for counsel, and influenced by nothing without himself.

32. Would predestination, on any other principle, consist with the independence of God? Ans. No.

33. Give some proof of this sovereignty in predestination, from Scripture? Ans. Matt. xi. 25, 26; Rom. ix. 15—23.

34. In predestination, whether does God act as a Judge, or as a sovereign Lord? Ans. As a sovereign Lord, and not as a Judge. The office of judge presupposes the subjects already existing, as under a law, and as possessing, according to law, either merit or demerit; while predestination is the act of Jehovah, as Lord, about to give existence to creatures of his hand, to give them laws, and to allot to them their circumstances; Rom. ix. 11, 20—22.

35. Were any predestinated to eternal life on account of any goodness foreseen in them? Ans. No.

36. Why so? Ans. (1.) Because the independence of God could not allow any cause without him to influence his determination. (2.) Because the creature could have no goodness but by his operation. (3.) God would not work that goodness in the creature without a design and purpose; and that design and purpose must be eternal. (4.) Therefore God could foresee no goodness in the creature but by his eternal predestinating act; and therefore that goodness in the creature could not be the cause or condition of election, since it is the fruit and effect of that election.

37. Were sinners predestinated to life because they were less sinful than others? Ans. No; this would be still a cause without God, if the cause of predestination. If less sinful than others, it is wholly the effect of divine operation and purpose, and therefore not the cause of predestination.

38. Was Christ or his satisfaction the cause or condition of election to life? Ans. No; Christ, as Mediator, and his satisfaction, were the effects of eternal predestination, and the predestined medium of effecting the predestinated salvation of sinners.

39. Why then is it said (Eph. i. 4.) that God "chose us in him?" Ans. It means that God chose Christ as the way of saving his

elect; that he purposed our salvation by him, and his satisfaction as the way.

40. But is not Christ and his satisfaction the ground on which our salvation is based? **Ans.** Yes; Christ is the predestined way; his righteousness is the meritorious ground of our salvation, but not the cause or meritorious ground of election. Election had no meritorious cause of any kind; it was sovereign and free.

41. What errors would it involve to say that Christ, as Mediator, was the cause of election? **Ans.** (1.) That he and the Father are not one in being and will. (2.) That Christ in offering his mediation as the cause of election, is not the true God. Or, (3.) Acknowledging him to be God, we admit that his purpose of salvation to sinners was the original cause of his mediation, which is the truth—the admission of our doctrine of God's original decree and purpose, and the contradiction of the error first asserted, that Christ as Mediator is the cause of election.

42. But if foreseen goodness in the sinner, or his less degree of sinfulness, be not the cause of election to life; on the other hand, was not sin the cause of the reprobation of the wicked? **Ans.** No.

43. But would any have been reprobated if they had not sinned? **Ans.** No; There would have been no occasion for reprobation.

44. How then was sin not the cause of reprobation! **Ans.** (1.) Sin is the cause or ground of damnation, but not the cause of God's purpose to leave the reprobate under their guilt and depravity. (2.) As divine sovereignty was the only reason why God determined to save some of fallen men, so it was the only reason why he passed by others in the same condition. (3.) God determined to inflict punishment on some individuals for their sins, but their sin was not the cause why he left them to perish, while he chose others to salvation from the same condition; otherwise the elect would have been chosen for their comparative goodness, and thus God would have been moved by causes without himself. (4.) Keeping in view the equal condition of elect and reprobate, as fallen and helpless in themselves, we must distinguish between the cause of the punishment of the reprobate, and the cause of the decree to leave them under sin, while others were chosen to life.

45. Were any reprobated because they were greater sinners than others? **Ans.** No; for this would deny sovereignty to be the sole cause of predestination, and would imply that others were elected because their sin was less. And facts show that some of the greatest sinners are chosen to life, and some more moral are left in unbelief.

46. Can God be charged with any injustice, either in punishing sinners with eternal misery, or in predestinating them to it? **Ans.** No; they deserve hell, and therefore God was under no obligation to save them.

47. Does this doctrine of divine sovereignty, in predestination, charge God with partiality? **Ans.** No.

48. How not, when the elect were by nature no better than the reprobate? **Ans.** Partiality, in the ordinary sense of the word, in-

ferring blame, consists in, (1.) Overlooking some claim that a person may have to favour; but man has none. Or, (2.) Conferring a favour, without any right to confer it. This cannot be charged to God; Matt. xx. 13—15.

49. Does God dishonour any of his perfections in either sovereign election or reprobation? Ans. No; he honours his truth, holiness, and justice, as well as mercy, in bestowing salvation by Christ; and especially honours his justice, truth, and holiness, in the perdition of the wicked, and without any dishonour to his grace and mercy.

§ IX.—*Of the wisdom of predestination.*—Quest. 50. Wherein does the *wisdom* of God appear in predestination? Ans. (1.) In glorifying all divine perfections in both the salvation of the elect and the punishment of the reprobate. (2.) In adapting the means to the end most perfectly and efficiently. (3.) In that the predestination is definite, efficient and irrevocable. (4.) In that mercy and salvation are bestowed on some to the glory of all divine perfections, through Christ, and judgment executed on others, without injustice to any, or dishonour to God.

51. Do the Scriptures assert the wisdom of God in predestination? Ans. Yes; Rom. xi. 33, 34.

52. When Pelagians, Arminians, &c., deny the sovereign and independent decree of predestination, and hold it to be conditional and changeable, that they may reconcile God's purposes with human liberty and with divine goodness, do they not dishonour the wisdom of God in his decrees? Ans. Yes; they not only dishonour his sovereign freedom and independence, but also represent him as weak, ignorant, and changeable.

§ X.—*Of the independence of predestination.*—Quest. 53. What are we to understand by the independence of the decree of predestination? Ans. That God's sovereign will is the sole cause of predestination, whether to life or death; that the decree was not founded on, or influenced by any foreseen goodness of the one class, or wickedness of the other, and was absolute and unconditional.

54. How does this independence of predestination appear from Scripture? Ans. (1.) Scripture makes the sovereign will of God alone the reason why some obtain salvation, and others are left to perish; Matt. xi. 25, 26; Rom. ix. 15, 18; Eph. i. 5, 9, 11. (2.) Scripture expressly denies any difference among men, except as God makes the difference, by his grace to some, according to election; 1 Cor. iv. 7; John xv. 16.

55. Do not men vainly and sinfully charge the doctrine of independence and unconditional predestination as ascribed unjustly to God? Ans. Yes.

56. Does not the Scripture notice and answer this charge, in the way of maintaining divine, independent and absolute decrees? Ans. Yes; Rom. ix. 14, 15, 19, 20.

57. Does not the independence of the decree appear from the Scripture denying all foreseen good or evil as the cause of the decree? Ans. Yes; as Rom. ix. 11, &c.

58. Do the Scriptures ascribe any goodness attained by man to God's grace, and to his decree as its origin? Ans. Yes; Phil. ii. 13. Particularly, faith, John vi. 37; Acts xiii. 48; holiness, Rom. viii. 29, 30; perseverance, 2 Tim. ii. 19.

59. Do the Scriptures teach that even the evil of unbelief and impenitence follows the decree of predestination? Ans. Yes; they were predestinated to those sins; as John x. 26; 1 Pet. ii. 8.

60. But does God work that unbelief and impenitence, though he has predestinated some men to these sins? Ans. No; the decree indeed appoints men to those sins, and they will infallibly commit them accordingly, although God is not the author of them. Men's wickedness is the sufficient cause of those sins, and the decree leaves them to them.

61. If God alone makes men to differ by bestowing grace on the unworthy, and leaving others to the power of sin, does he thereby do any injustice to either party? Ans. No; for, (1.) Grace is undeserved, but not unjust. (2.) Passing by and leaving men to sin and perdition is neither withholding any thing which they deserve, nor taking away any thing which they had.

62. If some things about the doctrine of absolute and unconditional predestination are deep and mysterious, yet would not the denial of such predestination deny the very perfections of God, and the explicit testimony of Scripture on this subject? Ans. Yes.

§ XI.—63. Who have chiefly opposed the doctrine of sovereign and unconditional predestination? Ans. The ancient Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians, the Papists, and the Arminians, and some Anabaptists and Lutherans.

64. Although they differed much in their particular sentiments, what was the general doctrine they held on this subject? Ans. That God had decrees of predestination, but that they were made on foresight of faith and perseverance, on the one hand, and of unbelief on the other; thus denying virtually God's independence, as ascribing a power to man independent of God, and of his decrees.

§ XII.—65. To the doctrine of absolute, unconditional predestination, it is objected, (1.) That the Scriptures ascribe to God foreknowledge in predestination, implying that on foreseen faith he predestinates; as Rom. viii. 29; 1 Peter i. 2? Ans. (1.) These passages ascribe both foreknowledge and predestination or election. (2.) There can be no divine foreknowledge of any man's faith or sanctification, but by predestination or decree; because none have faith or any grace but by divine gift; and God gives according to decree. (3.) When foreknowledge is ascribed to God as the ground of predestination, it does not mean simply knowledge or foresight, but *approval* or *disapproval*, *choice* or *rejection*, *love* or *disapprobation*. Thus in Rom. viii. 29, foreknowledge is used as synonymous with purpose, expressed in the preceding verse. Therefore, instead of simple foresight, it means such a choice of the persons to salvation as led to predestinate them to holiness, as necessary to salvation; distinguishing predestination to favour and salvation, and

predestination to holiness, as distinct objects, but necessarily united in the decree. (4.) That knowledge, here ascribed to God, does not mean simple knowledge or foresight, but approbation, love, or choice, is manifest from its use elsewhere; as where he is said *not to know* the ungodly, while, as to simple knowledge, he knows all without exception. Thus, Matt. vii. 23, "I know you not," means the denial of a practical knowledge, by communion and approbation. So his knowledge of Moses means approbation; Exod. xxxiii. 12, "I know thee by name." So of Jeremiah, i. 5; so of Israel, Amos iii. 2. Therefore these passages mean, Whom God loved, of his own sovereign choice, and chose to salvation, he predestinated to holiness, and elected to happiness, on the ground of his own sovereign love.

66. Obj. (2.) Those who are predestinated to life are said to be conformed to Christ, Rom. viii. 29; intimating that they are so predestinated because of their foreseen conformity to Christ? Ans. In Rom. viii. 29, *conformity to the image of Christ* is set forth as the object and fruit of predestination, and not as its cause or reason. So Eph. i. 4, 5, "Chosen us to be holy," &c.

67. Obj. (3.) Some passages of Scripture represent faith as the ground and cause of election; as James ii. 5; Heb. xi. 6? Ans. (1.) As the apostle James is contrasting what God and depraved men approve and value, he is rather stating the object of God's approbation than the ground of his eternal election. (2.) But as there is nothing evangelically good in man, but as bestowed by God according to eternal purpose, so *to be rich in faith* is presented, not only as the object of God's approbation, but as the effect of his eternal choice, and not as the cause of it. (3.) This appears further from the addition, in the same construction, that they are "*heirs of the kingdom.*" It will and must be admitted that *heirship* is owing to God's purpose, and is his gift, and not the ground of his purpose. In both these cases, therefore, (Rom. viii. 29, and James ii. 5,) *εις το ειναι (eis to einai)* is understood, indicating the end or object of predestination, as expressed on the same subject, Eph. i. 4. (4.) Therefore, these texts must be understood consistently with other texts which make faith and holiness the effect of predestination, as 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Peter i. 2. (5.) It is true that *without faith we cannot please God*, (Heb. xi. 6;) yet it is as true that *faith is not of ourselves, but the gift of God*; and as true that God works this faith, as all other things, according to the counsel of his own will; Eph. i. 11; and, therefore, it is the effect and not the cause of predestination. (6.) Accordingly, though unbelief is displeasing to God, and a cause of condemnation, yet it is not the cause of reprobation, but the fruit of that depravity to which the reprobate are left, in the decree of predestination, 1 Peter ii. 8. They were predestined to perdition through the sin of their nature and lives, which procures their damnation; Rom. ix. 22.

68. Obj. (4.) The doctrine of unconditional predestination denies the necessity of faith and holiness, and the certain salvation of those

who are sanctified? Ans. (1.) This is a total misrepresentation of the Scripture doctrine of predestination, and a mere slander on those who hold it; as our doctrine does not deny the necessity of faith and holiness in order to salvation, but only that these are causes and grounds of election. (2.) Predestination absolutely and unconditionally secures the salvation of those who believe and are sanctified, and secures those graces to all the elect as the means of salvation. (3.) This slander supposes that faith and holiness are unnecessary, unless they are the ground and cause of election and salvation; whereas they are absolutely necessary as means of salvation, and as ends and effects of election, Eph. i. 4, 5. (4.) Moreover, this slander supposes that salvation is not the free gift of God; that man is independent of God in furnishing grounds of his salvation and of God's choice of him; and, therefore, that man and not God is the sole author of faith and holiness; thus utterly subverting the doctrine of free grace.

69. Whether is God's benevolence or complacency towards man first in order and exercise? Ans. His love of benevolence, decreeing to make the sinner a new creature, and fit to be an object of divine complacency. The doctrine of conditional decrees supposes the love of complacency to be first, and, therefore, that the sinner must be holy before God's benevolence is exercised towards him.

LECTURE XIV.—IMMUTABILITY AND PARTICULARITY OF PREDESTINATION.

§ XIII.—*Of the immutability of Predestination.* Quest. 70. Is predestination absolutely *unchangeable*? Ans. Yes.

71. How does this appear? Ans. From the same evidence that proves the immutability of decrees; as, (1.) From the immutability of God, his purposes must be immutable. (2.) From his independence; he has no occasion to change. (3.) From the fact that predestination secures every thing which could be supposed, by its failure, to produce a change; connecting means and end. (4.) The events also prove the immutability of predestination; as the actual salvation of all believers, and actual damnation of all unbelievers, which could not be but by the will of God. (5.) From many direct texts of Scripture; as Heb. vi. 17; Matt. xxiv. 24, implying that it is impossible to finally deceive the elect; John vi. 37; 2 Tim. ii. 19.

§ XIV.—72. Arminians and others object to the immutability of predestination, (1.) That it renders our endeavouring to attain holiness and assurance of our individual salvation useless, and admonitions to it preposterous? Ans. (1.) God has, in his decree, united these means with the end, and the one is not obtained without the other; and, under his decree, the proper use of the means will not fail of attaining the end. (2.) Nor can we attain the assurance of our own salvation without piety, which includes the use of the means. (3.) If the objection were valid, it would forbid the use of means in every thing; because there is a certain unchangeable futurity of

every thing which is to occur,* whether the purpose of God, or the imaginary heathen *fate*, may be supposed to bring it about. But, (4.) The apostle takes precisely the opposite view of this matter from our opponents. In Phil. ii. 12, 13, he urges diligence in the use of means from the very consideration that all the gracious exercise we can attain to is wrought by God "of his own good pleasure;" and, therefore, it neither originates with ourselves, nor is our gracious exercise any condition on which God either purposes salvation for us, or works grace in us.

73. Obj. (2.) The Scriptures speak of blotting out names from the book of life, which implies a change of the decree of predestination; as Rev. xxii. 19; Ex. xxxii. 32; Rom. ix. 3? Ans. (1.) These figurative texts must not be explained in contrariety to others which unequivocally maintain the immutability of the decree. *The book*, in some cases, refers to the book of the present life; as Ex. xxxii. 32, compared with verse 10th; the blotting out referring to the proposal (ver. 10th) of making of Moses a great nation. (2.) Rev. xxii. 19, means, declaring that they were never really written in that book of life, although they had hoped that their names were written there, and had professed that hope. So of Judas and others, referred to in Ps. lxxix. 28; their names being blotted out, is explained as "not to be written with the righteous." (3.) The book is a figure; as if a man enrolled all in a book of registry, who give in their names with appropriate outward evidences, as applicants for eternal life; and yet would blot out the name when a man failed to maintain the character which is necessary to his standing. Therefore, it is not the book of decrees that is meant, but the book or record of profession and of hope. (4.) The case of Paul, (Rom. ix. 3,) does not contradict the immutability of the decrees. For, if he should be understood as saying, "I could wish myself accursed," &c., it only showed his great earnestness: and if he intended to say, as the words seem to warrant, that he *did* wish himself accursed, &c., it was consistent with his views before conversion, and yet argued his great devotedness to his brethren.

74. Obj. (3.) Some given to Christ perish; as John xvii. 12; and some, (as Paul) feared that they might be *castaways* or *reprobate*? Ans. (1.) John xvii. 12, is not to be understood as though Judas was one of those given to Christ by predestination to eternal life, but as given to be a follower of Christ in the world with others, and not given by predestination to life; for he is the son of perdition, devoted to destruction, according to prediction, and therefore according to predestination. Besides, the words *εἰ μὴ* (*ei mē*) are often taken ad-versatively, and should be so taken here, and not as denoting an exception; as though he said, "None of them is lost, *but the son of perdition is lost*," &c. So it is taken, Matt. xii. 4, *εἰ μὴ*, not to any of David's company, but on the contrary, for the priests only. And so Gal. ii. 16, "Not justified by the works of the law," *εἰ μὴ*, (*ean mē*) but,

* That is to say, Whatever is to be *will be*, and whatever is not to be *will not be*.

on the contrary, "by faith of Jesus Christ;" as no part of the works of the law. And so Rev. xxi. 27, *nothing unclean, working abomination, &c.*, and no exceptions among these, *εὐ μὴ*, but, on the contrary, "Those written in the Lamb's book," &c. (2.) Paul, in expressing his fear, says nothing about a changeable decree; but either means a cautious care, by the use of means, to know his election, and to prove it, while he had not made the attainment of a full assurance; or it is a fear that, by negligence, he might be rejected, or laid aside, by God and man, from his work and usefulness in the ministry; and teaches that diligence in duty is the necessary means of accomplishing the decree of election.

75. Obj. (4.) The doctrine of absolute and immutable election and reprobation leads either to indifference and negligence, or to despair? Ans. (1.) The doctrine may be so abused by those who misunderstand it. But, (2.) The doctrine, rightly understood, and received as God's truth ought to be, tends to no such results; because, (3.) It is only in the way of diligence and holiness that we can know that we are elected; and therefore the doctrine is useful in promoting diligence; Phil. ii. 12, 13. And, (4.) A knowledge of election and certain perseverance promotes grace, and stirs up to duty; 1 Cor. xv. 58. (5.) The doctrine should not lead to despair, because no one can know, in this life, (except by the unpardonable sin) that he is not elect; as he may yet be converted. (6.) Either of the perversions stated in the objection supposes an error, that we must know our election without means; or that the use of means is unavailing, unless we know our election first; or that the promise of God, and his revealed law are not sufficient warrant for faith and duty, unless we first know the decree. All this is error.

§ XV.—76. Are all men predestinated either to happiness or misery? Ans. Yes; because the one of them will be the lot of every one.

77. Was not even Christ himself predestinated? Ans. Yes; 1 Peter i. 20.

78. In what character was Christ predestinated? Ans. As Mediator.

79. Was not every thing that befell Christ in this world predestinated? Ans. Yes; even his sufferings; Acts ii. 23; iv. 28; and his actions; as prophecies respecting these show.

80. Wherein may the predestination of Christ and that of believers be said to differ? Ans. In many things; particularly, (1.) In the station that he and they were destined to occupy. He as their glorified Redeemer and Lord. (2.) In the condition in which he and they were viewed in predestination. They in sin and misery. (3.) In respect to the ground on which predestination allotted them respectively to glory; him, on his merits; they, on the ground of free grace.

81. What is the connexion between the predestination of Christ and that of his people? Ans. Christ's predestination to the Mediatorial work was for the sake of his people, and they were predestinated to holiness and glory in him.

82. Whether, then, was Christ's predestination subordinate to that of his people, or theirs subordinate to his? Ans. Christ's predestination, as Mediator, was subordinate to that of his people, as it was only for their redemption that he became Mediator, or was chosen to that work. He was chosen to accomplish the decree of their election to salvation.

83. Has not the doctrine been held by some, and abused to favour error, that Christ as Mediator was predestinated as the primary object, and sinners chosen to salvation in subserviency to that design? Ans. Yes; and some have, under this view, held that his atonement was universal and indefinite, and sinners chosen to receive the benefit of it.

84. How does it appear from Scripture that the salvation of sinners was the primary object in predestination, and the predestination of Christ secondary, or subordinate to it? Ans. (1.) From the revealed fact that the elect were chosen in Christ from all eternity, representing Christ as the medium chosen in order to their salvation; Eph. i. 4, 5. Thus they were "chosen in him to be holy, and predestinated to adoption by him." So Eph. iii. 11, "Purposed in Christ." (2.) From the revealed truth that Christ was foreordained for his people; 1 Peter i. 20, "Who (Christ) was foreordained for you." (3.) From the Scripture declaration that God's sovereign love to sinners was the original cause, not only of their salvation, but of the whole plan of salvation, and of his gift of Christ for us; John iii. 16, "God so loved the world," &c. (4.) From the Scriptures representing that the election of Christ to the work of Mediation was for the purpose of salvation to sinners, Isa. xlii. 1, 6, 7.

85. Does it militate against this doctrine that the glory of God was the ultimate and highest end in the plan of salvation? Ans. No; God's glory is not only the ultimate and highest, but the primary end of the plan of salvation; and yet, while the salvation of sinners was predestined as subservient to that high end, the mediation of Christ was chosen as subservient immediately to that salvation, and ultimately to the glory of God thereby.

86. Is there any sense in which the predestination of Christ to the Mediatory office may be said to have the precedency of our predestination? Ans. Yes; if by that we only mean the precedency of the glory and dignity to which he is appointed as Mediator, and his Headship over his people, and the gift of them to him for his glory.

§ XVI.—*Of the particularity of predestination.* Quest. 87. Is every individual of the human family predestinated to a definite end, of happiness or misery? Ans. Yes.

88. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the Scriptures everywhere speaking of *persons* and not *qualities* predestinated; as Phil. iv. 3, "Whose names are in the book of life;" Rom. ix. 13—17. (2.) From the mentioning of *persons* definitely, and not merely *numbers*, as predestinated; as Rom. viii. 29, "*Whom*," and not merely "*as many*;" 2 Tim. ii. 19, "Knoweth *them*," &c., not merely

how many. (3.) From the figurative expression of "*names written,*" Luke x. 20; Phil. iv. 3. (4.) From the fact that only some are elected and others reprobated; as Matt. xx. 16, "Many are called, but few chosen," evidently referring to individual persons definitely. (5.) From the fact that God orders the circumstances of every individual, working all things according to the counsel of his own will. Therefore the predestination of man must be particular and definite, as well as absolute and immutable.

89. If predestination were not definite and particular, would the election be really of God? Ans. No; if not definite, it would be rather of men; dependent on their works; and God would thus be dependent and man independent.

90. But the Socinians and Arminians, holding that predestination is not definite, but indefinite, of believers and unbelievers, without determination of the persons, object, that in Scripture the elect and believers are the same? Ans. (1.) They are the same indeed, because God predestinated all the elect to faith. This is the effect of predestination, and, therefore, believing is the uniform character of the elect. (2.) The error of the objectors lies in mistaking the cause for the effect, and the effect for the cause. Election, as the cause of faith, unites election and believing in the same persons, as well as making faith the ground of election could do.

91. Obj. (2.) That John vi. 40, makes God's will of saving *believers* all that is included in election; and, therefore, that there was not a definite predestination of persons, but only of characters? Ans. (1.) God's will of saving believers is indeed included in predestination, but it is not the whole of it. This much God reveals in his word. But his will respecting the persons to whom he will give faith and salvation, is included also in predestination, though not revealed till it appears in the event. These are secret things, which belong only to the Lord; Deut. xxix. 29. (2.) The salvation of the elect is directly the object of God's will in sending his Son; and the character which these elect shall possess is the matter spoken of in this text.

92. Would admonition and reproofs be rendered vain by the doctrine of a definite predestination, as its opponents object? Ans. No; they are necessary means of promoting godliness, or of convincing of sin; and they are appointed means of effecting the objects of predestination.

LECTURE XV.—END OF PREDESTINATION.—ELECTION.

§ XVII.—Quest. 93. But, on the subject of predestination, a question has arisen, the opposing parties on which have been distinguished as *Sublapsarians* and *Supralapsarians*. Is the controversy of much moment? Ans. No; unless the parties run into extremes, as some on both sides have done.

94. May we not hold sound sentiments on either side, in reference to the decrees? Ans. Yes.

95. What sentiments or doctrines are necessary to be held in

this controversy, in order to guard against error and unwarranted extremes? Ans. (1.) That God's decrees, as they are in himself, are one and perfectly simple or uncompounded. (2.) That his decree is perfectly free and independent. (3.) That it is most holy and becoming the nature and perfections of God; so that he is not the Author of sin, and that he is perfectly good, as well as just and holy.

96. What is the difference between Sublapsarianism and Supralapsarianism? Ans. The difference is not great, when each party strip their system of error, and hold the above doctrines. But *Sublapsarians* view God's decree of election and reprobation as made in reference to man as fallen; *Supralapsarians* view those decrees as making a display of divine mercy and justice the ultimate and chief object, and that God decreed the creation and the fall of man in order to this end.

97. Is there not a truth in both views? Ans. Yes; according to the Sublapsarians, God did predestinate man as fallen; and according to the Supralapsarians, he did decree the display of his mercy and justice, as his ultimate end and highest object, and the creation and fall of man as means leading to this end.

98. Do not the Scriptures maintain both these views, so far as now stated? Ans. Yes; Rom. ix. 15, Eph. i. 4, 5, favour the Sublapsarian view, showing that in predestination God viewed man as fallen. And Rom. ix. 21—23, favours the Supralapsarian view, representing God as the most free and independent Lord, acting on his own will, and determining to promote his own glory, both of justice and mercy.

99. When both propositions or sides of the question are understood in a sound sense, may they not be considered as merely different methods of viewing and explaining the decrees? Ans. Yes; the Sublapsarian views the decrees in the order in which they are executed; the decree of creating man and permitting him to fall before his predestination to happiness and misery; and in this light the Scriptures present them to us, 2 Thess. ii. 13. The Supralapsarian views them according to the nature of the thing; first, the ultimate end; secondly, the means in order to that end, such as the creation, the fall of man, and his predestination to happiness or misery; and the Scriptures seem to favour this mode of viewing the matter also, Rom. ix. 21—23.

§ XVIII.—100. Into what extremes has this controversy led the parties? Ans. It has led some into the following errors; (1.) Some of the Supralapsarians have said that the decree of predestination to happiness or misery had no respect to men's sin. (2.) Some Sublapsarians held that the creation and the fall of man were not intended of God as means leading to the ultimate end of manifesting God's glory in the display of his mercy in the elect, and of his justice in the reprobate.

101. What evil do we charge on the first of these errors; viz., That the decree of predestination had no respect to man's sin? Ans. It would maintain that God might, for his own glory, damn

the innocent, and save by Christ those who had no need of salvation. It would maintain that damnation of some men was merely to fulfil the decree, and was not appointed to them on the ground of desert of punishment.

102. What evil do we find in the second error; viz., that the creation and the fall were not intended of God, in his decree, as means leading to the glory of his mercy and justice? **Ans.** It represents God as not connecting end and means in his decree; as forming only detached decrees, utterly inconsistent with infinite wisdom.

103. But do these errors properly belong to the question in controversy? **Ans.** No; they were only attached to it by some excited controversialists.

104. Since, then, both parties held sound sentiments on the subject of predestination, so far as clearly stated, what was the real point of difference? **Ans.** (1.) As before stated, the one (the Sublapsarian) viewed the decree of predestination according to the order of execution; the other according to the order of nature, as means to the ultimate end. But, (2.) The Supralapsarian viewed the decrees of God, of means and end, as one whole, and the decree respecting the creation and fall of man, and predestination to happiness and misery, as *mere* means of attaining the ultimate end, the glory of God; implying that God decreed the creation of man in order that he might fall, and the fall of some men in order to effect their misery. But the Sublapsarian viewed the decrees of creation and predestination as important ends of themselves, and also as means of attaining the ultimate end.

105. On what grounds should we prefer the Sublapsarian view? **Ans.** (1.) Because the Scriptures warrant this view, when they represent God as choosing sinners to salvation, and leaving some sinners to eternal misery, as the punishment of their sin. (2.) This view also sustains the doctrine that the glory of divine mercy and justice was the ultimate end, as creation, happiness, and misery are means in order to that end. (3.) Because, as this view is sustained by Scripture, so it is best adapted to man's apprehension of God's decrees. (4.) The simple purpose of God to display his glory, the glory of his mercy and justice, (according to the Supralapsarian notion) is not so properly predestination, of which the Scripture speaks, which refers to the salvation and damnation of sinners, and to individual persons and their final end, or the steps towards that end; while the Supralapsarian view refers to God's decrees respecting himself. (5.) Our very conception of man's salvation and damnation necessarily supposes his creation and his fall.

106. While we hold that God who decreed all things did intend, in his decree of creating man, to permit his fall—to save some and to reprobate others—and all to his glory, yet are we to hold that he created man for the special purpose that he might fall, and a part of mankind to be miserable? **Ans.** No; (1.) God neither takes pleasure in sin, nor in the misery of his creatures for its own

sake. (2.) Though he decrees some things for their own sakes, as well as [to be] means to a higher end, as the happiness of his elect, in which he delights, yet other things he determines, not for their own sakes, but wholly in order to a higher end; as the perdition of the wicked.

§ XIX.—107. What is the ultimate and supreme end of predestination? Ans. God's glory, Prov. xvi. 4.

108. What perfections of God are especially glorified by it? Ans. Goodness and justice, Eph. i. 6; Rom. ix. 22, 23.

109. What are the chief subordinate ends of predestination? Ans. The salvation of a part of mankind, subordinate to the glory of God's goodness, Eph. i. 5, 6; and the perdition of a part, subordinate to the glory of his justice, Rom. ix. 22.

110. How, then, is predestination divided? Ans. Into *election* and *reprobation*.

§ XX.—111. What do we understand, in general, by *election*? Ans. The choosing of some persons to a certain purpose, and leaving others unchosen.

112. Is the word *elect* or *election* used in Scripture? Ans. Yes; Isa. xlii. 1; Matt. xxiv. 22; Rom. xi. 7.

113. What other words and phrases are used in Scripture, synonymous with *elect*, or *election*? Ans. *Purpose*, Rom. ix. 11, Eph. iii. 11; *ordained to life*, Acts xiii. 48; *appointed to salvation*, 1 Thess. v. 9; *written in the book of life*, Rev. xxi. 27; *chosen to salvation*, 2 Thess. ii. 13; *given to Christ*, John vi. 37; *loved*, Rom. ix. 13; &c.

114. But does election of God always mean his choice of a person to salvation, as it is used in Scripture? Ans. No; it is used in several senses.

115. Mention some of these senses? Ans. (1.) It sometimes means the persons elected, Rom. xi. 7. (2.) Sometimes the excellence or preciousness of a person, 1 Pet. ii. 4, 9, Acts ix. 15. (3.) God's calling some to office, civil or ecclesiastical, 1 Sam. x. 24; John vi. 70. (4.) God's calling or separating some to special outward privileges, Deut. vii. 6, 7; 1 Pet. v. 13. (5.) God's calling some to special privileges of saving communion with himself, 1 Cor. i. 26, 27; John xv. 16, 19.

116. Still, do not all these applications of the word include the general meaning of selection from among others according to God's sovereign will? Ans. Yes.

117. But in what sense are we to understand the chief meaning of the word *election* in Scripture? Ans. God's eternal election of some of mankind to eternal salvation in Christ; Matt. xx. 16; Eph. i. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 13.

118. While the Arminians admit the use of the word *election* in all the above noted senses in Scripture, except the last, (of election to eternal life,) in what way do they attempt to explain away this meaning of the word? Ans. That it does not, in a proper sense, mean election to eternal salvation, but is used by way of metonymy

for the bestowment of a privilege, in time, to enjoy eternal life; or the gift of it when the person has chosen it for himself.

§ XXI. Definition.

§ XXII.—119. What is the only fountain and source of this decree of election? Ans. The good pleasure of God; his sovereign and gracious will; Eph. i. 9; 2 Tim. i. 9.

120. Does such election imply that God does not hate sin in his elect? Ans. No; it even manifested his hatred to sin, as in pursuance of election he gave his Son to suffer for the sin of his elect, and, through him, his Spirit to cleanse them from sin.

§ XXIII.—121. Does not election imply that some of mankind were not chosen to salvation? Ans. Yes.

122. Do the Scriptures expressly teach that only a part of mankind are elected, and that others are not? Ans. Yes; John vi. 37, x. 26.

123. Do not some men, admitting that the Scriptures teach the doctrine of election, maintain that *all* are elected? Ans. Yes; as some Semi-Pelagians.

124. How do they state their doctrine of universal election? Ans. Chiefly in two ways; as (1.) That all are elected conditionally—on the condition of faith and repentance; some holding that faith is left to man's ability and will in this decree, and some that the decree provides that God will work that faith. (2.) Some hold universal election absolutely, as to the event—that all will be eventually saved.

125. But is there any conditional election at all? Ans. No; for God's decrees are necessarily absolute respecting the salvation of those he has chosen to eternal life; Isa. xlvi. 10. And, though faith and repentance are necessary to salvation, yet God, in the election of the sinner, absolutely predestinates him to faith and holiness; 2 Thess. ii. 13; Eph. i. 4, 5.

126. If faith and repentance be suspended on the operation of God, as they are, can they be conditions of election? Ans. No; because God, by an absolute decree, purposed to work that faith and repentance, not as a condition of salvation, but as a means. In other words, he did not predestinate the elect to salvation because he would work in them faith and repentance, but he purposed to work in them faith and repentance because he purposed their salvation. He purposed their faith and repentance in subordination to their salvation, as the means to the end.

127. Does not the fact that many perish, prove that only some are elected? Ans. Yes; because, if they had been elected, they would have been saved.

128. How explain John iii. 16, ("God so loved the world," &c.,) consistently with a limited election? Ans. It means, (1.) Men, in distinction from angels. (2.) The elect out of the world. (3.) Men of all nations, in opposition to its limitation to the Jews. Or, (4.) God's love of benevolence, giving an opportunity of salvation to all.

129. How explain Rom. xi. 32, (intimating that God intended to

“have mercy on all,”) to consist with a particular election? Ans. (1.) It signifies the extension of new covenant privileges to all nations, in opposition to its limitation to the Jews. (2.) The whole context shows that it does not mean mercy or salvation to every individual of mankind; for it shows that many unbelieving Jews perished, and that all the heathen had perished.

130. How explain, consistently with particular election, those passages which speak of God's willing all men to be saved, and not willing that any should perish, &c.; as 1 Tim. ii. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 9; Tit. iii. 4? Ans. These passages declare, (1.) God's will of complacency, as revealing our privilege, and the privilege of all who hear. He makes all welcome. (2.) That God takes no pleasure in the perdition of any; has no delight in their misery for its own sake, even though he left many to perish; for he is love, and his complacency is in salvation.

131. How answer their objection to particular election, who plead that the universal offer of the gospel is inconsistent with the absolute election of a part only of mankind, and who maintain that if our doctrine be true, such a universal offer would be a mockery? Ans. (1.) The external call gives every one who hears, the actual privilege of salvation, warrants his faith, and will be made good to all who accept. (2.) It is the actual means of conversion and salvation to the elect, and for their sakes it should be made known, though others reject. (3.) By the universal offer every one has his privilege of choice, to accept or reject. If he reject, he does it, not by compulsion or restraint, but of his own will, and lays the ground for condemnation by his own conscience. (4.) The reprobate has the gospel offer, is welcome to the salvation offered, and the decree of reprobation does not hinder him from accepting it. That decree only leaves him to his free-will. Therefore, the universal gospel offer is necessary in order to the reprobate exercising his will, and laying the foundation of his conviction, and is necessary as a means of grace and salvation to the elect, and as a means of leading them to a rational choice.

LECTURE XVI.—ELECTION.—REPROBATION.

§ XXIV.—132. Are the elect fewer in number than the reprobate? Ans. Holy Scripture probably answers this question in the affirmative. And as far as the world has existed already, facts would unquestionably prove it. But what may be the effect of the millenium on the comparative numbers of the redeemed and damned, we do not know. In Luke xiii. 23, 24, our Lord treated this as an unimportant question, or perhaps as an improper question, prompted by curiosity. Yet in the parallel passage (Matt. vii. 14) he says, “Many go in at the wide gate, and few find the strait gate,” seemingly answering this question in the affirmative. And Matt. xx. 22, “few are chosen;” and Luke xii. 32, “little flock,” seem to maintain the same thing. Yet these passages may refer immediately to the times in which they were spoken. It is, perhaps, best not to be positive on this point.

133. But if the elect be comparatively fewer, (and whether so or not, since all are not saved,) does the smallness of the number saved argue any defect in the power of God? Ans. No; because, (1.) It was not the divine power, but the sovereign will of God that limited the number of the elect. (2.) The same power that saved a part could have saved all, since infinite power was necessary in the salvation of even one.

134. Does the salvation of but a part of mankind argue any defect in the goodness or grace of God? Ans. No; because, (1.) The grace of God was infinite, in saving any whatever. (2.) He had a perfect right, in his wisdom and sovereignty, to give or withhold mercy as he pleased. (3.) When divine wisdom and justice saw meet to glorify justice, holiness, and power, in the perdition of many, the claims of justice argued no defect of grace. (4.) If God had saved none, but consigned all to eternal misery, it would have argued no defect of his grace, because he was under no obligation to exercise grace; and consequently, to leave a part to perdition could not prove defect of grace, Matt. xx. 15.

135. Do they magnify the grace of God who deny eternal and particular election, and represent the grace of God as consisting wholly in giving a privilege of salvation to all, and bestowing salvation on some men on account of their good qualifications? Ans. No; their scheme would really be a denial of grace in our salvation; Rom. xi. 6, "If it be of works, it is no more grace," &c. As a benefit bestowed on merit, or mercy that is inefficacious, is no grace at all; but the salvation of even one sinner, wholly of God's goodness, is infinite grace. Justice, although it is not grace, is not a defect of grace, nor in contrariety to it.

136. Still are not the elect absolutely numerous? Ans. Yes; Matt. viii. 11; Rev. vii. 9.

§ XXV.—137. What is the general outward worldly condition of the elect? Ans. Poor, despised, weak in knowledge, Matt. xi. 25; 1 Cor. i. 27, 28; James iii. 5.

138. But is this universally their condition? Ans. No; 1 Cor. i. 26.

139. Was it because such characters were more easily persuaded, or were more docile, than those of higher worldly condition, that they were chosen? Ans. No; they were no more disposed to compliance with the gospel call, naturally, than others.

140. For what reason were such generally chosen? Ans. For no reason in themselves; for no reason without God; for no reason moving God to choose, as a cause; but for reasons which were objects to be effected by the wisdom of God; as, (1.) That no flesh should glory in his presence, 1 Cor. i. 29; or to exclude boasting. (2.) That all the glory might be given to God and his grace, and their salvation not be attributed to them, or their circumstances, as causes, or reasons. (3.) To show that this world was not their portion. (4.) That the elect might be conformed to Christ, who was poor and despised in the world. (5.) And that worldly comforts and advantages might not hinder their grace.

§ XXVI.—141. To what are the elect chosen? Ans. To glory, or final salvation, and to grace preparatory to that ultimate end; as to effectual calling, justification, sanctification, &c., Rom. viii. 29, 30.

142. Should not both glory and preparation for it be considered as ends or objects of election? Ans. Yes; the one, ultimate; the other, medial, or subordinate; 1 Thess. v. 9; Eph. i. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 13.

143. Though these two ends can be distinguished, are they ever separated? Ans. No.

144. Does not God, according to purpose, give a common grace to many of the reprobate? Ans. Yes; such as civilization, gospel-light and privileges, some moral benefits by instruction, reproofs, ordinances, and even good moral qualities.

145. But is this grace of the same nature as saving grace? Ans. As to outward circumstances, and merely external gifts, the elect and reprobate obtain the same favour, but as to God's intention in giving these, the manner in which they are given,—to the one in covenant love, and to the other under the curse—and as to the internal gifts, they are *essentially different*.

146. Does God's gift to the reprobate, of common grace, qualify him for the exercise of faith, godly repentance, &c., as the Arminians plead? Ans. No; the reprobate's heart is not renewed by common grace; no real, internal conformity to Christ is communicated by it; nor does it flow from union to Christ.

§ XXVII.—147. What is the difference between an *objective* and a *subjective* certainty of election? Ans. An objective certainty is the *immutability* of the divine purpose, or the certainty of its execution: a subjective certainty is our assurance of our own election.

148. May we obtain this subjective certainty, or assurance of our own election to eternal life, without the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; such as inspiration? Ans. Yes.

149. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From direct declarations to this effect; as Rom. viii. 16, in which the apostle is speaking of the privileges of all believers, and not of himself only. (2.) The command or exhortation to seek this knowledge or certainty necessarily implies it; 2 Peter i. 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 5. (3.) The experience of believers, stated by the apostle, not as peculiar to himself, but as common to himself and others, 2 Cor. v. 1. (4.) Marks of grace stated in Scripture, 1 John iii. 14. (5.) From the consolation of believers, which implies knowledge of their actual interest in Christ, Rom. v. 2. (6.) From the duty of believers of giving glory to God for his salvation to their souls, which implies knowledge of the fact.

150. Can we attain the certain knowledge of our election previous to faith, or possession of grace? Ans. No; till then, it is a secret with God.

151. How is the assured knowledge of our election to be attained? Ans. Election is to be inferred from its consequences or effects, and in the use of means; as, (1.) By self-examination, 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

(2.) By direct faith in Christ as offered in the gospel, Heb. x. 22.
 (3.) By communion with God, which promotes grace, and produces evidence, and is a fruit of election, 1 John i. 3.

152. Can this assurance be attained without the Holy Spirit? Ans. No; Rom. viii. 16; 1 Cor. ii. 12. We can neither possess the marks of grace, nor perceive them in a satisfactory manner when possessed, without the Holy Spirit's influence.

153. Is it our duty to endeavour to attain this assurance? Ans. Yes; 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

154. For what purposes should we endeavour to ascertain our election? Ans. (1.) For our comfort and support in trials. (2.) That we may glorify God by grateful acknowledgments of his grace to us, Ps. lxvi. 20; ciii. 2. (3.) That we may be rendered more active and diligent in duty, 1 Cor. xv. 58; Ps. cxix. 32.

§ XXVIII.—155. It is objected, against the doctrine that our election may be certainly known by us, (1.) That many believers are in Scripture represented as doubting of their state of grace, Ps. lxxvii. 7–9. How answer? Ans. They do so through weakness of faith and the hiding of the divine countenance; but this is no reason why we may not arrive at assurance. And the doubts of such are generally but temporary.

156. Obj. (2.) Many deceive themselves in their confidence, Matt. vii. 21, 22. How answer? Ans. This is true, and shows the necessity of care, and of comparing our state with the Scriptures. But this is no reason why we may not attain to a solid assurance in the right use of means; and no argument against the Scripture injunction to seek assurance.

157. Obj. (3.) From Ecc. ix. 1, 2, "That no one knows love or hatred," &c.? Ans. (1.) This passage must not be tortured to contradict direct injunctions to seek assurance. (2.) The meaning of this passage evidently is, that we cannot know love or hatred by mere outward providences. They are much alike to all.

158. Obj. (4.) That this doctrine of assurance would take away all fear, and all diligence in seeking salvation? Ans. The objection is founded on error; as, (1.) It supposes that servile fear, which this assurance takes away, is necessary to duty and holy diligence, and that nothing but servile fear will induce to diligence. (2.) That if servile fear be removed filial fear is lost. (3.) That servile fear can produce holy diligence, which it cannot. (4.) That faith, with attendant graces, with the indwelling of the Spirit cannot produce holy diligence.

§ XXIX.—159. What is the general meaning of the word *reprobation*? Ans. *Disapprobation—rejection*.

160. Is reprobation, in reference to man, represented in Scripture as an act of God? Ans. Yes.

161. What are some of the Scripture expressions of it? Ans. *Hating*, Rom. ix. 13; *appointed to wrath*, 1 Thess. v. 9; *appointed to unbelief*, 1 Peter ii. 8; *ordained to condemnation*, Jude 4; *fitted to destruction*, Rom. ix. 22; *not written in the book of life*, Rev. xiii. 8; xvii. 8.

162. Is this term, or its equivalent, used in Scripture to express an eternal act of God, or a decree? Ans. Yes; Jude 4; 1 Pet. ii. 8.

163. Is not the eternity of this act of God necessarily implied in the eternity of the election of the people of God? Ans. Yes.

164. Are we to understand that God by his eternal act of reprobation forbids to the reprobate the privilege of salvation? Ans. No; wherever the gospel comes, the privilege of accepting and enjoying salvation is given.

165. Are we to understand by it that God imposed any restraint on the will of the reprobate, to hinder him from believing, &c.? Ans. No; he left the reprobate to their own will, and determined not to bestow renewing grace.

LECTURE XVII.—REPROBATION.

§ XXX.—*Definition*.—§ XXXI.—Quest. 166. What was the source of this awful act of God? Ans. His own will or good pleasure, Matt. xi. 25, 26; Rom. ix. 11, 18.

167. Would it be consistent with the independence and sovereignty of God to ascribe this decree to any other cause? Ans. No.

168. Was man's sin the cause of this act of God? Ans. No; sin is the cause of that judgment or misery to which this act appointed them, but not the cause of the act appointing them to judgment; for the elect were also sinners, and in the very same condition.

169. Had God any cause of hatred at the reprobate more than at those he elected? Ans. No; because they were viewed in the same condition of sin and guilt.

170. Was it on account of hatred to the reprobate that he ordained them to wrath? Ans. No; hatred of their sin is the reason of their damnation, but not the reason of the act of reprobation; since God as much hated the sin of the elect. Hatred of their persons was not the cause, then, of reprobation, but the sovereign will of God, Matt. xi. 25, 26. To this cause alone does the Scripture ascribe this act of God.

171. What errors would be involved in holding that God's hatred of the reprobate was the cause of their reprobation? Ans. (1.) It would follow that love to the elect, for some good in themselves, was the cause of their election. (2.) That something without God is the cause of his purposes, and therefore that this act was not sovereign.

172. How, then, is it said, (Rom. ix. 13,) "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated?" Ans. This text and that in Mal. i. 2, 3, do not express the cause of the decree of reprobation, but the act itself is manifested in the execution of it.

173. But did not God view the reprobate as sinners, in the act of reprobation? Ans. Yes; he equally viewed the elect and reprobate as sinners, in election and reprobation, but this sin was not the cause of his will of electing and reprobating; but his sovereign good

will and pleasure was the reason why he chose to redeem some from their sins and to leave others in their sins.

174. Has not this decree of reprobation been called by divines, God's act of *preterition*, or passing by the reprobate in the decree of election? Ans. Yes; and with great propriety, as it was his *not choosing* them to salvation.

175. Is this negative view of that decree warranted in Scripture? Ans. Yes; as God's *not choosing, not loving, not showing mercy*, are necessarily implied in his choosing, loving, and having mercy on the elect. Christ's declaration, John x. 26, "Ye are not of my sheep," implies it.

176. But is this negative view the whole doctrine of reprobation; or was there also a positive act of God respecting the reprobate? Ans. The negative is not the full view of the matter: there was a positive act of God respecting them, appointing them to wrath, 1 Thess. v. 9; appointing them to unbelief, 1 Peter ii. 8; foreordaining them to damnation, Jude, 4.

177. Was the sin of the reprobate the cause of this positive act of God in the decree? Ans. No; it was not the cause of the decree, in either the negative or positive view of it; sin was only the cause of the punishment to be inflicted according to the decree, Rom. ix. 22.

178. Since the reprobate are appointed to unbelief and disobedience (1 Pet. ii. 8,) is the decree of reprobation the cause of their sin? Ans. No; the sin follows the decree by necessity of consequence, but it is depravity or apostacy that causes the sin.

179. Wherein appears the justice of God's sovereign decree of reprobation, both in its negative and positive character? Ans. (1.) God was under no obligation to show mercy. (2.) It was, therefore, perfectly just to consign the reprobate to the judgment which they merit. (3.) By this act God took nothing from them which they possessed as their own. (4.) He withheld nothing to which they had a claim. (5.) By this act God inflicted no punishment; he only determined to inflict the punishment which they deserved. (6.) Mercy to others did no injustice to them, Matt. xx. 15; Rom. ix. 20—22.

180. Was there any cruelty in this decree? Ans. As there was no injustice, so there was no cruelty: it is not cruel to inflict what is fully deserved, nor cruelty to leave to deserved misery those who have no claim to mercy.

181. Although this decree of reprobation be an act of God's good-pleasure or sovereign will, (Matt. xi. 26,) yet may we call it an act of *gracious* good pleasure, or an act of grace? Ans. No; but an act, a sovereign act of glorious justice.

§ XXXII.—182. Does reprobation refer only to qualities or characters condemned and rejected, or does it refer to individual persons? Ans. To individual persons.

183. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the cases of individuals reprobated; as Esau, Rom. ix. 13; Pharaoh, ix. 17; Judas,

Acts i. 25. (2.) Because persons and not qualities are represented as reprobated; John x. 26; Jude 4; Rev. xiii. 8. (3.) Because election is restricted to certain individuals. (4.) From the actual damnation of some, which could not take place without the divine purpose.

184. Obj. (1.) Against reprobation as an eternal decree of God appointing individual persons to wrath and misery, That the Scriptures represent the reprobate and unbelieving as the same? Ans. They are the same in the event; but this does not argue that they were not so determined from eternity, or that reprobation is the consequence of unbelief.

185. Obj. (2.) That God is represented as loving all men? Ans. He loved all with a love of benevolence, but not with a special love which brings salvation.

186. Obj. (3.) That, on this doctrine of reprobation, God would be justly chargeable with cruelty? Ans. Besides what is said, Quest. 180, observe, This charge arises either from a misunderstanding of the decree, which is a leaving of sinners to themselves, and appointing them to just punishment for their sins, or from false notions respecting God's character and the desert of sin, as though God were under obligation to show mercy to sinners, or as though sin were a small thing, and not deserving of punishment. Let it also be observed that even to the reprobate God gives favours utterly undeserved.

187. Obj. (4.) That, on this doctrine, the gospel call to all sinners is not sincere? Ans. God's gospel call is most sincere, as he thereby calls man to his duty, and makes all welcome to salvation; his promises and threatenings are perfectly true, and the rejection of his call is voluntary on the part of sinners, and not under compulsion.

§ XXXIII.—188. Is it only or chiefly the poor, or the weakest, or the most despicable of mankind that are reprobated? Ans. No; on the contrary, (although there are many exceptions,) it is generally the more noble, the most powerful, and the wisest of the world that are reprobated, 1 Cor. i. 26; Matt. xi. 25.

189. What ends are answered by this dispensation of mercy and judgment? Ans. (1.) That believers may give all the glory of their salvation to God, and renounce all boasting, 1 Cor. i. 26—31. (2.) That unbelievers may see that there is no hope for them, but in sovereign grace. (3.) To show that no earthly greatness is of any account in God's sight. (4.) And for the encouragement of those who have less earthly comfort, and of those who feel their weakness and unworthiness.

190. Although we cannot know the reprobate particularly in this world, yet are there not some classes that, according to Scripture, must be considered as reprobate? Ans. Yes.

191. What are some of these classes? Ans. (1.) All heathen, living and dying in heathenism, Eph. ii. 3, 12, 17; Rom. ii. 12. (2.) All who do not know the gospel, though in a gospel land, Jer. x.

25. (3.) All infidels remaining so, Mark xvi. 16. (4.) The infants of unbelievers, who die in infancy, Eph. ii. 3, 12; 1 Cor. vii. 14; "Then were your children unclean."

192. Is the objection of any weight, that it would be cruel to damn heathen, who have no revelation, nor opportunities of gospel knowledge? Ans. No; Because, (1.) They are under guilt in Adam, Rom. iii. 9; v. 18, 19. (2.) They willingly live in sin, Rom. i. 18—32; ii. 12. (3.) And because, if this objection were valid, it would be equally valid as a charge against God in not bestowing gospel privileges on the heathen, nor saving knowledge, nor faith, on all who have the gospel.

193. But it is especially objected against the doctrine that the infants of unbelieving non-professors shall perish, dying in infancy, on the ground that they are innocent? Ans. (1.) 1 Cor. vii. 14, teaches that the infants of unbelievers are unclean, or unholy, and without God's covenant, plainly teaching that, dying in infancy, they perish. (2.) Infants are under guilt in Adam, as the Scriptures show, Rom. v. 12, &c., and elsewhere; and universal depravity further proves it. (3.) There is no salvation where there is no promise; and there is no promise to such. (4.) The promise being expressly made to the children of believers or church members, and God's covenant expressly including them, (Gen. xvii. 7—10; Acts ii. 38, 39,) proves that others are reprobated.

194. Do not these considerations lay a solemn obligation on parents to embrace the gospel, and profess the name of Christ? Ans. Yes; Acts ii. 38, 39.

LECTURE XVIII.—REPROBATION—SUMMARY.

§ XXXIV.—195. What is the end to which the reprobate are predestinated? Ans. To eternal damnation or wrath, Jude 4; Matt. xxv. 46.

196. May it be said that they were created for this end? Ans. Yes; as Pharaoh, Rom. ix. 17.

197. But should we understand by this that damnation was the chief and ultimate end of their creation? Ans. No; the glory of God, and of his holiness, justice, and truth, was the chief and ultimate end, Prov. xvi. 4; Rom. ix. 22. And, moreover, they were created under an obligation to glorify God by holy duties, and that they might have the opportunity of doing so.

198. Or should we hold that the reprobate were created for damnation as the object of God's complacency? Ans. No.

199. Or should we hold that the damnation of the reprobate was so much the end of their creation, that, but for this end, they would not have been created? Ans. No; they were created in order to accomplish the whole of God's purposes respecting them; their damnation was neither the primary nor the chief design of their creation.

200. Whether should we consider the damnation of the reprobate as appointed on account of the common sin in Adam, or on account merely of gospel rejection or unbelief? Ans. Although

both are included as the ground of punishment to those who have the gospel and reject it, yet as many shall perish on account of their guilt in Adam, who are not chargeable with gospel-rejection, having never enjoyed its privileges, so reprobation had in view especially the common sin of Adam as the ground of perdition in all the reprobate, Rom. i. 18; ii. 12; ix. 11, 21; Eph. ii. 3; John iii. 18, 36.

201. (The same question in another form.) Was, then, this decree of reprobation made purely with reference to the gospel, as some hold, and without regard to the common sin of man? Ans. No; it included all men, even the heathen as well as gospel-hearers.

202. But although the common sin of man in Adam be the immediate, the formal, and the sufficient ground of the perdition decreed to reprobates, yet are not their actual transgressions and their unbelief, who reject the gospel, antecedents to their actual damnation, and aggravations of their guilt and punishment? Ans. Yes; Rom. i. 18—32; John iii. 19.

203. And did not the decree of reprobation include these actual sins as grounds of punishment, although the common sin of man be the formal ground? Ans. Yes; 1 Pet. ii. 8; Jude 4.

204. Are not all men, who are in their state of nature, even heathen, guilty of unbelief negatively? Ans. Yes.

205. What may we understand by *negative* unbelief? Ans. It means that natural depravity, blindness, and enmity of man, who knows not the gospel, which would lead him to positive unbelief, if the gospel were given him. All men have naturally the principle of unbelief in their hearts.

206. Obj. It is said (Rom. ii. 16,) that God will judge at last according to the gospel, and, therefore, that perdition of the reprobate will be inflicted only on account of unbelief and gospel-rejection? Ans. In that text, the word *gospel* is largely taken, as it often is elsewhere, for the whole word of God; for his laws, ordinances, and doctrines, which exhibit the law given to Adam; the law as a covenant of works, as well as the gospel strictly taken. The *gospel*, in this large sense, exhibits the rule by which the last judgment shall proceed, with respect to both heathen and gospel-hearers. Besides, in Rom. ii. 12, 13, the law is expressly said to be the rule by which all shall be judged, although the heathen will not be condemned as despisers or rejectors of privileges, by a written law.

207. Is not God represented, in Scripture, as reprobating both negatively and positively? Ans. Yes; as *not knowing, not loving, not writing, &c.*; and also positively, as *hating, ordaining to damnation, &c.*—the same thing.

§ XXXV.—208. Are foreseen unbelief and impenitence the cause of reprobation? Ans. No; neither unbelief and impenitence, nor any, nor all other sins, are the causes of reprobation. If they were, all would have been reprobated, for unbelief, or other sins. These are grounds of punishment, to which the decree of reprobation had reference, but were not the cause why some were not elected to life, when others were elected.

209. Are not the reprobate, under the gospel, predestinated to unbelief and impenitence? Ans. Yes; these were subsequents of reprobation, and not causes.

210. As this doctrine is misunderstood, and much opposed by many, the evidence of its truth should be made plain. What proofs have we of it? Ans. (1.) Direct Scripture; as Matt. xi. 25; John x. 26; Rom. ix. 17, 18; 1 Peter ii. 8. (2.) Because, as God did not predestinate them to faith and repentance, they were necessarily left to unbelief and impenitence. (3.) Because nothing can take place, good or bad, but by divine purpose, since God alone is self-existent and independent.

211. But, in predestinating the reprobate to unbelief and impenitence, did he determine to infuse moral evil into them, or actively make them unholy? Ans. No.

212. How do the Scriptures represent God as executing this decree? Ans. As acting both negatively and positively in its execution.

213. How is the negative action described? Ans. He leaves the reprobate to themselves; does not enlighten; does not give grace, &c., Ps. lxxxii. 12. Thus left to themselves, and without the gift of saving grace, their own depravity leads them to unbelief and impenitence, according to the decree.

214. What positive action do the Scriptures ascribe to God in the execution of this decree? Ans. (1.) He blinds and hardens judicially, Rom. i. 28; xi. 7; Isa. vi. 9, 10; Ex. vii. 3. (2.) He takes away the common grace and privileges which they had, and had abused, Matt. xxv. 28, 29. (3.) He judicially delivers up to the power of sin, Hos. iv. 17; viii. 11; Rev. xxii. 11. (4.) He exposes them to temptations to which their depravity will yield; Hos. viii. 11; Ps. lxxix. 22. (5.) He gives Satan liberty against them, Ps. cix. 6.

215. Is the predestination of the reprobate to unbelief and impenitence fulfilled by these means, with unfailing certainty? Ans. Yes; God not only gives them up to depravity, but he restrains, and directs, and overrules their depravity infallibly to the predestined end, yet leaving them to act on free choice.

§ XXXVI.—216. Although reprobation is certain *objectively*—i. e., the decree is immutable, and its execution infallibly certain,—yet is it certain *subjectively*, to individuals, in ordinary cases; i. e., can an individual, in ordinary cases, certainly know that he is reprobated? Ans. No.

217. Why may it not be subjectively certain, as well as election? Ans. Because the gifts and calling of God, according to election, are without repentance; but grace may be given to the greatest sinner, and to the most hardened and impenitent, Matt. xx. 1, 3, 5; 1 Tim. i. 15, 16.

218. Does not this decree combine all the properties of all other decrees of God; as that it is *eternal, immutable, holy, wise, absolute, independent, and sovereign*? Ans. It necessarily does.

219. Is its immutability and infallible certainty any ground of discouragement or despair? Ans. No.

220. Why is it not? Ans. (1.) Because none can be sure of their reprobation in the present life, however wicked, except those who know they have committed the unpardonable sin. And even their despair does not arise so directly from the decree as from the nature of their sin, as unpardonable, and as such that no repentance, nor disposition to repentance will take place. (2.) Those who feel no concern will not despair under that indifference; and those who do feel concern have no reason to despair while mercy is offered.

221. Is not the doctrine of reprobation calculated to awaken concern for our soul's salvation, and diligence in seeking it? Ans. Yes; and the apostle applies it to this purpose; 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

§ XXXVII.—222. Is not this whole doctrine of predestination a deep mystery? Ans. Yes; and therefore should be treated with reverence and caution.

223. Is it necessary to be known and believed? Ans. Yes; and therefore should be taught.

224. Why is it necessary to be believed? Ans. (1.) Because God has revealed it in the Scriptures. (2.) Because all our salvation, and all grace to us flows from this fountain. (3.) Because it is necessary to the maintaining of the doctrine of free grace. If this doctrine be denied, the sovereignty and freeness of divine grace is denied, and the ground and reason of our salvation is ascribed to ourselves. (4.) Because it is necessary to a correct knowledge of God and his perfections; as the contrary leads to deny God's independence, sovereignty, and actual government of all things. (5.) It is necessary in order to maintain a right view of ourselves, as dependent, sinful, impotent, &c. (6.) It is necessary in order to produce a holy caution and diligence in endeavouring to make our calling and election sure, Phil. ii. 12, 13. (7.) And it is necessary in order to solid consolation, as the believer sees in it an unfailing security of his final salvation, and that his progressive sanctification, as well as preservation in a state of grace, is provided for in election in Christ.

225. Is not the doctrine of predestination, and especially of election and reprobation, disagreeable to human depravity? Ans. Yes.

226. Why is it so? Ans. (1.) Because man is naturally at enmity with God, and to be entirely dependent on God's will and power, as this doctrine teaches, is painful to depraved man. (2.) Because this doctrine humbles the pride of man, allows no merit nor power to him, and makes him entirely dependent. (3.) Because it requires man to seek his happiness in God, and to seek holy communion with him in his free grace.

227. Is not man's opposition to the doctrine a reason why it should be carefully taught and maintained? Ans. Yes; because otherwise this necessary and important doctrine would be lost. And we find that the denial of it has always led its opponents to

deny free grace in man's salvation, and to advocate the false and ruinous doctrines of human ability, and of legal methods of salvation.

☞ A brief synopsis of the doctrine of predestination may be given as follows; (1.) God alone is independent, and the Source of all created being and power. (2.) God, therefore, is the Author of all things, and must necessarily be sovereign; and holiness, goodness, and wisdom require that he act on his own sovereignty. (3.) Man, being necessarily dependent, can do nothing but as a dependent being, and, as a sinner, can do nothing that is good. (4.) All grace and goodness, therefore, that man attains, must be of God, and performed by God. (5.) Therefore, as God is an intelligent Being, he performs that good work, or sustains grace, with design at the time; and being independent and unchangeable, he must have formed that design in eternity. (6.) Therefore, God in eternity chose all those to salvation, immutably, infallibly, and particularly, whom he, in time, brings to salvation, and determines all their graces and gracious exercises, which in time they possess or attain. (7.) This eternal choice of some men to salvation and holiness must have been sovereign in God, and the sole reason why any are saved in time, as man can do nothing good but by God's operation, resulting from his eternal purpose. (8.) As God in eternity chose some of mankind to holiness and salvation in his sovereignty, so he did not choose all; i. e., he passed by a part, leaving them in their natural state, under guilt and sin, and without salvation; so that reprobation is the necessary counterpart of election. (9.) As God's own good pleasure and sovereignty, and not goodness in man, was the only source or reason of the election of some, so his good pleasure and sovereignty, and not the sin of the reprobate, was the reason why he passed them by, or did not choose them to salvation. (10.) And as he chose to save the elect on the meritorious ground of Christ's mediation, so he chose to punish the reprobate on the ground of their sin, as deserving that punishment. (11.) And as man, left to himself, and without redemption by grace, must remain in sin and guilt, so God's passing by the reprobate must necessarily leave them to eternal perdition. (12.) But as God is still necessarily the moral Governor, even of his sinful creatures, so he must overrule their sin to his own glory; and therefore he must not only punish them for their sins, but he must also direct the causes and occasions of their sins, and direct their depravity into such channels, as shall effect, and not counteract his holy purposes. (13.) As God thus left a part of mankind to themselves, to live in sin, so he did predestinate them to unbelief and impenitence, who live under the gospel dispensation, and he may justly give them up to greater sin, as a measure of the just punishment of their iniquity. (14.) This decree of reprobation is perfectly just, as by it God inflicts nothing which the sinner does not deserve; takes nothing from him to which he has any claim; and denies him no rights or lawful desire. Nor is justice a violation of any principle of grace.

CHAPTER VIII.

OF CREATION.

LECTURE XIX.—DEFINITION, &C.

§ I.—Having formerly spoken of the nature and perfections of God, and of his mode of subsistence in Trinity, we come next to speak of his works, under the distinction of *immanent*, (internal, unchanging and continuous,) and *transient* acts. And having spoken of his *immanent* acts under the head of *decrees*, we now come to speak of his *transient* acts or works, or those passing in time.

Q. 1.—What was the first of those external and transient works of God? Ans. *Creation*; as this was the beginning of time.

2. Was not creation the execution of an eternal decree? Ans. Yes; and this opened the way for the execution of God's other decrees.

3. Was it not necessary, if God should create, that he should also govern? Ans. Yes.

4. How may God's external works, in execution of his decrees, be divided? Ans. Into works of nature and of grace.

5. And how may the external works of nature be divided? Ans. Into the works of *creation* and *providence*.

6. Do not all the works of God, in creation and common providence, manifest grace of a certain kind? Ans. Yes; they manifest what may be called *common* grace, or free goodness to all his creatures capable of enjoying it.

§ II.—7. Some suppose that the word *create* is originally derived from the Hebrew word קרא , (*kara*.) How would the idea of *creation* come from this word, which signifies *he called*? Ans. That creation was a *calling things into being by God's word*, and is so described, Rom. iv. 17, "calleth those things which be not," &c.

8. What Hebrew words are usually used for *creation*? Ans. בָּרָא (*bara*,) and אָשָׂה , (*asah*,) and Greek, κτίσειν (*ktidzein*,) and Ποιείν , (*poi-ein*.)

9. Are not the words *asah* and *poi-ein*, signifying *to make*, often used in a latitude of meaning for making or fashioning materials into some new form? Ans. Yes; but yet they are used for creation proper; as Psa. xxxiii. 6; cxxi. 2.

10. Is not even the word ἐγενετο (*egeneto*,) used for *creation*? Ans. Yes, as John i. 3.

11. But the Socinians, wishing to evade this evidence of our Lord's divinity, argue that *egeneto* does not mean his creating, but his modifying some things, as the introduction of the gospel? Ans. (1.) The word *egeneto* bears the idea of creation; as it will signify the causing a thing to be, or the being caused. (2.) That passage speaks of the beginning of all things; that they took or received their beginning from Christ, even the world which knew him not.

12. Does that passage speak of Christ's work as after his incarnation? Ans. No; it speaks of the beginning of all things, and therefore of a time long prior to Christ's incarnation, and consequently teaches that he is the eternal God, and that by him, as God, all things were created.

§ III.—13. Is not the word *create* applied to God's works of providence? Ans. Yes; (1.) To common providence, as Psa. civ. 30; cii. 18. (2.) To special providence in the work of grace, as Isa. iv. 5; 2 Cor. v. 17.

14. Why, may we suppose, are works of providence called a *creation*? Ans. (1.) Because providence is like a continued creation, requiring the same infinite power and energy to maintain things in existence, and direct their order and operations, as to create at first. (2.) Because, in reference to some things, especially in the matters of salvation, divine providence is a giving existence to some things not existing before; as in regeneration, &c.

15. What is the peculiar meaning of the word *create*? Ans. *To produce something out of nothing*; Rom. iv. 17.

16. In its most appropriate meaning, then, to what does the word *creation* apply? Ans. To the first formation of things out of nothing, by God's word, Psa. xxxiii. 6.

17. Is not the meaning of the word *create* also extended to the formation of one thing out of another, which the laws of nature could not effect? Ans. Yes; as the formation of man from the ground, &c.

18. And is not this as much the work of God's infinite power, as to bring existence out of nothing? Ans. Yes.

19. Is the distinction made by some of any importance, that creating is not so much the production of something out of nothing, as the production of something by mere command? Ans. No; it is useless; because, if it be a production, by command, of something out of another thing naturally unfit for it, still there is something out of nothing, in form, in quality, &c., as *man* from the *ground*. A mere change on a thing created, which would make nothing new, though done purely by God's command, is not the ordinary meaning of the word *create*; as the change of the state of the *wicked in the judgment*; "Depart, ye cursed," &c. Thus *creation*, in its strict and proper sense, is the production of something out of nothing, and that by the command of God.

§ IV.—20. Does the light of nature itself teach that there was a proper creation of all things, even though it cannot give full information on the subject? Ans. Yes; Rom. i. 20.

21. How does the light of nature teach the fact? Ans. (1.) The unreasonableness of supposing that matter is eternal, compels us to suppose that it had a beginning. (2.) The necessary dependence of all things shows that matter could not produce itself. (3.) The perpetual changes going on in all things shows their dependence, and that they are under the constant control of a Being able to give them their being and nature. (4.) The arts and sciences,

and their progress, and historic accounts, show that their beginning is not even very remote.

22. But it is objected against the light of nature teaching that there was a creation, that the apostle says, (Heb. xi. 3,) that we learn (or understand) this *by faith*; that is, we learn it only from Scripture. How answer? Ans. (1.) The same apostle also says, (Rom. i. 20,) that "the invisible things of God, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." (2.) What is known by the light of nature may also be revealed in the Scriptures. (3.) What is obscurely known by nature's light is more fully known by revelation. (4.) A divine faith in any thing is produced by revelation, and not by the light of nature. (5.) The manner of the creation, by the word of God, and the order of the work, are known only by revelation; and of these the apostle is there especially speaking. The fact of creation being known by nature's light, it is not so directly the design of the Scriptures to teach the fact, as the manner and order of the creation, and that it is of God alone.

§ V.—23. How does it appear that creation is God's work? Ans. (1.) The Scriptures directly ascribe the work to God; as Isa. xl. 26, 28; Psa. xxxiii. 6. (2.) We may judge *a priori*, that the self-existent God, possessed of all perfection, is the Creator. (3.) We may judge, *a posteriori*, from the greatness of the work, and its order and beauty, that he is the Creator.

24. Is it not manifestly absurd to suppose that heathen idols created all things? Ans. Yes; Psa. cxv. 5—7; Jer. x. 11, 12; Isa. xlv. 10—20.

25. Could the world be the effect of a concurrence of atoms, as some infidels, Epicureans and others have alleged? Ans. No; the supposition is foolish and unworthy of the rational mind; for, (1.) The doctrine is a mere hypothesis, which never has been, and never can be affirmed on proof, and it is only a vague and unfounded hypothesis, invented merely as a relief from faith in God as the Creator. (2.) Those atoms could not be self-existent, and must have been created. (3.) On supposition of their existence, they could have no concurrence, but by an intelligent, directing hand; or they must, in order to concur, have possessed such a nature, or be under such laws, as would bring them together, and produce the effects found in the world, and this nature and these laws could not be self-existent. (4.) It is utterly unreasonable to suppose that their concurrence could produce that harmony and adaptation of one thing to another, which we see in all nature, without a wise, almighty and directing hand. (5.) Even the supposition of a concurrence of atoms producing the order and harmony that we see in nature, implies in the clearest manner the operation of the infinite wisdom and power of God, and necessarily involves the doctrine of a Creator. And so we admit that providence is carried on by God through the instrumentality of the laws of nature; but he gave those laws and sustains them; and we do admit that in the process

of creation God gave such laws to material things, and sustained them in their action.

26. But might not nature, when its laws were given by God, and the atoms created by him, produce the world, without God as their Creator, by that power which was given them? Ans. No; (1.) Because these laws of matter can no more exist and act without God's immediate superintendence and exercise of power, than they could come into existence without him. (2.) It is as easy to believe God's immediate creation of all things, as that he should give such a natural power and energy to created things; and it is more reasonable. (3.) Things must be created by God, and obtain their nature from him, before they can act; so that the operation of the laws of nature presupposes creation. (4.) The Scriptures ascribe creation immediately to God.

§ VII.—27. Is then creation the work of God alone? Ans. Yes; and this both Scripture and reason teach; Job ix. 8; Isa. xlv. 24.

28. Is it not necessarily the work of infinite and self-existing power? Ans. Yes.

29. Is creation the immediate work of God, or did he employ instruments in creating? Ans. It is his immediate work, and not by instruments.

30. Why may we not suppose that God employed instruments in creating? Ans. (1.) An instrument supposes some materials to work upon, which is not supposable in calling matter out of nothing. (2.) In forming a being out of matter unfit by nature for it, in which much of the work of creation consisted, an instrument, (which requires suitable materials,) could not be employed.

31. But as we do admit that in the process of creation God gave and sustained the laws of nature, is not this admitting that these laws were instrumental in creation? Ans. No; these laws were themselves the effects of creating power, and not instrumental in farther creating, but in sustaining and governing the things created.

32. Could angels, then, as Gnostics held, have been instrumental in the work of creation? Ans. No.

33. Are we to understand, as Arius and others held, from Heb. i. 2, that Christ was an instrument in creating work, when it is said that "by him God made the worlds?" Ans. No; Christ was himself God, the Creator, John i. 3; Col. i. 16.

§ VIII.—34. Is the power of creating communicable? Ans. No.

35. Why not? Ans. Because the communication of such a power would imply a contradiction—that a creature should possess infinite power, and therefore be independent. For infinite and independent power is necessary to creating work.

36. Do miracles imply creative power in those who work them? Ans. No; unless they be performed by their own power by those who work them; as in the case of Christ's miracles. None among men ever performed a miracle by his own power, but Christ, who is the Almighty God.

37. But as men appear to have been instrumental in working

miracles, how could they act as such and not have the power communicated to them? Ans. Men were never physical instruments in working miracles, but moral. Therefore God alone wrought the miracle in their persons, and with the word which they spake, or the deed which they performed. Thus Peter teaches, Acts iii. 12; here Moses erred, Num. xx. 10.

38. Do angels perform miracles by their own power? Ans. No; because they do not possess self-existent and independent, nor infinite powers.

39. Can they by mere will perform outward actions, as Descartes and some others held, without exerting an efficiency in them? Ans. No; if they could, then their will approving of God's work of creation, would be actual creation by them. God can make them will a miracle, and himself work the miracle according to that will; but their will does not effect it.

§ IX.—40. Is creation a work common to all the persons of the Trinity? Ans. Yes. Psa. xxxiii. 6; John i. 3.

41. When it is said, Heb. i. 2, respecting Christ, "By whom also he made the worlds," does it signify the Father as the author of the work, and the Son as the instrument? No; because (1.) Christ is elsewhere represented as the Creator; John i. 3; Col. i. 16. (2.) The preposition *δια* (*dia*) there used, often signifies the cause, author, or principal in the work; as Rom. xi. 36; 1 Cor. i. 9. (3.) Because, in this text, the order of operation in the economy between the persons of the Trinity is signified, and not instrumentality.

42. How is creation generally ascribed to the Father? Ans. According to the economy of operation between the persons.

§ X.—43. Is creation to be considered as a generation, communicating the divine nature, or divine manner of existence? Ans. No.

44. Do such passages as Psa. xc. 2, (Before the mountains were brought forth,) or Acts xvii. 28, (We are his offspring,) maintain any such idea as generation of created things? Ans. No; these are either figures, expressive of production out of nothing, or are expressive of man's formation in the image of God.

45. Does creation imply any transfusion or imparting of the divine perfections to created things? Ans. No; such a passage as 2 Cor. v. 18, "all things are of God," means, by his efficiency, not a participation of his nature, as some fanatics have supposed.

46. Does creation imply any fatiguing labour in God, in performing the work? Ans. No; "He fainteth not, nor is weary," Isa. xl. 28. And his "resting," does not refer to fatigue, but means ceasing that manner of operation.

47. Does it mean the production of things by the almighty command, or exercise of his will? Ans. Yes; Rev. iv. 11, "for thy pleasure," or "by thy will," &c. Gen. i. 3; Psa. xxxiii. 6; Rom. iv. 17.

§ XI.—48. Was creation a change in God, passing from a state of inactivity to activity? Ans. No; the will of God was in eternity and in time the same.

49. What change did occur in creation? Ans. Things passed from a state of non-existence to existence, by the will of God, and a new relation to God took place in them, but no change in God.

50. Is there then any difference between God's decree and creation, since it is the same will in God? Ans. Yes; in the decree God's will is exercised or put forth in purpose; in creation, his will is put forth in the execution of that purpose.

LECTURE XX.—ORDER, END, AND PERIOD OF CREATION.

§ XII.—Question 51.—Was creation entirely voluntary on God's part, or did he determine by any necessity to create? Ans. (1.) God having decreed to create, it was necessary to fulfil that decree; but, (2.) He was under no necessity to decree the creation of the world. That decree was perfectly voluntary and free. God was free to choose either to create or not to create; and, therefore, had what is called the liberty of contradiction.

52. What errors would be involved in the supposition that God was under a necessity to decree the creation, or that a creation was necessary to God? Ans. It would imply that, as created things are without God, or distinct from him, their existence was necessary and independent, and that God was dependent on things without him; or that created things are eternal, because if necessary to God now, they were eternally necessary.

53. Obj.—As God is supremely good and performed the work of creation most perfectly, he could do no otherwise than create things as they are, otherwise he would have failed of exercising perfect goodness? Ans. God is not by his nature bound to exercise his goodness or power in every way that is possible to him. He is at liberty to exercise it in such a way as in sovereignty he chooses. So he might have exercised it in saving all men; but in sovereignty he did not, and yet there was no failure of his goodness. Besides, if it had been necessary for God to create in order to exercise his goodness, it would have been necessary from eternity to create.

54. Obj.—God being supremely good is communicative of himself, and therefore creation was necessary in order to that communication of goodness? Ans. (1.) There was sufficient occasion for that exercising of goodness between the persons of the Trinity. (2.) God was at liberty to provide occasion for the exercise of goodness or not as he pleased. (3.) The exercise of goodness to creatures supposes the existence of those creatures, but his goodness did not render it necessary to create them.

§ XIII.—55. What is creation, considered passively? Ans. It is the work as done by God in creating, or a suitable production of things [at] the Almighty command of his will.

56. How does it appear that all things were created out of nothing? Ans. (1.) From express Scripture; Heb. xi. 3; Rom. iv. 17. Compare these two passages. Things "not appearing" and things "not being" mean the same. (2.) From Gen. i. 1, 2, in which Moses describes the creation of matter as "the beginning."

If matter previously existed, then the creation, as recorded by Moses, was not the beginning. (3.) From those passages of Scripture which represent eternity as that which was before the creation, as recorded by Moses; as Psa. xc. 2; Prov. viii. 24, 25; Eph. i. 4. To that recorded creation these passages refer, and all before it was eternity, and consequently there was no pre-existing matter. (4.) From reason. Matter cannot be self-existent, and, therefore, cannot be eternal. Consequently, creation was out of nothing.

57. Is the philosophic axiom, that "out of nothing nothing can be made," of any weight in this question? Ans. No; that axiom is true in reference to natural generation, or second causes, under the present existence of things, but cannot apply to the first existence of things under God's creating hand.

58. Was the creation, as recorded by Moses, the beginning of creatures and of time? Ans. Yes; because he says it was "in the beginning;" but if creation existed in any form before it, then creation, as recorded by Moses, was not the beginning.

59. But philosophers believe that they have demonstrated, by geology, that the world must have existed long before the Mosaic account of creation? Ans. It is not the first time that philosophers have thought that philosophy contradicts the Mosaic account of the creation, but further philosophic discoveries have proved their error, and confirmed the Mosaic account. We shall notice this matter more fully on § XXIII.

§ XIV.—60. Although all matter was at first created out of nothing, was every particular thing formed in its present state, and in its specific form and nature, immediately out of nothing? Ans. No; matter was formed out of nothing, but individual things were afterwards formed out of that matter; as the light, plants, animals, &c.

61. Might not this formation of things into their specific kinds be called *creation*, in a secondary sense? Ans. Yes.

62. Was not this secondary creation, in some sense, still a creation out of nothing? Ans. Yes; the peculiar form and nature of the individual thing did not exist in the mass of matter first brought into existence: it was a creation of an individual thing or a class of things out of matter which of itself could not produce it.

63. Did not this secondary creation require the same power as to bring matter out of nothing? Ans. Yes; because the existence and specific nature of each particular thing could not be produced by the matter itself, and must be something new, which did not exist before.

64. What is the difference between such a secondary creation and the works of intelligent creatures, in their works of art? Ans. The work of art, by man, is only combining substances, qualities, and powers, which, by God's creation, existed before in nature, and were adapted to these new forms and uses; but God formed creatures out of the mass unsuitable to their nature and powers; i. e. created something out of nothing.

65. Do the order of creation and the time employed in it imply that God could not, in a moment, have formed every particular thing perfectly and immediately out of nothing? Ans. No; God adopted this method purely of his own sovereignty, and, no doubt, to answer some good purpose.

66. What good purposes may we suppose the adoption of the divine plan answered? Ans. (1.) No doubt it was adopted to give intelligent creatures a more distinct view of the divine work. (2.) That the remembrance of creation-work might be kept up more distinctly among intelligent creatures. (3.) That the wisdom and goodness of the Creator might be more manifest to intelligent creatures, as God thus prepared one thing for another, and each thing, as they successively came into existence, thus found things adapted to its subsistence, its actions and its use.

67. Does this view of successive creation contradict the statement by Moses, (Gen. i. 1,) that "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth?" Ans. No; Moses, in that first expression, asserts the creation of all things in general, from its beginning to its completion, and then proceeds to record the progressive steps.

68. Does this doctrine of progressive creation give any countenance to the doctrine that matter was eternal? Ans. No; although it has been charged as favouring the doctrine of Hermogenes, a heretic of the second century, who held that God created all things out of an eternal and corrupt mass of matter, yet our doctrine denies the eternity of matter, and adopts the plain statement of Moses, that matter was first brought into existence, in a confused mass, and then formed successively into its particular forms and qualities.

§ XV.—69. In what sense may we understand that express approbation of the works of creation, given generally in respect to the work of each day, that they "were good?" Ans. That they were made perfectly to answer their purpose, which is the only goodness that belongs to material things; and, with respect to intelligent beings, to answer their purpose includes moral goodness.

70. Why, may we suppose, is the expression of approbation at the close of the second day omitted, and a double expression of approbation given the third day? Ans. It appears that the work begun on the second day was not finished till the third; viz., the separation of the waters, and of the land and water; and the expression is withheld till the third day, when the work is finished. Other works were begun and finished on the third day, as the bringing forth of herbs, &c., on the dry land; and the approbation of this was expressed.

71. Would it be proper, as some do, to translate the verb *וַיִּמַּל* (Va-yomer) in the pluperfect, as found in verse 9th, as though it were filling up the account of the second day? Ans. No; because there is no necessity for it; it is contrary to the use of this word, often occurring in this chapter; it would represent Moses as having forgotten the statement in the right place; and would represent the things stated in the 9th and 10th verses, as occurring on the second

day, though Moses had closed the account of that day's work in verse 8th.

72. Is it a profitable question, whether every thing was made the best that it was possible for God to make it? Ans. No; it is useless, curious, and perhaps profane. It is best to say, that all were made as God, in his wisdom and sovereignty, was pleased to make them.

§ XVI.—73. Wherein may the order observed in the progress of creation-work appear admirable? Ans. In that God proceeded from the less to the more perfect parts of creation-work, and prepared one thing for the reception of another. Thus he made the inanimate part of creation first, the animate afterwards, when things suitable for them were prepared; and from the irrational he proceeded to the rational. This was a display of both wisdom and goodness.

74. Was there manifested in the order of the work of creation, any inconsistency with the laws of nature, which God has given to all things? Ans. No; so far as we can perceive. The light created before the sun might have been quite sufficient, on the third day, for the growth of plants.

§ XVII.—75. As the ultimate end of all God's works is his own glory, what perfections of God does the work of creation itself especially manifest? Ans. His wisdom, power, and goodness.

76. But, considering creation as a step in order to the display of divine grace in redemption, was it not for the display of all divine perfections? Ans. Yes.

77. Can any but the rational part of creation apprehend or perceive this display of the glory of God? Ans. No.

78. Was not man's benefit a subordinate end of the creation of other things; or, in other words, were other things made for man's benefit? Ans. Yes.

79. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From Scripture, 1 Cor. iii. 21, 22, "All things are yours," &c.,—an assertion respecting things in general. Respecting particulars—for example, *the earth*, Ps. cxv. 16, "The earth hath he given to the children of men;" Isa. xlv. 18, "He formed it to be inhabited"—*the heavenly luminaries*, Gen. i. 15,—*the highest heavens*, 2 Cor. v. 1—*irrational creatures*, Gen. i. 28—even *angels*, Heb. i. 14. (2.) From the fact that man was made in the image of God, we may believe that all other earthly things were made to subserve his interests. (3.) From the fact that man was made lord of the lower creatures, we may believe they were made for his benefit. (4.) From the fact that the elect are redeemed by the blood of Christ, we may conclude that even holy angels are employed for his benefit.

80. But should we believe that all these things were made for man as their only end? Ans. No; they were designed to subserve the highest and ultimate end, the glory of God; and various subordinate ends also.

81. Or are we to believe that the lower creation was made for the sake of man individually, or as an individual? Ans. No; but

for man collectively, as a special part of the creation; and yet that each individual should enjoy the benefit of that which was made for the family of man.

82. Or are we to hold that they were made only for the bodily or temporal use of man? Ans. No; we are to believe that they were made for his bodily and temporal use, as far as they are necessary for that purpose; but especially for his spiritual benefit, directly or indirectly.

83. Is this doctrine chargeable as a vain and proud assumption of man's superior importance and desert of service from the lower creation? Ans. No; for, (1.) It is no vanity or effect of pride to hold that man formed in the image of God is more excellent than the lower orders of creation, who possess nothing of that image. (2.) Nor is it vanity to hold that inferior things were made for man's use, over which God had constituted him the earthly ruler. (3.) Nor is it an assumption that man is deserving of such service from the creatures, or of such honour from God, to maintain that God granted him such honour and favour, of his own sovereign authority and goodness. (4.) It is not pride or vanity to maintain this doctrine, if we, with humility and gratitude, acknowledge God's goodness in bestowing such an excellent nature on man, and so many favours, by the service of the lower creatures, and even the ministry of holy angels. It is even our duty to acknowledge it, and therefore we should believe and maintain the doctrine; Ps. viii. 4—8.

84. Obj. Many things, on account of their distance can be of no benefit to man? Ans. We cannot say of any thing in creation, however distant, that it is of no use to man, mediately or immediately; or that it never has been and never will be of any use to him.

85. Obj. Many things can be of no use to man on account of his ignorance of them? Ans. (1.) Ignorance may be removed, and he may yet actively use them for his benefit. (2.) God may make them useful to man even while man is ignorant of them.

§ XVIII.—86. Is it our duty to examine into the works of God, both as inferrible from Scripture, and as discoverable in nature by philosophy? Ans. Yes; Ps. cxi. 2, "The works of God are sought out of all them that take pleasure therein;" Ps. cxi. 24, "Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom thou hast made them all."

87. What cautions should be observed in these investigations? Ans. (1.) Indulge no question of mere curiosity. (2.) Guard against positive assertions of merely doubtful or conjectural conclusions. (3.) Admit no philosophical speculations against the doctrine of Holy Scripture.

§ XIX.—88. When did time begin? Ans. With the first work of creation; or from that fact time proceeded.

89. Was there any reason why the world was not created sooner or later than the period at which it was created, but the good pleasure of God? Ans. No.

90. In comparison with God's eternity, was there any such thing

as sooner or later? Ans. No; the terms here used refer only to subsequent duration; as, for example, in reference to some or any period of the world, it was wholly of God's sovereignty that the world did not commence sooner or later, or at a greater or less distance of time from that period.

91. Did any thing exist before creation but God? Ans. No; because all things besides him are creatures.

92. Could matter have been created from eternity? Ans. No; because, (1.) Creation is (actively) a bringing things out of nothing into existence; or (passively) a transition from non-existence to existence. (2.) That transition was a beginning, and, therefore, not eternal.

93. Could matter have existed from eternity without creation? Ans. No; (1.) Because then it would have been self-existent, independent, and necessary; for such characteristics must an eternal, uncreated being possess. (2.) Because such a being would have been God; i. e., Jehovah; and the unity of God would thus be destroyed. (3.) If matter were properly eternal, then there would have been two eternal, independent beings; one spiritual, the other material; and the spiritual, true God would not be almighty or independent, because this supposed material God, being necessary, independent, and self-existent, would limit the power and will of the true God. Such absurdities would necessarily follow the doctrine of the eternity of matter. (4.) We see and know that all matter has a successive duration, and is subject to changes; but successive duration and changes must have a beginning.

94. Have not the eternity of creation, the eternity of the world, and the eternity of matter, been held both by heathens and by professed Christians, as well as infidels? Ans. Yes.

95. What is the native tendency of such a doctrine? Ans. Its native tendency is to infidelity, and even to Atheism, whence it sprang, as it will necessarily lead to the doctrine of two Gods, and thence to the doctrine of no spiritual, living, and true God.

96. Is the denial of the possibility of an eternal creation a limitation of the power of God? Ans. No; because an eternal creation is inconsistent both with the nature of God, and with the nature of the Creator; and, therefore, it is not an object of power.

LECTURE XXI.—PERIOD AND DURATION OF CREATION.

§ XX.—97. Although we can make a near approach to an exact computation of the age of the world, can we as yet attain to the exact knowledge of it? Ans. No; because the divine writers, from whom we attain our knowledge of this, especially in the early ages of the world, give the periods in round numbers, and generally without fractions.

98. What number of years, in round numbers, from the creation till Christ? Ans. 4,000.

99. When infidels and heathen make its age much larger, should we not hold their computations fabulous and false? Ans. Yes;

and so if their measure of the years in former ages be less than ours, or not solar years.

100. Is there not evidence from the discoveries of science and inventions of the arts, that the age of the world is not greater than our common computation? Ans. Yes; and also from the fact that the sacred writers of the later ages, and contemporary profane writers, substantially agree in their chronologies, and, therefore, the measure of their years was generally the same.

§ XXI.—101. Can we certainly know the season of the year in which the world was created, or what season commenced the age of the world? Ans. No; nor is it of much importance, or it would have been expressly revealed.

102. What is the most probable season? Ans. Autumn; because then the fruits for sustaining animal life were in readiness. And, although an intervention of creative power was necessary, whether it were spring, summer solstice, autumn, or winter solstice, either to bring fruit to maturity instantly, but in its season, or by miracle to provide it out of its season, it is more probable that, as there was an adaptation of one thing to another, in the work of creation, so the adaptation of fruit in its natural time was furnished in creation. And, moreover, it favours the same idea, that, as man and the lower animals were brought to perfection in creation, so were the fruits, as their food. Moreover, the autumn began the civil year with the Jews, and most, if not all, contemporary and earlier nations. The sacred year of the Jews beginning in Spring, Christ's death and resurrection at that time do not bear on this question. Christ's death, in the time of it, was to answer to the sacred year, the deliverance from Egypt, and the Passover. The Jewish civil year commenced about the middle of September; the sacred in March.

§ XXII.—103. Did time commence with night or with day? Ans. With night, or darkness; because, (1.) Moses so records it, as evening and morning. (2.) Reason maintains the same; as absence of light was first, when chaos was brought into existence, and light was the first step in the progress of creation. (3.) The Jews, in their Sabbath and feasts, reckon from evening to evening; Lev. xxiii. 32. (4.) Paul alludes to this fact in creation; 2 Cor. iv. 6.

104. Is there any weight in the objection that darkness is a privation and implies the previous actual existence of light? Ans. No; darkness is rather a negative, and necessarily occurs before light, which is a positive. It cannot be called a privation, unless in reference to the previous actual presence of light. Or, as our author says, neither does privation always suppose the actual opposite to be previously present.

§ XXIII.—105. In what space of time may we believe that God created the whole mass of matter out of nothing? Ans. No doubt, in a moment; as there is no medium between non-existence and actual existence; and no space of time is specified by Moses. It

was also the beginning of the first day's work, and the formation of light and its separation from darkness followed in that day.

106. When, and in what space of time, may we believe that God created spirits—the angels? Ans. In a moment, and when all created being was brought into existence.

107. Why may we suppose that angels were created in a single moment, and with the first existence of created being? Ans. (1.) Because angels were brought into existence out of nothing, by God's command, as well as matter, Ps. xxxiii. 6. No doubt angels are here especially intended by "the hosts of heaven." (2.) Because angels are simple, uncompounded spirits, and it was only those things which are compounded, in which an order of operation could be perceived by us, that are represented as formed progressively. (3.) Because, under the names of "morning stars" and "sons of God," they are represented as singing and shouting at the performance of creation, Job xxxviii. 4-7.

108. But what time was occupied in the secondary creation; or the making of particular things in their finished forms? Ans. Six days.

109. As six days are often mentioned as the time of the creation, and very minutely described by Moses, and as God did not need such time for the work, was it not wholly of his sovereign will that six days were employed in the work? Ans. Yes.

110. But though God, in this, as in everything else, acted on his own sovereign will, yet, at his will, he chooses to effect certain objects by his work and his manner of working. What (may we judge) was God's design in employing time in the secondary creation? Ans. (1.) To set us the example of working and resting. (2.) To give his intelligent creatures a more distinct idea of his work, in its greatness and beauty. (3.) Perhaps, also, to introduce, from the first, that natural order of operation, and the actual operation of the laws of nature, which he intended to make permanent; as the revolution of the earth and of the heavenly bodies.

111. But various opinions exist respecting the meaning of the six days, as to what time one of those days was intended to signify. What are the leading various opinions in regard to this? Ans. (1.) Some hold that "a day" there means an indivisible moment of time. (2.) Some hold that it means a month. (3.) Some a year, &c. (4.) Some, a long and indefinable period. (5.) And others, that it means literally a natural day.

112. Which of these is the truth? Ans. We hold that, in the account of the creation, a day means literally a natural day, and that the creation was in progress for six natural days.

113. How may this opinion be sustained? Ans. (1.) Each day is described as consisting of evening and morning, which would not consist with the idea that a day was a moment, or a month, or a year, or an indefinite and long period. It consists only with the natural day, as afterwards expressed by that name. (2.) The seventh day, as a day of rest, is spoken of as similar to the other days, and established afterwards as a day of rest—a natural day;

and this day first observed was unquestionably a natural day, as creation was then finished, and the works of nature proceeded in their natural order. (3.) God's working six days and resting on the seventh (a natural day) is given as the reason why we should work six natural days, and rest the seventh. (4.) No hint is given that there is any thing metaphorical in the expression, or in the terms; and it is an admitted rule that we should never depart from the literal to a metaphorical meaning, in the interpretation of Scripture, without a valid reason. (5.) God was able to do all the work of each day in a natural day. And, considering the multitude and magnitude of the works done in each day, there was a glorious display of Almighty power, as real, and as great, as if done in a moment, and even more conspicuous. (6.) Although God was able to make all in a moment, he chose to employ time, and he could as well choose six natural days as any other imaginable period of time. (7.) By working six natural days and resting the seventh, God divided our time into weeks, by positive institution and example, and not by the laws of nature, as he divided the days, months, years, and seasons. It is therefore reasonable to believe that the example corresponded, in its duration, to our week. (8.) It is reasonable to believe that as the smaller items of creation received the laws of their nature in their formation, and that these laws, when given, went into operation, so the whole earth and the heavenly bodies, at their formation, received their laws of motion, and obeyed them immediately; and therefore that the revolution of the earth measured the day, as now; and that is intimated by the description of the day as "evening and morning."

114. Is there any weight in the argument (used to prove that each day was a moment) that the work of each day is said to be done by the divine command? Ans. No; because, (1.) The command is represented as the expression of the divine will, and that will could employ time. (2.) The works of Providence, which we know employ time, are expressed in the same manner, Ps. cxlvii. 15, 16, "He sendeth forth his commandment and melteth them," &c., respecting the operations of nature.

115. What has chiefly induced men to give a metaphorical meaning to the days of creation described by Moses? Ans. (1.) Some suppose each day but a moment, imagining that this would better display the power of God. This is evidently an insufficient ground for departing from the literal use of words, and is based on mere human imagination. (2.) Some have supposed a day of creation a long, indefinite period, from some geological appearances, which they think inconsistent with the fact that each day of the creation was but a natural day.

116. What is the prevailing doctrine of geologists, at present, respecting the days of creation? Ans. That the earth, with the planetary system to which it belongs, had existed for an indefinite time, in several conditions, different from one another, and from the present state of things; that the history of creation, by Moses, only states God's creation of matter, without defining the time,

passes over in silence a long, and to us unknown period, in which the changes which geology requires occurred, and describes only the creation of the present state of things, as occurring in six natural days.

117. Is this view inconsistent with the Mosaic account of creation? Ans. We think so, although Christian geologists endeavour to explain the Mosaic account consistently with their geological inferences.

118. Even while we hold that their doctrine, of the preëxistence of matter for long and indefinite periods before creation as recorded by Moses, is false and inconsistent with divine revelation, should we charge such geologists with infidelity? Ans. No; because, (1.) Although some infidel geologists have maintained that geological facts are inconsistent with the Mosaic account of creation, yet the great body of geologists plead that they are consistent with the Bible, and that the Mosaic account is true. If they err, their error is in the construction of the Mosaic account. (2.) If their geological inferences be false and opposed to divine revelation, and their construction of the Mosaic account be erroneous, the tendency of their doctrine may be to infidelity, contrary to their intention. Therefore, we should be cautious in admitting their speculations, and their construction of the Bible account of creation.

GEOLOGY AND THE MOSAIC ACCOUNT OF THE CREATION.

On this subject we offer the following remarks:

1. There are many well-ascertained facts in geology, which are not to be denied, although there is an apparent discrepancy between them and the Mosaic account of creation.

2. But yet it would be rash in us, in the present state of geological science, and especially in our degree of knowledge of it, peremptorily to deny the facts alleged, or dogmatically to give explanations of them, in order to make out a consistency between those facts and divine revelation. We may, for good reasons, reject a conclusion, while we are unable to explain the facts from which that conclusion is professed to be drawn. The burden of proof lies on him who affirms, and demands our assent to his dogma. We are not bound to the alternatives of receiving his dogma, or explaining or accounting for the facts he alleges, so long as we are not bound to fathom the depths of divine operations. On the other hand, we are bound to give positive reasons for the doctrines which we advance.

3. All things laid down as facts in geology, are not yet established by sufficient observation, and cannot command our belief.

4. In reference to well-ascertained facts, we are carefully to distinguish between them and the merely apparent facts connected with them, and especially between those facts and the inferences drawn from them.

5. The actual and ascertained discrepancy between geologists and the received doctrines of revelation concerning creation, does

not lie between geological facts and revelation, but between the inferences drawn from them and revelation. We may admit a fact, and deny an inference made from it.

6. It is no new thing for philosophy to assume to correct supposed errors in revelation, while further philosophical discoveries prove the truth of the Scriptures, and the error of former philosophical deductions. And, in the progress of the science of geology, many conclusions generally held by geologists have been abandoned on further discoveries. And the science is confessedly not yet arrived at its maturity. We are not, therefore, compelled to adopt its immature conclusions.

7. The point on which geologists at present disagree with the commonly received doctrine of creation is, not that matter is uncreated, or that it is eternal, or that the demiurgic days, (or days of creation) were severally long, indefinite periods, but that the matter of this world was not brought into existence, out of nothing, on the first day of [the six days'] creation, as seems to be asserted by Moses, Gen. i. 1-5, but had been created long before, as the habitation of animated beings.

8. To this doctrine, however, we object, and maintain that the divine record of creation, by Moses, teaches that the production of matter out of nothing was the commencement of creation-work, and belonged to the first day of creation, and that day similar to the other days of creation. And in the few following remarks, we shall, first, endeavour briefly to establish this doctrine, and, secondly, answer the objections drawn from geology.

I. Establish the doctrine.

1. Moses certainly asserts the production of matter out of nothing, by God's creating power, Gen. i. 1. Though he calls it "the heavens and the earth," and may have reference to the whole work of creation throughout the six days, yet he includes the idea of the production of the matter of the heavens and the earth out of nothing, as appears, (1.) From the use of the word *בָּרָא* (*ba-ra*), which properly signifies *to create*, to make something out of nothing. (2.) From his representing, in verse 2, that matter as in a chaotic state. (3.) From his saying that it was "in the beginning," which it would not have been if that matter had existed long before. But geologists here admit that the production of matter out of nothing is "the beginning;" only they say that Moses does not mean that this part of creation occurred at that time; that he asserts the general truth of the proper creation of matter, and that this was the beginning, but does not say when it occurred, passing over this matter in silence.

2. Moses does include, in the first day, that creation of matter, and the commencement of the secondary creation from it, in the production of light; and that first day he represents as similar to the other days of creation, as he describes it as consisting of the "evening and the morning." Now that first day, including both the formation of light and the production of the chaotic mass out of nothing, could not truly be described as evening and morning, if

the world had existed ages before, as the habitation of animals, with light, as well as other accommodations.

3. It is argued that the Scriptures do not intend to teach us philosophy, astronomy, or geology, and often speak of these things according to the apprehension of men in an age of ignorance, and that therefore we are warranted to suppose that Moses speaks in the same manner here. But we deny that this is a fair view of the case, or that the supposed cases and this of creation are parallel. When the Scriptures speak of the rising and the setting of the sun, they represent the matter truly; the sun does rise and set; and we say so still. The Scriptures, in such cases, give a fair practical view of the matter. They express all that is necessary to belief or action, in such a case, and do not *profess* to tell how it rises or sets. So, in Joshua's time, the sun did stand still, in reference to the earth, and the divine history of Joshua did not pretend or profess to tell how it stood still. But in the divine account of the creation, Moses professed to teach us what we could not know with certainty otherwise, and to teach us what we should receive with a divine faith; Heb. xi. 3. He professed to teach us the beginning of things and of time, the time occupied in creation, and the order of it, as well as the Author of the work, and the way in which it was executed, even by the command of God. But if matter was created many thousands of years before, and underwent many changes, under the providence of God, of which Moses says nothing, then he did not reveal God's procedure in creation, as we believe he professes to do.

4. Subsequent writings in Holy Scripture always honour the divine record of the past. They refer to it as the ground of a divine faith, and not to any other evidence from tradition or philosophy, when a divine record exists to which reference can be made. Therefore, when any subsequent divine writer refers to creation, he always refers to it as recorded by Moses. Consequently those texts refer to the Mosaic account of the creation, which represent eternity as before the foundation of the world, as Eph. i. 4; as before "the earth," "the depths," "the mountains," "the hills," &c.; Prov. viii. 23; Psa. xc. 2. Now these texts speak of eternity as before the earth, &c., and referring to the Mosaic account, represent the primary and secondary creation as belonging to the same period. For, if the geological account of the creation be true, all before creation as recorded by Moses was not eternity. Time had existed long before that creation. Therefore, Eph. i. 4, "chosen before the (Mosaic) foundation of the world," might not have been in eternity. So Psa. xc. 2; Rev. viii.

II. We are next to notice the grounds on which geologists maintain the preëxistence of the earth before the creation recorded by Moses. They advance facts discovered by geology which they suppose prove incontestably that the materials of this earth must have existed thousands of years before man was created, and existed in several conditions, as the habitation of animals; and therefore that, while they admit that the Mosaic record is divine and true, it must

be explained so as to agree with these facts. While it would transcend our limits to advert to all their facts, we will only advert to a specimen, which we think is, nevertheless, the substance of all the facts on which they rely.

They classify the rocks according to age, (beginning with the oldest, and generally the lowest,) into *Primary*, *Secondary*, *Tertiary*, *Drift*, and *Alluvial*. In the *Primary*, they find no fossil remains; [that is, remains of organic substances, as animals and plants.] In the *Secondary*, &c., as they ascend, they find fossil remains of animals of kinds different from any now inhabiting the earth, and none of those kinds now on earth, nor any human remains among them. But in the later formations, as the *Alluvial*, they find remains of man, and of classes of animals now existing on earth; and none, or few, of the classes found in the older formations are found here. From such data they conclude that the earth existed long before the creation recorded by Moses; that the animals, whose remains are found in the earlier formations, inhabited the earth in those early ages: that those early formations of rock and fossil remains could not have been formed in the short time since the creation recorded by Moses; that the animals whose older fossil remains are found in the *Secondary* and *Tertiary* rocks could not have belonged to the creation recorded by Moses, as there are no specimens (or few) of them now living; that if the earth did not exist before the creation recorded by Moses, we should find fossil remains of man, and of classes of animals now living, in the earlier formations of rock, but none such are found there, but they are found in the later, the *Alluvial*, while none of the earlier animals are found in the *Alluvial* formation.

Similar arguments are drawn also from vegetables, and also from the changes which appear on the earth's crust, too great, they think, to have occurred since the creation recorded by Moses; and which can be accounted for, they say, only on the supposition of the preëxistence of the earth, and of the entire change or changes at the several periods of supposed destruction and renewal. Now they insist that these things prove the preëxistence of the earth, preëxistent animals, and preëxistent creation and dissolution, &c.; and that we must admit these facts and conclusions, or solve the difficulty, and the geological contradiction of our doctrine. To this we answer;

1. Many of the above facts we admit, but not their conclusions.
2. Many of the above facts we do not profess, in the present state of geological science, to account for, consistently with our doctrine of the creation.
3. But it is demanding too much to require us to renounce a received doctrine, and the literal language of Scripture, and its implied teachings, because we cannot satisfactorily explain or account for all these wonders and mysteries of nature, so long as geologists do not and cannot prove that there is no possibility of accounting for them otherwise than they have done, and that they have attained the ultimatum of knowledge on the subject, which they admit they have not.

4. We do not yet know that God did not at first create many of the rocks, ores, coal-beds, &c., which are now existing, and allow others to be formed, and many or all of them to undergo changes by processes of nature.

5. We do not yet know whether many of the disruptions of rocks and convulsions producing them, might not have occurred in the chaotic state of the world, when the process of creation was going on, in the second and third day, in the separation of land and water, which convulsions are supposed to be too great to be affected by the flood.

6. We do not know how many, nor what classes of animals may now have become extinct, which were created on the fifth and sixth days; nor what causes, by temperature, moisture, &c., may have produced animals of gigantic size, in the early ages; nor whether the same natural causes which prolonged man's life to nearly 1000 years, instead of 70, may have proportionally increased the size of both man and beast. Nor do we know what need there might have been for some animals, in the early age of our world, which need does not now exist; nor whether, if the earth could well bear them at that time, it could also bear them now.

7. We do not know how much more rapidly than now some changes in the earth may have occurred in the early ages, producing, in a comparatively short time, what it now requires ages to effect; as changes on rocks Secondary or Tertiary, or on Drift, or Alluvium.

8. In our position, we are neither bound to prove any of the above suppositions to be facts, nor even to prove their possibility. It lies with the geologists to prove them impossible before they can legitimately require us to admit their conclusions against the literal interpretation of Scripture.

9. If it be asked, Why do we find no fossil remains of man in those rocks in which we find the remains of extinct animals, if man was coëval with them? and, on the other hand, Why do we find fossil remains of man, and none of the extinct animals, in the later formations? we acknowledge we do not know; nor are we bound to account for this, as we are not advancing a geological doctrine, and claiming belief of it; but we have a right to demand incontestable proof of a geological inference which demands our belief, and that it be satisfactorily shown that the facts alleged can be accounted for in no other way. But we ask, in turn, since the antediluvian world of mankind, numerous as it must have been, was destroyed by a flood, where is there any proportionate amount of human remains in the fossil rocks of the Drift, or Alluvium, where geologists allege all the fossil remains of the present creation must be found? We see no adequate account of such remains of man.

10. We also object to the doctrine of the preëxistence of the earth, from the following considerations;—(1.) If animals and plants flourished in a preëxistent state of the earth, by all analogy, the inhabitants must have enjoyed the benefit of the sun, for light and heat. But light was created on the first day, and the sun on the

fourth, of our creation; and therefore had not existed before. (2.) Our earth is but a speck, compared with the whole amount of creation. Shall we suppose that our earth was created without the stars, in that early period, and that, in our creation, the stars—immeasurably the greatest part of created matter—were first brought into existence; for they were created on the fourth day of our creation? The concealing of those heavenly bodies for a time, and the unveiling them at our creation, (as some allege to be all that is meant by their creation, as recorded by Moses,) is too imaginary, unfounded, and weak, to need a reply.

11. Dr. Pye Smith's theory of the creation recorded by Moses, as including only a small part of our earth, and his theory of the flood, as confined to a similar small portion, we shall not wait to refute. We count it too unreasonable, too plainly directed and guided by a desire to sustain a theory, and too directly opposite to the Bible, to need any thing more than this passing notice here.

12. We may observe, further, that although we do not propose to enter into a discussion of geology, both because we are not sufficiently versed in the science, and because it would be out of place here, yet we do think geologists are plainly at fault, when they (representing the disruption and upheaving of rocks, which are manifest in the earth, as too great to be accounted for by Noah's flood) insist that it is proof positive that the earth must have existed before our creation, and must have undergone several creations and dissolutions; and when they insist, as a settled point, that all rocks, ores, coal-beds, &c., must have been entirely formed by processes of nature since creation, and that none of them were created at first. In opposition to these views, we remark.

(1.) That we see no reason to deny that some parts of these several strata were formed by God's creating hand, at first, as matter on which changes should pass by processes of nature. There is certainly no necessity to suppose that all the sandstones in the earth were at first but separate grains of sand, or separate chemical materials; or that all limestones now in the earth were at first but separate elements of lime, carbon, water, &c.

(2.) Agreeably to our view, Moses does not represent the waters as *created* on the second day, or the dry land, on the third, but that they were already created, and on the third day the waters and the land were separated. "Let the dry land appear," was the command, Gen. i. 3; and this he called "earth," ver. 10. Now why should that dry land or earth, then separated from the waters, not consist in part of rocks, coal-beds, &c., as well as soil for herbs which were to be produced the same day?

(3.) Again, geologists at one time say, no rocks were formed at first, but only their materials, to be formed into rocks by processes in nature; and again, that there was no soil for the production of herbs but by detrition of rocks and other processes. Now, on the first supposition, the earth was all soil, which the latter utterly denies; and, on the latter supposition, there was no soil, and therefore no material to form rocks, by processes of nature, because all

was rock, which the first supposition utterly denies. We see no occasion for this contradiction, but the desire to maintain the theory of a preëxistent state of the earth. But,

(4.) While we admit that there are unmistakeable indications of such convulsions in the earth, and upturning of rocks, which cannot be well accounted for by volcanoes, or by Noah's flood, we see not why all this might not be accounted for by the chaotic state of the world in the first three days of our creation, and especially in the separation of land and water on the third. The geologists, to avoid this conclusion, represent that operation as a quiet and peaceful one, because (they say) many rocks, and especially those of the primary formation, give evidence of having never been disturbed. But we think the separation of land and water on the third day, as described by Moses, warrants the supposition of any thing but a quiet state, and nothing but an interposition of Omnipotence, when there was no occasion for its exercise in such a way, could prevent an upheaving and convulsion, above any thing that has ever since occurred. Surely, before the land and water were separated, the present mountains lay beneath the surface of the waters, else the dry land would have then appeared. The mountains, then, must have been raised in that operation, at least to their present altitude, and the rest of the dry land to nearly its present height, to make room for the waters below. And what more adequate cause could the geologist find, in the supposed destruction and re-creation of the earth before the time of our creation, for the stupendous upheaving of rocks, than is found in our present creation as recorded by Moses?

But perhaps we have pursued this subject too far.

In conclusion: We have stated evidences for our doctrine of the six Mosaic days as the beginning of created beings, and the beginning of time. We assert no geological doctrine. We only demand incontestable facts, and incontestable conclusions from these facts, against our doctrine of the creation, before we acknowledge our obligation to yield our doctrine to the theories of geology. And when we offered suppositions in geology, in opposition to the current theory of geologists, it was not to establish these suppositions, but to show that it is not yet proved that there is no other possible way of accounting for certain geological phenomena, than the present geological theories. Such a proof we have a right to demand.

LECTURE XXII.—THE WORK OF EACH DAY.

§ XXIV.—Quest. 119. What was created on the first day? Ans. The heavens and the earth, and light.

120. What are we to understand by the creation of the heavens and the earth on the first day? Ans. (1.) The first verse of Gen. i., may be understood as a general and comprehensive statement of the whole work of creation, from the formation of matter out of nothing, till the completion of the whole work, embracing in the general statement all the particulars of the work of creation to be afterwards specified. But, (2.) As the work of the first day, it

signifies only the production from nothing of all the material of the heavens and the earth; unless it includes the highest heaven, which it is probable was created on that day.

121. May we believe that the highest heaven, the abode of holy angels and of glorified saints, is a place, and not merely a state or condition? Ans. Yes.

122. What evidence have we for this? Ans. (1.) Created spirits require place. (2.) Glorified bodies will, and now do occupy it. (3.) The Scriptures represent heaven and earth equally as places; Ps. cxiii. 5, 6, "The Lord humbleth himself to behold things that are in heaven and in earth;" 1 Thess. iv. 17, "Then we who are alive shall be caught up," &c.

123. May we believe the highest heaven to be a material and a created place? Ans. Yes; because, (1.) Bodies of men do, and will occupy it, and our Lord, in human nature, dwells in it. (2.) It is represented as created, Neh. ix. 6, "Thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens," &c.

124. Do we know any thing of the material of heaven? Ans. No; because, (1.) It is not revealed. (2.) It is a spiritual matter, such as are the glorified bodies of our Lord, and of his ascended saints, as Enoch and Elijah, and such as the apostle describes glorified bodies, 1 Cor. xv. 44. And, (3.) We are not capable of comprehending it, not possessing, as yet, those qualities necessary to the understanding of it.

125. May we believe that the highest heaven was created on the first day of creation? Ans. Yes; because, as we have seen, angels were then created, and no doubt their place was prepared for them.

126. Is it any objection to this doctrine of heaven being a place, that angels ministering to God's children on earth, are represented as always beholding the face of God in heaven, Matt. xviii. 10? Ans. No; that text refers to their home, their ordinary abode, and does not mean that they are in heaven at the same time that they minister to saints on earth.

127. Is it any objection to our doctrine, that heaven is said (2 Cor. v. 1) to be "not made with hands?" Ans. No; such Scriptures mean that heaven is a fabric not of this world, nor made by men's hands, and (as in Heb. ix. 11, 24,) that heaven is a building not earthly, as the Jewish tabernacle was.

128. Obj. The Scriptures represent that the created heavens shall be dissolved in the general conflagration at the last day, Heb. i. 10, 11; 2 Peter iii. 12; how answer? Ans. As the apostles are speaking of that material system which is earthly, and which was connected with man's sin, it is not necessary to understand that dissolution as extending to the highest heaven.

129. Should we believe that the highest heaven was created out of that chaotic matter brought into existence on the first day? or should we believe that it was created separately by itself? Ans. As the Scriptures appear to be silent on this matter, it is not for us to answer; nor is it a matter of faith, or a matter of any importance to us.

130. What are we to understand by the light which was created on the first day? Ans. Natural light, taken in its ordinary acceptation.

131. But some have supposed that it means angels, as they are called "angels of light," 2 Cor. xi. 14. How answer? Ans. Holy angels are called angels of light, on account of their knowledge and glory, but they are never themselves called "light."

132. May we suppose that the production of light was the production of a quality, without a subject, as the Papists pretend? Ans. No; it does not appear that light is a mere quality, though its material be of a peculiar nature.

133. How are we to understand light as existing, when the sun, and other luminous bodies, were not created till the fourth day? Ans. It is not necessary that we fully comprehend this matter, but no doubt it was separated from other matter, and constituted the day in distinction from the night, and, by some motion, distinguished the evenings and mornings of the first three days. Probably it was stationary, and the earth in motion.

§ XXV.—134. What was the work of the second day? Ans. (1.) The expanse, or firmament. (2.) The dividing of the waters.

135. What are we to understand by "the firmament?" Ans. The space above us, including the atmosphere, and the whole planetary system.

136. How does it appear that the whole planetary system is included in the firmament? Ans. Because, (1.) The original word פֶּרַק, *Ra-ki-à*, signifies *expanse*, probably called, by the Latins, *firmamentum*, from the imagination that the boundary of our vision is a solid canopy, according to its appearance. (2.) Because it is said, (ver. 14, 15,) "God created the sun and moon in the firmament." (3.) It is said, (ver. 8,) that "God called the firmament *heaven*;" with which compare Isa. xl. 22, "He stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain," &c.

137. What may we understand by the "*waters divided*?" Ans. (1.) The waters proper which are on the earth; and, (2.) The vapour in the clouds, which is called "waters," Job xxvi. 8, "He bindeth up the waters in his thick clouds;" Prov. xxx. 4, "Bound the waters in a garment."

138. What may we understand by his "*dividing the waters*?" Ans. Not that the distinct waters were different from one another in nature or qualities; nor that the same waters are always beneath, and the same always above; but that God then separated a portion of water to the atmosphere in vapour, and established the laws of evaporation, suspension in clouds, rain, &c.

139. But if the upper waters be vapour or clouds, then they are in the firmament. How then explain the expression that the upper waters were placed *above* the firmament, ver. 7, and that in Ps. cxlviii. 4, "The waters *above* the heavens?" Ans. These expressions do not necessarily mean above the whole of the atmosphere, but above the earth, and above a part of the heavens. And in both texts the same compound preposition is used, signifying

“from above,” and may signify “partly above,” especially when the preposition *ς* follows it, as in Gen. i. 7. We may add that, although in Ps. cxlviii. 8, meteors, as fire, vapour, &c., are named, it does not imply that the waters in the 4th verse did not include these, but in the 8th verse the parts are particularized.

§ XXVI.—140. What was the work of the third day? *Ans.* The separation of land and water, and the production of herbs, grass, and trees.

141. In what state is it necessarily implied that the earth proper, (or land,) was, before the work of this third day? *Ans.* That it was entirely submerged; the land being more solid than the water, and no doubt the law of gravitation being then in operation, the land was doubtless globular, as well as submerged.

142. Must not the land, at that time, have undergone a change, at least of its external forms, into mountains and valleys, by convulsions and upheavings of (to us) inconceivable force? *Ans.* Yes; and sufficient to account for all the appearances of violence, on its structure and materials, which are observed by geologists.

143. What are we to understand by such passages of Scripture as represent the earth as founded on the waters and on the floods; as Ps. xxiv. 2? *Ans.* That the habitable surface of the earth is raised above the waters, or higher than the waters; and perhaps, also, that the waters, by their weight and their fluidity, by which they tend to an equilibrium, tend even to sustain the elevated parts of the earth in their position.

144. Are we to believe that, on this third day of creation, thorns and thistles, with which the earth was cursed after the fall, and poisonous herbs, were created? *Ans.* Yes; because, when the seventh day arrived, God had ended the whole work of creation; Gen. ii. 2. No new thing was after this created.

145. How then understand the curse pronounced, (Gen. iii. 18,) that “the earth should bring forth thorns,” &c.? *Ans.* That these useless and injurious shrubs, &c., should interfere with man’s labour and comfort, probably be more abundant, &c.; that poisonous herbs should be injurious; whereas, if man had not sinned, these things would not have been suffered to injure him, but would have answered only their useful purposes as they still do.

§ XXVII.—146. What was the work of the fourth day? *Ans.* The production of the luminaries—sun, moon, and stars.

147. What were the “two great lights” which are especially mentioned? No doubt the sun and moon.

148. Why should they be called “great,” when most of the planets are greater than the moon, and probably the fixed stars are as great as our sun? *Ans.* Moses speaks of them as related to this earth. These are the great lights to us; and the sun rules the day, and the moon the night; and the stars are separately mentioned.

149. What were the designs or uses for which these two great lights were formed? *Ans.* To give light on the earth, to distinguish day from night, to give heat, as light and heat are inseparable, (?)

to distinguish or mark days, years, and seasons, and to be for signs of these and some other things.

150. Do these lights distinguish weeks and months, as well as days and years? *Ans.* Yes; by the changes and quarters of the moon, although these do not precisely agree with the arbitrary divisions of weeks and months.

151. How are we to understand the express use of them as signs? *Ans.* As natural signs, indicating days, weeks, months, years, and seasons, according to their revolutions.

152. Were the sun and moon only, or were the stars also, designed for these uses? *Ans.* The sun and moon chiefly; but the stars also were included; Gen. i. 14: here, all these uses are ascribed to the lights; but the stars are lights.

153. But do the stars actually answer such purposes? *Ans.* Yes; were it not for the stars, we could not accurately measure the year or the seasons; and the Polar stars indicate the North and South, and thereby the East and West, the Equator, &c.; and more may yet be known by them than has thus far been discovered.

154. Is there any truth in the pretensions of astrology, as though the stars, by their conjunction, &c., indicated future contingent events? *Ans.* No; their use as signs refers to no such things, but only to the native and physical effect of their position and revolutions.

155. Why should we reject the pretensions of astrology? *Ans.* (1.) Because the stars can have no influence on human events. (2.) Because the supposed influence which astrology ascribes to them is imaginary; is founded neither on the known nature of the stars, nor on effects observed. (3.) Good and bad occur to individuals born under the same positions of the stars. (4.) God reserves to himself the knowledge of future contingent things, and reveals them beforehand only by prophecy, Isa. xli. 22. And, (5.) He warns us against such superstition as heathenish, Jer. x. 2. It is idolatrous.

156. *Obj.* Our Lord approves of noticing the indications of the clouds and wind, Luke xii. 54, 55; Matt. xvi. 2, 3. How answer? *Ans.* To notice the natural and usual indications of the clouds and wind, is lawful; is no superstition; and may be useful in our management of business; and of such observances our Lord speaks. And, accordingly, it is lawful to calculate eclipses, changes of the moon, &c.; for these are not contingent; they are the effects of certain laws.

157. Since light was created on the first day, how are we to understand the fact that the sun and moon were created on the fourth? How was it a creation? *Ans.* The sun and moon belonged to the secondary creation, which brought no matter into existence, but only gave to individual things their distinct existence, their peculiar nature, and their laws. So the sun, moon, and stars were, on the fourth day, formed as distinct creatures.

NOTE:—Astrology no doubt arose from idolatry, and from a disposition to fear and reverence certain things which are great, and

to us but little known. This disposition led many to imagine that the sun, moon, and stars were intelligent beings, and, as such, were the objects of worship. From this they naturally fell into the notions of astrology.

§ XXVIII.—158. What was the work of the fifth day? Ans. Fishes and fowls.

159. Of what were they formed? Ans. Of the water. At least this is asserted of the fishes. It is true, the literal rendering of ver. 20, does not expressly teach that the waters shall bring forth the fowls; but “that the waters shall bring forth the moving creature that hath life; and the fowl that fly,” &c. Yet we think our author is not warranted to say that the fowls were formed from the earth. For, if the original does not say that they were formed from the waters, it is still more evident that it does not teach that they were formed of the earth. His only ground, we suppose, is because other living creatures, above the face of the ground, were formed from it, and therefore he supposes the fowls were. We still think they were formed from what the text calls “waters,” for these reasons; (1.) Properly land-animals (as ver. 24, &c.) are expressly said to be brought forth from the earth, but fowls are not classed with them. (2.) Fowls are classed with the fishes, (ver. 20, 21, 22,) and were created on the same day, and not on the sixth, with the land animals. (3.) Every other thing is represented as created for that element for which they were fitted, and in which they move; and therefore we might suppose that the fowls were formed out of the element appropriated to their mode of life. (4.) The air may be called *water*, from its possessing so much of the qualities of water, as fluidity, and tending to an equilibrium; and therefore the fowls might be created out of it.

160. What should we believe of the bird called *Phoenix*; that it was fabled, or real? Ans. That it was fabled, and not real, according to the description given of it, as single, and a new one to arise out of its ashes. This would be a resurrection, not natural propagation. It would be a miraculous or supernatural production. Besides, according to the blessing pronounced, (ver. 22,) the fowls were to multiply in the earth; and Noah afterwards took in animals by pairs, the male and the female; and these pairs were to be of every living thing of all flesh; and therefore there was no such living thing existing as the Phoenix. Job (xxix. 18,) borrowed his figure from another idea of the birds; their nests are their home, and there are their special comforts.

§ XXIX.—161. What was the work of the sixth day? Ans. Land-animals, and man. ~~See~~ The subject of man's creation, on account of its importance, is reserved for another chapter.

162. Of the inferior land-animals, what distinctions are expressed? Ans. There are three general divisions; as, (1.) Domestic animals; called “cattle.” (2.) Wild beasts; called “beasts of the earth.” (3.) “Creeping things.” And of each of these there are many distinct species.

163. Are we to understand Moses as recording the creation of the inhabitants of the planets, or only of the earth? Ans. Only of this earth. It is but matter of conjecture whether those planets are inhabited by animated or intelligent beings. We have no need to know the facts of such matters. The power of God is adequate; but this does not prove his will. And telescopes cannot inform us.

164. Should we believe the creation of carnivorous animals? Ans. We suppose it must remain in doubt. That those animals, now carnivorous, were created on the sixth day, there can be no doubt. But whether they were then carnivorous, we may not be able to assert or deny, with knowledge. Difficulties attend either view.

§ XXX.—165. What was done on the seventh day? Ans. God rested.

166. What are we to understand by God's resting? Ans. His ceasing from the production of things by creation, and acquiescing in his work as good.

167. Did God then sanctify the seventh day, to be a Sabbath of rest to man? Ans. Yes; Gen. ii. 2, 3.

168. But might not this account in Gen. ii., be a *prolepsis*, or antedating of the time of sanctifying the Sabbath; meaning that it was at the giving of the law at Sinai that this sanctifying of the seventh day took place? Ans. No; there is nothing in the words of Moses, in Gen. ii. 2, 3, or in Ex. xx. 11, that demands such a supposition. God's resting on the seventh day was the setting it apart from the other days. The Decalogue (Ex. xx. 11,) represents God as blessing the Sabbath when he rested on it. And, further, there is no reason to suppose that in the early ages of the world they had no Sabbath, nor that God would not make the Sabbath obligatory from the creation.

§ XXXI.—169. When the Scriptures speak of God's creating the world, what are we to understand by "the world?" Ans. The universal system of bodies, including their whole nature, depending on the same principle—their creation by God—and tending to one end.

170. What did the Jews generally call the world; or how describe it? Ans. "The heavens and the earth;" sometimes adding, "and all things in them."

§ XXXII.—171. Is the present world the first that ever existed? Ans. Yes; and [we so believe] for these reasons; (1.) Moses describes the creation of the present world as "In the beginning." (2.) The Scriptures refer to the creation as recorded by Moses, representing all before it as eternity.

172. What does Peter mean (2 Peter ii. 5) by "the old world?" Ans. He means the Antediluvian world, or rather the men of it.

173. Is this world the last that shall exist? Ans. It is, so far as we have any information, except that it is to be renewed, 2 Pet. iii. 13.

§ XXXIII.—174. Is there any but one world now existing?

Ans. No; if we understand "world" as comprehending the universe of God's creation. Taking it in this broad sense, more worlds would imply another God, with his system of worlds. But, viewing this earth as the world, distinct from the other planets, or our whole planetary system as a distinct world from other planetary systems created by God, we may say there are many worlds, without venturing to assert that they are inhabited, or how they are inhabited. And to the worlds in this view, perhaps the apostle refers, Heb. i. 2. But perhaps he refers to heaven, earth, and hell.

§ XXXIV.—175. Has the world, with all its inconceivable extension, nevertheless bounds and limits? Ans. Yes; because bodies occupy place; and each body being limited, the whole must be limited also. No being is infinite but God.

176. What is meant by those passages of Scripture which represent the world as beyond measurement; as Isa. xl. 12; Jer. xxxi. 37? Ans. That it is beyond precise measurement by man.

§ XXXV.—177. Is not God able to make other worlds if he pleases? Ans. Yes; his power is unlimited.

§ XXXVI.—178. Can we, with any propriety, ascribe to the world collectively, a soul, or intelligence? Ans. No; it is inconsistent with its nature and its parts. It tends to deny the providence of God. The Scriptures give no such ideas. The supposition is a baseless imagination.

CHAPTER IX.

OF ANGELS.

LECTURE XXIII.—THEIR NAMES AND NATURE.

§ I.—Quest. 1. To what class of creatures—visible and corporeal, or invisible and spiritual—do *angels* belong? Ans. Invisible and spiritual.

2. Does the name *angel* signify nature, or office? Ans. Office.

3. What does the name *angel* mean? Ans. Legate—messenger.

4. What other names do angels receive in Scripture? Ans. They are called "spirits," "gods," "sons of God," "thrones," "principalities," "powers," &c.

§ II.—5. Has not this name many applications in Scripture? Ans. Yes; (1.) It is applied to Christ; as in Acts vii. 30, 38; Isa. lxiii. 9; Job xxxiii. 23; Mal. iii. 1; 1 Thess. iv. 16. (2.) It is applied to men, whether as sent by men or by God; as James ii. 25; Mal. iii. 1; Hag. i. 13.

6. How does it appear that the term "archangel," in 1 Thess. iv. 16, applies to Christ? Ans. (1.) Because the name is applicable to him, as the Prince of angels. (2.) From Dan. x. 21; Rev. xii. 7, "Michael, your Prince;" "Michael and his angels fought," &c.

7. Why is Christ called an angel? Ans. Because he is sent of God, as the messenger to sinners.

But the most frequent, and the most direct meaning of the name is—an order or class of created spirits, whose special work and office is to act as God's messengers; and of them, as such, we here speak.

8. Is not the name given to both good and bad spirits? Ans. Yes; 1 Peter i. 12; Matt. xxv. 41.

§ III.—9. Does the light of nature prove the existence of angels? Ans. It proves it rather darkly, but renders their existence probable.

10. What evidence is there of their existence from reason, or nature's light? Ans. (1.) *A priori*; that, as God employs men as his instruments and messengers, in works suited to their capacity, so we might expect that he would employ a superior order of instruments and messengers for works above men's capacity. (2.) *A posteriori*; remarkable operations and occurrences would render their existence probable.

11. But do not the Scriptures clearly establish the doctrine of the real and permanent existence of angels? Ans. Yes; they are often spoken of in the most unequivocal terms.

12. Is not the denial of [the existence of] angels represented in Scripture as an error? Ans. Yes; as Acts xxiii. 8.

13. Is it probable that the Sadducees absolutely denied that angels ever existed? Ans. No; it is not probable; because they admitted the books of Moses, which unequivocally assert that angels exist. But some suppose they only admitted the temporary existence of angels, during appearances and operations, but not their permanent existence.

§ IV.—14. What do we mean or understand by *an angel*? Ans. A complete and distinct spiritual creature.

15. How prove that they are creatures? Ans. (1.) They cannot be self-existent, which is the prerogative of God; and therefore they received their existence from God by creation. (2.) The Scriptures plainly assert their creation; as Ps. civ. 4; Col. i. 16, 17. (3.) They belong to the created "host of heaven;" Gen. ii. 1; Ps. xxxiii. 6.

16. Should we admit that the angels were created before the creation as recorded by Moses? Ans. No; because the Scripture holds all as eternity before that beginning.

17. Is the precise time of their creation revealed? Ans. No; but it may be inferred that they were created on the first day of the creation, because they belong to the "host of heaven," (Gen. ii. 1,) and because they are represented (Job xxxviii. 7,) as singing and shouting at the laying of the foundations of the earth; at the work of creation.

§ V.—18. As angels are creatures, are they not finite? Ans. Yes; necessarily so, in essence, powers, gifts, duration, and number.

19. Are angels limited to place? Ans. Yes; immensity is the attribute of God alone.

20. But do they occupy place, as matter, exclusively? Ans. No; because they do not possess the properties of matter, and therefore have not extension as matter, excluding other things from the same place. Therefore, many angels may be in the same place at the same time, and also in the same place with matter.

21. How does it appear that angels occupy place, and are limited to a definite place of existence at any time? Ans. (1.) From reason; as they exist as finite creatures, and are not possessed of immensity. (2.) From the Scriptures representing their ordinary abode—the good angels in heaven; Matt. xviii. 10; and evil angels in hell; 2 Pet. ii. 4.

22. Can an angel be in more places than one at the same time? Ans. No; this belongs either to division, of which angels as simple essences are incapable, or to immensity, which belongs to God alone.

23. Why might we not resolve the presence of angels into their external operations; that is, hold that their operations are their presence, while their essence exists nowhere? Ans. (1.) It is not a conceivable idea—of operations without an essence to perform them. The supposition solves no difficulty, is wholly unnecessary, and is imaginary. (2.) The Scripture neither asserts such a thing, nor anything that can imply it. (3.) The supposition would separate the agent from his action, and the will to act, from the essence acting. (4.) These operations are not continued, and therefore the supposition would annihilate the existence of an angel, on the cessation of his operation, and bring him again into existence in another operation; and thus it would deny his identity, his accountability, and his capability of either happiness or misery.

24. How are angels said to be finite in duration? Ans. Not only because they had a beginning, but, being creatures and finite, their existence is a continued succession, although it be continued to eternity.

25. Is their number great? Ans. Yes; Psa. lxxviii. 17; Heb. xii. 22; but it is not infinite.

§ VI.—26. As angels are spirits, are they real substances or beings? Ans. Yes; as appears from their being created; from their being spirits; Heb. i. 14; and from their actions, which suppose an actor or agent.

27. Why not admit that they are mere thoughts? Ans. Because thoughts, whether general or special, are not beings, or essences, or creatures, but mere actions. And thoughts, being the actions of an essence or substance, must be different from it. This was a notion of Descartes, and has been embraced by Hopkinsians, in regard to the human soul.

§ VII.—28. Are angels entirely incorporeal? Ans. Yes; being spirits, as the Scriptures uniformly represent, they are, of consequence, incorporeal; Luke xxiv. 39.

29. Does it not necessarily follow that they are invisible to the bodily eye? Ans. Yes; Col. i. 16; speaking of angels created by Christ, the apostle says, “all things—visible and invisible.”

30. Is there any weight in the objection to our doctrine, of the pure spirituality of angels—that they are represented in Scripture as like fire, winged, standing, moving, and often visible? Ans. No; (1.) Their wings, their standing and moving, and their likeness to fire, are symbolical representations of their powers, activity, and readiness to obey the divine will. And such emblems are applied to God himself, answerable to his nature and operations. (2.) Their appearing to men in the form of human bodies, was either imaginary, as in a dream or a trance; or the appearance of a human body was assumed for a time; or, in some cases, perhaps—as of the three men appearing to Abraham, Gen. xviii. 2, 8, 9, 22, who ate and conversed—human bodies (or rather bodies like the human) were formed for the time, to be as miraculously dissolved, when they had answered their purpose.

31. But what authority have we for giving such explanations of those appearances of angels recorded in Scripture, and departing so far from the literal use of the words of Scripture? Ans. (1.) Because the unequivocal Scripture accounts of angels as spirits will not allow a literal construction of those extraordinary appearances recorded. (2.) Because, in several cases, the apparent body of the angel vanished out of sight. (3.) And because the power of God could furnish an appearance, or a real body, for an angel, as occasion would require, and again cause it to disappear, and dissolve it, if it were real.

32. Have we any reason to believe that an angel ever assumed the real body of a man, dead or alive, in which to appear to men? Ans. No; there was no necessity for this. The power of God could provide a body for the purpose, and a real body, and in the entire likeness of the human, though not actually human, or sprung from Adam.

33. Did the assumption of a real body, by an angel, constitute a personal union between the angel and that body? Ans. No; there was no necessity that such a union should exist, even for a moment. The body was prepared and assumed only for a purpose. The angel was still purely a spirit.

34. But the question may be asked, Why is the punishment of eternal fire prepared for the fallen angels, (Matt. xxv. 41,) if they have nothing corporeal? Ans. Fire is here used figuratively for exquisite torment. Their punishment is also described as darkness; 2 Pet. ii. 4.

§ VIII.—35. Are angels endued with understanding? Ans. Yes; 2 Sam. xiv. 17.

36. How may we believe that angels obtain their knowledge? Ans. Three ways; as, (1.) They have a natural knowledge by creation; being created intelligent, and with a measure of innate knowledge. (2.) Their knowledge is also acquired, by experience and observation; Eph. iii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 12. (3.) By immediate revelation; Dan. ix. 21, 22; Rev. i. 1.

37. Do they not excel man in understanding? Ans. Yes.

38. Wherein does their understanding excel man's? Ans. (1.) In the mode of their understanding; not by sensation, but purely intellectual. Their insight is deeper and more rapid. (2.) In the objects of their knowledge, which are more extensive.

39. What gives them advantages over man in knowledge? Ans. Although we do not know all their advantages, we may notice some of them; as, (1.) Their natural power of perception. (2.) Their extensive employment about all the variety of things in God's government of the world. (3.) Their long experience and observation of the providence of God. (4.) Their pervading all bodies. (5.) Their intercourse with one another.

40. Do they obtain all their knowledge by intuition; or, is all their knowledge intuitive? Ans. No; they reason and reflect; Eph. iii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 12.

41. But do they know all things? Ans. No; this belongs to God only; Mark xiii. 32.

42. Do they know the secret counsels of men's hearts? Ans. No; this belongs to God alone; 1 Kings viii. 39, "For thou, even thou only, knowest the hearts of all men."

43. Do they know future contingent things, except by special revelation? Ans. No; Isa. xli. 22, 26.

§ IX.—44. Have the angels a free will? Ans. Yes; as they have desires and choice; 1 Pet. i. 12; the good, free will to holiness, and the wicked, to sin; Psa. ciii. 20; Jude 6.

45. Does this freedom signify indifference to good or evil? Ans. No; but liberty to exercise their will according to their nature.

46. Have not angels desires and passions, according to their nature? Ans. Yes; 1 Pet. i. 12; Luke xv. 7. These belong to created and intelligent beings, and to those who are accountable, as the angels are.

§ X.—47. Do angels possess great power? Ans. Yes; so it is asserted, Psa. ciii. 20; 2 Thess. i. 7; their works also prove it; as 2 Kings xix. 35.

48. Is it correct to say that they have no power but the will, and that, without the exercise of power by themselves, God produces the effect immediately, at their will? Ans. No; (1.) This would deny that they had any power whatever. (2.) It represents them as only moral instruments. (3.) On this supposition, angels might, without any power, be moral instruments in creation and divine works of Providence, and have these as well as other works ascribed to them. (4.) Satan's power of seduction would be nothing, and the power put forth for this end would be ascribed to God.

49. But must we not admit that all power is of God, whatever agent he employs; and that no creature has any power but by God's gift, and sustaining power? Ans. Yes; but there is a difference between God's communicating a physical power to a creature, and his putting forth his own power immediately, while he makes the creature only a moral instrument. On man and on

angels; God has bestowed certain powers appropriate to their station and employments.

50. Although the power of angels is great, is it unlimited? Ans. No; this is the prerogative of God.

51. What are some things they cannot do? Ans. (1.) They cannot create. (2.) Nor work miracles, by their own power; Ps. lxxii. 18. (3.) They cannot change the human heart; Prov. xxi. 1; because all these things require omnipotence. (4.) They can do nothing beyond the divine permission.

52. Can they communicate thoughts to us? Ans. Yes; so Satan; Acts v. 3; Eph. ii. 2.

53. But can they do this without using the medium of our powers, external or internal? Ans. No; it is God's prerogative to communicate thoughts to us immediately; to form thoughts within us.

54. Have they power over material things? Ans. Yes; as Satan with Job; the angel in the camp of the Assyrians, &c.

55. Can we apprehend their power, or mode of operating, either on spirits or bodies? Ans. No.

LECTURE XXIV.—THEIR OFFICE.—GOOD AND EVIL ANGELS, ETC.

§ XI.—56. Have angels, good and bad, the image of God? Ans. Yes.

57. Wherein do they possess that image as angels good and bad? Ans. They possess it as they are spirits, and possess many powers as intelligent beings.

58. Have holy angels the image of God in any peculiar sense, beyond fallen angels? Ans. Yes; in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness.

59. Does the silence of Moses, on the subject of the image of God in angels, when he says that man was created in the image of God, militate against this doctrine? Ans. No; because he does not explicitly narrate the creation of angels.

60. Does not the name, "sons of God," given to angels, (Job i. 6; ii. 1; xxxviii. 7.) imply the image of God in them? Ans. Yes; this name indicates the image of God in them more directly than their creation by God.

§ XII.—61. What is the special work or office of angels? Ans. To minister to God and for him; Ps. ciii. 20.

62. Wherein do they minister? Ans. (1.) In celebrating God's glory; Isa. vi. 3. (2.) Declaring to men God's counsels; Luke ii. 10. (3.) Executing God's counsels; in judgment on the wicked; Ps. xxxv. 5; and in protecting the godly; Ps. xxxiv. 7; xci. 11, 12.

63. Did they minister to Christ as Mediator? Ans. Yes; (1.) To worship him; Ps. xcvi. 7. (2.) They ministered to his wants as man; Matt. iv. 11. (3.) They will minister at the last day, at the judgment; Matt. xiii. 41. (4.) They minister to the church for him; Heb. i. 14.

64. Can any corporeal object hinder their motion or operation? Ans. No; because they are spirits, and without extension as bodies.

65. Do the angels, in ministering to God in his providence, move from place to place? Ans. Yes; because they are not omnipresent; nor can they operate where they are not. And the Scriptures always represent them as moving, or changing place, in attending to the various objects of their ministry; and so they are said to be *sent*, to *come*, &c. And the emblem of their wings teaches the same things.

66. Though their motion is swift, yet is it not actual, and therefore successive? Ans. Yes; because they are finite spirits; although the time is not conceivable by us.

67. As God has no need of the ministry of angels, why are they employed? Ans. Because of his own sovereign pleasure. Besides, the ministry of angels is a display of his glory; Matt. xxiv. 31; and their existence and service give occasion for the exercise of his goodness, in the happiness of these glorious intelligences.

§ XIII.—68. Is there any division among the angels, of those who stand before God, and of those who minister? Ans. No; they all minister; Heb. i. 14; and their standing is only a symbol of ministering; Dan. vii. 10; Luke i. 19.

69. How are angels now divided? Ans. Into good and bad.

70. As to the good angels:—What are they generally called in Scripture, to distinguish them from the evil angels? Ans. They are called “elect angels,” “holy,” “heavenly,” “angels of God,” &c.

71. Have any of them been distinguished by proper names? Ans. Yes; one is called Gabriel; Dan. viii. 16; ix. 21; Luke i. 19, 26.

72. Is Michael the proper name of a created angel? Ans. We have reason to believe that this name belongs to Christ, the uncreated angel; Dan. x. 13, 21, “Michael your Prince,” says Gabriel; Dan. xii. 1; Jude 9, “Michael the Archangel;” Rev. xii. 7, “Michael and his angels fought,” &c. Accordingly there is but one Archangel—Christ.

§ XIV.—73. In what state were all the angels created? Ans. In a state of holiness; Jude 6, “Kept not their first estate;” 2 Pet. ii. 4, “Angels that sinned;” implying holiness originally.

74. But were they all created liable to fall? Ans. Yes; as well as men; and the event showed this in respect to a part of them.

75. Is there any reason to believe that a part of the angels were created liable to fall, and a part not? Ans. No; because there is no intimation given of this difference in their original creation. And the perseverance of a part is ascribed to election. They are called “elect angels;” 1 Tim. v. 21.

76. What is meant by a liability to fall, in the case of those who are infallibly kept by divine power and grace? Ans. A creature is said to be fallible, when he does not possess infallibility in the nature which is given him, or in the power of his constitution.

77. Can any creature be infallible in this sense? Ans. No; such a power is an incommunicable attribute; and therefore all the angels, as well as men, were created fallible.

78. Do not the holy angels, then, owe their perseverance in holiness to the sovereign electing grace of God? Ans. Yes; it was not the grace bestowed in the creation of the angels who persevered in holiness, that kept them from falling, but the grace of God preserving them according to election; as it is not the grace of God communicated to redeemed man, but the grace of God according to purpose, that keeps him from falling. The sovereign grace of God in election, and that alone, and not grace communicated in creation, made the difference of final state between the holy and the fallen angels.

§ XV.—79. Are the holy angels now confirmed in holiness? Ans. Yes; so that they can never apostatize or perish; as may be inferred from their being called “elect angels;” from the happiness ascribed to them; Matt. xviii. 10; xxii. 30; where the saints in glory are compared to the angels.

80. How are they confirmed; or, what is their security? Ans. Not only the purpose and power of God secures them, but his actual communication of persevering grace.

81. Does God secure them from falling by communicating an infallible nature to them? Ans. No; the grace they have received is not their security, but grace in God, engaged to keep them.

82. When it is represented, in Gen. vi. 2, that the sons of God apostatized by worldly allurements, has it any reference to the angels? Ans. No; the “sons of God” there, ensnared by women, evidently do not mean angels, but the children of Seth, Gen. iv. 26; members of the church.

83. Does Job iv. 18, signify that the angels are unholy? Ans. No; that text only teaches that the holiness of angels is not to be compared with the holiness of God.

84. Should we infer from Gal. i. 8, that angels are liable to err? Ans. That text does not mean that they may fall, but rather that it is impossible. A supposition does not assert a fact, nor always imply that the supposition is possible. The passage rather means that though the error of an angel is impossible, yet a change of God’s truth is much more so; which is the subject of the apostle’s discussion.

§ XVI.—85. Was it through the intervention either of Christ’s atonement or intercession, that the good angels were confirmed? Ans. No.

86. How may this be sustained? Ans. (1.) The Scripture does not ascribe their confirmation to Christ. (2.) It teaches that Christ is the Mediator of men only, 1 Tim. ii. 5. (3.) It expressly teaches that Christ did not take hold of angels, to save them, Heb. ii. 16. (4.) Having never sinned the angels did not need a Mediator, or an atonement. (5.) Christ having made no atonement for them, he did not intercede for them; as his intercession is based only on his atonement.

87. But is not Christ, even as Mediator, their Lord, and are they not servants to him in that character? Ans. Yes; all things are put into his hand as Mediator, even angels and every thing else, though not purchased by him.

88. But do not holy angels even subsist by Christ, according to Col. i. 17? Ans. Yes; they, as well as all other things subsist by Christ as God, which the apostle there teaches.

89. But it is said (Eph. i. 10; Col. i. 20;) that God by Christ gathers all things, (even angels,) into one; and that Christ having made peace by the blood of his cross, God, by him, reconciles all things (even angels) to himself. How explain? Ans. These passages mean that, by Christ's atonement for man, and his Headship over all things, God brings man and holy angels into communion together; and that the saints already in heaven when Christ made his atonement, enjoyed that happiness through Christ's mediation, as well as those to be afterwards brought in.

90. May we hold that God covenanted with angels, to give them happiness and confirmation, on condition of obedience, as he did with Adam; and that the confirmation of angels stands on that covenant fulfilled by them? Ans. We cannot, with our author, positively assert this doctrine; but, so far as we know, the supposition is not contrary to the doctrines of divine revelation. But we have no direct information on the subject, but that the holy angels kept their first estate. Further, although such a covenant might have been made with angels, as well as with men, for aught we know, yet there was not the same occasion for making it with them, as all the angels were created at once, and in their maturity; while man should propagate, and come into the world in immaturity. And we have no information, expressly, that the fallen angels broke covenant. Yet, if there was no formal covenant of works with angels, they were, for a time, on trial, on the moral law of their nature; as we see by the fact that some fell, and others did not. So that the probability lies in favour of the doctrine that there was a covenant of works with angels.

§ XVII.—91. As the office of angels is to minister for God, in his government of the world and the church, are we to believe that God has committed the guardianship of individual persons to individual angels, or the guardianship of particular nations, parts of a country, societies, or arts, to special angels, as their special province? Ans. No; because, (1.) The Scriptures represent many angels as sometimes engaged in the same service; Gen. xxxii. 1, 2; Ps. xci. 11, 12; 2 Kings vi. 17; and one angel to many; 2 Kings xix. 35; Ps. xxxiv. 7. (2.) Because this idea arose from a leaning towards heathenism, which held that the minutiae of the government of the world was too much for one God; and that the supreme God appointed certain *genii*, or inferior gods, to the care of certain persons, regions, cities, arts, &c. (3.) The Scriptures plainly represent that all the holy angels are employed, as God in his sovereignty requires, in the various services which his government requires.

92. Is it any support of the doctrine which we here oppose, that our Lord (Matt. xviii. 10) speaks of the angels of little children? Ans. No; he only teaches that little children are under the guardianship of holy angels who stand in the presence of God.

93. Or is it any support of the same opinion, what some alleged respecting Peter, (Acts xii. 15,) that, instead of Peter at the gate, it was his angel? Ans. No; they might mean that an angel, on that particular occasion, was engaged in Peter's cause; and, at most, it was but the expression of the opinion of those who uttered it. This was not an expression authorized by the Holy Spirit.

94. Do angels act as intercessors for men, as the Papists allege? Is this their office? Ans. No.

95. Why should we deny the doctrine of their intercession, when the Scriptures seem to allege the fact; as Job xxxiii. 23; Zech. i. 12; Rev. viii. 2, 3? Ans. (1.) These passages speak of Christ, the Angel of the Covenant. (2.) Christ is the only Intercessor for man; 1 John ii. 1; 1 Tim. ii. 5. (3.) To make angels intercessors is derogatory to Christ. (4.) We have no need of their intercession. Christ is all-sufficient; Heb. vii. 25. (5.) Angels cannot be intercessors, having no merit as the ground of their intercession. (6.) They are unable to be intercessors, as they cannot know our hearts, nor all our wants.

LECTURE XXV.—HOLY AND FALLEN ANGELS.

§ XVIII.—96. Ought not holy angels to be esteemed, loved, and venerated? Ans. Yes; as beings that are good, holy, great, and honoured by [being engaged in] the special service of Jehovah.

97. Should we worship them, by prayer to them, or by any adoration? Ans. No; because, (1.) They are but creatures, and, in reference to God, they are our fellow servants; Rev. xxii. 9. (2.) God forbids worship to any but himself; see 2d commandment. (3.) The angels forbid worship to themselves, Rev. xxii. 9; Judges xiii. 16. (4.) God expressly forbids the worship of angels, Col. ii. 18; Rev. xix. 10.

98. Should we subject ourselves to them with servile fear, or hold them as our masters or lords? Ans. No; 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.

99. Was the Old Testament church subjected to the lordship of angels, as some suppose is implied in Heb. ii. 5? Ans. No; the holy angels performed their ministry to the Old Testament church, under the government of Christ her only Head and Lord, but they exercised no lordship over her. Heb. ii. 5, does not imply that the Old Testament church was subjected to angels, but the apostle is reasoning to show that the New Testament church was put into subjection to Christ alone, and not to angels; because the subjection of all things, mentioned in Scripture, (such as in Ps. viii.) was spoken of Christ, and not of angels.

100. But it is alleged that there are, in Scripture, approved examples of worship given to angels; as Gen. xviii. 24—32; xlvi. 16; Rev. i. 4. How answer? Ans. It is Jehovah himself that is

intended by "the angel" in these texts; and the expression, "the seven spirits," means the Holy Spirit.

§ XIX.—101. Is the number of holy angels great? Ans. Yes; Dan. vii. 10.

102. But can we have any knowledge of their number, or of the number of the good, compared with the bad? Ans. No.

103. Have we reason to believe that there is an order appointed and observed among them? Ans. Yes; as appears, (1.) From the names, "armies," "principalities," "powers," "thrones," &c. (2.) From analogy;—the instituted order of the church of Christ on earth. (3.) From the declaration, in reference to this order, that "God is not the author of confusion," 1 Cor. xiv. 33, 40. But, in regard to this order, we know nothing of the form of government, of the extent of authority, or whether perpetual in the same ones.

104. Have we any reason to believe that the names, "Seraphim" and "Cherubim," mean certain distinct classes, or orders? Ans. No; but rather, names for them all.

105. Are we not forbidden to indulge in speculations on these matters? Ans. Yes; as Col. ii. 18. And this is reprov'd because many had indulged in such things, and because there is a propensity in man to do so. The Jews had indulged in these speculations; and many have done so in the New Testament church.

NOTE:—The Christians who followed the Platonic philosophy divided the angels into three classes;—the supercelestial, the celestial, and subcelestial;—and into nine or ten orders;—as the living creatures, the ophanim, the aralim, the chasmalim, the seraphim, the angels, the gods, the sons of God, the cherubim, and the jochim. And some, as a pretended Dionysius, the Areopagite, hold that there are three classes, and under each class, three orders. In the first and highest class, they say, are the cherubim, seraphim, and thrones:—in the second, the dominions, principalities, and authorities:—in the third, the powers, the archangels, and angels. All which is the fruit of curiosity, ignorance, and folly.

§ XX.—106. Where is the ordinary abode of holy angels? Ans. In heaven; in the immediate presence of God, where he displays his special glory, Matt. xviii. 10.

107. May we suppose that it is any diminution of their happiness to be sent on missions through the universe, in the service of God? Ans. No; as holy creatures, that service is their pleasure, Ps. ciii. 20, 21. And no doubt they have the enjoyment of God's gracious presence in all their services.

§ XXI.—108. By what names are the fallen angels designated in Scripture? Ans. They are called by various names; as "devils," "unclean spirits," "principalities and powers."

109. Is there not one of them who acts as prince among them? Ans. Yes; Matt. xii. 24, "Beelzebub the prince of devils."

110. What is that one called, by way of eminence? Ans. By various names; as, "the Devil," Rev. xx. 2; "Satan," "the old serpent," "Beelzebub," &c.

111. Does the Scripture give him the name of "Lucifer," as some have thought? Ans. No; though the name may suit him, yet, in Isa. xiv. 12, it is primarily the king of Babylon that is meant.

§ XXII.—112. Were the fallen angels created holy and good? Ans. Yes; all things that God created, he pronounced good. Nor would it consist with the goodness of God to create any being sinful.

113. May we believe that they fell soon after their creation? Ans. Yes; for, (1.) We infer this from John viii. 44, "a murderer from the beginning;" 1 John iii. 8, "the devil sinned from the beginning." (2.) From Satan's early action in tempting Eve.

§§ XXIII. XXIV.—114. Could their fall have been before the creation, as recorded by Moses? Ans. No; because they were included in "the hosts of heaven," which were created in the creation of the heavens and the earth, Gen. i. 1; Ps. xxxiii. 6; and this was in the beginning, as recorded by Moses.

115. May we suppose that they fell before the work of creation was finished? Ans. No; at the close of that work (Gen. i. 31) God, on a review of all his work, still pronounced it very good.

116. Was their fall voluntary? Ans. Yes; they sinned in their will; as is shown by their present depravity, and wilful sinning; and, as may be inferred from Scripture descriptions of their apostasy. It is called "sinning," 2 Peter ii. 4; "not keeping their first estate, and leaving their own habitation," Jude 6; "not abiding in the truth," John viii. 44; though this text may have special reference to Satan's tempting Eve.

§ XXV.—117. Do we know the particular kind or manner of sin by which the angels fell? Ans. Not certainly: it is not expressly revealed, and all we can gather is by inference.

118. What sin may we suppose it was, by which they fell, as gathered by inference? Ans. Pride and envy; as these two sins are perhaps inseparable, where there is occasion for envy.

119. How does it appear probable that these were the sins by which they fell? Ans. (1.) Because Paul (1 Tim. iii. 6,) warns against pride, as endangering the condemnation of the Devil; *i. e.*, the same condemnation as the Devil's. (2.) Because pride produces envy, and envy leads to murder, and so Satan is called a murderer from the beginning, John viii. 44; not only from the beginning of the world of man, but as an original sin of Satan. (3.) Because Satan showed his envy of man, by his temptation of Eve, and his spirit of pride, in tempting Eve to pride.

120. But against whom might it be supposed their envy was directed? Ans. Not against man as the future object of salvation by Christ, as some suppose, for that plan of salvation was not yet revealed. Nor is it probable that it was against man at first, as others suppose, on account of his near equality to themselves. His nearness of equality, while still inferior, was not calculated to produce envy, while man's holiness and happiness might produce that envy, after they had fallen. But it is probable that it was envy at God himself, and perhaps at some of their fellow-angels, and pride,

producing disobedience to God. So wicked men are called "children of disobedience," (Eph. ii. 2,) in reference to Satan's influence with them. Moreover, not only envy at man, but enmity to God and to his glory, is still the prominent trait of their character.

§ XXVI.—121. Have they not been under punishment ever since? Ans. Yes; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6.

122. In what does that punishment consist? Ans. (1.) In the loss of the gracious presence and favour of God. (2.) In being cast down from heaven to hell. (3.) In degradation, and incapability of happiness, by the loss of the divine image. (4.) In horror, fear and despair, under divine wrath. (5.) In not being employed of God in any honourable service. (6.) Their expectation of the judgment of the great day.

123. In what respect have they lost the image of God? Ans. (1.) Not that image which belongs to the constitution of their being. They are still spirits, and live as spirits. They have intellect and knowledge, and are capable of exercising it in cunning; 2 Cor. xi. 3. They can put on some external appearance of good; 2 Cor. xi. 14; and they have power; Matt. xii. 29. But, (2.) They have lost that image in reference to their internal character. They have lost all true holiness, of understanding, affection, and will. (3.) They have lost all holy joy and true happiness, as well as the beatific vision of God.

124. What (may we judge) is the difference between their present punishment, and that which shall be inflicted after the day of judgment? Ans. We cannot fully know it; but (1.) Now they have some liberty—then, none. (2.) Now, the horrors of Jehovah's wrath are not inflicted as they will be then; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6. It will then be more intensive and more extensive; Matt. xxv. 41.

125. Is their liberty and power diminished in any respect, since Christ's coming into the world? Ans. Yes; Col. ii. 15.

§ XXVII.—126. Is the state of fallen angels irreparable? Ans. Yes.

127. Is the want of hope for them owing to their nature, or the greatness of their sin? Ans. No; the power of God is able to renew them, and the blood of Christ would have been sufficient, if appointed for this purpose.

128. What is the reason their state is hopeless? Ans. Because God has provided no Saviour for them; and his sovereign will is the sole reason why he provided no salvation for them. In his sovereignty, he determined to show inflexible justice, though they were of a higher rank of creatures [than men.] No doubt their sin partook of the nature of the unpardonable sin of man, as wilful and malicious, and against knowledge, though not against gospel offers. But the unpardonable sin is unpardonable, not from defect of divine power, or of the merit of Christ, but from the sovereign will of God.

§ XXVIII.—129. Are fallen angels, with all their power, their

subtily, and malice, entirely subject to the divine will? Ans. Yes; whether in their evil influence on the wicked or in their inflictions on the godly; as we see in the case of the devils possessing the swine of the Gadarenes, and in the case of Job; Mark v. 12, 13; Job i. 12; ii. 6.

130. Is there any reason, then, why we should entertain a slavish or discouraging fear of them? Ans. No; we ought so far to fear their power, cunning, and malice, as to be on our watch, and live by faith on Christ; 1 Pet. v. 8, 9; but we should carry on our warfare with confidence of victory; Jas. iv. 7; Rom. xvi. 20.

§ XXIX.—131. Is the number of the fallen angels great? Ans. Yes; as appears, (1.) From a legion being in one man; Luke viii. 30. (2.) From their having a kingdom; Matt. xii. 26; and their being called principalities and powers, Eph. vi. 12.

132. Do we know their number, either absolutely or relatively? Ans. No.

133. Some have thought, from Rev. xii. 4, that they are just the third part of all created angels. Is this construction correct? Ans. No; the "stars," in that place, are men, not angels.

§ XXX.—134. Do the Scriptures teach that there is an order of government among the fallen angels? Ans. Yes; Matt. xii. 24; xxv. 41; Rev. xii. 7.

135. But as one is called "Prince," do we know how far his authority extends, or how he obtained it? Ans. No; whether that authority was obtained by being the leader in the rebellion against God; or by a voluntary choice among themselves; or by his superior power and cunning, to which all the rest submit; or by a sovereign constitution of God, as a punishment to these fallen spirits; we know not. Nor do we know their form of government; nor whether there are among them superior and subordinate authorities; although the Scriptures make the latter idea probable, by speaking of "principalities and powers," in the plural; Eph. vi. 12.

CHAPTER X.

OF PROVIDENCE.

LECTURE XXVI.—ITS EVIDENCE, AUTHOR, AND ACTS:—PRESERVATION.

§ I.—Q. 1. Did God's eternal decree determine any farther work to be performed by him than creation? Ans. Yes; it determined the work of providence.

2. Is providence the continued execution of God's decrees? Ans. Yes.

3. May providence be called, in a sense, a continued creation? Ans. Yes.

4. Why so called? Ans. Because providence is the preservation of creatures in their existence and order; and it requires the same divine power and wisdom.

5. Could created things continue in existence, or in their order, without divine providence? Ans. No; as they cannot be independent.

§ II.—6. What is the meaning of the word *providence*? Ans. Literally, it means *foreseeing* or *looking out for*; figuratively and ordinarily, it signifies—working with design to effect a certain end—and, therefore, *preserving, governing and taking care of*.

7. Is *providence* a Scripture term for the works of God since creation? Ans. Yes; as Gen. xxii. 8, *Jireh*, or *Yireh*, “God will *provide* himself a lamb;” Heb. xi. 40, “God having *provided* (προβλεψαμενου) some better thing for us.”

8. Do we mean, by providence, the simple foreknowledge or decree of God? Ans. No; but an actual providence, of divine care, operation and government. The decree may be called God’s eternal providence; his operations in time, his actual providence. It is the latter of which we now speak.

§ III.—9. Do the Scriptures maintain that there is a divine providence ruling all things? Ans. Yes; Heb. i. 3; Ps. xxxvi. 6; Acts xiv. 17; xvii. 25. And the Scriptures uniformly assume this truth.

10. Does reason itself maintain the truth of a divine providence? Ans. Yes.

11. Did not heathen nations ascribe events in the world to God, or to supernatural beings, and thus give evidence that nature’s light teaches this truth? Ans. Yes.

12. How does the truth of a divine providence appear from reason? Ans. It appears both *a priori*, and *a posteriori*.

13. How does it appear *a priori*? Ans. Both from the perfections of God, and from the dependence of the creature.

14. How does it appear from the perfections of God? Ans. (1.) From his perfections, he has a right to govern. (2.) From his perfections (as wisdom, power, and goodness,) he is able to govern. (3.) From his necessary activity and energy. (4.) From his immutability; the same will that purposed will rule and effect his purposes.

15. How does it appear from the dependence of the creature? Ans. (1.) Because, without God’s sustaining hand, the creature would be annihilated. (2.) Because the creature has no power but as communicated of God. (3.) From the want of both wisdom and power in the creature; so that none but God can govern. (4.) From want of unity of will and purpose in the creature.

16. How does the truth of a divine providence appear from reason, *a posteriori*; or from actual occurrences? Ans. (1.) From the order and harmony of the creatures, so long continued, although these creatures are of different and opposite natures. (2.) From the important ends accomplished, amidst such variety of causes and means. (3.) From predictions accomplished, and these often by means that seemed to oppose the predicted event.

17. Would not the denial of providence be, in effect, the denial of a God? Ans. Yes; because the creature cannot sustain itself;

and the God that created must uphold and govern; Isa. xli. 23. "Show the things that are to come, that we may know that ye are gods—yea, do good, or do evil," &c. This teaches that they who cannot do these things are no gods, and implies that if there be none to do them, there is no God.

18. Is there any weight in the objection, that a particular providence proves a defect in the creatures; and that God did not create them perfect? Ans. No; (1.) The creatures, as they came from the hand of God, had all that perfection which suited their nature and end; but a perfection of independence, which the objection supposes, cannot belong to the creature. (2.) The objection supposes that a perfection of creatures, capable of governing themselves without God, would glorify the Creator more. But this supposes what is impossible, and contrary to the nature of God; *i. e.* creature independence. It is a vain human conception.

19. How answer the objection, that a continued providence is inconsistent with the happiness and ease of Jehovah? Ans. The objection is based on a false conception of God, in whom perpetual activity is perfect ease and happiness. It originated in the vain imagination that God is like ourselves, weak, and wearied with cares and employment.

20. How answer the objection, that prosperity to the wicked and afflictions to the righteous are inconsistent with the immediate providence of a holy and righteous God? Ans. Objections based on such grounds prove both ignorance and error in the objector; because, (1.) We are not infallible judges of the question, who are good or evil. (2.) Prosperity to the wicked proves the goodness and patience of God, but not injustice. (3.) Afflictions to the righteous are deserved by sin. (4.) Afflictions to the godly are not real evils; they are sent for their benefit. (5.) The present life is not the place of retribution; and eternity will furnish room for abundant distributions of goodness and justice.

§ IV.—21. Is providence an external work of God, in contradistinction to his decree or purpose? Ans. Yes.

22. What are the objects of divine providence; or those over which God exercises providence? Ans. All his creatures.

§ V.—23. Whose work is divine providence? Ans. It is the work of God alone; Neh. ix. 6; Isa. xlv. 7; Acts xiv. 17, "He left not himself without witness," &c. Thus providence proves a God.

24. Why is providence ascribed to God alone? Ans. (1.) Because no other is able to exercise it. (2.) Because it belongs to the manifestation of his glory. (3.) Because it gives ground for trust and comfort to his intelligent creatures.

25. Is there such a thing as *fortune* or *chance* in the providence of God? Ans. No; everything is infallibly decreed which comes to pass, and God "works all things according to the counsel of his will."

26. What is meant by *chance*? Ans. Something occurring without a known cause; or something unexpected.

27. May not a thing be chance to us, though not to God? Ans. Yes.

28. Does not the ascribing of occurrences to chance, or fortune, as is too often done, imply the denial of the providence of God? Ans. Yes; it was the doctrine of the Epicureans that events were fortuitous, as they thought a providential government was inconsistent with the ease and happiness of the Deity.

29. Is it not absurd to ascribe an influence to the *stars*, as some have done, in the events of this world, otherwise than as second causes and instruments, in the providence of God? Ans. Yes.

30. Is anything governed by *fate*, as it is commonly understood? Ans. No.

31. What is *fate*, as commonly understood? Ans. It is something producing events by some necessity, and to which God himself is supposed to be subject. It is a necessity arising from second causes; or from the nature of things; or from power superior even to God himself; all which is heathenish.

32. If by *fate*, we should understand the original meaning of the word, in Latin,—*a word*, or *command*,—may we not, with propriety, say the world is governed by fate? Ans. Yes; so Heb. i. 3; 2 Pet. iii. 5. But, on account of the abuse of the word, [the use of] it should be avoided.

§ VI.—33. Though God is the sole Author of providence, does he not generally employ means, or instruments? Ans. Yes; Hos. ii. 20, 21.

34. Does God employ those means as necessary to himself? Ans. No; he can work in providence immediately, and without means, as well as in creation, if he pleases; and even against means, as he has done in miracles.

35. Why then does he use them? Ans. (1.) That he may make things useful, and a source of happiness to his intelligent creatures. (2.) To add happiness to intelligence, by employing them as instruments. (3.) To give his intelligent creatures exercise in judging, in hoping, and in acting. (4.) To give the more evidence of his power and presence, by the instrumentalities which he uses; and frequently, by producing the greatest effects by inadequate means, and by rendering the fittest means abortive; 1 Cor. i. 27, 28; Psa. cxxvii. 1, 2.

§ VII.—36. Does providence belong equally to the three persons of the Godhead? Ans. Yes.

37. Is it not most generally attributed to the Father? Ans. Yes; Matt. xi. 25. But this is only according to the order of subsistence and operation of the persons.

38. Is there any peculiar sense in which providence is attributed to the Son? Ans. Yes, as all things are delivered by the Father to him, as Mediator. The Three-one God in Christ conducts providence over all things for the church; John v. 17; Col. i. 17; Heb. i. 3.

§ VIII.—39. Are not providential occurrences the effect of the

divine will and command, as much as creation? Ans. Yes; Psa. cxlvii. 15, 16; Rev. iv. 11.

40. Does the exercise of divine providence produce any change in God; any expenditure of power; or require any labour in him? Ans. No.

§ IX.—41. What may be called the acts of divine providence; or what does that work include? Ans. Three acts, or operations; viz., *preservation, coöperation, and government.*

42. What does God in his providence preserve? Ans. The existence, the essence, and the nature and qualities of things, which God gave them in creation.

43. How does it appear from Scripture that the providence of God thus preserves his creatures? Ans. Psa. xxxvi. 6, 7; cxlv. 15, 16; Col. i. 17; Heb. i. 3.

44. Is this preservation of things a positive act, or only negative? Ans. It is positive: negative would be only suffering them to exist.

45. What would be the error of holding that God's providential preservation is negative? Ans. It would be to maintain that things once created are independent and self-existent; and that God, having created all things, has no care of them, or government over them. Whereas, the negation of preservation would in fact be annihilation, because created things are necessarily dependent; Job vi. 9; Psa. civ. 29, 30.

46. Does not God generally employ means in preserving his creatures? Ans. Yes.

47. And does he not also preserve immediately by his power, and without means? Ans. Yes; the preservation of the existence, the essence, and the nature of things, appears to depend immediately on the power of God,—the same power that created them; while the modifications and order of their existence, appear to be by means.

48. In regard to the means employed by God in his providence, of preserving things in their modifications and order, are they all ordinary, according to settled laws of nature? Ans. No; some are extraordinary or miraculous.

49. Is not the providence of God engaged in preserving various things in different ways, according to the nature which he has given them? Ans. Yes.

50. What different ways may be noticeable, in which God preserves his creatures, in his providence? Ans. He preserves some in their state as it belongs to the present world, as individuals; and some in their species, while he suffers individuals of those species to vanish from the present state of existence: for example, spirits, sun, moon, stars, &c., he preserves in their present existence, without changing the individuals; others, as human bodies, beasts, trees, herbs, &c., he preserves in their species, but removes individuals.

51. But does not God, in his providence, preserve all these lesser things as individuals, as well as in their species? Ans. Yes; so long as they are continued in the present state of existence, they are preserved as individuals; but their kinds and species are preserved when the individuals are removed.

52. Does not this variety of divine providence show the sovereignty, the power, and the wisdom of God more plainly than if all were preserved as individuals? Ans. Yes; as it shows the inexhaustible treasures of his wisdom and power, and the dependence of all things on himself.

53. Although God will preserve his creatures in existence, does he do this by the necessity of his nature, or by any necessity of the nature of his creatures? Ans. No; he preserves them of his perfect, free and sovereign will.

54. Does not the freedom of God's preserving providence imply that it would not be inconsistent with his nature and perfections to cease to preserve his creatures, if he had so willed it? Ans. Yes; he could annihilate any or all of his creatures, if such were his will.

55. Have we any assurance that God will not annihilate any of his creatures? Ans. We think not. We think we have no such assurance, either from his word, or from reason; while we have assurance that some things he will not annihilate; as man, angels, &c.

56. But does not Eccles. iii. 14, ("I know that whatsoever God doeth, it shall be forever; nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it," &c.,) prove that God will not annihilate any of his creatures? Ans. No; that passage may be understood as teaching the permanency of things as God created them, while God is pleased to sustain them; and that no creature can change the nature of any part of creation.

57. Would annihilation require a positive act of God? Ans. No; as creatures are dependent, all that is necessary to their annihilation is that God would cease to uphold them.

NOTE:—There is some probability that the spirits of beasts are annihilated at death; Eccles. iii. 21, "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?"

LECTURE XXVII.—CO-OPERATION—GOVERNMENT—EXTENT OF PROVIDENCE, ETC.

§ X.—58. Does the providence of God include a *coöperation*, or concurrence, with the actions of his creatures? Ans. Yes.

59. Is God, in his providence, the first cause of these actions of his creatures, as to the being of the action? Ans. Yes; Isa. x. 15, "Shall the axe boast?" &c., said in reference to the Assyrian king whom God employed as the rod of his anger, verse 5, &c. And Jer. x. 23, "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps;" showing God's *coöperation*.

60. In what does this *coöperation*, or concurrence, of God with the actions of his creatures consist? Ans. In an impulse of the creature to the action, immediately by God himself, and that impulse, in the order of nature, previous to the action, and determining of the creature, or leading him to determine.

61. Is not, then, the action, in its being, of God as the first cause,

and of the creature as the second cause? Ans. Yes; the creature, in performing the action, is, in reference to God, the instrument and second cause; Isa. x. 15.

62. Is not the action, then, the same, as it is of God as the first cause, and of the creature as the second cause? Ans. Yes; the same in its being.

63. To avoid the appearance of making God the author of sin, would it consist with truth to deny any other concurrence of God with the actions of his moral creatures than that God preserves to them their powers of action? Ans. No; (1.) This would be merely preserving, not governing them. (2.) It would imply the independence of the creature on God in its actions. (3.) It would deny the divine government, leaving the creature the independent governor of its own actions. (4.) It would make God's decree respecting those actions the effect of mere foresight, and therefore a dependent decree.

64. Or, to avoid making God the author of sin, might we hold that God's concurrence with the actions of his moral creatures consists merely in impressing on them a law of nature, according to which they act? Ans. No; as this would make God's concurrence or government only a moral influence; making the creature independent in action, and God's purposes dependent and uncertain.

65. Or, for the same purpose, might we hold that God's concurrence with the actions of his moral creatures consists only in a general influence on the creature, leaving him to act or not act, as he pleases? Ans. No; this would involve the same error, of man's independence, and deny God's efficient government.

66. Or, might we hold, as some do, that God's concurrence with the actions of his creatures consists in an act of God simultaneous with the action of his moral creature, influencing the action, but not the actor or agent? Ans. No; if there be any logical meaning in this hypothesis, it leaves the agent ungoverned and independent.

In a word; to avoid a merely apparent difficulty, all these hypotheses run into actual and manifest error; denying the dependence of man, and the independence of God; and also God's actual and infallible governing providence. So, according to the necessary and the revealed character of God, and of his creatures, we hold that God's concurrence with the actions of his creatures must be an efficient and infallible government of them and their actions; and therefore that his influence on them must be immediate, by himself, and previous to the action, in the order of nature, as the power is previous to the action.

67. But how can we reconcile this efficient concurrence of God in the actions of his moral creatures with their liberty and accountability, and avoid making God the author of sin? Ans. (1.) We should admit that there is in this subject a deep mystery, such as should be expected in God's government of his moral creatures; the truth respecting which is revealed, but the mystery is not explained, and is not comprehensible by us, even if explained. (2.) No doc-

trine can be true which denies man's entire dependence on God; or God's independence; or the sovereign infallibility and independence of God's purposes; or his independent and efficient "working of all things according to the counsel of his own will." (3.) When we think we can see the consistency of God's absolute government of inanimate and irrational creatures, we should not deny God's government of his rational and moral creatures in the same absolute manner, merely because we see difficulties which we cannot comprehend. We must not deny God's ability to govern his moral creatures, in as perfect consistency with his nature and character, as to govern his inanimate creatures in the same consistency with his necessary dominion over them. (4.) The facts are plain, that man is a free agent and accountable, and at the same time that he is entirely dependent; and that God's government is absolute and infallible. (5.) It is manifest, too, that God is not the author of sin, and that, while from man's necessary dependence, he cannot be the independent author of any action in its being, all the sin of his action must be ascribed to himself. We may add, (6.) That the action itself, so far as it is from God, is, in its being, good, but all want of conformity to the law, in that action, as performed by man, is of himself, as a sinner.

§ XI.—68. What is meant by God's providential *government*?
 Ans. It is his actually ordering all things, all creatures and all their actions, to their proper ends, according to his eternal purpose; Eph. i. 11; Ps. cxv. 3; Dan. iv. 35.

69. Do all creatures, inanimate, irrational, and rational, fall under this government? Ans. Yes; Dan. iv. 35.

70. And as he governs his creatures, does he not necessarily govern their actions? Ans. Yes; it would not be the government of the creatures, if it were not the government of their actions? Isa. x. 5-7; Ps. lxxvi. 10; Acts iv. 27, 28; xvii. 28.

71. Is it necessary to this government, that all the creatures know their subjection to it; or that they consent to it, when they do know it? Ans. No; the irrational creatures know nothing of it; many rational creatures know their subjection, and are averse to the government; yet God is continually fulfilling his purposes by them, even against their will; and often when they labour in designed opposition to his will, and against the declared designs of his providence, they are still fulfilling these designs; Ps. lxxvi. 10. And even believers, who willingly obey his law, are bringing about divine purposes of which they have no knowledge.

72. Can God ever fall short of effecting his purposes by human depravity, or by irregularities in nature? Ans. No; Isa. xiv. 24-27.

§ XII.—73. How may the common providence of God, *i. e.*, providence over natural things, be divided? Ans. Into *ordinary* and *extraordinary*.

74. What is God's *ordinary* providence? Ans. (1.) It is that providence of God in which he conducts things in the universe ac-

ording to that order of things which he established in the beginning, or according to the laws of nature which he constituted and appointed in creation; which, in other words, is working by cause and effect, or second causes. And, (2.) It is that course of nature which shall continue as ordinary till the end of time, Jer. xxxi. 35, 36; xxxiii. 20.

75. What is God's *extraordinary* providence? Ans. It is an occasional departure from the established laws of nature, in the working of a miracle.

76. What are the designs of miracles? Ans. To manifest, for the confirmation of the believer's faith, or for the conviction of unbelievers, the power, presence, and providence of God, and the mission of certain persons from God, and the truth of their doctrine.

77. Is it a sufficient and adequate representation of a miracle, to say, that its cause or reason cannot be accounted for by the laws of nature? Ans. No; because things conducted according to the laws of nature and not at all miraculous, may be unaccountable to us. A miracle is something above, without, or contrary to, the laws of nature; and true miracles usually, if not always, are manifestly so.

78. Is it a truth of divine revelation that many true miracles have been wrought by God, above, and contrary to the laws of nature? Ans. Yes.

79. Is it not calculated to promote infidelity to attempt to account for miracles from the laws of nature? Ans. Yes; although, in some miracles, some natural causes may have been employed, yet, in a true miracle, there is always something above or contrary to nature.

80. How would the attempt to account for miracles by the laws of nature tend to promote infidelity? Ans. (1.) It would tend to take away many evidences of the truth of Christianity. (2.) It would represent our Lord and his apostles as deceivers who professed to work miracles in confirmation of their mission and doctrines.

81. Are the ordinary constancy of the laws of nature, our past experience, or the divine constancy, any evidence against the truth of miracles? Ans. No; because, (1.) God who gave the laws of nature can suspend or reverse them when he pleases. (2.) The laws of nature can show that they cannot suspend or alter themselves, but they cannot show that God cannot suspend or alter them. They can show that a creature cannot suspend them, but not that God cannot suspend them. (3.) Therefore sufficient positive testimony that a true miracle was wrought, meets with no contrary, or rebutting testimony from reason.

§§ XIII. XIV.—82. Does God's providence rule *all things, great and small*? Ans. Yes.

83. Have the great things of creation comparatively less need of God's providential government and sustaining hand, than the small? Ans. No; nothing is so great as to possess any independence.

84. Is any part of creation so small as to be beneath God's providential care? Ans. No.

85. Why may we believe that the smallest things of creation are objects of God's providential care. Ans. (1.) Scripture expressly teaches that they are, Matt. x. 29, 30; vi. 26, 28, 30; Ps. cxlvii. 9. (2.) The small things are as worthy of God's providence as of his creation. (3.) They could not subsist without providence, and none can exercise providence over them but God. (4.) Small things are, by creation and providence, made to be necessary parts of the whole system.

86. Is it any objection to this doctrine, that we can see no use of many of the smaller creatures? Ans. No; in many of them we see a use and an instrumentality, in carrying on the greater; and if of other things we see no use, we should attribute it to our ignorance.

87. What should we think of the objection to the doctrine of God's providential care of small things, that such care is unworthy of God? Ans. It is based on unworthy views of God, as though greater things were nearer an equality with God than smaller things.

88. How understand 1 Cor. ix. 9, "Doth God take care for oxen?" Ans. This is not a denial of God's providential care of small things; but it teaches that comparatively they are of a less value than man, &c. The passage directly means that that law concerning oxen referred, by emblem, to greater things; that the protection of oxen was not its chief object.

89. Would it not be most unworthy of God to suppose that his care of small things interferes with his care of the greater? Ans. Yes.

90. Could God govern the greater according to the order which he established in creation, without governing and upholding the lesser? Ans. No; for example, by frogs, locusts, caterpillars, flies, and lice, he executed judgment on Egypt, and delivered his church from bondage, Ex. viii. 16, 17, &c.

LECTURE XXVIII.—EXTENT, DISTINCTIONS, PROPERTIES, AND USEFULNESS OF PROVIDENCE.

§ XV.—91. Are things that are *physically necessary* ruled and governed by the providence of God? Ans. Yes; such as water flowing downward; fire burning combustible matter, &c.

92. On what does their physical necessity depend? Ans. On laws of nature imposed on them by the sovereign will of God, in creation and providence.

93. Does not God sometimes change or suspend these laws in his providence, as in the case of a miracle? Ans. Yes; as dividing Jordan—preserving the three children in the furnace—staying the sun—showing that his providence sustains or suspends these laws, at his pleasure.

94. Are these laws so fixed in creation that they are independent of divine providence? Ans. No; their existence, power, and operation, are maintained and governed by divine providence, because

they can possess no independent power; and Scripture teaches that these are maintained by Providence, Ps. civ. 19, 20; Matt. v. 45.

§ XVI.—95. Are *contingent* things governed by divine providence? Ans. Yes.

96. What are contingent things? Ans. Such things as are immediately produced by second causes, while these causes are unknown to us, and from the changes which occur in these causes, without any order known to us, we cannot foresee the event:—such as sickness; injuries by what are commonly called *accidents*; unexpectedly meeting friends, or enemies, &c.

97. But are these things contingent to God? Ans. No; they are all decreed, and must infallibly occur accordingly, and therefore must be under the government of God's providence.

98. Do the Scriptures always ascribe the government of these things to God? Ans. Yes; Ps. cxlvii. 16—18; Ex. xxi. 13; Deut. xix. 5; Prov. xvi. 33.

99. Do not divine predictions of contingent events unquestionably prove both the fixed decree, and the overruling providence of God? Ans. Yes; as the death of the children about Bethlehem, slain by Herod; Christ's being in Egypt, crucified between two thieves, &c.

100. How answer the objection, that the divine decree and providence take away all contingency? Ans. We admit that the divine decree and providence leave no contingency with God, but leave things just as contingent with us, (till the event occurs,) as if no decree or providence existed.

101. Obj. That our doctrine of providence takes away all utility in the use of means? Ans. God ordinarily employs means in his providence, and works by the means we use; and while the event is uncertain and contingent to us, we should use the means, to attain a lawful object of desire, reverentially trusting in the God of providence for success.

§ XVII.—102. Are our *freest thoughts and actions* governed by divine providence? Ans. Yes; Prov. xvi. 19.

103. How does such government agree with our liberty? Ans. (1.) Our liberty does not consist in indifference; but in the cordial choice of the heart; in choosing according to our pleasure. (2.) God is the first cause of this liberty. (3.) The liberty of the creature must consist with God's prerogatives. (4.) God does not interfere with this liberty of choice, either by his decree, or by his providence; but by both he gives occasion for its full exercise.

§ XVIII.—104. Are all *good things*, natural and spiritual, under the government of divine providence? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. iv. 7; Jas. i. 17; Phil. ii. 13.

105. How does God govern those things spiritually good in his rational creatures? Ans. By commanding, enlightening, persuading, and inclining the will, God operates the moral and gracious disposition, and actively leads to the action, Phil. ii. 13.

106. Why is this work of God necessary? Ans. (1.) We depend on God, not only for our powers of mind, but also for a gracious disposition. (2.) These are God's proper work in our sanctification.

107. At the same time is not the good work thus wrought man's action? Ans. Yes; though God is the first and efficient cause, yet man acts under that influence as the second cause.

§ XIX.—108. Are all *evil things*, natural and moral, penal and sinful, under the providential government of God? Ans. Yes.

109. How prove that penal evil is governed by divine providence? Ans. (1.) From Scripture, Amos iii. 6. The history of the Jews. (2.) Reason shows that it is a part of God's providence, in reproofing man for sin, in sending chastisements on his people, and in executing judgment.

110. How prove that moral evil, or sin, is under the providence of God? Ans. (1.) Many direct declarations of Scripture prove it; as Ex. x. 1; Isa. vi. 9, 10; Rom. i. 24, 26, 28. (2.) Examples show it; as the betraying and crucifying of Christ, which was according to the eternal purpose of God, Acts ii. 23; iv. 27, 28; the selling of Joseph into Egypt, which was sinful and yet by the providence of God, Gen. xlv. 8; l. 20.

111. How does the providential government of these moral evils consist with divine holiness? Ans. Though God's government is mysterious, and beyond our full comprehension, yet some things we may perceive, in which such government is consistent with divine holiness; as, (1.) God, in accomplishing his immutable purposes, leads to an action, leaving the sinner without his renewing grace, to the power of his depravity in the performance of the action. (2.) God leads the sinner to the action according to the sinner's depraved disposition, while he does not communicate that sinful disposition. (3.) God, in his judgments, often punishes sin, by leaving the person to the power of his sin, and to the commission of iniquity; Isa. vi. 9, 10; Ps. lxxxi. 13.

112. As this is a mysterious and intricate subject, what would be the evil of denying that God co-operates with the sinful actions of men, and rules them, in his providence? Ans. (1.) Such a denial would be a withdrawal of sinful actions from the providence of God. (2.) It would make the purposes of God uncertain, and leave to God, at most, a foreknowledge depending on the actions of men. (3.) It would make the sinful creature self-sustaining, self-governing, and independent. Or, (4.) It would place him under the government of some other being than God. These manifestly false consequences of such a denial, show that the doctrine is true, which places the sinful actions of man under the controlling providence of God, as the Scriptures assert. And this doctrine is attended with no absurdities, and no manifest errors, although it is deep and attended with many difficulties.

§ XX.—113. Against what errors are we especially to guard, on this doctrine of divine providence over moral evil? Ans. Three errors have been maintained by different parties, into some one of which, people are apt to fall. As, (1.) Making God the Author of sin, as the Manicheans and Hopkinsians, while they acknowledge God's efficient government of moral evil. (2.) A denial that there is any real moral evil, or sin, and holding that the moral evil exists

only in the imagination or persuasion of him who believes it a sin. This is the doctrine of the Libertines. And thus they hold God's efficient government of what the Scriptures call *sin*, but that God, though the Author of it, is not the Author of moral evil in reality. (3.) The Pelagian, or Arminian notion, that though there is such a thing as sin, or moral evil, yet God is not the Author of it, because his providence is not efficient on this character of actions, that they are, as actions, wholly of the sinner, and God merely permits the sins, withdrawing from the government of such things, leaving these things to man, as though he were independent and self-sustaining, while God has no efficient or infallible purpose, but only a dependent foresight.

§ XXI.—114. May God, then, in any sense, be said to cause an action which is sinful? Ans. Yes; as in the case of Pharaoh.

115. How then avoid making him the Author of sin? Ans. (1.) In every sinful action there are two things to be noticed, (a.) The action itself, and, (b.) The modification of the action. (2.) The action, as it is physical, or a physical effect of the natural powers of a rational creature, is good, and is through God's sustaining and directing power. But, (3.) The modification of the sinful action, is the want of conformity to the law of God, in the manner in which it is done. (4.) This want of conformity to the law of God, is not produced by God. He leads the moral agent to act. He does not communicate that grace which would enable the agent to act in a holy manner; for he is not bound to communicate it. (5.) Therefore God leads the sinful creature to act, as he is, and with those sinful propensities which he possesses, neither communicating sinful dispositions, nor taking away from him anything which was good, nor yet communicating any goodness of disposition, by which he might perform the action in a holy manner. Thus, by way of a simile, a rider may impel a lame horse to move, while he is not the cause of his lameness, (nor of his imperfect motion.)

116. Does God, then, permit the wickedness of the sinner? Ans. Yes; while he causes the action to be done, so far as it is a physical action, he permits the sinner to do it without grace, *i. e.*, in a sinful manner. In other words, he suffers him to remain destitute of holy dispositions, while he impels to the action; and therefore it is done sinfully, because done without holy affections or principles.

117. Does God even increase the wickedness of the sinner, in his holy providence? Ans. Yes; Exod. x. 1; Isa. vi. 9, 10.

118. How does he effect this, without being the Author of sin? Ans. (1.) Judicially; giving the sinner up to the power of his sin; Psa. lxxxi. 13. (2.) Exposing him to temptations or trials, by things which may be good in themselves, but which the sinner's depravity uses as incitements to sin. (3.) Even taking away moral restraints, which might have deterred him from compliance with the temptation; Matt. xxv. 28, 29.

119. Does not God, in the government of the sinner, limit him as to his acts of sin, his objects, and the measure and duration of his sinful acts? Ans. Yes; Psa. lxxvi. 10.

120. Does God, in his providential government, direct and overrule the sinner's depravity to holy ends? Ans. Yes; as Satan and the Jews in crucifying our Lord.

121. Under these views, should we not hold that God's permission of sin is efficacious? Ans. Yes; it is efficacious of the sinful action, as God impels the sinner to the action, while he permits, or leaves, the sinner to be without grace.

§ XXII.—122. What is the ultimate end and design of divine providence? Ans. The glory of God and the salvation of his elect; Rom. xi. 36; viii. 28; Prov. xvi. 4; Eph. i. 22.

§ XXIII.—123. Is not our doctrine, of the universal and efficient providence of God, much opposed? Ans. Yes; and chiefly by those who wish to maintain human independence and power.

124. What evils do they generally charge on our doctrine? Ans. That it denies and dishonours the character and perfections of God;—that it maintains a fatal necessity in all things;—and that it tends to produce carnal security in men.

125. What character or perfections of God, do they allege our doctrine denies or dishonours? Ans. His liberty, ease, majesty, justice, and holiness.

126. But how does it appear, on the contrary, that God's inflexible rectitude, and adherence to his purposes, is consistent with his perfect liberty? Ans. Perfect liberty of any being, is to choose and act according to his nature, uncontrolled. But the nature of God chooses and maintains his rectitude and his purposes.

127. How does it appear that God's ease is not disturbed or infringed by his perpetual providence? Ans. Because he is Almighty, and necessarily active. He has no imperfection requiring rest. The imagination that perpetual activity is wearisome to God, is a most unworthy and heathenish conception.

128. How is it supposed that God's universal providence is inconsistent with his majesty? Ans. By the vain and weak imagination, that a universal providence, and especially over the smaller things of creation, is a defect of dignity. Whereas, God's majesty is manifested by his works, great and small. There is infinite greatness in all his works.

129. Does God's infliction of chastisements on his people, and bestowment of temporal benefits, [on the wicked,] derogate from his justice? Ans. No; for, (1.) Chastisements are deserved. (2.) They work for good to his people. (3.) Temporal mercies to the wicked, are unmerited goodness, but not injustice. And, (4.) Eternity will give occasion for ample justice.

130. Does God's permission of sin, or his efficient government of his sinning creatures, reflect on his holiness? Ans. No; because all the influence that God exercises in these matters, is perfectly holy; and in holiness, he permits and governs the sin, and overrules it for good.

131. Does the doctrine of divine providence maintain a fatal necessity, inconsistent with human liberty and responsibility? Ans. No; although, by necessity of consequence, the decree must be

fulfilled, the intelligent creature is at perfect liberty. The decree provided for this. And the necessity does not arise from second causes, to restrain liberty, but from God, the First Cause, who provided for our liberty.

132. How does it appear that our doctrine of a universal and efficient providence, does not tend to produce carnal security, on a mind rightly disposed? Ans. (1.) God usually conducts his providence by means. (2.) He requires us to use means, and to walk according to his revealed will. He will not save us in the neglect of duty.

133. What are the properties of God's providence? Ans. Holy, wise, and powerful.

134. Wherein is the providence of God holy? Ans. In his purposes, and in the execution of them; in the means used; in the influence exerted; in the effects, as they are the work of God; and in the ends attained.

135. Wherein may the wisdom of God's providence be seen? Ans. In the ends to be effected, being the best; in adopting the most appropriate means; and in the infallible success of the means, in effecting the ends designed.

136. How does the power of divine providence appear? Ans. In ruling all things, and infallibly effecting his will.

137. Besides the distinction of ordinary and extraordinary providence, what further distinction may be observed? Ans. A distinction into *common* and *special*.

138. What is God's *common* providence? Ans. His government of all things in general, and directing them to their natural ends.

139. What is God's *special* providence? Ans. It is the government of his rational creatures, and of his church in particular, otherwise called his *moral government*.

140. Does the special providence of God include his whole work of grace, through Christ? Ans. Yes.

141. Does God's special providence toward his church, direct things to their spiritual, moral, and supernatural ends? Ans. Yes.

142. Does it interfere with or suspend his common providence? Ans. No.

143. How does it appear that special providence, in the moral government of the church, does not interfere with or suspend common providence, since the ends are different in these two classes of government? Ans. God, in his infinite wisdom and power, and according to eternal purpose, while governing all things to their natural ends, also directs them to their special end, the salvation of his people.

144. Is there any difference between God's providential government of natural things, as it relates to the men of the world, and to his people? Ans. Yes.

145. What is the difference? Ans. God directs all things to their natural ends, equally in reference to the men of the world, and his own people. But, in directing them to their natural ends,

he governs all things for the good of his people; Rom. viii. 28; and, by consequence, as ultimately a curse to the wicked; Prov. iii. 33; "The curse of the Lord is in the house of the wicked," &c.

146. What is the ground of this special providence to the church? Ans. The covenant of grace and the atonement of Christ; Rom. viii. 28, 30.

§ XXIV.—147. Although the adversaries of the doctrine of God's universal efficient providence, charge it as dishonouring to God, and injurious to man, does it not both honour God, and prove useful to man? Ans. Yes.

148. Wherein is it honouring to God? Ans. It glorifies his wisdom, power, and goodness, and indeed all his perfections; it ascribes independence to God alone, denying it to the creature; and represents him as conducting his own work of creation, and as the object of adoration and of faith in his providence.

149. Wherein is it useful to man? Ans. (1.) It instructs us, both respecting the perfections of God, and the imperfection and dependence of all creatures, even the most powerful. (2.) It gives ground of consolation to God's people, to see that all things are conducted by their almighty and faithful Friend, and not left to blind chance, nor even to the guidance of our own limited wisdom; 1 Pet. v. 7; Psa. xxxvii. 5. (3.) It is calculated to awaken the careless, and arrest the wicked in his sin, to reflect that all his destinies, for time as well as eternity, are in the hands of God. (4.) It induces to patience in afflictions, when we consider that all things are ordered by a wise, almighty, and gracious God, who has promised that all things shall work for good to his people; Job i. 21. (5.) It leads to gratitude and humility, in prosperity; Gen. xxxii. 10; Deut. viii. 10, 18. (6.) It tends to promote diligence in duty; because God confers his favours, in his providence, by means, and in the performance of our duty; Psa. lxxi. 16. (7.) It tends to promote faith and hope, even respecting future things of the present life, and to excite to prayer; since all things are governed by God, who is the God of our salvation. (8.) It is calculated to render us spiritually minded; as we have, in daily providence, the remembrancers of God's presence, and of our dependence.

CHAPTER XI.

OF THE WORSHIP OF GOD, AND HIS LAW.

LECTURE XXIX.—DEFINITION, OBLIGATION, MOTIVES, ETC.

§ I. Having spoken of the nature, perfections, and mode of subsistence of the true God, of his purposes, and of his works of creation and providence, it is proper that we now speak of what is due to him from his intelligent creatures; and particularly of his *worship*, which is founded on the true knowledge of him.

Question 1. Do not the Scriptures require, of all intelligent creatures, the worship of God? Ans. Yes.

2. By what names is the worship of God called in Scripture? Ans. By various names; as honour, fear, love, prayer, praise, &c.; which expressions are most usual in the Old Testament. In the New Testament it is expressed by *ευσεβια*, (*eusebia*), *veneration*; *ευλαβια*, (*eulabia*), *caution or fear, or laying hold of*; *δουλεια*, (*douleia*), *bound*; *θρησκεια*, (*threskia*), *religious*; *λατρευια*, (*latreia*), *service*; *λειτουργια*, (*leitourgia*), *ministering, &c.*

3. What distinction do the Papists make between *λατρευια*, and *δουλεια*? Ans. They suppose the former denotes the worship of God alone, and the latter a worship—religious worship of creatures.

4. How does it appear that the distinction is unfounded? Ans. (1.) Because religious worship of the creature is absolutely forbidden. (2.) Because *δουλεια*, in the original Scriptures, is used to denote the worship of the true God; as Rom. xii. 11; Gal. iv. 8. The latter expression implies that this service should have been rendered to God alone.

5. Is not the term *worship* used in a latitude of meaning, to signify either civil respect to creatures, or religious, or divine service to God? Ans. Yes.

6. Since civil worship or respect may be given to creatures, and religious worship to God alone, how is the latter distinguished from the former? Ans. (1.) Divine or religious worship includes absolute subjection of heart, of understanding, and of conscience, to God, the object of it. (2.) It includes supreme love, deep, adoring reverence, and unlimited faith and confidence. (3.) It is accompanied with appropriate outward signs. Of this worship of God we now speak.

§ II.—7. Is the worship of God equitable, reasonable, and just? Ans. Yes.

8. On what grounds is it due and reasonable? Ans. (1.) On account of God's majesty and greatness. The infiniteness of his character and perfections, renders the service, or worship, most reasonable and just; Jer. x. 6, 7. (2.) Because he is our Creator, and has, therefore, a perfect right over us; Eccles. xii. 1. (3.) Because he is the God of providence sustaining and supplying us; Psa. xxxiii. 18, 21; Psa. cvii. 8. (4.) Because of redemption; Tit. ii. 11; Rev. v. 9.

9. On what other grounds, besides the reasonableness of it, should worship be given to God? Ans. It is necessary, and it is useful.

10. On what grounds is it necessary? Ans. (1.) On the ground of God's authority commanding our worship; Matt. iv. 10. (2.) On account of God's end and design in creating and preserving man; Prov. xvi. 4; Rev. iv. 11. (3.) From the threatenings of God against those who do not worship him; Jer. x. 25; 2 Thess. i. 8. (4.) On account of our dependence on God, rendering faith, hope, prayer, and praises, necessary for the supply of our wants.

11. Wherein is the worship of God needful? Ans. (1.) From our dependence and necessities, and God's all-sufficiency to supply our wants; Gen. xvii. 1. (2.) On account of the righteousness of God; Psa. xi. 4, 7; to which the believer betakes himself, from the injustice of man. (3.) From the goodness and mercy of God, to defend and supply us, in love and kindness; Psa. lxxiii. 1. (4.) From his promises, which are great, many, and precious, warranting us to come with [assurance of] success; Psa. xxxiii. 18; cxlv. 19. (5.) From the exercise of worship, as cultivating godly affections, and affording occasion for communion with God. (6.) It appears from the recorded experience of all those who worship him; Psa. lxxiii. 28.

12. But it is objected by some, that it is unworthy of God to demand worship from his creatures? Ans. The objection is founded on a weak and perverted conception; for, (1.) God does not demand the service as necessary or useful to himself. (2.) It is the natural and necessary duty of a rational creature to reverence, love, admire, adore, and trust in, infinity, majesty and perfection. (3.) To neglect or refuse this, is necessarily sin, disobedience, rebellion, and a violation of nature, and of natural and moral obligation. (4.) The reverence, love, and admiration felt, should be outwardly expressed in a suitable manner, for the creature's own improvement, and for the profit of other intelligent beings. (5.) Man was created to enjoy and to serve God; and worship is a means of that enjoyment, and a mode of that service. (6.) Man was created dependent on God, and he should feel that dependence, and acknowledge it, by worship—by faith, hope, prayer, and thanksgiving. Therefore, (7.) Since worship is a moral duty, incumbent on the intelligent creature, and the neglect of it a sin, the holiness and justice of God necessarily require it of the creature.

§ § IV. V.—13. Can there be true worship of God without obedience? Ans. The true worship of God is obedience.

14. What is the character of that obedience? Ans. It is an entire subjection of the person to God, and confidence in him.

15. What is included in that subjection of the person to God, which is required in his worship? Ans. (1.) Entire submission of the understanding and judgment to God, according to his revealed character and will. (2.) An entire yielding of the affections and will, to the revealed will of God. (3.) A reverent awe of God in the heart, subduing every power of the soul to obedience and acceptance of God, as our God.

16. Do the Scriptures require confidence in God to be exercised in his worship? Ans. Yes; Heb. iv. 16; x. 22; xi. 6.

17. What is that confidence which is included in the true worship of God? Ans. (1.) Confidence in God's perfections, of power, justice, truth, &c. (2.) In his love and kindness. (3.) In our privileges with him, and our acceptance before him; Heb. iv. 16; x. 22; Jas. i. 6.

18. How does this confidence belong to the true worship of God?

Ans. (1.) Without this, we do not honour his truth and grace by trust in them. (2.) Without it, we do not, and can not, yield a cheerful and willing worship, as to our God and Father. (3.) Therefore, without it, we do not give him our hearts. (4.) And without it, we do not love him, nor return to him as our God.

19. Are any but rational creatures capable of performing this worship, or under obligations to perform it? Ans. No; irrational creatures were not formed with powers to perform it, and consequently were not placed under a law requiring it.

20. How then are we to understand the call on all creatures, irrational and inanimate, to praise God; as in Psa. cxlviii. 3-10? Ans. It is a declaration of our assent that they do praise him passively, as the works of his hands, and a call on rational creatures, to observe and celebrate the glory of God, as appearing in these works of his hands.

21. Can any rational creature be exempt from the obligation to worship God, in spirit and in truth? Ans. No; it is their imperious duty, whether able or unable, willing or unwilling.

22. Can any worship of God be acceptable, without heart-reverence, love, obedience, and faith? Ans. No; 1 Chron. xxviii. 9; Prov. xxiii. 26; Isa. xxix. 13.

23. On the other hand, is heart-worship sufficient without the observance of outward forms? Ans. No.

24. Why so, since God is spiritual, and needs no outward exhibitions? Ans. (1.) Because God has commanded outward forms, and true worship is obedience. And, moreover, the heart is not right in the worship of God, that is indisposed to obey divine commands and institutions. (2.) Because the observance of these outward forms, is necessary, in order to promote and exercise our inward worship, and godly affections. (3.) Because the observance of these, is a means of making God and his salvation known to others, and of leading them to knowledge and to salvation.

25. What are the proper motives to the worship of God? Ans. (1.) God's will and authority commanding; Isa. xlv. 11; (*intuitus*; regard to the divine will as supreme and equitable.) (2.) The glory of God; 1 Cor. x. 31. (3.) The majesty and greatness of God, leading us to reverence and fear him, with godly fear; Psa. civ. 1. (4.) The goodness of God, leading us to love him; Psa. cxviii. 1. (5.) Our delight in God, and in the exercise of worship; Psa. xxxiii. 1-3; cxlvii. 1. (6.) Our own interest; Psa. lxxiii. 28.

26. May fear of punishment, and hope of reward, be our only or our chief motives to worship? Ans. No; (1.) Because it would not then be a willing service; and therefore not acceptable. (2.) It would not be in faith; and therefore could not please God. (3.) It would then proceed wholly on the principle of selfishness, and not on love to God. It would be on the principle of regard to ourselves and our interests, and not to God's glory.

27. But although such fears and hopes should neither be our only, nor our chief principle, in God's worship, yet are they not

allowed to have some place in our motives, as inducements to God's worship and service? Ans. Yes; Tit. i. 2; Heb. xi. 26; Matt. v. 12.

28. How far, then, may fear of punishment and hope of reward influence us; and how may we know when they have a just influence over us, and when an unholy influence? Ans. (1.) When we worship and obey God from love, in child-like confidence, and with cheerfulness of spirit, taking pleasure in the enjoyment of God's gracious presence, and in the prospect of enjoying happiness with him forever, the motive is lawful. (2.) When our desire for divine blessings is subordinate to our love to God, and to our desire of promoting his glory, and our hope in him for our happiness, and our desire for his glory sweetly harmonize, our regard to our own interests is lawful. (3.) When we worship him in faith of his free mercy, and expect and desire his gifts as free in Christ, our motives are lawful. (4.) When a fear of punishment leads us to faith's appropriation of Christ and his salvation, as ours, it is lawful. (5.) When our hopes and fears lead us to seek communion with God in Christ, and Christ and his free salvation are precious to us, such motives are lawful. Our hope of heaven, and fear of wrath, are often appealed to in Scripture, to excite to diligence, and therefore they should have a place in our motives in the service of God. But it is obvious that, as God requires faith and love as our ruling principles; as by these hopes and fears he requires us to return to him as children to a father, and to the exercise of a heart right with God; therefore, if we serve him under the chief motives of fear and hope, we are selfish, without faith and love, and have not returned to him, as his warnings and promises require. And to serve and worship God with the hope of escaping wrath and enjoying heaven by our service, is a rejection of the free gift of salvation in Christ; trusting in our service, instead of the righteousness of Christ, as the ground of our happiness, and in God's favour through our righteousness, and not through his love and grace in Christ.

29. But it is objected, that heaven and happiness are promised to us under the name of *rewards*, in order to excite us to duty, in the service of God; and why then should we not serve God, in order to obtain them as rewards of our service? Ans. (1.) Reward, in Scripture, does not always mean reward, in its strict and proper sense; and in reference to any blessing of salvation bestowed on the believer, it is never so used; as we are unequivocally warned that by works of the law no flesh shall be saved; and that when we have done all, we are unprofitable servants; and that salvation is a gift of God, a free gift, and not of debt, but of grace; Rom. iv. 4, 5. (2.) Therefore, in the Scriptural use of the word, in reference to God's gifts of grace to his people, it signifies a gratuitous favour; Matt. v. 12; vi. 6. It may be observed that *reward*, in its proper sense, includes several ideas; as, (a.) A benefit. (b.) An expected benefit. (c.) A benefit expected, as deserved or purchased. Now, in the gospel sense of a reward to the be-

liever, the latter and proper sense is expressly excluded, and the word is retained as expressive of the two former significations. Therefore, (3.) We are to serve God in view of the promised blessing, but we must serve him in a right spirit, under that view; in faith of a free salvation, in love, obedience, &c.

LECTURE XXX.—OBJECT AND RULE OF WORSHIP.

§ VI.—30. Is religious worship due to any being but the true God; to saints, living or dead, or to angels? Ans. No; it is expressly forbidden to any other; Matt. iv. 10.

31. Why is it due to none but the true God? Ans. (1.) Religious worship to any other than God, would be a violation of his claims on us as our Creator and our Lord; as it would be withdrawing from him our faith, and that glory which is his due. (2.) None else than God is worthy of that fear, reverence, love and faith's confidence, which should be exercised in divine worship. (3.) However exalted any of the creatures may be, as angels, or glorified saints, still they are but creatures, at best but servants of God and instruments in his hands. They have no independent power to help us. They are no nearer equality with God than we. And he is still the independent source of all blessing. (4.) They are unable to know our hearts or our necessities. (5.) There is no need to give them any religious worship, as we have free access to God himself, as the fountain of blessings, through Christ our Advocate.

32. Should our worship be given equally to the three persons of the Trinity? Ans. Yes; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; John v. 23. Our worship must be given to God, but each of the persons is God, and the three are one God, and therefore all the persons are the object of worship.

33. When one of the persons of the Trinity is directly addressed in prayer, or any act of worship, how is the worship directed then to the three persons? Ans. To the Three-one God in that person; John v. 23; xiv. 10, 11.

34. Is it acceptable worship if given to the one God without regard to the Trinity, or under a denial of the Trinity? Ans. No.

35. Why not? Ans. (1.) Because, under a denial of the Trinity, it is not the true God as he is, that is worshipped. (2.) Because the Scriptures ascribe worship to the three persons as one God; Matt. xxviii. 19; 2 Cor. xiii. 14. (3.) Because we ought to acknowledge the revealed mode of the divine subsistence; and without this, we do not adore God according to that mystery. (4.) Because, without this faith in the Trinity, we do not entertain right views of the work of redemption.

36. Would it be religious worship to employ angels or departed saints as advocates or mediators with God on our behalf? Ans. Yes; because, (1.) We are then putting our trust in their love, sympathy, faithfulness, power, or influence with God on our behalf. (2.) We are trusting that they can hear our prayers, understand

our wants, and know our hearts. This is a distrust of God's kindness and love, of Christ's compassion and sufficiency as our advocate, and of our immediate access to him, and to God through him. (3.) We are assuming that they are omnipresent or omniscient, to be always present to hear our prayers, and the prayers of millions at the same time, in different parts of the world.

37. But, as it is admitted that we may, without idolatry, employ our fellow-church-members in prayer for us, and request an interest in their prayers, (as Paul, 2 Thess. iii. 1.) what is the difference between this and employing angels or departed saints? Ans. (1.) We ask our brethren's sympathy for us, to whom we have access; but to saints or angels we have not access; and to suppose we have is idolatry, supposing them omnipresent. (2.) We ask our fellow-men to sympathize with us in what we make known to them: to suppose we can make these things known to angels or departed saints is error and idolatry. (3.) We ask our fellow-men to join us in intercessions through Christ, our only Advocate, according to the privilege which we know they have in common with us; but departed saints or angels are employed by idolaters, as mediators between Christ and them; and as having some merit or worth, or nearer equality to God than we; all of which is error, and none of which we ascribe to our fellow-men in asking their prayers.

38. But, in favour of the worship of creatures, saints, angels, &c., it is pleaded that Jacob (Gen. xlviii. 16,) required that his name should be invoked by Joseph's sons? Ans. The objection is a misrepresentation. He only required that they should be called by his name; i. e., that, as Jacob had the promise of God for him and his seed, he claimed the sons of Joseph as his seed and the heirs of the promise.

39. Obj. Moses (Exod. xxxii. 13,) prayed in the name of his departed fathers? Ans. Moses did not pray in the name of his fathers, but that God would remember his covenant made with them.

40. Obj. Job (v. 1,) is invited to pray to saints; and (xix. 21,) he himself supplicates his friends? Ans. In the first place, it is not an exhortation to prayer, but to make a reference to the opinions or experience of saints in this world, whether now dead or alive, to see if they would justify Job in his present sentiments. In the second case, it is no religious worship, but an appeal to the sympathy of the living.

41. Obj. Glorified saints and angels are of superior excellence, and deserve some special honour? Ans. It is proper to honour them as exalted creatures, but they are not divine or worthy of adoration.

42. Obj. Relics have had a divine power; as the body of Elisha, 2 Kings xiii. 21; the clothes of Christ, Matt. ix. 20, 21; the shadow of Peter, Acts v. 15; the garments of Paul, Acts xix. 12; and therefore the relics of saints should be adored, and the saints themselves worshipped? Ans. (1.) These were miraculous interpositions, in the days of miracles, but are not continued. (2.) By

these interpositions, God testified to the truth of his word taught by those persons, and to the reality of their commission. But these relics were not objects of religious veneration, nor were the human persons, to whom they belonged, objects of religious worship. Paul and Peter forbade worship to be offered to themselves; Acts x. 25, 26; xiv. 13-18. (3.) Relics may be valuable on some accounts; as when kept as memorials of friends, &c.; but it is silly superstition now, when the days of miracles are past, to attribute any divine power to them, or to the saints to whom they belonged.

§ VII.—43. What is the rule of divine worship? Ans. The law, or institution of God; Isa. viii. 20.

44. Can human tradition, or human will, direct or authorize the manner or means of worship? Ans. No; both are expressly condemned; Matt. xv. 3, 9; Col. ii. 20, 23.

45. Why cannot human wisdom and prudence institute and authorize acceptable worship? Ans. (1.) Obedience to God is an essential ingredient in all acceptable worship; Matt. xv. 9; Isa. i. 12; Eccles. xii. 13. But to offer to God worship unappointed by him, is no obedience to him. (2.) It is God's essential right to command and to be obeyed. (3.) He alone has wisdom sufficient to appoint a worship acceptable to himself, and profitable to the church. (4.) No ordinance can be profitable to us without his presence and blessing; and he will bless only his own appointments; Matt. xv. 9. (5.) God has appointed all ordinances that are necessary; therefore, all ordinances of man's appointment are unnecessary, and will, therefore, be injurious. (6.) The observance of human ordinances will produce a neglect of those which are divine. (7.) Human appointments will introduce human errors, and will corrupt the church.

46. As there is no obedience to God in the observance of human institutions, is not the observance an obedience to whatever authority appoints them? Ans. Yes.

47. Is not service and obedience, then, in matters of worship, idolatry, even though we intend to worship God by it? Ans. Yes.

48. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) It is obedience to another in the stead of God; and obedience is an essential ingredient in worship. An entire subjection is due to God. (2.) If we, in religious worship, obey another than God, we reject God, and worship him whom we obey. (3.) This obedience to human device was the essence of the apostacy and idolatry of the Jews of old, and was usually the first step of their apostacy; 1 Kings xii. 28, 33; Exod. xxxii. 5. (4.) It is on this account that men are charged with sacrificing to devils, and having fellowship with them; even when they intend to worship God; Lev. xvii. 7; Deut. xxxii. 17; 1 Cor. x. 20.

49. If the matter of worship appointed of God be observed, may a liberty of appointing the manner and the means be taken by man? Ans. No; nothing must be added to, or substituted in place of God's appointments. Thus Aaron and the people (Exod. xxxii.

6,) were idolaters, though they offered burnt offerings and peace offerings.

50. Does this forbid the exercise of human prudence, in choosing and determining a convenient mode of observing the divine institutions? Ans. No; those measures which are necessary to the observance of the divine institutions, and which God has not prescribed but left to human prudence, it is lawful to the church to devise. But such things are not a part of the worship; such as tokens at the communion, or some convenient means of ascertaining who have a right to commune, and who have not.

51. Obj. In favour of a liberty of human device in divine worship—that the ancient fathers in the church, as Adam, Abel, Noah, &c., offered sacrifices without any divine institution? Ans. Their acceptance with God in these sacrifices, and their faith exercised in the service, prove that their service was instituted of God, although the history, on account of its brevity, does not expressly record the institution.

52. Obj. (2.) If ordinances of man appear, in our circumstances, appropriate, and be instituted by man with a good design, they must be lawful? Ans. (1.) A good design cannot set aside the ordinance or authority of God, or justify will-worship; Col. ii. 23. (2.) A good design is not a substitute for divine wisdom or authority. (3.) The use of such institutions excludes obedience to God; assumes that an offering or service to God is that which gives value to our worship, though obedience be wanting; and it implies a charge of defect in God's law, and in his goodness and wisdom. (4.) To justify human devices in the worship of God, on the plea of good design, and that they are appropriate, assumes that human wisdom is capable of judging in these matters, and that the taste and inclinations of the human heart are a safe guide in providing for, and establishing the worship of God. (5.) And, therefore, to admit this argument opens the door for the introduction of all the errors of the human heart into the church, and into her worship.

LECTURE XXXI.—OF THE LAW OF GOD.

§ VIII.—53. Is not the word *law* used in a great variety of meanings in Holy Scripture? Ans. Yes; it is used, (1.) For human laws, or rules of conduct in human society, Acts xix. 38. (2.) A powerful principle, Rom. vii. 23; viii. 2. (3.) The gospel and its principle, called "the law of faith," Rom. iii. 27. (4.) The whole written word of God, Ps. i. 2. (5.) The Old Testament, John x. 34, 35. (6.) The books of Moses, Luke xxiv. 44; Gal. iv. 21. (7.) The law as a covenant of works, Gal. iii. 10; v. 4. (8.) The moral law as a rule of life, 1 Cor. ix. 21.

54. In which of these significations should we understand the word *law*, when taken as a rule of worship? Ans. The moral law as a rule of faith, and as revealed in the Scriptures.

55. Why not consider it as the law as a covenant of works? Ans. Though the law as a rule of worship was given to man in innocence

as a covenant of works; and although every one, under the dispensation of the gospel, who refuses salvation by Jesus Christ, is under the covenant of works, even in its commands of divine worship; yet, (1.) It is the law as a rule of life that is given to us, under the gospel, as our rule of worship, as the law which the gospel encourages us to obey, and which it is the good pleasure of God that we should obey. (2.) Because, we should not look for acceptance by the law as a covenant, but worship God in faith in Christ as our Mediator, &c. (3.) To take the law as a covenant of works, in our service to God, is contrary to faith, and a rejection of Christ.

56. What are we to understand by the law as a rule of faith, in contradistinction from the gospel? Ans. While the gospel, strictly taken, is wholly a free promise, the law, in contradistinction from it, is our rule of duty; containing injunctions to duty, and prohibitions of sin, prescribed by God to man, and containing threatenings and reproofs; and to this law are appended gospel promises.

57. Are the positive precepts, respecting the mode of worship and instituted ordinances, included in the moral law as a rule of life? Ans. Yes; Ex. xx. 4, 5, &c.

§ IX.—58. Does this law extend to all our actions, even to our words, our thoughts, and our principles of action? Ans. Yes; Prov. xxiii. 26; Jer. xvii. 9, 10.

59. Does it extend to all our actions, in all our circumstances? Ans. Yes; Ps. cxix. 96.

60. Is the law of God so perfect and complete, that it leaves none of our actions absolutely indifferent? Ans. Yes; although some things are indifferent in themselves, as moving the hand or foot, yet, in relation to our motives, designs, or affections, the action is either good or evil. Thus, to lift the hand, is indifferent; we may do it or not, as we please, provided the design and the affection be right in the choice; but to lift it to relieve the oppressed is duty; to injure or oppress, is sin.

61. Is there any thing, which is a duty, left uncommanded? Ans. No; every thing which is our duty is commanded, either expressly or by implication, Ecc. xii. 13.

62. In the worship of God, is any thing lawful and right which is uncommanded, though not explicitly forbidden? Ans. No; to add any thing which is not commanded, in the worship of God, is forbidden, Deut. iv. 2; xii. 32. It is will-worship; it is not obedience; it is not the service of God; and it implies a charge of defect of wisdom or goodness in God.

63. Are the actions, even of holy men, a rule to us, besides God's law, or in opposition to it? Ans. No; their good works are exemplary, but not a rule. Because God is sufficient as a rule; is the only rule; and because of the imperfection of even holy men, we may not make their conduct even a rule.

64. Are even the works of God, in his providence, in things above or besides the law which he has given to us, a rule of our conduct? Ans. No; although his works are exemplary as manifestations of

his justice, holiness, and truth, yet, as God is not under the law which he gave to man, we may not imitate him, on account of his authority and perfection, further than his works manifest his will respecting our observance of the moral law. Thus he may execute judgment in a way in which we may not execute it, even though in our power. Nor may we always hold communion with our fellow-man in ordinances in which he may hold communion with them. Not his doings, but his law, is our rule.

§ X.—65. Was it not necessary that God's law be made known to man, in order that it might be a law to us, and obligatory on us? *Ans.* Yes; Deut. xxix. 29; Rom. v. 13.

66. Would obedience be possible to man, if the law were not revealed? *Ans.* No; Because we could not know our duty otherwise; and without a revelation of God's law, even good deeds, if attainable, would not be acts of obedience.

67. Could a person be guilty of violating the law of God, if it had never been made known to man by any means whatever? *Ans.* No; Rom. v. 13.

68. But may not the person be guilty of a sin, and of violation of a law of God once made known to man, though that individual may not know it personally himself? *Ans.* Yes; because his heart and life may be in opposition to that law, and therefore in rebellion against God. His perversity of heart keeps him in blindness. A moral creature cannot be in a neutral state; Rom. ii. 12, "As many as have sinned without law, shall perish without law;" which teaches that the heathen may be guilty and perish, though they have no revelation but that given to Adam; and Rom. ii. 14, 15, "Not having the law, are a law unto themselves," &c., teaches that, by that revelation to Adam, there is in all men light enough to condemn them.

69. But would any merely positive precept, (which is not natural-moral,) though once made known to man, involve a person in guilt, in his practice, who personally knows nothing of it, and has no opportunity of knowing it? *Ans.* No; Rom. ii. 12. Thus, though the gospel was made known to Adam and Noah, yet the heathen, in after ages, are not condemned for unbelief of the gospel.

70. What is the reason of this difference between the obligation of a natural-moral precept, and of a merely positive precept, on the person who is personally ignorant of both? *Ans.* (1.) The natural-moral law involves a person in guilt, who violates it, ignorant of it as a revealed law, because he has still some traces of it in his conscience, and might have more knowledge still by nature's light, if depravity of heart and understanding did not prevent, Rom. i. 18—32; ii. 14, 15. (2.) But a merely positive precept, such as a command to believe in Christ, or in a revelation of him, is not given in the law of nature, and therefore a heathen can have no trace of it in his conscience. Thus, in order to obligation, a revelation must, in some manner, be made to man.

71. But is not his sin aggravated by a new and special revelation of God's law, if he disobey it, though he remain in much igno-

rance? Ans. Yes; because his ignorance is owing to depravity and rebellion of heart; for nature's light would teach that he needs a revelation of God's will and salvation by grace. It is hatred of the revelation, of which he has heard, that prevents his attainment of knowledge, John iii. 19.

72. And is not his sin still more aggravated, if he disobey the light actually received into his understanding? Ans. Yes; Luke xii. 47.

73. Has the new revelation of God's will been alike clear in all ages? Ans. No; the light became more clear as the canon of Scripture was filled up; and even the complete revelation made in the Scriptures, becomes more clear as Providence leads the church forward in her testimony.

§ XI.—74. How may the law of God be distinguished as to its form? Ans. As *a covenant of works*, and *a rule of life*.

75. Is it the same law in its matter under both forms? Ans. Yes.

76. Even if no covenant of works had been made with man, was it not necessary that a penalty should be appended to the law? Ans. Yes; from the very nature of God, as holy and just, and from the necessary condition of man, as accountable, the penalty must belong to the law.

77. Do both Scripture and the light of nature teach that a penalty is attached to the law? Ans. Yes; Ezek. xviii. 4; Rom. i. 32.

78. Are not all who are in their natural state under a covenant of works, and under its penalty? Ans. Yes; Gal. iii. 10; John iii. 18.

We, at present, leave the discussion of the *covenant of works* for Chap. XIV. § XIII. Yet we may ask,

79. Whether men are under the covenant of works and its penalty, or under the covenant of grace, and freed from the penalty of the law, being under it merely as a rule of life, yet does either form of the law allow any indulgence of sin, or a dispensation of obligation? Ans. No; all men are under all its obligations. Christ did not set us free from obligation to obedience; nor did he come to dishonour his law, or to relax any of its obligations to duty.

80. Is there any ground for the Popish distinction of sins into *mortal* and *venial*? Ans. No; it is true that sin, under the covenant of works, and without interest in Christ, is mortal; and sin, when we are united to Christ, is venial, or pardonable, or rather is pardoned; yet there is no such thing as the Popish distinction, which means, by *venial* sins, sins of little guilt, excusable, pardonable without Christ. Such a distinction is the result of ignorance and depravity.

81. Can there be any ground for a dispensation of obedience to the law? Ans. God does not give it, and man cannot.

82. Could our sin, and consequent inability to obey the law fully, set us free from any measure of obligation to obey the law? Ans. No; God cannot, by man's sin, lose his right to command. Man cannot, by sin, release himself from obligation and guilt.

83. What was the penalty of the law in the covenant of works, or of the law of nature to man? Ans. Death; Rom. vi. 23.

84. What is included in this penalty? Ans. All that can be included in it,—death *temporal*, *spiritual* and *eternal*.

85. What is temporal death? Ans. The dissolution of the active union between soul and body, under the curse.

86. What is spiritual death? Ans. The loss of the image of God, consisting in knowledge, righteousness and holiness.

87. What is eternal death? Ans. Eternal separation from the gracious presence of God, and positive infliction of his wrath.

88. Is all this punishment due for every sin? Ans. Yes; even the least; Gal. iii. 10; Jas. ii. 10.

89. Is this punishment reasonable? Ans. Yes. God's justice and holiness necessarily require it; and there is a natural impression on man that death is the wages of sin.

90. Does the occurrence of natural death prove that man has sinned? Ans. Yes; Rom. vi. 23; v. 14. In all cases it is the consequence of sin; and in the case of the wicked it is the execution of the penalty.

91. But might not death be considered as the necessary result, or consequence of man's natural constitution, as the Socinians hold? Ans. No; the Scriptures ascribe it to sin. And death, as a suffering, would not have occurred to man in his innocence.

LECTURE XXXII.—DIVISIONS OF THE LAW.

§ XII.—92. Has God appended a promise to his law? Ans. Yes.

93. What did he promise as the reward of obedience? Ans. Life.

94. What was included in the life promised? Ans. All that can be included in it, according to the nature of man; as, (1.) Life temporal; the continued union of soul and body in the favour of God. (2.) Life spiritual; the continued possession of the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness and holiness. (3.) Life eternal; the enjoyment of the love, favour, and gracious presence of God forever.

95. How prove that there was such a promise of life appended to the law, when in the account of the covenant of works, (Gen. ii. 16, 17,) it is not expressly mentioned? Ans. (1.) Because man was created in a state of life, and it was not threatened to be taken away, except for disobedience; necessarily implying its continuance for, or in case of obedience. (2.) Though life would not have been merited by man's obedience, it would have been the necessary result of obedience, through the goodness of God, and perfectly consistent with his justice. (3.) Because the promise of life is often made in Scripture in connexion with obedience to the law; Lev. xviii. 5; Matt. xix. 17; Rom. x. 5. It is the natural hope and expectation of man, that life will be the result of obedience; and this is not contradicted by Scripture; it is even taught in Scripture, and it is inferred from the goodness of God; Job x. 3.

96. Did the promise of life belong only to the precepts of the moral law, or did it refer also to ceremonial precepts? Ans. It re-

ferred also to ceremonial precepts. As every thing that God should, at any time, command, is obligatory by his authority, and the moral law binds to obedience to it, so the promise of life is appended to it. So Lev. xviii. 5, and Ezek. xx. 11, teach that the promise refers to ceremonial as well as moral precepts. In these passages, ceremonial and moral commands of God are not opposed to one another, or distinguished, as though the promise was appended to the one and not to the other; but God's commands, of whatever kind, are opposed to the devices of men.

97. Would not life have been appended to obedience, even if no covenant had been made? Ans. Yes; the goodness of God would have secured this, as long as man had continued obedient. But the further discussion of the promise, as made in the covenant of works, is reserved for Chapter XIV.

§ XIII.—In speaking of the law of God as the rule of life, it may be useful to consider it under its various divisions and aspects. It may be variously divided.

98. How may the law of God be divided with respect to its principle? Ans. Into *positive* and *natural* law; or *moral-positive* and *moral-natural*.

99. How divided as to its parts? Ans. *Moral*, *ceremonial* and *forensic*.

100. How divided as to its duration? Ans. Into *perpetual* and *temporary*.

101. How divided as to its extension? Ans. Into *universal*, binding on all; *particular*, binding on certain classes, as parents and children, governors and governed, &c.; and *singular*, binding on individuals in a singular case, as the command to Abraham to sacrifice Isaac; or even on a specified nation in a singular case, as Israel dispossessing and cutting off the Canaanites.

102. How divided in respect to promulgation? Ans. As *natural and not written*, as to Adam in innocence, and the remains of it on the natural conscience; and as *revealed or written*. It might also be considered in its various ends or designs; as for *direction*, *conviction*, or *probation*.

103. In regard to the division into Positive and Natural, what are we to understand by the Positive law, or moral-positive part of the law? Ans. It is that which flows from the mere will and good-pleasure of God, and is not natural or necessary, otherwise than by his will; such as the Sabbath, appointed forms of ordinances, &c.

104. Is such a law necessarily perpetual? Ans. No; it may, at any time, be abrogated or changed by God, the Great Lawgiver, because it does not flow from his nature.

105. On what is the Natural law, or moral-natural law founded? Ans. Not only on the will of God, but also on his nature, and man's relation to him.

106. Is the law of this character always binding? Ans. Yes; it is perpetual, because necessary, and could not be annulled without a violation of the nature of God.

107. Is such a law, then, universally binding on all men? Ans. Yes; because it is necessary, and therefore must bind all.

108. Which of these classes of law is it that is written on the natural conscience? Ans. The natural-moral; because it can be discovered, in some measure, by the light of nature, while the positive-moral cannot. The knowledge of the latter depends entirely on a special and supernatural revelation.

§ XIV.—*Of the moral-positive.*—Quest. 109. Was there any moral-positive command given to man before the fall? Ans. Yes; the prohibition to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

110. Were there not many laws of this character given to the Old Testament church? Ans. Yes.

111. Are there any such laws given to the New Testament church? Ans. Yes.

112. What are some of them that are of binding force still, under the New Testament? Ans. Baptism and the Lord's Supper; the Sabbath; and, indeed, all the instituted ordinances in the church.

113. As these institutions will continue till the end of the world, on what ground are they obligatory and continuing? Ans. Purely on the ground of the divine will.

114. Were any laws given to the New Testament church which were so temporary that they have already passed away? Ans. Yes; such as prophesying; speaking with tongues; which belonged to the commencement of the New Testament dispensation as necessary to it.

115. Was the Synodical interdict of blood and of things strangled, (Acts xv. 20, 29,) intended as of continual obligation, till the end of the world? Ans. No.

116. How does this appear, since it was a decree of the apostles under the new dispensation? Ans. (1.) Because many Scriptures teach that the common use of any wholesome food is allowed us under the new dispensation, without ceremonial restrictions, Rom. xiv. 14; 1 Cor. x. 25, 26. (2.) Many Scriptures warn us that it is vain superstition to place religion in meats or food, Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. viii. 8. (3.) The reason given of old why blood should not be eaten, was ceremonial; i. e., that it was set apart as an atonement for the soul. (4.) The reason given for the prohibition by the Synod at Jerusalem was of a temporary character; i. e., that they might not give offence to the Jewish converts, who could not at that time see the freedom of the new dispensation from the ceremonial yoke, Acts xv. 24; xxi. 25. So Paul recommends to avoid things that are lawful, while it stumbled the Jews; Rom. xiv. 20, 21; 1 Cor. viii. 13.

117. But many argue that, according to that synodical decree at Jerusalem, it is still unlawful to eat blood, and plead that the decree itself calls these "necessary things?" Ans. These things were necessary at the time, to avoid offence, though not necessary afterwards, when that offence would cease. They were necessary for the comfort of the weak. The original word properly means "necessary

for the occasion," *επιναγκειο*, for the necessity, or necessary upon occasion.

118. But it is argued that the prohibition of blood, &c., is joined with the prohibition of fornication, and therefore it is of the same permanent obligation to avoid blood as to avoid fornication? Ans. We cannot infer that two or more things, mentioned together, are of the same character or nature. A natural law of permanent obligation, may be mentioned in a prohibition along with a ceremonial prohibition. Both may be necessary for distinct and separate reasons.

119. Obj. 3. In the prohibitory decree of the Synod of Jerusalem, the prohibition of blood, &c., is set forth as different from the yoke of the ceremonial law? Ans. These few things were light, compared with the whole burden of the ceremonial law. Besides, in Acts xxi. 25, James and the brethren seem to represent the matter in this light to Paul—that they would not bind the converts to the whole ceremonial law, but only to these lighter matters, for the time, that they might not give offence; as well as to avoid things offered in sacrifice to idols, and fornication. And as to things offered to idols, mentioned in the decree, Acts xv. 20, 29, Paul shows they were matters of indifference, except as the participation might be stumbling to the weak; 1 Cor. xiii. 4, 7, 10; and yet, in the decree of the Synod, they are called "these necessary things."

120. Is it a universal rule, that a law is natural-moral, and perpetual, if it have a natural-moral reason given for its observance? Ans. No; for, (1.) There is a natural-moral reason given by God, for the observance of every ceremonial law; viz., his authority. (2.) It is only when the obligation to the duty depends on the natural-moral reason, independent of the express positive command, that we can infer that the duty is natural-moral and perpetual.

§ XV.—121. How are the positive precepts of the Old Testament divided? Ans. Into *forensic* or *judicial*, and *ceremonial*.

122. What was the forensic, or judicial law? Ans. It was the civil law given by God to the Jews as a nation, respecting magistrates, marriages, servants, inheritances, and punishments.

123. What was the object and design of that law? Ans. (1.) The preservation of good order in civil society. (2.) Maintaining and guarding the observance of the ceremonial law, as well as the moral law. (3.) That the people might be kept separate and distinct from the heathen around.

124. Did it not coincide, in many things, with the moral and ceremonial laws? Ans. Yes; because it was given to sustain them; and therefore, the observance of those laws was embraced in the judicial law; as the punishment of adultery, blasphemy, false-witness, Sabbath-breaking, &c., was a recognition of the moral law. And again, in recognition of the ceremonial law, it embraced the laws respecting the inheritance of the first born, the cities of refuge, the sabbatical years, the jubilee, &c.

125. Was it in anything contrary to the moral law? Ans. No; although it permitted some violations of it; as in the case of divorces, polygamy, &c. Although it did not enjoin these violations, it did not punish them; Matt. xix. 8.

126. Is the judicial law of the Jews now abolished? Ans. Yes: so far as it was peculiar to the circumstances of the Jews, as under a Theocracy, and to their forms of religion; but, as far as it was moral, it is binding on people under the New Testament, and ought to be followed, in its moral character, by nations in their civil capacity.

127. How shall we know what is abolished, and what is not? Ans. (1.) What the New Testament sets aside expressly is abolished; as the rules of divorce, &c. (2.) What was peculiar to the Theocracy, and not applicable to our times, is abolished, by the fact of the abolition of the Theocracy, and is impliedly set aside by the New Testament; as the punishment of idolatry by death. (3.) What was figurative and typical, as the anointing of kings, is abolished by the abolition of types. (4.) What was necessary for the purpose of conducting and guarding the typical and ceremonial worship, and not necessary to the New Testament worship, is abolished; as the laws of naturalization; keeping the tribes to their own inheritance; kings deposing priests, &c.

§ XVI.—128. By the ceremonial law, are we to understand merely a law enjoining external rites, or ceremonies? Ans. No; for we still have such laws under the New Testament dispensation.

129. What, then, was its peculiarity? Ans. It was a law enjoining external ceremonies of a typical and figurative signification, setting forth spiritual and religious things.

130. Were these laws abolished because they were not good? Ans. No; for, (1.) They were given by God, and therefore were good and holy. (2.) They answered a good purpose, as a dispensation of the gospel through Christ. (3.) They were truly means of grace, while standing by God's appointment.

131. Is it to this law that reference is made in Ezek. xx. 25, "statutes that were not good," &c., as given by God to the people? Ans. No; he there refers to his judgments in giving the people up to their idolatrous practices. No law enjoined by God is called evil.

132. Why then is the ceremonial law called "commandments contained in ordinances," Eph. ii. 15, which Christ abolished; and "weak and beggarly elements," Gal. iv. 9; and "carnal commandments," Heb. vii. 16; and weak and unprofitable, vii. 18? Ans. It is so called, not because useless or injurious in its proper place, but, (1.) In respect to the outward rites of it, as having no power in themselves to sanctify or save. (2.) As taken (as it was by the unbelieving Jews,) unconnected with Christ. (3.) As compared with New Testament light. (4.) As compared and contrasted with the grace which those ceremonies signify. (5.) And on account of the temporal and physical burdens it imposed.

LECTURE XXXIII.—THE CEREMONIAL LAW.

§ XVII.—133. As to the precepts, or appointments, of the ceremonial law, were they not intended to exhibit, in type, or emblem, spiritual things? Ans. Yes; such as the person, work, and offices of Christ; spiritual worship, and spiritual duties; Heb. ix. &c.

134. How may the precepts, or institutions, of this law be divided? Ans. They have been variously divided; as, into things which had regard to matters of ordinary life, as garments, rules of cleanliness, about meats, &c.; and things which concern the worship of God, as sacrifices, &c. But they are more commonly divided into precepts respecting, (1.) Sacred persons; as priests, Levites, pastors, &c. (2.) Sacred things; as sacrifices, sacraments, sacred utensils, &c. (3.) Sacred actions; as the services of the priests, observances by the people, &c. (4.) Sacred places; as the tabernacle, temple, &c. (5.) Sacred times; as their various feasts, the Passover, the day of atonement, new moons, &c.

§ XVIII.—135. Was this ceremonial law all given at once, or successively? Ans. Successively.

136. When did the giving of this law begin? Ans. In the garden of Eden, when the gospel was first announced.

137. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) When God clothed Adam and Eve with skins, there can be very little doubt that they were the skins of animals killed in sacrifice. (2.) Abel offered acceptably of the firstlings of the flock, and of their fat; Gen. iv. 4. (3.) Noah offered of clean beasts on the altar, &c.; Gen. viii. 20.

138. Does it appear that even in that early age the distinction of clean and unclean beasts was given? Ans. Yes; as Noah observed this distinction: Gen. vii. 2; viii. 20.

139. Should we suppose that sacrifices, and distinctions of clean and unclean beasts, were devices of men, since we have no account of these things being given in commandment? Ans. No; because, (1.) It is not probable that nature's light would either have led to sacrifices, or to that distinction of beasts which was afterwards made. (2.) If these things had not been appointed of God, they would not have been acceptable; Isa. i. 12. (3.) The silence of the early and brief records of Scripture is no argument against the divine and explicit appointment.

140. When does it appear that there was any important addition made to the ceremonial law? Ans. Besides the prohibition received by Noah, and the addition of the prohibition of eating blood, (Gen. ix. 4,) made to Abraham, the covenant of circumcision was given, Gen. xvii. 10.

141. Why, (may we suppose,) was circumcision given to Abraham, when the church had been so long without it? Ans. In Abraham's time, God was about to give up to heathenism, all but Abraham's family, and circumcision was to be a badge of distinction.

142. When was the chief addition to this law? Ans. In the

time of Moses; both in Egypt, at the institution of the Passover, and at Mt. Sinai.

§ XIX.—143. Were sacrifices appointed or used in Adam's state of integrity? Ans. No; because, (1.) We have no information of such a thing in Scripture. (2.) Because they were instituted and used in reference to actual sin and guilt, and could not have been used before sin. (3.) Because sacrifices have reference to Christ's atonement and intercession; but there was no revelation of a Saviour before the fall, and no need of one. The supposition is a figment of the Papists, to justify their sacrifices.

144. Was the ceremonial law, with its rites and sacrifices, given as a yoke of bondage, in the way of a punishment of sin, as an expression of divine wrath, and especially as a punishment for making the golden calf, as some have supposed? Ans. No; because, (1.) The institution of sacrifices was given long before the making of the calf. (2.) The institution is expressly said to be given as a divine favour and blessing; Neh. ix. 13, 14. (3.) Sacrifices were instituted as means of acceptable worship, and as means of grace and communion with God. (4.) God called these sacrifices "offerings of sweet savour;" Lev. iii. 5. (5.) They were designed as atonements for ceremonial guilt, and emblems of the true atonement by Christ; Heb. ix. 13, 14. (6.) They were designed to lead to faith in Christ, and salvation by him; Gal. iii. 23, 24.

145. Obj.—That God gave the institution of sacrifices after the making of the golden calf, and as a punishment of sin, because (Jer. vii. 22,) he declares that he did not command these when they came out of Egypt? Ans. (1.) This is a gross perversion of that text; for we know that he had commanded sacrifices long before; that Moses said to Pharaoh that they were going into the wilderness to sacrifice to the Lord; Ex. x. 25, 26: and he had commanded the sacrifice of the Passover. (2.) But the passage means that he did not command sacrifices as their whole or their chief service, as that apostatizing people were taking them, but that the chief thing required was obedience.

146. Obj. 2.—That Jer. xxxi. 32, declares that he ruled over them with rigour, in giving them a law when they broke his covenant; referring to the sin of the golden calf? Ans. (1.) That text is variously translated. It may mean, I acted the part of a husband to them—I acted as a Lord to them—I cast them off. But, (2.) Whichever way it be translated, according to the text, God declares that he had made his covenant with them in kindness, even from the land of Egypt; and the covenant included the institution of sacrifices. (3.) The passage refers to all their breaches of covenant, through all the old dispensation. And, (4.) If the passage means that he chastised them, it refers to all his judgments executed, not by his giving the law, but other judgments for violating the law. (5.) But we think the text means that God had given them his law, including the ceremonial law, and that, both in giving and administering it, he had acted as their husband and

Lord, with both kindness and authority; but that they did not profit by it as they should, and he would make another covenant with them—the new dispensation.

147. Obj. 3.—The apostle says (Gal. iii. 19,) that “it, (the law,) was added because of transgression?” Ans. (1.) The apostle was there speaking of the whole law, as necessary, till Christ should come, to lead to him; the moral, to restrain sin and punish it, and the ceremonial, to remind them of sin and lead them to the atonement in Christ; Gal. iii. 23–26. But, (2.) He does not mean that the law itself was given as a punishment of transgressions, but as a restraint of them; and therefore, it was given in mercy.

148. Why then is this law spoken of as “a killing letter,” 2 Cor. iii. 6; and a faulty covenant, Heb. viii. 7, 8? Ans. (1.) Not only was the ceremonial law a killing letter, but the revelation of the New Testament may be so used, [as to become such,] if we rest on our doctrinal knowledge, or our moral or religious observances, as did the Jews of the apostle’s time. (2.) God’s covenant with the Jews was said to be “faulty,” not as containing any error, or anything injurious, nor yet as if it did not answer its purpose; but as it was not intended to answer or suit to New Testament times; as it was not so clear as it would be in New Testament times; and as it pointed out a Saviour to come, and not a Saviour as already come.

§ XX.—149. What then was the end and design of the ceremonial law? Ans. It had several designs all tending to the great ends—the glory of God and the salvation of sinners. It, therefore, had ends principal and subordinate.

150. Was it any part of the design of the old dispensation to try man’s ability, in working out his salvation himself? Ans. No; God never, since the fall of man, proposed a plan of salvation by works, except by holding forth the law as a covenant for man’s conviction.

151. Was it a design of the law to give man salvation on the ground of an atonement by carnal sacrifices and ceremonial observances? Ans. No; God neither proposed, nor could his justice and holiness admit, that any sinner could be saved by any other way than by the atonement of Christ.

152. Was it merely to display divine sovereignty, in appointing a system of observances, and requiring obedience? Ans. No; God had designs to effect, by this ceremonial dispensation, for the salvation of sinners, as well as to display his sovereignty.

153. What were the less principal, though real and important objects in that dispensation? Ans. (1.) A declaration of God’s authority and dominion, which he necessarily shows in all his appointments. (2.) The separation and distinction of Israel from other people, and that for important purposes; such as, to be the depository of the oracles of God. (3.) To withdraw the people from idolatry.

154. What were the principal objects intended by that dispensation? Ans. Principally for the instruction of the people in di-

vine things, and for directing them to Christ; as, (1.) That they might be taught the fact, the nature, and the demerit of sin, and the need of a real atonement. (2.) To show the people the way of salvation, of justification and peace with God, and access to him through Christ: to show them the will of God for their salvation. (3.) To lead them to faith in Christ, and to a renunciation of all other grounds of hope; Gal. iii. 23-26; Heb. viii. ix. (4.) To lead them to the acceptable worship of God, and into communion with him through Christ; and to be a gospel-instruction to the church in all ages. See Hebrews throughout.

155. Was, then, the very gospel, and way of salvation, which we now have, taught by that ceremonial law? Ans. Yes; Gal. iii. 8, 23-26; Heb. vi. 12. Only it was not then so clearly taught. Nor do we so fully understand the gospel system, by the New Testament, without the knowledge of the Old.

LECTURE XXXIV.—CEREMONIAL AND MORAL LAW.

§ XXI.—156. Although this ceremonial law was good, and contained the gospel, should it now be observed in practice; or is its practice abolished by divine authority? Ans. Its practice is abolished, and it is not now to be observed.

157. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the express declarations of the apostles; Acts xv. 10, 28; Gal. v. 2-4. (2.) From prophecy; Dan. ix. 27; Jer. iii. 16. (3.) From the very nature and design of that law; its ceremonies being types and shadows of Christ to come, and of spiritual worship, which of course should give way when the things signified by them have come. (4.) From the fact that the ceremonial system was not adapted to the church, as embracing all nations, as is intended under the new dispensation. They could not possibly all attend at one altar. (5.) And from the fact, that the temple and ark are destroyed, the tribes of Israel dispersed, and the Levitical tribe, and especially the family of Aaron, unknown.

158. Obj. 1. That God is immutable; which would require the continuance of the law given by himself? Ans. God designed that law only for a time, till Christ should come; Heb. ix. 9; and therefore the immutability of God required its abrogation in due time, according to his purpose.

159. Obj. 2. These ceremonial commands are said to be forever; Gen. xvii. 13; Jer. xxxiii. 18? Ans. It is a restricted eternity that is meant, as appears from the evidences given above, that the law was intended to be abrogated. So (1.) many things are said in a restricted sense, to be eternal, as "everlasting hills;" "servants forever," Lev. xxv. 46. (2.) Eternity, in such cases, means the whole of that period spoken of. (3.) Eternity, in reference to the ceremonial law, may be considered as absolute and unlimited, when the law is taken in a spiritual sense; as when David's reign is taken spiritually for Christ's, Aaron's priesthood for Christ's, circumcision for regeneration, &c.

160. Obj. 3. The abrogation of the ceremonial law is condemned;

Deut. xiii. 3; Matt. v. 17; Rom. iii. 31? Ans. These texts, and others of a similar meaning, do not speak of the abrogation of the ceremonial law at its proper time, but of the whole body of God's law, in its moral nature. As (1.) in Deut. xiii. 3, it is the violation of the law, while in force by divine authority, that is spoken of; and directly it speaks of the moral law. (2.) In Matt. v. 17, our Lord speaks of the whole law of God, and his whole truth; that it shall all be fulfilled. But his fulfilment of the ceremonial law was the abrogation of it, giving us the substance instead of the shadow; and fulfilling the whole shadow. (3.) In Rom. iii. 31, the apostle speaks of the whole law of God in force;—directly, of the moral law; indirectly, of the ceremonial; as maintaining all its truth. (4.) In all these texts, so far as they refer to the ceremonial law, the spiritual signification of it is acknowledged, and its obligation in that sense, is maintained.

161. Obj. 4. The apostles observed the ceremonial law, at least, in part, and commanded its observance; Acts xv. 20? Ans. They observed some parts of that law for a time, for the sake of the weak, who could not see, for the time, the freedom of the church from the bondage of ceremonial observances.

162. How was this conduct of the apostles consistent with truth and honesty, in reference to the truth and law of God? Ans. The practice and observance of the ceremonial law, has been justly divided into four periods. As (1.) Before Christ came, it was in full force, (or *flourishing*,) as then properly answering the end of its institution. (2.) While Christ was in the world, it began to *languish*, as the shadow was gradually giving way to the Sun of righteousness arising, but its observance was still required. (3.) For some time after Christ's death, resurrection and ascension, it was *dead*; no longer in force. Its purpose was fully answered, but its observance was not sinful to those who could not see its abolition, nor to those who would avoid giving offence to the weak. (4.) After some time, when the temple was destroyed, the Jews scattered, the temple-service made to cease, gospel light became clearer, and all had sufficient time and opportunity for obtaining the knowledge of the truth, the observance of the ceremonial law was *deadly* and sinful; because none then observed it, but as a justifying righteousness, and in the rejection both of Christ and of his righteousness; Gal. v. 1-4.

§ XXII.—*Of the Moral Law.*—Q. 163. Where is the moral law summarily set forth? Ans. In the ten commandments; Exod. xx. 2-17.

164. Why is it called *the Decalogue*? Ans. Because it is contained and set forth in *ten* commandments, or *ten words*; Ex. xxxiv. 28; Deut. iv. 13; x. 4.

165. Do all the commands in the Bible belong, in some respect, to this moral law or decalogue? Ans. Yes; they belong to it as they are commands of moral duties; or, as positive commands of God, the moral law binds to their observance, on account of the divine authority of them.

166. What are the peculiarities of this law, expressive of its peculiar nature? Ans. (1.) It is natural; as it flows from the very nature of God, as to the principle of it, and from man's relation to God, as a rational creature. (2.) It is absolutely perfect, extending to all our thoughts, words, and actions, and binds us to obedience to all positive commands of God. (3.) It is immutable, both by the will of God, and from his nature and perfections. (4.) It is, therefore, always binding.

§ XXIII.—167. Was this law given to man at his creation? Ans. Yes; Rom. ii. 15.

168. How was it then given to him? Ans. It was written on his heart.

169. What may we understand by the writing on the heart? Ans. (1.) A discernment of the moral law of God, as inferred from his nature, and man's own relation to God, as given to him in creation. (2.) A disposition conformed to the law, leading him to love, reverence, and obey it.

170. How does it appear that the law was thus written on Adam's heart in creation? Ans. (1.) Because he was made in the image of God, which, in its first existence, consisted chiefly in knowledge and holiness. (2.) Because the positive precept in the covenant of works would have answered no purpose, without this moral law written on the heart. He would not have understood its obligation; he could not have obeyed it, nor indeed have been properly accountable, without the moral law written on his heart. (3.) From the conscience which Adam showed when receiving Eve for his wife; Gen. ii. 23, 24. (4.) From the fear which Adam and Eve showed on their commission of the first sin. (5.) From the remains of that law on the heart of man still, though fallen; Rom. ii. 15. (6.) Because that moral law was the chief matter of the covenant of works; and the knowledge of it was necessary to obedience, justification and life.

171. What was the design and necessity of giving the law to man, in his state of innocence? Ans. (1.) As the rule of life to him, and to remind him of his subjection to God. (2.) As the law in obedience to which he should obtain justification and eternal life; Rom. viii. 3. The law is now weak through the flesh; but it was not so then.

§ XXIV.—172. How does it appear that there are still remains of the natural or moral law of God, written on the heart of fallen man? Ans. (1.) From Rom. i. 19, 20; ii. 14, 15. (2.) From a conscience of sin, natural to man, and the manifestation of this by his fear of divine judgments. (3.) From the heathen approving of natural-moral good, and in such things having an approving conscience. (4.) From the consent of heathen nations and philosophers. Heathen nations formed their wholesome laws from the moral law, or the law written in their hearts.

173. Some assert that all the conscience in man, of certain moral evils, arises from traditions, custom, and human laws, and not from

any law written on the heart. How disprove this? Ans. (1.) It is contrary to Rom. i. 19, 20; ii. 14, 15. (2.) Civil laws and customs of a moral and good character, must be founded on this law written on the heart. From that source they are drawn. (3.) The assertion we oppose is a denial of the natural impression of the law on the heart, and ascribing the existence of any impressions on the heart to tradition, custom, and human laws, without proof. (4.) When an impression is made by custom or human laws, which is not sustained by conscience, it will generally be neither strong nor permanent. Without this impression from the law of nature, customs will soon be abandoned and laws trampled on. (5.) It further proves that there is a natural law in the heart, and that all moral impressions are not made by custom, tradition, or human laws, that a new idea may be presented to a heathen man, to which custom, &c., had never drawn his attention, and even contrary to these; and this idea may take firm hold of his conscience, proving that there is a law in his heart which gives this new idea power, and a power entirely independent of the influence or authority of his instructor. Thus it is with the preaching of the gospel among the heathen. Though it is the Spirit of God that gives the word power, yet he operates on the person's natural powers.

174. What is the evil of denying these natural remains of the law in the heart? Ans. (1.) It contradicts Scripture. (2.) It is designed to acquit the heathen and the ignorant of guilt, where the Scriptures and conscience hold them guilty. (3.) It places moral obligation on a false ground—on civil laws and customs.

175. What do the Jews say of these natural remains on the heart? Ans. (1.) That men have these impressions by tradition from the sons of Noah, from whom the whole world sprung. (2.) They make these natural laws to be seven; (a.) the law against false worship; (b.) against blasphemy; (c.) against murder; (d.) against illicit connexion of the sexes; (e.) against theft; (f.) against civil injustice; (g.) against cruelty to animals.

176. Is not this a very defective enumeration? Ans. Yes: it omits the fifth and ninth commandments, of which men naturally have a conscience, and it includes a positive precept—of appointed worship.

177. Do the law of nature and the written law differ in their matter? Ans. No; they are the same, so far as the law of nature goes; but the written law is perfect, while that of nature is defective. The written law is more full and clear.

178. What is the use of these remains of the natural law in the heart of man? Ans. (1.) They direct to moral duties and restrain vice. (2.) They are useful to society, in preserving order, peace and comfort. (3.) They convince of sin, and render sinners inexcusable. (4.) They assist our apprehension of the written law, enforce it on the conscience, enable those who have knowledge, to have some influence for good on the ignorant and immoral, and in the hand of the Spirit, are means for the conversion of the elect.

179. Does it not appear, however, that among natural men there is a great difference, in their moral perception, and the liveliness and efficiency of their moral impressions? Ans. Yes.

180. How may this difference be accounted for? Ans. Although there be a difference among men in this matter, the very difference still proves the existence of the natural law. But the difference may arise from various things; as, (1.) Difference in knowledge may in some cases produce a marked difference of moral impression. Those whose knowledge is more extensive, and whose views are more enlarged, may have a livelier sense of moral obligation than the ignorant. (2.) And, on the other hand, God may, in judicial judgment, give up even those of much knowledge, to judicial blindness and hardness of heart, so that they will, for the time, feel and show but little impression.

LECTURE XXXV.—THE MORAL LAW.

§ XXV.—181. Where is found the supernatural revelation of this law? Ans. In the Holy Scriptures.

182. Was there any remarkable revelation of the moral law as a summary of the whole law? Ans. Yes; on Mount Sinai.

NOTE.—Several things may be considered in the giving of this law; as (1.) The legislator; (2.) The ministers employed; (3.) The mode of giving it; (4.) The circumstances; (5.) The end and design.

(1.) 183. Who gave the law on Mount Sinai? Ans. The Three-one God.

184. How were the Father and Holy Spirit engaged in giving the law on that occasion? Ans. They gave it by Christ Jesus, as the Prophet and King of the Church. God, in the person of the Father, (Exod. xxiii. 20, 21,) calls Christ his angel, and says that his name is in him.

185. Was it, then, Christ the Mediator, the Son of God, that immediately gave the law on Mount Sinai, with all the solemnity, the majesty, and the terror manifested on that occasion? Ans. Yes.

186. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Christ was then, indeed, the Mediator, the Prophet and the Lord and King of his church, and the medium of communication between God and man. (2.) In Heb. xii. 24–26, the apostle says, “Ye are come to Jesus whose voice then shook the earth,” &c., evidently referring to the giving of the law on Mount Sinai. (3.) In Acts vii. 35, Stephen refers to the appearance to Moses in the bush, and calls him who appeared there, “the angel.” Yet, that angel is called “Jehovah,” and calls himself “the God of Abraham,” &c.; Exod. iii. 4, 6. “Angel” signifies *messenger*. God, sent as a messenger, is no other than the Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, it was Christ who appeared in the bush. But (verse 38,) Stephen says it was this angel who spoke on Mount Sinai. (4.) He who ascended on high (Psa. lxxviii. 18,) is proved (Eph. iv. 8–11,) to be Christ. But he that ascended on high (Psa. lxxviii. 18,) is the same who (verse 7, 8,) went before the people in the wilderness, and before whom “the

earth shook, the heavens dropped, and Sinai was moved." Therefore, it was Christ who immediately gave the law on Mount Sinai.

187. Though Christ then acted as Mediator, was he then acting in his humbled state? Ans. No; but as the Lord and King of his church.

188. How does this agree with John i. 17,—“The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ?” Ans. That passage refers not to the Author of the law, but to Moses as an instrument of its revelation, and especially to the ceremonial law as containing the type of salvation, while the reality of it was [given] by Jesus Christ. Moreover, it would express the main doctrine of that passage to say—Christ gave, through Moses, the ceremonial law, as a shadow or type, but he himself, is the reality shadowed forth by it.

(2.)—189. Who were the *ministers* in giving the law? Ans. Holy angels and Moses.

190. How does it appear that holy angels, i. e. created angels, were employed in the giving of the law? Ans. (1.) Deut. xxxiii. 2, speaks of that solemn occasion, and the saints there mentioned must be the holy angels. (2.) Stephen teaches the same thing, Acts vii. 53; so Gal. iii. 19; Heb. ii. 2. But, (3.) The ministry of angels in giving the law may also refer to the whole revelation of the Old Testament, in which angels were often employed as messengers to prophets.

191. Although we do not know the whole service of the angels at the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, yet what were some of the designs of their employment on that occasion? Ans. (1.) Their attendance was for the display of the glory of God; Deut. xxxiii. 2; Matt. xxv. 31. (2.) Besides they may have been employed as instruments in the wonderful exhibitions of that day; as the fire, the smoke, the thunder, &c.

192. How did Moses act as a minister on that occasion? Ans. As a prophet, a special messenger, and a mediator; Gal. iii. 19.

193. In what sense was he a mediator? Ans. Not properly so, but as an intervening messenger between God and the people; Deut. v. 5, “I stood between the Lord and you,” &c.

(3.)—194. How, or in what *manner* was the law promulgated at that time? Ans. In a two-fold manner—by an audible voice—and written by the finger of God.

195. Was it the moral law only, or also the ceremonial law, that was spoken on the mount, and written on tables? Ans. It was only the moral law; Deut. v. 22; ix. 10.

196. Of how many commands did the moral law, as delivered from Mt. Sinai, consist? Ans. Of ten.

197. Do we know this only by distinguishing the sense or matter of one command from another; or do the Scriptures expressly state this number? Ans. The Scriptures expressly state it; Ex. xxxiv. 28; Deut. iv. 13; x. 4.

198. Do these ten commandments express all the particulars of

the moral law; or do they only express the summary, and imply the particulars? Ans. They only express the summary and imply the particulars.

199. Where are the particulars found? Ans. In the Holy Scriptures, at large.

200. On what were they written? Ans. On stone.

201. On how many tables? Ans. On two.

202. Was there any division of the law indicated by the two tables? Ans. Yes. The first and second tables—our duty to God, and our duty to man.

203. Do the Scriptures make any reference to this division? Ans. Our Lord denominates them two commandments, distinguishing them by their general tenor or matter; Matt. xxii. 37—40.

204. By whom were the tables made and written? Ans. By God himself; Ex. xxiv. 12; xxxi. 18.

205. How often did he write them? Ans. Twice.

206. Did God prepare the tables or stones the second time? Ans. No; Moses prepared them; Exod. xxxi. 1; Deut. x. 1.

207. What instruction may we draw from these facts? Ans. (1.) They were written on stone, to show the perpetuity of their obligation; (the ceremonial law was not so written;) and perhaps to intimate the hardness of the human heart, on which the law should be written. (2.) God himself wrote the law, to intimate his authority, and perhaps to intimate the fact that it could be written on the heart only by himself. (3.) It was written on both sides to intimate its perfection, and that nothing should be added. (4.) The providential occurrence of breaking the tables, and their being written a second time by God, should remind us that the law is broken by man; that God has again revealed it in mercy; and that his law is the same in its matter under the second revelation as under the first; Ex. xxxiv. 1.

(4.)—208. At what *time* was the law thus publicly given? Ans. Shortly after the people's coming out of Egypt; supposed to be the fiftieth day from the Passover, to which the appointment of the feast of Pentecost afterwards referred, and an emblem of the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, when the new dispensation properly commenced.

209. Is there any thing noticeable in the circumstances of the place where the law was delivered? Ans. Yes; as, (1.) It was on a mountain, as an emblem of the publication of the law to the whole world. (2.) It was in the wilderness; intimating that it is the rule of our life in this world, in our journey to the heavenly Canaan. (3.) And that, without the gospel, it is a burdensome service to the sinner, to which the apostle seems to refer, Gal. iv. 24—26.

(5.)—210. What was the design, end or purpose, of giving the law on Sinai? Ans. (1.) That the people might see their duty and obligations. (2.) That the nation might have a rule of external order in their commonwealth, and that immorality might be restrained. (3.) That individuals might be convinced of sin, and see

their need of Christ and his righteousness and salvation, as offered in the gospel. (4.) To be a rule of life to all the people, individually and collectively.

211. Was it given as a method of attaining justification and salvation by their obedience? Ans. No; since the fall of man, God never encouraged sinners to hope for acceptance and salvation by their works. God could not enter into a covenant of works with *fallen* man, although he holds him under a covenant of works formerly made.

§ XXVI.—212. Did God at Sinai enter into a covenant of any kind with the church or people of Israel? Ans. Yes; it is often called his covenant; Jer. xxxi. 32.

213. What kind of a covenant, then, was it that God made with Israel at Mt. Sinai? Was it the covenant of works, or the covenant of grace, as these covenants are generally defined in Scripture? Ans. Strictly speaking, it was neither; if, by the covenant of works, we understand the promise of life on condition of obedience, and by the covenant of grace, God's eternal covenant with Christ for the redemption of his elect. Many opinions have been held respecting this covenant at Sinai; and though the Scriptures present it under various aspects that may have some appearance of contradiction, they exhibit it as possessing a specific character. We, therefore, observe, that it was a covenant which God entered into with the church, of a gracious character, including the promises of the covenant of grace, the duties of the law, and recognising the covenant of works as still binding on sinners, and rendering a Saviour necessary to man. It might be called an *administrative* covenant;—founded on the covenant of grace and administering it: the promises being free, on the footing of the covenant of grace; the commands being the rule of life under the gospel promises; and the covenant of works being exhibited to show the need of the Saviour.

214. How does it appear that God's covenant at Sinai was a gracious covenant, containing the promises of the covenant of grace? Ans. (1.) Because God introduces his law (Exod. xx. 2,) with the new covenant declaration, "I am the Lord thy God;" under which he gives the law. (2.) The "law," as well as the prophets, spoke of Christ; which law includes, not only the moral, but the ceremonial law, and all which were embraced in the covenant at Sinai; Luke xxiv. 44. (3.) The law at Sinai was but carrying out God's covenant with Abraham, in which he gave the gospel to him and his seed; Gal. iii. 8. (4.) The apostle to the Hebrews shows that the ceremonial law, which was included in the covenant at Sinai, pointed out Christ particularly; Heb. ix. x. (5.) Believers under the covenant of Sinai, had salvation by Christ, and joy and peace in believing; which no one since the fall has had by the covenant of works, or by any other way but Christ and the covenant of grace.

215. As then, the moral law, or ten commandments, were given on Mount Sinai, were they the whole covenant in its matter and

form? Ans. No; they were but a part of that covenant;—the law of it, or the rule of life—while the promises, and the whole ceremonial system exhibited and offered Christ as the Saviour.

216. Had not the law, and especially the decalogue, an appearance of a legal covenant, or a covenant of works? Ans. Yes; and especially as threatenings for disobedience, and seemingly conditional promises were annexed to it. It therefore presented the covenant of works for conviction, and to show the people their need of the Saviour; but it did not invite or command the people to seek life by their own righteousness.

217. Had it, then, any more of the form or spirit of the covenant of works to Israel than it has to us? Ans. No.

218. What, then, does the apostle mean, when he says, (Rom. x. 5, quoting Lev. xviii. 5,) "Moses describeth the righteousness of the law," &c.? Ans. (1.) He does not mean the law as given to the Jews, any more than the law as given to us, but the law as a covenant in whatever age. (2.) Lev. xviii. 5, from which the apostle there quotes, means the whole law, including law and gospel, and that, if a man live as the gospel and the law require, he shall indeed live. But if any one seek justification by his obedience to any law of God, he takes it as a covenant of works. And, in the latter light, the apostle is speaking of obedience, in reproof of the Jewish legality.

219. But are not the law which was given to Israel at Mount Sinai, and the gospel, set in opposition to one another; Heb. xii. 18—24; Gal. iii. 17; iv. 21—28; as if that law were the covenant of works? Ans. In certain respects they are set in opposition; as, (1.) When that Sinai covenant was taken as a covenant of works, it was then taken as contrary, or in opposition to the gospel. This, however, was a perversion and an abuse of it, and this the apostle, in these texts, condemns. (2.) That Sinai covenant is contrasted with the new dispensation, as darker in its exhibitions, and thus involving the people in a comparative bondage. (3.) In Gal. iii. 17, the apostle does not mean that the law given at Sinai was in opposition to the Abrahamic promise, but, on the contrary, he argues that it did not annul the promise, as it would have done; if a legal covenant, as some Jews supposed; and therefore it was a gospel covenant, carrying out the Abrahamic.

220. Had not that covenant at Sinai a national character, applying to the nation as such, in reference to their national existence, prosperity, and temporal inheritance? Ans. Yes; it was a covenant of law and promise to the nation, as well as to the individuals of it.

221. Therefore, were not at least many of its promises of a temporal kind? Ans. Yes; as the promise of Canaan, of worldly prosperity, of victory over their enemies, and protection as a nation.

222. Were these promises, then, of a gospel character, and secured by the covenant of grace? Ans. Yes; the covenant of grace secures that all things shall work together for good to them that love God; that these things should be given in love, &c. As God's

people are interested in Christ, all things shall be ordered to them for good, their national and ecclesiastical concerns as well as others; and even the unbelievers in the nation shall, for the sake of the godly, enjoy national benefits.

223. But as people are interested in Christ as individuals, and not as nations, was not the Sinai covenant, at least so far as it was national, a covenant of works, their temporal and national prosperity being promised on the condition of obedience? Ans. No; as individuals, they were interested in Christ, and in the promises of grace, and as interested in Christ they had the promise of all things working for their good to them; their national affairs as well as other things. Our true prosperity in the favour of God, in things both temporal and spiritual, is, by God's covenant, connected with our obedience, but is not merited by it. Such prosperity is not properly the reward of obedience, but is given freely to the obedient. It may also be observed that the national temporal blessings of the Jews were not promised merely as earthly blessings, but as types of spiritual, new-covenant blessings.

§ XXVII.—224. Some hold that it was the covenant of grace that was made with Israel at Mt. Sinai, and that this covenant is found in the Decalogue itself. Is this correct? Ans. No; the Decalogue was itself only the law of the covenant, not the covenant itself.

225. What would be the error of holding that the Decalogue itself was the covenant of grace? Ans. It would be turning the covenant of grace into a covenant of works, suspending our salvation on our obedience.

226. But they suppose that the covenant of works was not exhibited at Mt. Sinai at all, unless as a renewal of it with man. Is this correct? Ans. No; it was exhibited as an existing covenant, and exhibited for conviction, &c.; but it was not renewed, or proposed for man's acceptance as a way of life.

227. As such errorists suppose that the Decalogue itself was the very covenant of grace, and thus turn the covenant of grace into a covenant of works, as though, by obedience to that law, we should obtain life; is there any weight in their argument, that it was delivered by Christ himself? Ans. No; for Christ delivered his law as well as his gospel.

228. Is there any weight in their argument, that God could not enter into a covenant of works with sinful man? Ans. No; though it is true he could not renew the covenant of works with sinful man, yet he could give the Decalogue to man, as a rule of life under the covenant of grace; which is the way in which the Decalogue was given at Mt. Sinai.

229. Is there any weight in their argument, that the preface to the Decalogue declares the gospel, and that the matter of the law itself is evangelical, and refers to the gospel? Ans. No; although, for example, the first commandment requires us to take God as our God, the second, third, and fourth, denominate God as our God, and although in the preface, God proposes himself to us as our God,

and thus proposes the covenant of grace to us, yet the Decalogue itself is only the law as a rule of life under the gospel, and not a covenant of acceptance on the condition of our obedience.

On the nature of that covenant with Israel at Sinai, in conclusion, we observe, (1.) It contained the whole gospel system, teaching and offering a free and full salvation through Christ, held forth by the ceremonial law, accompanied with instructions and promises. In no other way than the gospel of free salvation through Christ, could God save any sinner of mankind, in any age. (2.) With that gospel system the whole moral law and divine ordinances were incorporated, as the rule of life and means of grace, as the moral law and ordinances of grace are to us—the law in the hand of Christ, to be obeyed in faith. (3.) That covenant had special temporal promises made to obedience, but made then, as such promises are made to us, to encourage obedience, but not as a merited reward. (4.) Under that gospel covenant, the people entered into a covenant of duty; believers among them accepting God in Christ as their God, and engaging to obey in divine strength, and in expectation of acceptance in Christ. (5.) To all those who took that whole law as the rule by which they were to attain justification on account of their works, it was a covenant of works; but it was not given to encourage any such disposition or endeavours; just as a person may now, by legality, pervert the gospel to a covenant of works, contrary to God's proposals. (6.) When, in any case, the New Testament contrasts the gospel with that covenant of Sinai, it is not with that covenant in its true tenor and purport, but as perverted by legalists to a legal system.

LECTURE XXXVI.—THE MORAL LAW.—CONTINUED.

§ XXVIII.—230. Has the moral law an intrinsic goodness?
Ans. Yes.

231. From what does the moral law derive this goodness? Ans. Partly from the nature of God, and partly from its adaptation to the nature of man; or, in other words, partly from the nature of God, and partly from his will, in the creation of man, and in adapting his law to man's nature.

232. Does it not, then, ultimately derive all its goodness from God; either from his nature or his will? Ans. Yes.

233. May we say, with some, that the goodness of the whole law, in all its precepts, depends primarily and merely on the will of God? Ans. No; because some things God willed because they were necessarily good; and others he willed, and thus, by his will, gave them a moral goodness. In other words, some things were, from the nature of God, necessarily good, and other things good only because he willed them.

234. Does this doctrine deny or derogate from the independence of God? Ans. No; it makes God himself the necessary, independent source of all goodness. His will determining according to his own nature, is not a dependence on any thing without him; it is his absolute freedom and independence: he cannot deny himself.

Some laws arise from the very nature of God; and his will necessarily choosing these, is perfectly free and independent.

235. Could God have willed the contrary of all his precepts?

Ans. No; such as his command to us to love, to fear, to adore, and to worship him.

236. On the contrary, do all divine commands flow from the nature of God, so that he was under the necessity of willing and commanding precisely as he did? Ans. No; some of his commands depend entirely on his will; such as some relative duties between man and man, particular forms and times of worship, &c.

237. Has not God occasionally dispensed with some of his laws?

Ans. Yes; as with the sixth commandment, in directing the destruction of the Canaanites; with the eighth, in taking the property of the Egyptians, the Canaanites, &c.; with the fourth, in works of necessity and mercy.

238. Could God dispense with all his laws in the same manner?

Ans. No; it would be contrary to his nature and perfections, to dispense with necessary laws, which arise from his nature, such as our duty to love and fear God. Therefore we see a difference in the origin and nature of his laws.

239. Is it correct to say that the goodness and obligation of God's moral laws arise from the nature of things? Ans. No; as this supposes that the nature of things is independent of God, and had controlled his will. Unless, by the nature of things, we understand the nature of God himself, and the constitution which, by his sovereign will, he has given to things; under this view we may say that the goodness and obligation of the law depend on the nature of things, as this is the same thing as to say that the goodness of the law depends on the nature and will of God—of some precepts, on his nature, and of others, on his will.

§ XXIX.—240. Ought we not to be cautious in admitting that the Scriptures granted dispensations of the law? Ans. Yes; as some have falsely alleged dispensations where there were none; as it has been falsely alleged that Elisha allowed Naaman to worship idols, 2 Kings v. 18, 19; in which case Elisha did not give any judgment. Some have supposed that the second commandment was dispensed with in making the cherubim and the brazen serpent; whereas these were never made to be objects of worship, but instructive types and emblems.

241. Do actual dispensations with the law, found in Scripture, warrant us to violate the general law at our pleasure? Ans. No; we cannot lawfully do so without an express command, or a clear warrant by express exceptions appended to the general law, as on the fourth commandment, Luke xiii. 15; Matt. xii. 3-5.

§ XXX.—242. Is the moral law immutable? Ans. Yes; as to its spirit and principles and true meaning, Matt. v. 18, 19.

243. Why is it immutable? Ans. Because it is founded either on the nature of God or the nature of man, and on man's relation to God.

244. What sentiments do the Socinians hold on this point? **Ans.** They hold that some moral laws of Moses are now changed; that some things commanded in the law of Moses are now forbidden, as divorces on disaffection, polygamy, and even incest, (as brothers and sisters marrying in the first generations of men,) and self-defence, Matt. v. 39, 40.

245. How does it appear that, in these cases, the moral law is not changed? **Ans.** (1.) Divorces and polygamy were only suffered, not commanded, of old, Matt. xix. 8. (2.) The marriage of brother and sister, in Adam's family, was necessary, and the law against such marriage is of a secondary obligation, and depends solely on the will of God, who may dispense with it when he pleases. (3.) As to Christ's doctrine (Matt. v. 39, 40,) he only forbids private revenge, and contentions about smaller matters.

246. What doctrines do the Papists hold on this subject? **Ans.** (1.) That the Pope has power to dispense with divine laws when he judges it necessary; as with the obligation to truth, the obligation of oaths, &c. (2.) That probable opinion justifies error, and good intention renders any act moral, though otherwise immoral. Which doctrines are too manifestly opposite to the Scriptures and sound reason, to need refutation here; Jas. iv. 12; Isai. v. 20, 23.

§ XXXI.—247. Is spirituality a characteristic of God's law? **Ans.** Yes; Rom. vii. 14.

248. What is meant by the spirituality of the law? **Ans.** (1.) That it includes all things, internal as well as external, that can be included in the nature of the command. (2.) That it reaches to the heart, and forbids, sins of principle, of motive and affection, and requires duty in the same manner.

249. What is the extent of the divine law? **Ans.** It forbids everything, in heart and conduct, that is contrary to the divine will, and commands everything in principle, motive, affection, and action, that is agreeable to that will; Psa. cxix. 96.

250. What rules, flowing from the spirituality and extent of the law, should be observed in obtaining the meaning of the law, and in applying it? **Ans.** (1.) That whatever duty is commanded, the contrary sin is forbidden; and whatever sin is forbidden, the contrary duty is required. (2.) Under one sin or duty, all of the same kind are forbidden or commanded. (3.) The fountain or principle of sin is forbidden, as well as the external sin specified; for the command reaches to the understanding, will, affections, motives, and principles. (4.) That an occasion which in its nature leads to sin, is forbidden, as well as the sin specified; 1 Cor. xv. 33. (5.) Even the appearance of evil is forbidden, (1 Thess. v. 22) when that appearance is unnecessary, as it may lead others to sin, and even defile our own conscience. See Larger Catechism. Q. 99.

251. How does it appear that the law is so extensive and spiritual? **Ans.** (1.) From the commendation of it in Scripture, as broad and spiritual; Psa. cxix. 96; Rom. vii. 14. (2.) From

the sum of it given by our Lord, Matt. xxii. 37-39. (3.) From the various commands and prohibitions in Scripture, all comprehended in this law. (4.) From the spirituality and infinite holiness of God, commanding every duty and forbidding every sin, in heart and life.

252. May we not, then, be guilty, under an erring judgment and conscience, though sincere? Ans. Yes; as we may, in error, do what is forbidden, neglect what is required, and be governed by wrong views, principles, or motives.

§ XXXII.—253. Is the law of God absolutely perfect as a rule of morals or duty? Ans. Yes; it cannot admit of additions or diminutions; Deut. iv. 2. There is nothing wanting in its fulness; nothing useless, to be cast away.

254. How does this perfection appear? Ans. (1.) From express Scripture declarations; Psa. xix. 7; 2 Tim. iii. 16. (2.) From the prohibition of all additions. (3.) From the promise of life to the keeping of the law; Matt. xix. 16, 17; which implies that it comprehends all duty. (4.) From the summary of it given by our Lord; Matt. xxii. 37-39, which embraces all duties.

255. What, then, is the evil of either adding to the law or taking from it? Ans. (1.) We thereby charge God with defect of wisdom or goodness. (2.) We sinfully lean to our own understanding. (3.) If we add, obedience is not then a characteristic of our service. (4.) By adding, we represent God as pleased with uncommanded service; and by taking away, we charge him with folly, or unnecessary strictness, and thus testify falsely; Prov. xxx. 6.

256. Does the law of God fully reach all our changes, and all the variety of circumstances in which we can be placed? Ans. Yes; no circumstances can possibly occur, beyond the reach of the law; and, in its letter or spirit, it directs to that action which is right.

§ XXXIII.—But, in opposition to this perfection of the law, it is held, by Socinians and others, that Christ set aside some of the moral precepts of the Old Testament, and added some that are new. The new commands, they say, are three—to deny ourselves; take up our cross; and follow Christ.

257. Are these commands new, and not included in the Decalogue? Ans. No; they are old commands, implied and included in the law from the beginning.

258. How does it appear that, to deny ourselves, was an old command? Ans. Supreme love to God, required in the law, necessarily required self-denial of pride, vanity, and all spiritual idolatry and sinful gratification of ourselves.

259. How does it appear that it was an old command to believers to take up their cross? Ans. It was required, Lam. iii. 27, 28. It was practised, and thus enjoined, Psa. xxxix. 9.

260. How does it appear that the command to follow Christ is not new? Ans. God, as our God in Christ, required his people to follow him, or imitate him; Levit. xi. 44, 45; Num. xiv. 24. It was even Christ as Mediator that was meant in these passages.

261. But it is argued that Christ gave a new commandment of

brotherly love, John xiii. 34; and that this was an addition to the moral law? Ans. The very same command was given in the Decalogue, as the sum of the second table; Matt. xxii. 39. The apostle John, (ii. 7,) when writing on brotherly love, says he writes "no new commandment, but an old commandment." It may be called "new," as a renewal of the old, and as giving new light on the obligation of it.

262. Again, it is argued, that Christ has given an addition to the law by the new commandment of *faith*? Ans. Faith was commanded in the Decalogue; Ex. xx. 2, 3. God proclaims himself as our God; and, in the first commandment, requiring us to have no other God, he requires faith.

263. But it is objected, by Socinians, that, in the fifth chapter of Matthew, our Lord adds many precepts to the law, and abolishes some, and substitutes others? Ans. (1.) In some of these passages—as in verse 21, on the sixth precept, verses 27 and 31, on the seventh, verse 33, on the third, and in verse 38, on a judicial law of the Jews, (*lex talionis*,) involving the sixth precept—our Lord does not set aside these commands, but corrects the interpretation given by the Pharisees, who made the law refer only to outward actions. He shows its spirituality. (2.) In verse 43, our Lord condemns the doctrine of the Rabbis, and shows the true spirit of God's law.

264. How are we to understand our Lord's declaration, Matt. v. 17, "I am come—to fulfil," &c.? Does it mean that he came to fill up the law, or to make it perfect, by additions? Ans. No; but to do what is prescribed, and thus to sustain its honour.

265. Obj. The expression so often used by our Lord, "It hath been said by them of old time," does not apply to the Pharisees, as they were then too recent to be so referred to; and therefore our Lord refers to the law itself, as a thing to be done away? Ans. (1.) When our Lord uses these words, as in verses 21, 27, 33, he refers to the words or substance of the Decalogue, but does not condemn what was said; he rather sustains it, and adds a spiritual view which the Pharisees had overlooked; not condemning what they had advanced, but condemning them for limiting the meaning of the law to that outward application. (2.) The Pharisees were not so recent a party but that the earlier Rabbis among them were then called "fathers," or "ancients," as the word means. (3.) But observe our Lord's mode of expression. He does not say that the ancients said so, such as Moses, Ezra, or other inspired men, but, "Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time;" as though he said, ye have heard the scribes and Pharisees say that the ancients say so, or give such comments. Now, this was their common mode of teaching; not proving, by the analogy of faith, the doctrines which they taught, but by the authority of ancient names, and when men depend on this kind of proof, they are not apt to give a fair construction to those whom they quote. And that this was their mode of teaching, and that our Lord refers to it, is rendered probable by Matt. vii. 29, "He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes."

LECTURE XXXVII.—MORAL LAW—CONTINUED.

§ XXXIV.—Quest. 266. What is the doctrine of the Papists about the perfection of the law? Ans. They hold several doctrines that deny its perfection; as, (1.) The necessity of tradition to supply the defects of the Scriptures, which we considered before. (2.) That there are evangelical counsels calling for extra duties beyond the law.

267. What is their doctrine of “evangelical counsels?” Ans. (1.) They make evangelical counsels, by obedience to which they suppose they can merit more than by simply obeying the law. (2.) They hold that there are some evangelical counsels in Scripture, encouraging to duties which the law does not require; and that the observance of these is more meritorious than obedience to the law itself.

268. Can man counsel or advise to any duty which the law does not require? Ans. No; it is no duty; it is will-worship, and not obedience to God; Luke xvii. 10.

269. Can any useful practice be adopted, beyond what the law requires in our circumstances? Ans. No; because God’s laws embrace all duty, and therefore, all that will be useful to us or to others. There is no comparison between God’s laws, and the laws of a commonwealth, which are necessarily imperfect.

270. Obj. God *counsels* us to some things, implying that they are useful, beyond divine commands; Prov. i. 25; Rev. iii. 18? Ans. God counsels to nothing but what he commands; but he is pleased to condescend to the form of counsels, which only makes the command more obligatory, from his kindness and condescension. Who can suppose that when we are counselled to “buy gold tried in the fire,” &c., we are not commanded to do it.

271. Obj. Paul aimed above the command, to preach the gospel without pecuniary expense to the people; 1 Cor. ix. 12, 15, 16? Ans. Though, in ordinary circumstances, the law requires that the ministering labourer have his temporal recompense, yet, in Paul’s circumstances, it was his duty, by God’s law, to labour without expense to the people; and he acknowledges this, verse 16.

§ XXXV.—272. With respect to the three celebrated counsels of the Papists—a vow of perpetual celibacy—of implicit obedience—and of voluntary poverty—are any of them commanded of God? Ans. No; and, moreover, they are contrary to God’s commands.

273. But, for continence, or celibacy, they plead that eunuchism is commended, Isa. lvi. 4, 5, and Matt. xix. 12? Ans. (1.) In the first passage, it is a promise to those who are eunuchs, not because they are so, but for consolation to them under their privation. (2.) In the other passage, it is abstinence, rather than self-violence, that is meant. It is also admitted that all are not capable of this abstinence, and therefore it is not their duty. (3.) No vow of perpetual celibacy is, then, spoken of, or commended. On the contrary, marriage is honourable; Heb. xiii. 4.

274. Does the apostle, 1 Cor. vii. 1, 7, 8, 9, command celibacy, as in itself a duty? Ans. No; but only in those times of difficulty,

verse 26, and that only to such as are capable of it without sin; verse 9.

275. Does the description of the followers of Christ, Rev. xiv. 4, as virgins, commend celibacy as a superior state of holiness? Ans. No; they are called virgins in a spiritual sense, as not morally defiled with idolatry, or apostacy from Christ.

276. With respect to the Popish vow of implicit obedience to those over them in ecclesiastical authority, is it commended in Scripture? Ans. No; such obedience is inconsistent with obedience to Christ, with Christian liberty, with the duties of faith, and with our individual accountability.

277. How then understand Heb. xiii. 17? Ans. It is not a blind or implicit obedience, but an obedience in the Lord, and so far as these rulers follow Christ.

278. Does the conduct of the Rechabites (Jer. xxxv. 6,) warrant implicit obedience? Ans. No; their filial regard to their father's command is approved, while they judged it an easy, a reasonable, and a useful charge.

279. With respect to the Popish vow of voluntary poverty, is it commended in Scripture? Ans. No; it is ingratitude to God, rejecting comforts which God gives; it injures society, and disables us for works of charity, and for supporting the gospel, and, withal, encourages a legal spirit; and the experiments made have proved hypocrisy in those who have so vowed—vowing poverty, and yet living in luxury and affluence.

280. But it is argued, for such a vow, that Christ pronounces those happy who are poor in spirit; Matt. v. 3? Ans. Poor in spirit, is expressly different from temporal poverty. It signifies an humbling sense of unworthiness.

281. Obj. Christ enjoined on the young man, Matt. xix. 21, to sell all and follow him? Ans. He did not command others to sell all in order to follow him: therefore, this command was singular, made in Christ's sovereignty, and for trial and conviction. Moreover, he did not counsel him to vow perpetual poverty.

282. Obj. We have the example of believers, in the time of the apostles, selling their goods, and having all things in common; Acts iv. 32? Ans. That conduct was temporary, and for the occasion; it was at their choice, for a time; and it was rather the use of their goods, than the right to property, that was common.

§ XXXVI. *Of things indifferent.*—noticed before.

§ XXXVII.—283. We hold that no man is able to keep the law of God perfectly in this life. How does the truth of this doctrine appear? Ans. (1.) From many express Scripture declarations; as 1 Kings viii. 46; Prov. xx. 9; Jas. iii. 2; 1 John i. 8. (2.) From the actual and grievous falls of eminent saints; as Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, &c. (3.) From the existence of two opposite principles, of grace and sin, in all believers; Rom. vii. (4.) From the duty incumbent on all to press forward towards perfection, implying present imperfection.

284. Though a man, in his state of nature, be unable to obey

the law in any measure acceptably, yet why is the believer not able? Ans. (1.) Because he is, in this life, renewed only in a measure. (2.) It is the sovereign will of God that the believer shall, in this life, be sanctified only in a measure, and sin be removed by degrees. (3.) Because no man has any power to obey, but as [that power is] bestowed by divine grace.

285. Is man's inability moral or natural? Ans. It is both.

286. What is moral inability? Ans. Unwillingness to obey the law, or indisposition to obey it, from want of love to God and his law.

287. How does it appear that in all men there is naturally a want of moral ability to obey? Ans. (1.) From the whole tenor of Scripture on this subject; as it describes him as carnal, and at enmity with God, and therefore not able to obey; Rom. viii. 7; as destitute of the new heart and right spirit; and as having a heart deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; Jer. xvii. 9. (2.) Even as to believers, there is a law in their members warring against the law of the spirit; Rom. vii. 23; the flesh lusting against the spirit; Gal. v. 17. (3.) Because, if there were a complete moral ability, there would be a complete natural ability, and the work would be done. (4.) Because, as we have seen, Quest. 283, no man obeys perfectly, which proves the want of moral ability.

288. What is natural inability? Ans. Not the want of constituent powers of mind and body, which are necessary to obedience, for all men have this; but a natural impossibility of renewing the heart, and removing the moral inability.

289. How does it appear that there is in all men a natural inability to obey the law? Ans. (1.) From the fact that all men are sinners while in this world. (2.) From Scriptural declarations; Rom. viii. 7; 1 Cor. ii. 14; John vi. 44; xv. 5; Jer. xiii. 23.

290. Obj. (1.)—Christ's commands are easy; Matt. xi. 30? Ans. It means they are agreeable and pleasing to believers; not a galling yoke, like the service of sin.

291. Obj. (2.) Some believers (Job i. 1; Luke i. 6,) are described as perfect? Ans. It is a comparative perfection, including the reality of grace in the heart, and a comparatively good measure of godly practice. This meaning the analogy of faith requires; 1 John i. 8.

292. Obj. (3.) According to 1 Jno. iii. 9, believers do not and cannot sin? Ans. (1.) To take this literally and absolutely would directly contradict many unequivocal texts of Scripture, and, therefore, it must have a qualified meaning. Therefore, (2.) It means that they cannot fall under the reign of sin, or its total power.

293. Obj. (4.) Unless man were able to obey the law perfectly, it would be useless and inconsistent to give him a perfect law? Ans. The objection is false; because, (1.) The holiness and authority of God necessarily require that he give man a perfect law. (2.) A perfect law is necessary to convince him of sin, and to justify God in punishing according to his holiness and justice. (3.) A perfect

law is necessary to show him what he must confess, and his need of a Saviour. (4.) A perfect law is necessary as the rule of obedience at which man must aim.

294. Are not works of supererogation a wicked and foolish fiction? Ans. Yes; because, (1.) If a man could even perform all that is commanded, he is an unprofitable servant; he has done only what is due. (2.) All that can in any case, be his duty, is commanded, because the law of God is perfect; and, therefore, there is nothing more to be done, in the way of duty, but what is due by command. And, moreover, (3.) He cannot even do all his duty, much less works of supererogation.

§ XXXVIII.—295. Is the Decalogue, or moral law, of perpetual duration? Ans. Yes; because it is moral; founded on the nature of God, and on man's nature and relation to God, which is always the same, as respects man as a creature.

296. But is it always binding on man as his way of obtaining eternal life by obedience, and as denouncing damnation for disobedience? Ans. It is until he is delivered from it by union to Christ; or, in other words, till a satisfaction to both these demands of the law be made, and accounted, or reckoned, or imputed to the sinner.

297. If the believer be delivered from both these demands of the law, by the satisfaction of Christ imputed to him; does that imply any change in the nature or claims of the law itself? Ans. No; the law is still of perpetual duration, even in its covenant claims, although the sinner is freed from them through Christ.

298. Is it the design of the gospel that man should remain under the claims of the law as a covenant, for either the penalty, or for a justifying obedience? Ans. No; although that law is still the same in its nature and in its claims, these claims being satisfied by Christ for the sinner, the gospel invites us to avail ourselves of Christ's satisfaction to the law, and of freedom from the actual claims of the law as a covenant. And thus he that obeys the gospel invitation, sees the Lord's claims honoured, and himself freed from all obligation to a personal fulfilment of them.

299. In what sense, then, are the claims of the law on believers of perpetual duration? Ans. As a rule of life and holiness, it still claims our personal, perfect, and perpetual obedience.

300. But if it have no actual claims on believers, for a justifying righteousness, Christ having fulfilled these claims for them, why does the law still claim obedience? Or, of what use is the law to believers? Ans. (1.) It is of important and necessary use to show us our duty. Therefore, (2.) It is a necessary means of promoting our holiness, and God's glory thereby, under the influence of the gospel. (3.) It is necessary in order to convince us of sin, and of the perfection of Christ's satisfaction, and of our need of his righteousness.

301. But as Christ has perfectly fulfilled the claims of the law as a covenant for us, as the sole and complete ground of our justification, what necessity is there for a personal obedience to the law, as

our rule of holiness? Ans. Our personal holiness consists in obedience to the law. Personal holiness, or obedience, is absolutely necessary to our happiness and fitness for heavenly enjoyment and duties. Christ's righteousness is not our personal and inherent holiness, nor a substitute for it, although it is the meritorious and procuring cause of it, according to the covenant of grace. Christ did not redeem us to happiness without holiness. He did not substitute his righteousness for our sanctification, or render a righteousness that we might live in sin; but that he might sanctify us, and by his Spirit bring us to conformity to his law.

302. But why does the law, as a rule of life, require a *perfect* and *perpetual* obedience, when not even the believer is able to render it? Ans. (1.) Man's ability is neither the measure of the law's demand, nor the reason of it. The nature and will of God, and man's nature and relation to God, as a creature, are the reasons and the measure of the law's demands; and these cannot be changed by man's inability produced by sin. Therefore, (2.) The law cannot command anything less than perfection, nor anything short of continued and perpetual obedience. For, if the law command perfect obedience at one time, it must command it at all times.

303. But it is objected by the Arminians, that if the law requires personal, perfect, and perpetual obedience, and man be unable to obey it, he must be condemned and perish; whereas, if it be adapted to man's ability, by the gospel as an easier law, man may attain to sinless perfection, and be saved? Ans. (1.) The objection proceeds on the supposition that the gospel is only a method of helping men to save themselves by their own righteousness, and that to the dishonour of God and his law, by a compromise of justice and holiness with mercy; which is an utter rejection of the gospel and a dishonouring of God. (2.) It is true that man, even the believer, in this life, is still sinning; but, through Christ, his sin is pardoned. And it is also true that man cannot attain to sinless perfection in this life, by any supposed accommodation of the law to his strength. For it is obvious that sinless perfection must, in the nature of things, be a personal, perfect, and perpetual conformity to the law of God.

304. But it is objected by Antinomians, that the law, even the moral law, is abolished, under the new dispensation; and, for this doctrine, they plead Matt. xi. 13, "The prophets and the law prophesied until John," &c.? Ans. It is not the moral law, as a rule of life, that is meant, but the law of the old dispensation, as a covenant with Israel; a dispensation setting forth Christ to come, and continuing as the dispensation of the gospel, till John the Baptist.

305. Obj. (2.) Believers (Rom. vi. 14,) are not now "under the law?" Ans. Believers in Christ never were under the law, in any dispensation, in the sense here meant—that is, the law as a covenant of works. Believers were under grace, and freed from the law as a covenant, under the old dispensation as well as under the new.

306. Obj. 3. The "law is not made for a righteous man," &c., 1 Tim. i. 9; and, therefore, believers are not under it? Ans. It is the penalty of the law that is there meant.

307. Obj. 4. The law was given to Israel with peculiar reasons, showing that it was for them alone—as, that God brought them from the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, &c.? Ans. (1.) True, God gave the law to Israel; but he commanded it to a thousand generations; Psa. cv. 8. (2.) The church of Israel and the church of the Gentiles are not two churches, but one and the same; Rom. xi. 17. The Gentile church was grafted into the good olive, and “partaker with them,” &c. So all their law in its spirit and design, was the same with ours, and the moral part is [given] equally to them and to us. (3.) Peculiar reasons, in the letter of them, might be appended to the law [as given] to them, and yet the same law be obligatory on them and us, for other reasons, which apply equally to them and us. And even those reasons which, in the letter, were peculiar to them, do, in their spirit and fulness of meaning, apply equally to us. God brings the New Testament church out of the house of bondage spiritually; and, as the whole church of the Old and New Testament is one, so he brought us as a church, out of the land of Egypt, and out of the house of bondage.

§ XXXIX.—308. As we have noticed, some parts of this law are purely moral, or natural-moral, and some parts are positive-moral, and so in part, ceremonial. What parts are ceremonial? Ans. Whatever part authorizes or commands positive forms, or specified times; as in the Decalogue, the seventh part of the time is appointed as the Sabbath.

309. Are these equally obligatory? Ans. Yes; as all flowing from the same authority. Yet, by the very nature and design of the positive or ceremonial part, the ceremonial must yield to the natural-moral, when the practice of both cannot be observed at the same time; as Matt. xii. 3, 4, &c.

310. How are these commands of the moral law further divided? Ans. Into affirmative and negative. The fourth and fifth precepts are affirmative, the rest are negative.

311. Although affirmative and negative commands are equally obligatory, is there not some difference in the extent of their obligation? Ans. Yes.

312. What is that difference? Ans. (1.) Although the affirmative commands are always binding, they do not bind to perform the duty at every moment. But, (2.) negative commands forbid the sin at every moment. As logicians say, the predicate of a negative proposition is always taken as universal; so what God forbids, is at no time to be done, and what he commands, is always our duty; yet every particular duty is not to be done at all times.

313. How is the Decalogue divided as to parts? Ans. Into two tables—first and second.

314. What is the sum of these two tables? Ans. Love to God is the sum of the first, and love to our neighbour, the sum of the second; Matt. xxii. 37–40.

315. What does Paul mean, Rom. xiii. 8–10, when he says in

reference to the second table, "Love is the fulfilling of the law?"

Ans. (1.) Love to our neighbour is the fulfilling of the second table.

(2.) On the same principle, love to God is the fulfilling of the first table. (3.) That love is not a substitute for the duties of either table, but is the operating principle of obedience to both.

316. Has either of these tables the precedence of the other in importance? Ans. Yes; Matt. xxii. 38, "This is the first and great commandment."

317. Why has it the precedence? Ans. Not in authority; but, (1.) in importance; as the direct object of love in the first is God, in the second, our neighbour. (2.) Love to God will secure love to our neighbour.

318. But does every precept of the first require its observance in preference to the second table? Ans. No; the principle of the second has precedence of the positive, or ceremonial part of the first. Thus, from love to our neighbour, or to ourselves, when necessity or mercy requires it, we may, and we must neglect, for the time, the observance of the Sabbath; Matt. xiii. 3, 4, 7, 8.

319. But, on the other hand, must not love to our neighbour, and manifestation of regard to him, yield to love to God? Ans. Yes; as love to relatives, Matt. x. 37; obedience to human superiors, Acts iv. 19, 20.

§ XL.—320. How do the Papists allot the commands to the several tables? Ans. Three in the first table, and seven in the second.

321. How do they effect this? Ans. By uniting the first and second into one, and dividing the tenth. Thus, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house," is the ninth, and the remainder is the tenth.

322. Wherein is this an unwarranted division? Ans. The first and second precepts are indeed, distinct; and the prohibition of covetousness is the tenth; and the specifications do not make different commands, but they are particulars under the same command; and, in Deut. v. 21, "wife" is put before "house," showing that the commandment is one.

323. Wherein are the first and second commandments different? Ans. The first respects the object of worship, and the second, the manner.

324. Why should we determine that there are four commandments in the first table, and six in the second? Ans. From the matter of them, as referred to by our Lord, Matt. xxii. 37-40. The first four do most directly refer to God, and the last six to man.

PART III.

CHAPTER XII.—OF THE DECALOGUE.

LECTURE I.—PREFACE AND FIRST PRECEPT.

§ I.—Quest. 1. What does the *Decalogue* mean? Ans. *Ten words*, Exod. xxxiv. 28; Deut. iv. 13; x. 4.

2. Is this Decalogue the full expression of the moral law, or only the summary of it? Ans. The summary, and not the full expression.

3. But does it not include the whole law, as given in detail throughout the Scriptures? Ans. Yes.

4. What is the preface to the Decalogue? Ans. "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."

5. Is this preface connected with the first precept only, or with the whole? Ans. With the whole.

6. What is the design of this preface? Ans. (1.) It virtually includes a promise, warranting our faith, and to encourage obedience. (2.) To show us in what manner and spirit we should obey. (3.) To give reasons why we should obey the law; or to show our obligations.

7. What is the first reason given for our obedience? Ans. It is the essential character of God the Lawgiver, expressed by the name *Jehovah*.

8. What is the force of this reason? Ans. (1.) That God is the Source and Author of our being and happiness. (2.) That he is infinitely worthy of obedience, on account of his perfections. (3.) That he is necessarily our sovereign Lord.

9. What is the second reason in the preface? Ans. It is taken from God's relation to us as our God;—"thy God."

10. What does this relation include? Ans. (1.) His common relation to men as their Creator and Preserver, and as the Author of all providences to them; in which, of course, the church is included? (2.) His relation to the visible church, separating them from the world. (3.) His saving covenant relation to believers.

11. How does it appear that this part of the preface includes a saving covenant relation to believers? Ans. (1.) In these terms God expressed his covenant with Abraham, Gen. xvii. 7, 8. (2.) It is the ordinary expression in Scripture for a saving covenant relation, Jer. xxxi. 33; Ps. l. 7; Isa. xli. 10.

12. Does this expression of the preface include a promise, gift, or grant of God himself. and all that he is and has, to be our God? Ans. Yes.

13. What is the force of this declaration and grant, as a reason of obedience? Ans. That we should not only obey God because he is our Lord and Sovereign, but also because of his grace and kindness, and our privileges.

14. What is the third reason? Ans. That he is our Redeemer.

15. What redemption is mentioned? Ans. "Have brought them out of the land of Egypt," &c.

16. How does this apply to us? Ans. (1.) God's church, in all ages, is one; and so we, as a church, were brought out of the land of Egypt, &c. (2.) Israel, as a people, were typical of the elect in all ages, and their deliverance from Egypt was typical of our deliverance from guilt, sin, and Satan. (3.) The perpetual obligation of the law on all who have it is accompanied with the perpetual obligation of redemption. (4.) If redemption from Egyptian bondage was in fulfilment of God's covenant promise to Israel, so our redemption from guilt, wrath, sin, and Satan, is in fulfilment of his covenant promise.

17. What does this preface teach us respecting the spirit and manner of our obedience? Ans. (1.) Not to obey God's law as a covenant of works. (2.) That we should obey in faith's appropriation of God as our God in Christ, by free gift; and, therefore, that we should first believe, and then obey. (3.) That we should depend on Christ for strength to obey. (4.) That we should depend on Christ for acceptance in obedience. (5.) That we should obey in godly fear, and in love, and because he commands.

18. Is not the law of the ten commandments given to us in connexion with the gospel, and under the gospel promise? Ans. Yes; and therefore forbids a legal obedience.

19. Can we, then, obey this law aright, without faith in God as our God in Christ? Ans. No.

§ II.—*The first commandment.*—20. What is the special subject of the first commandment? Ans. The object of worship—God himself.

21. In what form is this command given;—negative or positive? Ans. Negative.

22. What, then, is the extent of the prohibition? Ans. It is universal: so negatives signify.

23. What does this command expressly forbid? Ans. Any "other God."

24. Does this imply that there are really other gods besides the true God? Ans. No; but that other things are treated and taken as gods.

25. What do the words "before me" signify? Ans. (1.) That God is omniscient, and that even secret heart-idolatry is open in his sight. (2.) That God holds us accountable for our idolatry, and will punish it.

26. In what does heart-idolatry chiefly consist? Ans. In transferring, to other things than God, our fear, trust, and love.

27. How does it appear that such a transfer of these affections

and exercises is idolatry? Ans. (1.) Because God claims these affections, &c., as due to himself, Ecc. xii. 13; Prov. iii. 5; Prov. xxiii. 26. (2.) Because he expressly forbids the transfer, 2 Kings xvii. 7; Jer. xvii. 5; Col. iii. 5. (3.) Because such a transfer necessarily produces neglect of the faithful services of God, and leads to outward acts of idolatry.

28. But is every degree or kind of fear, trust, and love towards creatures, idolatry? Ans. No; when such affections towards creatures are subordinate to the exercise of them towards God, they are lawful and right; but when they substitute the creature for God, they are idolatry.

29. Is, then, our trust in departed saints, or in angels, as mediators, a breach of this command? Ans. Yes.

30. Is the use of divinations, or the regarding of fanciful omens, a breach of this command? Ans. Yes; Jer. x. 2.

31. Is any mode of worship, not appointed by God, a breach of it? Ans. Yes.

32. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) The service is not obedience to God. (2.) It is submission to other authority. (3.) It is leaning on other wisdom.

33. Does the prohibition of this precept require us to take the true God as our God? Ans. Yes; otherwise the prohibition would not have been given.

34. What is included in having or taking the true God as our God? Ans. (1.) To know him truly; otherwise we can neither love him nor trust in him. (2.) To trust in him as our only hope. (3.) To acknowledge him as our God, by profession and practice. (4.) To love, fear, and obey him.

35. Does this commandment require us to worship God, and to worship in faith and love? Ans. Yes; because this is due to him as our God, and no worship is acceptable without faith and love.

36. Does it require us to take Christ as our Saviour, and our way to the Father? Ans. Yes.

37. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the preface, in which God offers himself to be our God; and in the first commandment we are required to take him as offered. (2.) Because it is only in Christ that he can now be our God; and this commandment requires us to take God as our God, in whatever way he is pleased to reveal himself to us.

§ III.—38. Does this commandment require our faith in the Trinity? Ans. Yes; because God so reveals himself to us; and all the duties of faith, love, worship, and profession, are to be performed in faith of this truth.

§ IV.—39. Does not this commandment require all the faith and worship which is prescribed in the new dispensation? Ans. Yes.

40. The Socinians maintain that, in the new dispensation, some things are added, as duties, which were not contained in this precept; as, (1.) The worship of Christ the Son. How answer? Ans. (1.) It was expressly commanded of old, Ps. ii. 12; and therefore

was included in this precept. (2.) Believers of old did worship him, Gen. xlviii. 16.

41. Obj. (2.) The manner of worship, i. e., through Christ the Mediator, is added in the New Testament? Ans. This manner of worship was commanded of old; Hab. ii. 4; it was prescribed by the ceremonial law; and it was exercised by believers; Ps. lxxx. 17, 18; lxxxiv. 9; Dan. ix. 17.

42. Obj. (3.) The duty of prayer is a new command? Ans. The objection is palpably false; for prayer is expressly commanded, Ps. l. 15; and it was exercised by all believers.

43. Obj. (4.) The Lord's prayer is an addition? Ans. It contains no new duty, no new matter, nor even a new manner; but simply a plain assistance in an old duty.

44. If believers of old prayed in the name of Christ, how understand John xvi. 24, "Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name?" Ans. Not that the church of old had neglected this manner of prayer, but that the disciples had not understood Christ's office of Mediator and Intercessor, and had asked himself for what they needed, rather than the Father in his name.

LECTURE II.—THE SECOND PRECEPT.

§ V.—45. What is the special subject or matter of the second precept? Ans. The mode or manner of worship.

46. Is this command negative, or positive? Ans. Negative.

47. What is expressly forbidden in this command? Ans. The making images or likenesses of any thing, as objects or means of worship.

48. Does this command forbid only images or likenesses as objects or means of worship? Ans. It also forbids all modes of worship not appointed of God.

49. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From other Scriptures forbidding all unappointed modes, and being on the same subject with this command, those prohibitions are included in it; as Deut. xii. 32; Isa. i. 12; Matt. xv. 9; Col. ii. 20—23. (2.) Human devices of worship are, in some sense, images or likenesses of God's appointments. (3.) Because human appointments are will-worship, and not obedience to God as our Lord. (4.) Because an innovation by human appointments opens the way for further apostacy, and is usually followed by it.

50. Are all images or pictures, for any use whatever, forbidden? Ans. No; only as objects or means of worship:—"Thou shalt not bow down thyself," &c. Historic representations, geographical, geological, and botanical delineations, &c., are innocent and useful, and likenesses of friends, for remembrance, &c., have no connexion with the prohibition of this command.

51. Is it lawful, on any occasion, or for any purpose, to make a pretended likeness or image of God? Ans. No; because, (1.) An image of him is impossible, and the attempt perfectly unreasonable. (2.) A pretended image of him is a denying of his spirituality. (3.)

Such an attempt is forbidden, for reasons which must always be in full force, Deut. iv. 12, 15.

52. Is it lawful to make an image of Christ, as man? **Ans. No;** (1.) Because no such image of him was preserved. (2.) It could not now be attained. (3.) It would tend to draw the heart from faith to imagination. (4.) It is forbidden, 2 Cor. v. 16.

53. Does God, by forbidding these modes of worship, which are not appointed by him, require the observance of his own appointments? **Ans. Yes;** as appears from other express requisitions of Scripture. And the prohibition implies this.

54. Does this command require us to keep God's ordinances both *pure*, without additions, and *entire*, without diminutions? **Ans. Yes;** Deut. xii. 32.

55. Does God, by forbidding innovations in his worship and ordinances, merely forbid our active transgression of this command, or does he also require our activity in keeping his worship and ordinances pure by all appointed means? **Ans. He requires activity, in keeping them pure and entire.**

56. How does this appear? **Ans. (1.)** The prohibition of a sin implies the contrary duty. (2.) From positive requisitions in Scripture on this subject, which must therefore be included in this command, Isa. xliii. 12.

57. Is it necessary, then, in keeping this command, that we keep up a testimony for it, and against the breach of it? **Ans. Yes;** Rev. xii. 11.

58. How is this testimony to be given? **Ans. (1.)** By a profession of the truth, Matt. x. 32. (2.) By church discipline, Rev. ii. 2, 14, 15, 20. (3.) By refusing communion in these innovations, 1 Cor. x. 20, 21.

59. Can the church keep this command fully, unless she so testifies for it, and against its breach? **Ans. No;** Rev. ii. 14, 15, 20.

60. Is it, then, a part of practical religion to keep such a testimony? **Ans. Yes.**

61. What is the reason that the church is required to be a witness in these things? **Ans. (1.)** Because of the blindness of man in spiritual things. (2.) Because of his depraved affections, tending to apostacy. (3.) Because of the injury to souls, and to the cause of God, by innovations. (4.) Because his church, having obtained divine instruction, is capable of giving testimony, and is appointed of God for this purpose, Ps. lxxviii. 1-8.

62. Does the church give her testimony faithfully and keep this command duly, even when she observes God's ordinances herself, and testifies by profession against innovations, if she relax discipline; allow some errors in her communion, under pretence of accommodating the weak; or allow occasional communion with the erroneous, under pretext of charity? **Ans. No;** Rev. ii. 2, 14, 15, 20.

63. By what reasons does God enforce this command? **Ans. By three reasons;** (1.) His sovereignty—"the Lord." (2.) His relation to us—"thy God." (3.) His zeal for his worship and authority—"a jealous God."

64. Is, then, any and every departure from the prescribed mode of worship a heinous and dangerous sin? Ans. Yes.

65. How does God, in this command, manifest his zeal for his worship? Ans. By threatenings and promises.

66. What is the threatening? Ans. "Visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children," &c.

67. Does this mean that God will inflict positive punishment on children, merely and only for the sin of the parents? Ans. No; but "of those that hate him."

68. If, then, the positive infliction of punishment be for the person's own sin, why is it said that he will visit the iniquities of the fathers on the children? Ans. (1.) God has been pleased to give promises of salvation and gospel privileges to children through their parents, Gen. xvii. 7; Acts ii. 38, 39. (2.) If parents be unfaithful in God's cause, either to make innovations in God's truth or ordinances, or to allow them to be made without witnessing against them, he threatens to withhold these blessings and promises from their children, for that sin of the parents. And this is an ordinary course of divine dispensation. (3.) Children thus left without the knowledge of divine truth and ordinances, remain in unbelief and sin, as the result of the parents' apostacy, and perish for their own sin.

69. Is not the threatening, then, in this command, perfectly consistent with divine justice, and with Ezek. xviii. 4, 20, declaring that, "the soul that sinneth, it shall die," and that "the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father," &c.? Ans. Yes; (1.) It is perfectly consistent with justice, as God is under no obligation to give knowledge and salvation to sinners; and if parents will neglect the means through which God has graciously promised salvation to their children, it is no violation of his promise to withhold that salvation. (2.) It is perfectly consistent with Ezek. xviii. 4, 20; because the child perishes for its own sin, according to the threatening of this command; and, if it forsake its father's apostacy it shall be saved, Ezek. xviii. 14—17.

70. What is meant by the limitation of the threatening to "the third and fourth generation?" Ans. (1.) Not that a certain number of generations will be uniformly the measure of the punishment, but generally several generations. (2.) That God will, in many cases, in the course of three or four generations of apostates, turn and enlighten and reform them, by his Spirit, and the pure means of grace. (3.) The purport of the threatening is to indicate the *heinousness* of the sin of unfaithfulness in the cause of God; to warn against its awful danger, not only to apostates, but to their posterity; and to lay hold of the natural love of parents for their children, as a means of inducing them to be faithful.

71. By what promise does God, in this command, manifest his zeal for his worship? Ans. "Showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me," &c.

72. Is this promise made as a merited reward of faithfulness?

Ans. No; but as a gracious reward, as an encouragement, and as a manifestation of God's zeal for the purity of his worship.

73. Do this promise and threatening apply to the other commands as well as to this? Ans. Yes; but they are appended to this expressly, as attached to it by way of eminence.

74. What may we suppose is implied in especially appending this promise and threatening to this commandment? Ans. Several things; as (1.) That the sin here forbidden is peculiarly heinous, and the duty required peculiarly important. (2.) That there is a peculiar propensity in man to violate this commandment. (3.) That the purity of the church and practical religion, in keeping the other commandments, will stand or fall with the keeping or violation of this precept; and by its violation especially the faithfulness of the church is endangered, and by the faithful keeping of it she is especially preserved. (4.) That the great promises of salvation and gospel-privileges to children, through their parents, have a peculiar connexion with this commandment.

75. Was it not especially by the violation of this commandment, that the church of Israel generally fell into apostacies and into declines of knowledge and godliness? Ans. Yes.

76. And have not apostacies, in the New Testament church, most frequently taken their rise in, and been promoted by, the violation of this command? Ans. Yes.

77. Is this command as obligatory and important under the New Testament dispensation as under the Old? Ans. Yes.

78. Has not practical religion prevailed most, in all ages, when the church was most faithful to this commandment? Ans. Yes.

79. Is not the Popish system of images and innovations of worship a most glaring violation of this commandment? Ans. Yes.

80. Have not Papists shown a consciousness of this glaring violation, by making this commandment a mere appendix to the first, and representing it as positive and adapted only to the Jews? Ans. Yes; for by this means they suppress it as far as possible.

81. Do not Lutherans, by the use of images in their churches, for instruction, and as an honour to departed saints; and Episcopalians, by superstitious ceremonies and holy days, violate this command? Ans. Yes.

§ VI.—82. Were images used in the primitive Christian church? Ans. No; they were introduced gradually, at first, for honour to departed saints, for impressing the minds of worshippers, and at length as means and objects of worship.

83. Were not the brazen serpent and the cherubim, images appointed of God? And how does this appointment agree with the second commandment? Ans. They were not appointed as objects of worship, nor even as means of it, but as instructive emblems.

84. Was any such thing as an image of Christ's crucifixion alluded to by the apostle, Gal. iii. 1, "Before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth," &c.? Ans. No; the apostle means the clear preaching of the gospel.

The remaining objections in favour of images, in this section, are unworthy of notice.

§ VII.—85. Does this commandment forbid carnal and corporeal conceptions of God, and images of him in our minds, as well as visible images? Ans. Yes.

86. Does it forbid communion with idols, or idolatrous worship? Ans. Yes; because this is one mode of making idols, 1 Cor. x. 14, 20.

87. As this command forbids all innovations in God's worship, whether in doctrine or ordinances, does it not also forbid communion with others in these innovations? Ans. Yes; because we are then partakers in those innovations.

88. Does it forbid all will worship? Ans. Yes; Col. ii. 20, 23.

89. Since unappointed means of worship are forbidden, does it not require the observance of those that are appointed? Ans. Yes.

90. Since images are forbidden, what is the character and nature of that worship which is required? Ans. It must be spiritual, and with the heart; John iv. 24.

§ VIII.—91. Is there any truth in the allegation of Socinians that there is an addition to this command, by the apostle's injunction (1 Cor. x. 14,) to avoid idols, idols' temples, and idol-offerings? Ans. No; these things were forbidden in the Old Testament; Deut. xii. 2, 3; Psa. cvi. 28.

92. On what account are these things again forbidden in the New Testament? Ans. Substantially on the same account as in the Old Testament, to prevent idolatry. But there was a peculiar reason for renewing the prohibition. Under the new dispensation, the worship of God has less of outward ceremonies, and some things were now free to the people's use, which were forbidden as ceremonial offences. Therefore, to avoid sin by an abuse of liberty, the apostle not only forbids eating in the idol's temple, as an act of worship, (or with conscience of the idol,) but also as dangerous to the person eating, by insnaring him, or as causing the weak to stumble.

LECTURE III. THE THIRD PRECEPT.

§ IX.—93. As the first commandment refers to the object of worship; the second, to the manner, mode, or means of worship; to what has the third commandment a special respect? Ans. To the spirit in which we worship God, or think or speak of him; or to the regard due to him.

94. Is this command negative or positive? Ans. Negative.

95. What are we here to understand by "the name of God?" Ans. God's name literally; Deut. xxviii. 58; and also everything by which he has made himself known; as names, titles, attributes, word and ordinances, worship, and providences.

96. What is meant by "taking God's name in vain?" Ans. Treating it *falsely*, as the word sometimes means; that is, using it falsely, or not according to the reverence due to it.

97. Would not a truly reverential regard for the name of God tend to holiness, to obedience, and to perseverance in faith and duty? Ans. Yes.

98. What is the threatening used to enforce obedience to this

commandment? Ans. "The Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain."

99. What does this threatening imply? Ans. (1.) That a violation of this commandment is a sin peculiarly heinous. (2.) That though men count it light, and let it pass unpunished, God will not. (3.) That not holding the transgressor innocent, he will positively punish.

100. Why is this sin accounted peculiarly heinous? Ans. (1.) It is committed directly against Infinite Majesty. (2.) The disposition that would violate this commandment, can obey no other, and is ready to run into all evil: while the heart that will keep this commandment is prepared to obey all others.

§ X.—101. What are some of the ways in which this commandment is violated? Ans. (1.) By profane oaths, blasphemy, &c. (2.) By using God's word in jests, or speaking with levity of his word, ordinances, or providences. (3.) By falsehood and perjury. (4.) By formality in worship. (5.) By games of chance; as cards, dice, &c.

102. How is the name of God profaned by formality in worship? Ans. By pretending to worship the heart-searching God, without the engagement of the heart, and with that sincerity which he requires.

103. How is it profaned by using his word in jests? Ans. By irreverence, and by using the word of God for a low and unworthy purpose.

104. How is it profaned by games of chance? Ans. Because these games, so far as they are games of chance, are lotteries, in which an appeal is made to God, without reverence, faith, or prayer, and for our amusement, and to decide a trifling matter by his immediate providence.

105. How is God's name profaned by falsehood? Ans. In a simple untruth, purposely told, that is, a lie, we profane God's name, as we make the declaration in his presence, without reverence for his omniscience and holiness.

106. What is perjury? Ans. A false oath; or an appeal made to God to gain credit to a falsehood.

107. Whether such an oath be formal or informal, in levity, or in a solemn and lawful form, is it not moral perjury? Ans. Yes.

108. How is such an oath a taking of God's name in vain? Ans. By levity and irreverence, appealing to God, as the infallible discerners and avengers of falsehood, for the truth of what we say, as though he were not omniscient, or not holy and just.

109. If the thing we assert on oath as a truth be false, although at the time we believed it to be true, do we profane God's name? Ans. Yes; unless we gave it as only our belief.

110. How does it appear that such a false oath is a profanation of God's name, when we honestly believed the truth of what we said? Ans. Because, in such a case, we did not swear in judgment and truth, as an oath requires, Jer. iv. 2: we rashly appealed to God.

111. May not a person be guilty of profaning the name of God by falsehood, both in declaratory and promissory oaths? Ans. Yes.

112. If, on oath, we promise anything without knowing what the thing is, whether possible or lawful, do we profane the name of God? Ans. Yes; even if the thing be both possible and lawful, because we irreverently appeal to God that we will do what we do not know or understand: the oath is not made in judgment, as required, Jer. iv. 2.

113. If, on oath, we promise to perform something which we find to be sinful, are we bound to perform it? Ans. No; Lev. v. 4, 5.

114. Why is he not bound by his oath? Ans. (1.) Because the law cannot bind him to violate itself. (2.) His oath cannot change the law of God, or render it of no obligation; Matt. xv. 5, 6. (3.) The performance of his oath would be but adding to the sin.

115. As, then, the law of God would require us to break such an oath, is there no profanation of the name of God in the whole transaction? Ans. Yes; the sin consists in making the oath; Lev. v. 4, 5.

116. If the person to whom we make a promissory oath, and for whose sake alone it was made, release us voluntarily, do we profane the name of God by the non-performance? Ans. No.

117. Why not, when we have sworn by the name of God that we will do it? Ans. Because the oath was, in reality, conditional on the man's requisition to whom we promised, whether that condition was expressed or not; and God holds us under moral obligation according to the condition.

118. In any conditional oath, are we not released, and free from profanation of God's name, if the condition be not fulfilled? Ans. Yes.

119. But does our after discovery that the performance of the oath will be to our temporal loss, release us? Ans. No; Psal. xv. 4.

120. Does all fraud, used by another, in order to engage us in a promissory oath, release us? Ans. No, Josh. ix. 15—21.

121. But if the promissory oath be made on the express condition that there be no fraud, would not fraud discovered release us? Ans. Yes; an oath binds only according to its conditions or terms.

122. Can heresy, or immorality, in the person to whom we swear, release us from the obligation of the oath? Ans. No; unless the oath was made expressly on these conditions.

123. Do mental reservations in making the oath release us? Ans. No.

124. Why not? Ans. (1.) An oath is for the purpose of ending strife, and therefore must be designedly expressed according to the clear understanding of both parties. (2.) Such a mental reservation in an oath is a wicked attempt to mock God, to whom we virtually appeal that we are using no deception, while we are purposely deceiving the other party in the oath.

125. Is a person guilty of profaning the name of God, when he fails, in some measure, of performing his promissory oath, through inability or oversight; if the prospect of fulfilling it was reasonable, and he has used all diligence and endeavour honestly to fulfil it?

Ans. No; believers daily come short in this way, respecting their vows to God.

126. If we be sworn to tell the whole truth in a case, is it perjury to keep back something wilfully, which we know to be material to the case? Ans. Yes.

127. Are we released from the crime of perjury, when we make full answers to all questions asked in a court, if the questions have not brought out the whole of that which we know is pertinent to the case? Ans. No; at least we are bound to offer a statement of what we know.

§ XI.—128. Does not the prohibition of the profanation of God's name require, on the other hand, the use of it in a reverent and holy manner? Ans. Yes.

129. Should not God's name be used only in what is true, serious, lawful, and important? Ans. Yes; nothing less is suitable to the dignity and majesty of God, and it is only in matters of such character that the word of God presents his name to us.

130. In what cases may the name of God be used without taking it in vain? Ans. Particularly, (1.) In making a profession of religion. (2.) In the worship of God, secret, private, and public. (3.) In serious conversation about God, his word, or his works. (4.) In a lawful oath; Deut. vi. 13.

131. Should an oath be by anything but the true God? Ans. No; Jer. v. 7; Matt. v. 34, 35.

132. Why should an oath be only by the true God? Ans. (1.) An oath is an appeal to the omniscience and Lordship of the true Jehovah. (2.) It recognises his justice, holiness, and truth, our accountability to him, and himself as the righteous Avenger of falsehood. (3.) It is, therefore, an act of solemn worship, to be offered to none but Jehovah.

133. Did Paul, as the Papists allege, swear by his soul, 2 Cor. i. 23, "I call God for a record on my soul?" Ans. Not at all; but by God, to whose vengeance his soul was subject.

134. Does the example of Joseph, swearing by the life of Pharaoh, warrant us to swear by creatures? Ans. No; we believe that Joseph erred in this case, and that his conduct is not recorded for our imitation.

135. Does our Lord justify the swearing by creatures, in Matt. xxiii. 16—22? Ans. No; our Lord's object was to reprove, (1.) The ignorance of the Pharisees respecting the comparative value of the altar and the gift—the temple and the gold which ornamented it. (2.) Their ignorance of the nature of an oath, which is properly an appeal to God, as the witness and avenger; verses 20—22. (3.) To teach, that though the oath was sinful, if taken by creatures, it was nevertheless binding; as it was an appeal to God, although made in a wrong manner; verses 21, 22.

LECTURE IV.—THE THIRD PRECEPT—CONTINUED.

136. Is it lawful to swear *to* God, as well as to swear *by* him? Ans. Yes; Psa. cxix. 106; cxxxii. 2.

137. What is such an oath to God commonly called? Ans. A *vow*; Psa. cxxxii. 2.

138. Is it lawful to swear to God, in secret, personal covenanting? Ans. Yes; Gen. xxviii. 20; Psa. lvi. 12.

139. Is social public covenanting or vowing, lawful? Ans. Yes.

140. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the consideration that what an individual church member ought to do, in practical personal religion, the church collectively ought to do. (2.) From the approved practice of the church; Josh. xxiv. 25; Asa's covenanting, 2 Chron. xv. 15; Josiah's, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 31; Nehemiah's, Neh. ix. 38. (3.) From Scripture predictions in [relation to] times of reformation; Isa. xix. 11; Jer. l. 5. (4.) From the character and design of the church—to be socially devoted to the Lord, as the individual members should be; and to be a public witness for God. (5.) And from the fact that all divine ordinances imply covenanting; and some of them, as the sacraments, directly include it.

141. Is public covenanting, according to Scripture, a distinct ordinance? Ans. Yes; under the Old Testament it was observed distinctly from circumcision and the passover.

142. Is vowing, or covenanting, a stated or an occasional ordinance? Ans. It is occasional; or to be observed when occasions call for it.

143. Who are to judge when these occasions occur? Ans. The church; as in judging of the time of fasting. And, so Joshua, Asa, &c., and the officers of the church determined to renew their covenant.

144. But has God given, in his word, any rules of judging of those occasions? Ans. Yes; by examples, predictions, &c.

145. What are some of those occasions which, according to Scripture examples and predictions, call for public social covenanting? Ans. (1.) When the church is depressed and in distress; Neh. ix. 33–38. (2.) When under a general decline of godliness, or under general apostacy; so Asa, Josiah, &c. (3.) When under temptation to apostacy; Deut. iv. 9, 10; xxix. 10–18.

146. To what should the church engage in public covenanting? Ans. To all the duty prescribed by God in his law; including faith in Christ, and particularly present duty.

147. Is it not, then, a most reasonable duty? Ans. Yes; it is socially professing and engaging to God, to love, to trust in, and to obey him.

148. Is there anything in public covenanting, rightly conducted, to which a believer, in the exercise of grace, can justly object? Ans. No; it is only doing publicly and socially, what every believer substantially does in believing, and in observing the Lord's Supper.

149. Is there anything in it ceremonial, figurative, or peculiar to any one dispensation of the gospel, that should render it unfit for another? Ans. No; it was not prescribed by the judicial law of the Jews; for it is religious worship, not a civil transaction. It was not ceremonial, as it was not typical, and has no antitype. It was moral and religious—avouching God to be their God.

150. Is the objection true, that the only examples of public social covenanting were under the Old Testament dispensation? Ans. No; in 2 Cor. viii. 5, the churches of Macedonia are represented as engaging in it. To "give themselves to the Lord, *not as the apostle hoped,*" intimates something more than faith, religious profession, and observance of the sacraments; for all this was expected and required of every church member.

151. And if this objection were true, would it have any validity as an argument against covenanting under the New Testament? Ans. No; Because, (1.) The Old Testament is still the rule of our faith and practice, as well as the New; 2 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. vi. 12. And, (2.) This ordinance did not, by its nature and form, belong to any law that was to be abrogated.

152. Obj. (2.) The command to vow to the Lord may be understood of personal covenanting? Ans. We acknowledge it may indeed, and ought to be so understood, but not exclusively. The approved practice of the church proves, that the command to vow included public social covenanting.

153. Obj. (3.) The substance of covenanting is included in the personal exercise of faith, and in the observance of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and, therefore, public social covenanting is unnecessary? Ans. (1.) Covenanting was as much included in Circumcision and the Passover, under the old dispensation, as in Baptism and the Lord's Supper now; yet those ordinances did not supplant it, nor render it unnecessary then. (2.) The same objection would make the observance of Baptism and the Supper unnecessary now, because the substance of the exercises of these ordinances is included in faith. (3.) When God appoints the same thing to be done in different forms, these forms are useful, and as obligatory as if no other exercise included or implied the same thing.

154. Obj. (4.) The Old Testament predictions that the Church would swear to the Lord in New Testament times, may be understood as figurative, and not literal vowing, swearing or covenanting? Ans. (1.) It is dangerous and unwarranted to explain away a literal duty, as if a figure, when there is nothing in the matter of it, nor in the text or context requiring such an explanation. (2.) To do so is wanton perversion of the Scriptures, when the duty prescribed or predicted is of a moral nature, and when the practice of it is a matter of simple history.

155. Obj. (5.) Covenanting requires knowledge, agreement in the church on doctrine and practice, and practical religion, more than are prevailing generally at present; and, therefore, is unsuitable to our times? Ans. (1.) Covenanting requires no more knowledge, harmony, and practical religion, than the law of God and our interest require. (2.) Covenanting is calculated to promote these desirable and important objects. (3.) To neglect covenanting, is to indulge in the want of these objects, and to encourage church members in ignorance and discord.

156. Would public social covenanting be justifiable, if God had not appointed it, however reasonable it may be? Ans. No; it would be will-worship, and no obedience; and, consequently would not be of use or benefit to the church.

157. On the other hand, if men can see no utility in covenanting, because the same engagements are made in the ordinance of the Supper, are they innocent in neglecting it, if it be an ordinance of divine appointment? Ans. No.

158. In what way did God declare or manifest his appointment of this ordinance? Ans. (1.) Abraham and all his house were informally brought under covenant with God, by accepting God's covenant; Gen. xvii. 5-23. (2.) At Mount Sinai God proposed his covenant to the whole people, and they accepting it, were brought under a covenant with God; Deut. v. 23-29. (3.) Its renewal by divine authority; Deut. xxix. 1, 10-29. (4.) The many examples of covenanting afterwards. (5.) The predictions of its occurring in New Testament times.

159. Is public covenanting useful? Ans. Yes; it has been found useful in the experience of the church; and all God's ordinances will prove so when faithfully observed.

160. Wherein does its utility appear? Ans. (1.) In promoting our own knowledge, faith, reverence, and obedience. (2.) In promoting religion in others. (3.) In giving to church members mutual assurance of love to the truth, and of co-operation in maintaining it. (4.) In testing our sincerity in other ordinances. For it is an open, explicit, and formal engagement, in a very solemn manner, to the same things to which we should engage in faith, in making a profession of religion, in Baptism, and in the Lord's Supper.

161. If we are not willing to engage publicly, and with a solemn oath, to the same things to which we profess to engage in the sacrament of the Supper, is there not danger that we observe the latter ordinance hypocritically? Ans. Yes.

162. Can the heart that intelligently, cordially, and honestly engages in the observance of the sacraments, really refuse to covenant publicly, because covenanting binds so formally, explicitly, and solemnly to the same things? Ans. No.

163. Is it not a dangerous position of a church, or of a church member, to join with the ungodly world in opposition to an ordinance and practice which characterized the church in reforming times? Ans. Yes.

LECTURE V. THIRD PRECEPT—CONTINUED.

164. Does not the obligation of a vow or promissory oath, bind perpetually to a perpetual moral duty, whether it be taken by an individual, or by a church collectively? Ans. Yes.

165. How does it bind the church perpetually, when the persons of which it is composed are changed by successive generations? Ans. The church is one continued moral person.

166. How does it appear that the church is bound by a covenant with God from generation to generation? Ans. (1.) The universal consent of nations holds a society, continuing from generation to generation, as the same moral person. (2.) God holds his church to be one and the same body from the beginning to the end, by laws and promises, given at one time to the church, still remaining obligatory on successive generations, and warranting their faith, and so Paul represents the Old and New Testament church as one; Rom. xi. 16, 17. God has bound children in their parents by his law, by his covenant promises, and by baptism. (3.) Moses expressly asserts this obligation of a covenant descending from generation to generation; Deut. v. 3; xxix. 15, 22-25; declaring that in future generations judgments would alight on them for breaking the covenant which the Lord made with their fathers. (4.) Express Scripture examples of judgments for breaking the covenant of their fathers; Josh. ix. 15, compared with 2 Sam. xxi. 1, 2. (5.) Express charges against children for breach of covenants entered into by their fathers; Jer. xi. 10; ii. 20.

167. Is there an obligation by covenant, distinct from and additional to the moral law, without an oath? Ans. Yes.

168. How does this appear, when the obligation of the divine law cannot be increased, and when nothing is made obligatory but by the law? Ans. By an oath we are placed under the law in a new form, as oath-bound—under an obligation by the law under which we were not till we took the oath. Thus the law itself lays an obligation on us in every relation and condition in which we are placed.

169. Is not, then, the breach of the law of God, in violation of an oath, a more heinous sin than the breach of the law without an oath? Ans. Yes. (See questions 182-186.)

170. What is the meaning and design of a *lot*? Ans. It is a direct appeal to God, to decide, by his providence, a matter in question, while we lay aside all other means of decision; Prov. xvi. 33.

171. May a *lot* be lawfully used under this commandment? Ans. Yes.

172. In what cases is it lawful? Ans. In weighty matters which cannot be determined otherwise, or which cannot be determined so as to settle controversies; as divisory lots, such as the division of the land of Canaan among the tribes of Israel.

173. In what manner should the *lot* be used? Ans. In a manner suitable to an appeal to God; with reverence and solemnity, with prayer, and only in important cases; Acts i. 24.

174. Is a *lot*, then, when rightly used, an act of religious worship? Ans. Yes; Acts i. 24.

175. May we suppose, with some, that small matters, and matters of amusement, are decided by chance, under the use of a *lot*, and without any divine disposal, since it is in the power of all men, even when used for the most frivolous and the vilest purposes? Ans.

No; this would be denying God to be the Governor of all things, under whose government there is no such thing as chance. As God governs all things in his ordinary providence, so the worst of men may avail themselves of his government to effect the vilest ends.

176. Are not cards, dice, and what is vulgarly called "cuts," a profanation of this ordinance? Ans. Yes; as they are used without prayer or solemnity, and for trifling or vicious purposes.

177. Are consultatory or divinatory lots (such as Joshua used to detect Achan, Josh. vii. 16–18,) lawful? Ans. No; such a lot was lawful only under a special warrant, and therefore only in an age of supernatural revelations; and consequently they are unwarranted in the present dispensation.

§ XII.—178. Were rash and profane oaths forbidden in the Old Testament; or is this prohibition added in the New Testament, as the Socinians pretend? Ans. They were forbidden of old, as well as now; as the third commandment implies, and as is shown by various texts in the Old Testament, as Eccles. ix. 2; Jer. iv. 2.

179. Are promissory oaths forbidden in the New Testament, as the Socinians assert? Ans. No; vowing to God is still a duty, and promissory oaths are still necessary as a means of safety to society. So in worship; Isa. xix. 18; xlv. 23; lxxv. 16.

180. Is an oath by Christ, as the Socinians pretend, (holding that Christ is not God,) permitted under the New Testament, as a concession of this command, and as an exception to its prohibition of worship to any but God? Ans. No; the notion is a figment of the Socinians, on account of their denial of the Deity of Christ. Christ being the omniscient God, and the judge of all, was always, under the Old Testament, the object of divine worship, and the church swore by his name and to him; Isa. xlv. 23; compared with Phil. ii. 10, 11.

181. But Quakers and others allege that all oaths are forbidden under the New Testament; and produce, in support of this, Matt. v. 34–37, and James v. 12. How answer? Ans. An oath on suitable occasions, is still lawful, as appears from the following considerations. (1.) The design and necessity of an oath, as still recognised in the New Testament, shows it to be lawful; Heb. vi. 16. (2.) The moral nature of an oath shows that as it was once lawful, it must be always so. (3.) Scripture prophecies of New Testament times, predicting the swearing to the Lord, show that an oath is lawful; as Isa. xlv. 23. (4.) The example of the angel, Rev. x. 5, 6, shows it to be lawful. (5.) The example of Paul, Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. i. 23, shows it. (6.) Therefore, those passages quoted in opposition are perverted. These passages do not forbid solemn oaths as acts of worship, and on proper occasions, but they reprove profane oaths, oaths by creatures, oaths about trifling matters without necessity, and oaths in common conversation. In these passages the name of God is not mentioned; and, as all lawful oaths are in the name of God, so if it had been intended to forbid an oath in his

name, in these passages, his name must have been mentioned in the prohibition.

182. May this command be violated by an improper mode of swearing? Ans. Yes; being an act of worship, it should be performed according to divine prescription.

183. What is the divinely appointed method? Ans. By the uplifted hand.

184. How does it appear that this method is of divine appointment? Ans. (1.) From the example of Abraham; Gen. xiv. 22. (2.) From God's own example; Psa. cvi. 26; Ezek. xx. 15. (3.) From the example of the angel, Rev. x. 5, 6.

185. Obj. The examples of Abraham, Gen. xxiv. 2, and of Jacob, Gen. xlvii. 29, using another form, by requiring the swearer to put his hand under the thigh, prove that there is no appointed form, and that any usage may be adopted that is common among the people? Ans. It does not appear that to put the hand under the thigh was a form or mode of an oath at all, but a custom of the country between superiors and inferiors, in which position the person acknowledged subjection, and professed obedience, and accordingly took the oath, of the form of which those passages say nothing.

186. Wherein is the evil of the form of kissing the book? Ans. (1.) It is an imitation of the heathen who kissed their idols; Hos. xiii. 2; Job xxxi. 22. (2.) It is either idolatrously worshipping the book, or worshipping God by the book, which is an unauthorized mode of worship. (3.) There is no hint of such a thing in Scripture.

LECTURE VI.—THE FOURTH PRECEPT.

§ XIII.—187. As the first precept respects the *object* of worship, the second, the *manner*, and the third, the *spirit*, to what does the fourth refer? Ans. To the *time*.

188. When did this command originate? Ans. When Creation was finished.

189. What does the word *Sabbath* signify? Ans. *Rest*, or *resting-day*.

190. Is our duty on that day merely negative, as the name would seem to signify? Ans. No; it means not only rest from worldly works and cares, but an engagement in divine services, in which the heart should rest in God, in the exercise of faith and love.

191. Does this precept require also the rest of beasts, as well as of men? Ans. Yes; the rest of beasts that labour for men.

192. When we say that the fourth precept refers to the time of divine worship, should we understand that the time is exclusive of all other time for the worship of God? Ans. No; the Scriptures plainly require worship at other times, in prayer, praise, and other ordinances. And God has not only required our worship at other times, but has also left us at liberty to engage in his appointed worship when opportunity favours.

193. What, then, is the peculiar design of the Sabbath as a

time of worship? Ans. (1.) It is a stated time; not merely requiring the observance of worship on account of favourable occasions, but on account of the time appointed. (2.) It is a whole day—a measured time, in which all secular employments (except works of necessity and mercy,) are to be laid aside, and the undivided attention, for the day, to be given to divine service. (3.) Its design is to cultivate the spirit of true religion, and to prevent carnality, and conformity of spirit to the world, of which we are in danger by uninterrupted worldly thoughts and employments.

194. Is it a correct representation of the appointment of the Sabbath to say that God gave us six days, and reserved one for himself; or that the six days are for man, and the Sabbath for the Lord? Ans. No; because the Sabbath was appointed for man's benefit; Mark ii. 27; Exod. xvi. 29. The direct object of the six days is for man's temporal benefit, and of the seventh, for his spiritual interests.

§§ XIV. XV.—195.—Is the Sabbath a moral institution? Ans. Yes.

196. Does it follow that it is of perpetual obligation? Ans. Yes.

197. How does it appear that it is moral? Ans. (1.) From its occupying a place in the Decalogue, or moral law,—one of the ten words pronounced by God himself, on Mount Sinai; Deut. v. 22, “and he added no more;” although to Moses, in the mount, he added many judicial precepts. (2.) Because this commandment, with the rest, was written on the tables of stone, and with the finger of God; Ex. xxxi. 18. (3.) It was given to man before the fall; as then the Sabbath was instituted; Gen. ii. 2, 3, when there was no need of types or ceremonial laws. (4.) From the original reason of the Sabbath, which must be perpetual—God rested from creation-work, and blessed the Sabbath. (5.) From the necessity and utility of the Sabbath, as a day of rest from worldly avocations, and of special employment in the service of God. (6.) Because the Sabbath is not abrogated in the New Testament, and its observance is exemplified by the observance of the Lord's day.

198. But although the Sabbath is a moral and perpetual institution, is it not, in some respects, ceremonial? Ans. Yes; as it includes a specified time, and a formal cessation of worldly employments; but it is not ceremonial as a thing to be abolished, and as a mere type, unmeaning and useless in itself, and deriving all its meaning and utility from its antitype.

199. But was not the Sabbath, even as given at first, a type of heaven? Ans. Yes; as appears from the apostle's making this use of it in Heb. iv. 1—11, in which he shows that that promise of a remaining rest, or Sabbath, virtually included in the denial of it to unbelievers, signified heaven.

200. Wherein, then, does the Sabbath, as a type of heaven, differ from the types of the Levitical law? Ans. (1.) The Levitical types had no morality or value of themselves. Their value and morality depended entirely on the appointment of God, and the spiritual thing signified; but the Sabbath had a morality in itself,

not only by the appointment of God, but from its design, and the nature of its exercises. (2.) The Levitical types, being mere shadows of spiritual things, were therefore to be laid aside when Christ came, and set up the new dispensation: but the Sabbath has a real morality in itself, and only terminates in a perfect Sabbath of the same nature; just as communion with God, in this world, terminates in perfect communion, but communion of the same nature.

201. But while the exercises of the Sabbath, and even the appropriation of some set time to the service of God, are moral, is the precise measure of the time which is set apart, and the order of that time, moral? Ans. Yes; but it may be distinguished as positive-moral; and therefore may be changed by God the Law-giver; as from the seventh day to the first, at the resurrection of Christ; and a part of the time for the whole, in heaven.

202. But while we call the appointment of the seventh part of the time as the Sabbath, positive-moral, may there not be reasons, in the nature and constitution of man, requiring that proportion of time, as better adapted to his wants than any other, although not known to us? Ans. Yes; there may be such reasons, but in our ignorance of them, and want of a revelation on this point, we may suppose the proportion of time is positive-moral, and the obligation by the authority of God, is all-sufficient to bind us to obedience.

203.—Obj. Our author, (who holds the Sabbath ceremonial, as a Jewish rite) objects, That the Sabbath is enumerated in Gal. iv. 9, 10, and Col. ii. 16, 17, as among “the beggarly elements” and “shadows,” &c.; and therefore was ceremonial and figurative. How answer? Ans. (1.) If reference were had at all, in these passages, to the weekly Sabbath, it was to the Jewish Sabbath as distinguished from the New Testament Sabbath; for the apostle is there speaking of conformity to the Jewish notions. (2.) But undoubtedly the apostle, in these texts, was speaking chiefly, if not wholly, of the Jewish ceremonial feasts; because, (a) In these texts the apostle calls the days *Sabbaths*, in the plural, while the weekly Sabbath is generally, if not always, spoken of in the singular. (b) The week is generally, if not always, called *Sabbaths*, in the plural; and their feasts were called *Sabbaths*, not only because they were many and various, but also because they all included a week, or weeks. (3.) Because, in these texts, the apostle is opposing the Judaizing teachers, who pressed the observance of the ceremonial law on the Gentile converts, with all their ceremonial feasts.

204. He objects, (2.) That the Sabbath was called a sign between God and the Jews, Ex. xxxi. 13, 17; and, therefore, they are a sacrament, and accordingly ceremonial and typical. How answer? Ans. A thing may be a sign, and neither a type nor a sacrament: so the rainbow is a sign, and not a sacrament. The Sabbath was indeed an outward, sensible, sign that the people were in covenant with God, and under his promise, Ex. xxxi. 13.

205. He objects, (3.) That the Sabbath is joined with the sanctuary or temple, Lev. xix. 30; and that, therefore, the Sabbath was among the Jewish ceremonies. How answer? Ans. (1.) In this passage, "the Sabbaths," in the plural, mean chiefly the ceremonial feasts. (2.) Although the weekly Sabbath is included, this connexion no more makes it ceremonial than the first, second, or third commandments, which are also connected with the sanctuary.

206. Obj. (4.) Ceremonial exercises were connected with the Sabbath, as double sacrifices, &c.; and therefore the Sabbath was ceremonial? Ans. These ceremonial exercises, in the age for which they were appointed, were of course used on the Sabbath, although the Sabbath was wholly moral; they no more prove the fourth commandment to be ceremonial, than the first, second, or third, with which these sacrifices are also connected.

207. Obj. (5.) The rest of the Sabbath was rigid among the Jews, and the breach of it punished with death; and therefore it had something peculiar to the Jewish dispensation? Ans. It was no more rigid than with us; but God displayed his displeasure by judgments then more than now, for instruction both to them and to us, 1 Cor. x. 6, 11; but his displeasure with a breach of the Sabbath is the same still. The punishments of Sabbath-breaking were suited to that dispensation, but the Sabbath was equally intended for all ages as the third commandment, the violation of which was punishment with death, Lev. xxiv. 14—16.

208. Obj. (6.) After the fall of man, the seventh day was typical of Christ's resting from his work of atonement? Ans. (1.) If it were made typical of a rest in Christ, this would not affect the morality of the Sabbath, which was the seventh part of the time, and is still obligatory. But, (2.) It was not properly a type of rest in Christ, as a type is properly a shadow of the antitype, not itself of the same nature with the antitype; it was a natural, outward thing, to yield, and be abolished, when the spiritual antitype should come. But the Sabbath is of the same nature as our final rest in Christ, and has only to yield to a higher degree of spiritual rest in heaven.

209. Obj. (7.) In Deut. v. 15, deliverance from Egypt is given as a reason for keeping the Sabbath; and therefore the Sabbath was peculiar to the Jews as a people? Ans. Deliverance from Egypt was an additional reason for keeping the Sabbath, but it was not the ground of the institution, nor can it affect its morality; as redemption by Christ is a motive of our love to God, and of our obedience, additional to the original obligation, but does not annul the original moral obligation.

210. It is objected against the moral obligation of the Sabbath in New Testament times, (1.) That it was first instituted in the wilderness, among the Jews, Neh. ix. 14, "And madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath;" Ezek. xx. 12, "Moreover, I gave them my Sabbaths to be a sign," &c. How answer? Ans. The Sabbath had been given before, but the command was renewed in the wilderness. And Ezekiel speaks of all the Jewish feasts.

211. Obj. (2.) That the Sabbath could not have been given to Adam in innocence, because the institution implies impurity of works from which we should rest? Ans. The Sabbath does not necessarily imply impurity of ordinary actions. God rested from all his work of creation, which was holy and good; and man should, on the Sabbath, rest from lawful worldly employments. Even Adam in innocence was to be lawfully employed in worldly avocations, but should have a weekly rest from these, in remembrance of a heavenly rest before him.

212. Obj. (3.) We do not read of the observance of the Sabbath before the time of Moses? Ans. (1.) The history of the world and of the church before the time of Moses was brief, and if there was no occasion to speak of the observance of the Sabbath during that period, this does not warrant us to conclude that there was no observance of it. (2.) There are, even in that brief history, several references which imply the observance of the Sabbath; as Gen. iv. 3, Cain brought an offering "in process of time," in the original, "in the end of days," Gen. viii. 10, 12; Noah several times sent forth a dove at the end of seven days, thus waiting a week, which division was marked by nothing but the Sabbath; Ex. xvi. 23, before the giving of the law on the mount, Moses expressly recognised the Sabbath as a standing institution. (3.) The original institution of the Sabbath was not only God's example, but for man's use, as we see by God's blessing and sanctifying, or setting apart the Sabbath, and as, in the fourth commandment, the institution is enjoined to be observed for the same reason.

213. Obj. (4.) It is predicted that the Sabbath should cease in New Testament times, Isa. lxvi. 23; Rom. xiv. 5, 6? Ans. The first passage rather predicts the continuance of the Sabbath, and the second speaks of the Jewish feasts and holy days.

§ XVI.—214. What is the negative duty of the Sabbath? Ans. Resting; or abstaining from worldly avocations.

215. Are there any exceptions to this rest or abstinence? Ans. Yes; works of necessity and mercy.

216. Are worldly works of this character, on the Sabbath, expressly required in Scripture? Ans. Yes; Matt. xii. 5, 7; Luke xiii. 15, 16.

217. How is the requisition of such works consistent with the prohibition in the fourth commandment? Ans. (1.) Because the prohibition in the fourth commandment is made by the Lawgiver subject to these exceptions. (2.) Because God requires mercy, and not sacrifice, Matt. xii. 7. (3.) Because, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," Mark ii. 27.

218. Does the Sabbath require rest from worldly thoughts, affections, words, and recreations, as well as from worldly works? Ans. Yes; Isa. lviii. 13.

219. Can we abstain from this unless the mind be exercised on heavenly things, or in positive religious duties? Ans. No.

220. What are the positive duties required in this commandment?

Ans. The worship of God. So Old Testament sacrifices were observed on the Sabbath, and the apostles and [early] Christians met for worship on that day.

221. Does this command require religious affections and meditations on the Sabbath? **Ans.** Yes; these belong to the worship of God, and are required, Isa. lviii. 13.

222. Does it belong to the morality of this command that a definite time be set apart to God's worship? **Ans.** Yes.

223. Does it also belong to the moral and perpetual obligation of this command that the time set apart for God's worship, and for rest from worldly employments, be appointed by God himself? **Ans.** Yes; otherwise it is will-worship, and not obedience.

224. Does the moral and perpetual obligation of this command include the seventh part of the time, whether that time be the beginning or end of the week? **Ans.** Yes.

225. Does it then follow that the Sabbath should be a whole natural day of twenty-four hours? **Ans.** Yes.

226. Does it not also belong to the morality of this command that six secular days should intervene between the Sabbaths, and that no human authority should abridge this working time by the appointment of set times obligatory on the people? **Ans.** Yes.

227. But was it a part of the moral and perpetual obligation of this command that the Sabbath should be the seventh day in order from the creation, or the seventh day of the week? **Ans.** No; the seventh day of the week was positive-moral, by God's appointment, and was obligatory so long as that appointment continued; but it was appointed subject to change by the Lawgiver. But we observe, (1.) It is the seventh part of the time we are to remember, allowing six working days to intervene. (2.) It is the Sabbath or resting day which God appoints, that we are to remember. (3.) Though God rested on the seventh day from the beginning of creation, it was the Sabbath, or resting day, that he blessed and sanctified, which was indeed the seventh day at that time, but was to be a different day at a future time. (4.) If God appointed any seventh day as the Sabbath, whether the last or the first of the week, he thereby preserves all the morality of the Sabbath.

LECTURE VII.—FOURTH PRECEPT—CONTINUED.

228. How prove that the Sabbath has been changed, by divine appointment, from the seventh to the first day of the week? **Ans.** (1.) Christ rose from the dead on the first day of the week, and so rested from redemption-work in his humbled state, John xx. 1. (2.) The apostle, Heb. iv. 3-10, speaking of heavenly rest, as indicated and set forth in emblem, by the Sabbath, refers to creation (verse 4,) as the occasion of the first institution of the Sabbath, and (verse 10,) to Christ's resurrection, as a ceasing from his work, as a similar reason for the Sabbath rest. (3.) The change from the seventh to the first day of the week was predicted by the Jewish feasts, which were called Sabbaths. They all consisted of eight days, and

the eighth day was a special holy convocation, (Lev. xxiii. 34—36,) as typical of the New Testament Sabbath occurring on the eighth day after the seventh day Sabbath; that is, on the first day of the week. (4.) Christ suffered at the time of the Passover, which was one of those feasts, and rose on the morrow after the Jewish Sabbath. (5.) The Pentecost, a feast of seven weeks or forty-nine days, followed the Passover, and it included an eighth day of the last week, or Pentecost, or fiftieth day, which also was the morrow after the Jewish Sabbath; the first day of the week, and seven weeks from our Lord's resurrection; and on that day was the special outpouring of the Spirit, remarkably opening the new dispensation, Lev. xxiii. 15, 16. (6.) The change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week was more expressly predicted, Ezek. xliii. 27, "On the eighth day, and so forward;" in which the prophet is pointing out New Testament services under the figurative language of old Testament services. Now, that eighth day was the first day of the week, and it was to be thenceforward the settled order of Sabbath services. Compare Isa. lxvi. 23, which predicts the settled order of the New Testament Sabbath, expressed by "new moons and Sabbaths for all flesh," when the church should embrace the Gentiles. (7.) Christ met with his disciples, after his resurrection, on the first day of the week, and at several times; not only on the day of his resurrection, to Mary Magdalene, John xx. 14—18; to the two disciples going to Emmaus, and to Peter, Luke xxiv. 15, 34; but to the disciples assembled, John xx. 19. He also met with them the following first day of the week, John xx. 26. Thus he sanctified that first day of the week as a day of special communion with himself, and as the Sabbath. (8.) The disciples and primitive Christians met for public worship on the first day of the week, and treated it as the Sabbath; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2. And in this manner were they met on the day of Pentecost, which was the first day of the week, as appears from John xix. 14, 31, which shows that our Lord suffered on the day before the Jewish Sabbath, and the day before the Jewish Passover, and, therefore, that, on that occasion, the Passover was on the Sabbath, and therefore that the eighth day, and the fiftieth of the passover, were the first day of the week. (9.) Also, the first day of the week is called "the Lord's day," Rev. i. 10.*

229. What evidence have we that the Lord's day was the first day of the week? Ans. (1.) His resurrection was on the first day; on it he met with his disciples, as we have seen, and these are good reasons why that day should be called his. (2.) There is no intimation of any other day being ascribed to him by way of eminence. (3.) There is no other periodical day recognised in the New Testament, but the weekly period; no monthly or annual period. Therefore, the Lord's day would be unmeaning, if it were not a weekly day, and if it were not a day of the week which alone is represented in Scripture, as having a special relation to Christ. (4.) The seventh

* An examination of Ps. cxviii. 22—24, will afford further confirmation of this point.

day Sabbath was called, of old, "the Sabbath of the Lord;" and therefore with propriety is the first day Sabbath called "the Lord's day." The former, because the Lord rested from creation-work; the latter, because our Lord rested from redemption-work.

230. Have we no express appointment of the first day of the week as the Sabbath, or of the change from the seventh to the first, in the New Testament? Ans. No; the former typical indications and predictions of the change in New Testament times; the importance of the Saviour's work; his acknowledged dignity and authority; his meeting with his disciples on that day, and thus exemplifying the Sabbath rest; the practice of his apostles; and the very nature of the Sabbath, as a rest in memory of the Lord's resting from his work, are sufficient indications of the change. And these methods of signifying the change to us, are calculated to lead us to investigation, and that investigation to lead us to profit.

231. Is it not fit and reasonable that the Sabbath should be in remembrance of Christ finishing redemption-work? Ans. Yes; Heb. iv. 10.

232. Does the change in the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week interfere with the design of the Sabbath, as a memorial of creation-work? Ans. No; as it is still the seventh part of the time that is employed as the Sabbath. Thus it is the seventh part of the time, in remembrance of the creation being performed in six days, and God's resting on the seventh; and it is the first day of the week, in remembrance of Christ's finishing redemption-work and rising to his rest, on the first.

233. Could the Sabbath have been changed, at the resurrection of Christ, from the seventh to any other day of the week than the first, without interfering with the six intervening working days, for that time? Ans. No; Christ's resurrection on the second, third, fourth, or any other day than the first or seventh, must have broken the order of the working days, by making it the Sabbath.

234. Is there any thing in the work of Christ, in redemption, to fix the proportion of time, as the seventh part for the Sabbath? Ans. Nothing revealed to us. Therefore the proportion of time arises from the work of creation, and the particular day on which that seventh part should occur, arises from Christ's resurrection.

235. How much of the day should be kept as the Sabbath? Ans. The whole day; that is, the seventh part of the time.

236. At what hour should the Sabbath begin and end? Ans. At such hour as begins and ends the other days.

237. Do not some professing Christians make conscience of beginning and ending the Sabbath at sunset? Ans. Yes.

238. What arguments, in general, do they adduce for this? Ans. (1.) The statements respecting the work of creation. (2.) The appointment of the passover and of the great day of the atonement, in the old dispensation, which was the evening; supposed to be sunset, Ex. xii. 18; Lev. xxiii. 32.

239. But may not the statement of the work of creation—"the

evening and the morning"—agree, nevertheless, with the arrangement of beginning the day at midnight, since, in that narration, "evening" means darkness? Ans. Yes.

240. If the appointment of the feasts of the passover and of the atonement require these feasts to begin in the evening, did that appointment prove any thing more than that these feasts began then on account of some peculiarity in them? Ans. No; it did not prove that ordinary days and ordinary Sabbaths began in the evening.

241. Have we not reason to believe, then, that the ordinary Sabbath, and other ordinary days, even under the Jewish dispensation, began at midnight? Ans. Yes.

242. What are some evidences of this? Ans. (1.) The morning and evening sacrifices (Ex. xxix. 39) were to be for the day, and the morning lamb was first: "The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning; and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even." But if the day began in the evening, the evening offering of the day would have been first. And all this was "day by day continually;" verse 38. (2.) Even in the appointments of the Passover and of the atonement, it is nowhere said that the evening was a part of the same day with the next morning. (3.) The common phrase, "Tomorrow is the holy Sabbath," as in Ex. xvi. 23, intimates that the Sabbath began at midnight, and that the employments of the Sabbath began the next morning, and that the evening of the day of this proclamation was not a part of it. (4.) The usual prohibition of work till the morrow after the Sabbath, implies that the Sabbath did not end till the morrow. (5.) The example of the women resting on the Sabbath, according to the commandment, or Scriptures, and not coming to the sepulchre till after midnight, shows the general practice of the Jews, and the accordance of that practice with the Scriptures, Luke xxiii. 56; xxiv. 1. (6.) That our Sabbath ought to begin at midnight appears from the fact that our Lord arose from the dead before day-light, on the first day of the week; because the women came to the sepulchre very early, while it was yet dark, and found that Christ had risen, John xx. 1; and this was the end of the Sabbath or week, and dawning of the first day of the week, Matt. xxviii. 1. Now, that our Lord should be a part of three days in the grave; and being buried in the evening of the sixth day, and lying in the grave during the seventh, or Jewish Sabbath, he must have remained in the grave till after the first day of the week had commenced; his resurrection being before day-light, it must be presumed that midnight was counted the end of the Jewish Sabbath and beginning of the New Testament Sabbath.

§ XVII.—243. Are days appointed as set times, or periodical days, for the worship of God, besides the Sabbath, lawful? Ans. No; it is adding to God's appointments, interfering with the labour of the six days, and binding conscience by human device and authority.

244. Why then are fast days lawful, which are appointed by man? Ans. Fast-days are occasional appointments, and not a set time, or

a periodical time; and for these occasional appointments we have God's authority.

245. What is the evil of set-days, periodically recurring, monthly or annually, for the worship of God? Ans. Although periodical days, monthly, annually, or weekly, appointed for the worship of God, are lawful, if appointed and observed voluntarily, by an individual or a society, if the appointment be judicious, not interfering with other duties, if conditional, to continue only as long as divine providence will favour it, and if not made binding on the conscience to favour the observance; yet, if otherwise appointed and observed, they are sinful, because, (1.) They are unauthorized, and therefore an exercise of will-worship. (2.) Such appointments infringe on the liberties of the people, who are allowed to work six days in the week. (3.) Man's wisdom is inadequate to make such permanent and unconditional appointments, so as to avoid interference with other duties. (4.) The moral worship of God was never suspended on the return of annual days. It was only ceremonial worship that was adapted to those anniversaries appointed to the Jews.

246. Is it innocent and allowable to observe the Passover, (or Easter,) the Pentecost, or the Nativity of our Saviour, (Christmas,) as our author alleges? Ans. No; Not even when the observance is left optional with the people; because, (1.) The Passover and the Pentecost are, by the introduction of the new dispensation, laid aside, as typical observances. (2.) The observance of them was partly in accommodation to the early Jewish believers, partly to please pagans with outward parade of worship, in compensation for the loss of their heathen observances, and partly by a declining church, that wished to substitute outward worship for that which is spiritual. (3.) There is no need of them in order to promote religion. The observance of them is will-worship, and will tend to the decline of religion. (4.) Christmas, or the Nativity, is unauthorized. The time is utterly unknown, being left in impenetrable darkness by the Holy Spirit in the divine records; and no doubt this was done because the knowledge of it was unnecessary, and in order to repress will-worship. In a word, while fast-days are appointed on account of the duty to be performed, in set days, or periodical days, the duty is observed on account of the day; and therefore the day must be of divine appointment, or it is sinful.

247. Is it at all probable the day of Christmas, at the close of the year, was the season in which Christ was born? Ans. No; it would not answer to the fact of the shepherds keeping watch by night. September would be more probably the time. But all is conjecture, and a poor foundation for an institution.

248: But it is objected, in favour of the church's appointing annual solemnities, that the days of Purim were observed annually in commemoration of the deliverance of the Jews in Mordecai's time? Ans. (1.) It appears that they were kept as civil, not as religious days. (2.) If kept religiously, Mordecai might have appointed them by divine authority.

249. Obj. Christ himself countenanced and observed the dedication; that is, the memorial of the cleansing of the temple, as appointed by Judas Maccabeus, John x. 22? Ans. (1.) The feast of the dedication was rather a civil than a religious feast. It was observed everywhere throughout the country, and not only at Jerusalem, as the divinely appointed ceremonial feasts were; and therefore the presence of Jesus at the temple was not a countenancing of it any more than had he been at any other place in the country. (2.) As a civil feast he would not disapprove of it as will-worship.

250. Is it correct to say that the Sabbath was instituted, as its chief design, to commemorate either God's resting from the work of creation, or Christ's resting from the work of purchasing our redemption? Ans. No; but while these objects are to be remembered, they were rather the occasions of appointing a day for the worship of God, and for our spiritual profit.

LECTURE VIII.—FIFTH AND SIXTH PRECEPTS.

§ XVIII.—251. What is the general object of this precept? Ans. Relative duties; in the way of honour and respect to superiors, and immediately and primarily to our natural parents.

252. Who are meant by "father and mother," in this commandment? Ans. Besides natural father and mother, all superiors, in age, gifts, or office; Isa. xxii. 21; 2 Kings ii. 12.

253. Why are "father and mother" named, instead of the aged, the gifted, magistrates, &c.? Ans. Because, (1.) The parental is the primary and original authority among men. (2.) It is properly the pattern of all others. (3.) The observance of duty to natural parents secures and promotes the observance of the duties of all other relations, and the violation of this promotes the violation of other authority. (4.) And to intimate that other superiors should act with a parental spirit towards their inferiors.

254. What is included in honouring father and mother? Ans. (1.) The honouring them with the heart. (2.) Using respectful language to them and of them. (3.) Honouring them by obedience, so far as their commands are consistent with the law of God. (4.) Honouring them by good moral and religious conduct, and thus showing respect to their good wishes, and showing the good effect of their instruction and example, if they were good.

255. Is this honour due to the mother as well as to the father? Ans. Yes; it is not only expressly required in this command, but, in Lev. xix. 3, the mother is named before the father; and other texts expressly require it; as, Prov. xxiii. 22, "Despise not thy mother when she is old."

256. What is the promise appended to this command? Ans. Long life.

257. Had this promise any special respect to the Israelites? Ans. Yes; it had a special respect to their enjoyment of the land of Canaan. Under the old dispensation, the land of Canaan was an emblem of heaven, and God was pleased to connect earthly blessings with

obedience, and earthly afflictions with disobedience, more immediately and manifestly than now, as a mode of instructing and guiding the church in her infancy, and to teach us, by his dealings with them, his approbation of obedience, and his displeasure with disobedience.

258. But is not this promise also applicable to us in the present dispensation? Ans. Yes; the apostle, Eph. vi. 2, 3, applies it to New Testament times.

259. Is this promise intended to be absolute and uniform in its temporal application? Ans. No; it is, like all temporal promises, given on the condition that it be for God's glory and our good.

260. But are not unhappiness in the present life, and premature death by violence, frequent results of the violation of this command? Ans. Yes; and such misery and death may often be traced to this very sin, as in the case of Eli's sons, Absalom, &c.

261. Is it not the tendency of meekness and obedience to prolong life? Ans. Yes; it is the natural tendency of such a course of conduct; and God often marks obedience with providential favours. And, besides, the obedient may have more happiness in a short life, under the smiles of Providence, than the disobedient in a long life.

262. Why does the apostle, Eph. vi. 2, say, "This is the first commandment with promise," when the second commandment has a promise? Ans. (1.) This is the first commandment respecting relative duties. (2.) The promise of the second commandment is mercy in general to those who keep all the commandments; but this is a special promise, in reference to this command in particular.

§ XIX.—263. What graces are necessary to the right observance of this command? Ans. Humility, meekness, and love. We cannot give due honour to superiors without these dispositions.

264. Is not obedience to this command calculated to cultivate meek submission to the will of God? Ans. Yes; early training to honour father and mother, leads the child to a sense of its dependence on the wisdom of superiors; to a sense of accountability; and to see that its will is not always to be gratified, but must submit to the will of God, in his law and providence.

265. Are magistrates, by this command, to be honoured by obedience and respectful language and behaviour? Ans. Yes.

266. How are magistrates included under the names of "father and mother?" Ans. (1.) Magistracy is an ordinance of God, for rule and government; and it requires obedience. (2.) Magistrates should rule as fathers, and in such a spirit. (3.) The law is spiritual and broad, and includes all to whom we owe honour and obedience. (4.) The Scriptures elsewhere require this honour; and therefore it belongs to this command respecting the governors and the governed, Rom. xiii. 1.

267. But is it an absolute and unlimited honour and obedience that we should yield to civil magistrates? Ans. No; it is only so far as their commands are lawful, Acts iv. 19; v. 29.

268. Who should yield obedience to the civil magistrates, under

a civil government? or, are there any persons or classes of men exempted? Ans. No; all classes, without exception, in a government, must be subject to the civil magistrate in all his lawful commands; church-members and church-officers, as well as others, Rom. xiii. 1, "every soul."

269. Does such obedience interfere with the duties of men as Christians, or with the duties of gospel ministers in their office? Ans. No.

270. Does irreligion, infidelity, or immorality, invalidate the magistrate's office, or warrant believers to disown him and his authority? Ans. No; unless his immorality or irreligion lead him to violate the constitution under which he is appointed to govern, or to pervert his office to defeat the ends of government.

271. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) The Scriptures require us to yield obedience to the powers that be, as these are ordained of God, Rom. xiii. 1, although obedience is limited to lawful commands. (2.) That obedience was required to be given to heathen magistrates, Rom. xiii. 1. (3.) Obedience was yielded to heathen magistrates by the people of God, according to the records of both the Old and New Testaments; and that even by prophets and apostles. (4.) Magistracy is from God as Creator, and as the moral and providential Governor of the world; and not from God as Redeemer. (5.) The magistrate's duty being civil, he may have the qualifications and authority for civil government, although he be not a Christian. Notwithstanding, Scripture qualifications are desirable and useful, while they are not essential to valid authority. (6.) We find no charge against the people of Israel for obedience, in lawful things, to their wicked kings. And David recognised Saul's authority.

272. Does this command forbid all opposition to a civil magistrate, and to his administration? Ans. No; besides that we ought to disobey unlawful commands, we may and ought, (1.) To testify, by all proper means, against unjust laws, and unrighteous acts of administration, even while these laws are not commanding us to sin. (2.) We ought to use orderly methods of obtaining the abolition of such laws, and putting down a sinful administration. (3.) Even the light of nature and reason teaches that we may and ought to revolutionize the government, even by force, when it violates the express or implied contract between the governor and the governed; when it renders submission intolerable, and ceases to answer the ends of civil government.

273. But though we may testify against unjust laws, is it lawful to rail at, or revile the magistrate? Ans. No; 2 Peter ii. 10, 11; Jude 8, 9.

274. Do such passages as Matt. x. 37, or Luke xiv. 26, forbidding love to father or mother more than to Christ, and requiring us to hate father and mother, &c., militate against this command, and honour to parents? Ans. No; they only require supreme love to Christ, and forbid a superior or equal love to relatives.

275. Does this command require of children an implicit and un-

limited obedience to parents? Ans. No; it is an obedience in the Lord, Eph. vi. 1. Honour to parents must always be subordinate to the honour of God.

276. Should children, in ordinary cases, contract marriage without consulting their parents? Ans. No; the honour due to parents requires of children that they take the counsel of their parents in their conduct generally, and especially in the most important matters. But still the manifestly unreasonable and unjust counsels of parents should be respectfully though firmly declined.

§ XX.—277. Does this command oblige parents to corresponding duties to their children and other inferiors? Ans. Yes.

278. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) The law is spiritual and exceeding broad, embracing converse duties. (2.) If children and other inferiors owe to their superiors the duties belonging to their relation, superiors owe the duties of their relation to inferiors. (3.) The Scriptures elsewhere require these duties; as, of parents and children, Eph. vi. 4; of masters to servants, Eph. vi. 9; of magistrates to subjects, 2 Sam. xxiii. 3.

279. What are some of the duties of parents to children? Ans. Provision, protection, love, counsel, and instruction.

280. Was this command the same in its application and obligation, under the Old Testament as under the New? Ans. Yes.

281. Does not the promise of long life to the obedient imply a threatening against the disobedient? Ans. Yes.

§ XXI.—*The sixth precept.*—282. What is the general object of this command? Ans. Justice towards mankind in reference to their persons.

283. Does this command forbid the killing of animals, either for food, or for our safety against beasts of prey? Ans. No; the original word, *רצח*, *Ratzach*, does not mean simply, *killing*, or killing a *human* being.

284. Does it forbid the killing of a man in all circumstances? Ans. No.

285. In what cases is the killing of a man lawful, and not a breach of this command? Ans. (1.) In necessary self-defence. (2.) In legal punishment of murder. (3.) In lawful war. To which it should be added that purely accidental homicide is no sin, nor the object of prohibition in this command.

286. How does it appear that it is lawful to take human life in necessary self-defence? Ans. (1.) From the express law of God, Ex. xx. 2. This law was not peculiar to the Jews; it was founded on the principles of nature. (2.) From the fact that self-love is the original principle of our nature, not condemned by the law of God, but recognised as a natural and just principle, with which love to our neighbour is compared. (3.) When killing in self-defence is necessary, the person against whom we defend ourselves is a murderer in intention, and has thereby forfeited his life; of which the assailed must be the judge, in the emergency, which does not allow the interference of the magistrate. (4.) From the

fact that, by divine authority, the magistrate bears the sword. This is given him instrumentally by society, for the defence of the body politic, and of every member of it; therefore, in an emergency when that sword cannot defend us, we resume it.

287. How does it appear that the killing of a murderer, by public authority, or capital punishment of murder, is lawful, and not a breach of this command? Ans. (1.) From express Scripture authority; Gen. ix. 5, 6. (2.) This law is permanent, because it was given before the Jewish nation obtained an existence; before their judicial law was given; because it was given to Noah for all mankind; and because of the ground on which it is expressly based—the image of God in man; a ground which is always the same. (3.) It appears also from the divine law awarding death to the wilful murderer; not allowing even the city of refuge or the altar to protect him; Num. xxxv. 31, 33; Deut. xix. 11–13; Ex. xxi. 14. (4.) Because God holds the nation guilty of blood, *i. e.*, of murder, that suffers the wilful murderer to escape; Num. xxxv. 33.

288. How does it appear that war may be waged, and human life taken, without a violation of this command? Ans. On the general principles on which individual self-defence is lawful; as, (1.) From the reasonableness of the thing; for, otherwise, the vicious would reign triumphant, and life, liberty and property would be at the mercy of murderers, robbers, and oppressors. (2.) From the fact that, under the old dispensation, defensive wars were approved; as of Abraham, &c. (3.) From the fact that the profession of arms was not forbidden by John the Baptist, when the question was fairly before him, and when faithfulness required him to condemn it, if war was, in all cases sinful; Luke iii. 14. (4.) And from the official duty of the magistrate to bear the sword, for public, as well as individual defence.

§ XXII.—289. In what cases is the killing of a man absolutely forbidden by this command? Ans. In general—in all cases the killing of ourselves, or the killing of others without just and necessary cause, and without authority to do it; whether it be the murder of Christian or savage, young or old, born or unborn; particularly, (1.) Killing on purpose to effect some selfish end, in anger or hatred, however great the provocation. (2.) Killing with intention to injure, and in anger, though not with intention to kill. Although this case be not so aggravated as others, the act is sinful, and may amount to murder. (3.) Effecting the death of our neighbour even by the hand of others; as David killed Uriah by the hand of the Ammonites, 2 Sam. xii. 9. (4.) Procuring death by fraud; as by false testimony, and even by keeping back testimony which might rescue the innocent; Prov. xxiv. 11, 12. (5.) Even a civil magistrate killing without just cause, or giving sentence, knowingly, on unjust or insufficient grounds.

290. Is the prohibition in this command limited to actual killing, or murder? Ans. No; it is spiritual, and extends to words, and even to thoughts, intentions, wishes, and dispositions; Matt. v. 21, 22; 1 John iii. 15.

291. On what principle are irritating words and unreasonable anger construed as breaches of this command, according to Matt. v. 21, 22? Ans. (1.) They are contrary to the law of love which is the sum of the law. (2.) They may lead us to murder, or provoke others to it.

§ XXIII.—292. What contrary duty does this command require? Ans. Love to our neighbour, and all lawful endeavours to preserve our own life and the life of our neighbour.

293. If, through ill-will or indifference, we do not use those endeavours to preserve our neighbour's life which are in our power and known to us, are we guilty of a breach of this command? Ans. Yes; Prov. xxiv. 11, 12.

294. Were the prohibitions of anger and irritating words, set forth by our Lord, additions to the law, under the New Testament dispensation? Ans. No; they were illustrations of the law.

295. Is punishment of crime by the civil magistrate, as some imagine, forbidden in the New Testament? Ans. No; our Lord's prohibition of revenge, or defence, Matt. v. 39-41, or Paul's prohibition, Rom. xii. 19, refer to private revenge; also to the spirit of revenge in our self-defence. And the prohibition of defence is comparative—not to contend about trifles.

LECTURE IX.—SEVENTH, EIGHTH, NINTH, AND TENTH PRECEPTS.

§ XXIV. *Of the Seventh Precept.*—296. What is the object of this command? Ans. Chastity.

297. As adultery is the sin here expressly forbidden, is not this the most heinous sin of uncleanness between the sexes? Ans. Yes.

298. What is the difference between adultery and fornication? Ans. Adultery is the criminal intercourse between a man and a woman, one or both of whom are married; while fornication is between persons unmarried.

299. Is not the lesser crime condemned in the greater? Ans. Yes.

300. Was not adultery, under the Mosaic law, punished with death? Ans. Yes; Lev. xx. 10.

301. Was there any peculiar test of this secret sin provided in the ceremonial law? Ans. Yes; Num. v. 11, &c.

302. Can such a test be used now? Ans. No; because it was then a test only by divine appointment, and by a miraculous interposition of Divine Providence.

303. As all ceremonial rites among the Jews, according to divine appointment, are instructions to us, what does this test teach us? Ans. (1.) That adultery is a most heinous sin, not only as a moral uncleanness, but as a violation of the marriage covenant; an injury to the consorts of those transgressing, and a special injury to society. (2.) That, though the sin is secret, God will sooner or later bring it to light.

§ XXV.—304. Owing to the spirituality and perfection of the law, is not every sin of the same kind forbidden in this commandment, however different from actual adultery? Ans. Yes. Matt.

v. 27, 28; as all carnal impurity in action, all illicit communication between the sexes, and the more abominable sins of sodomy and bestiality; and also all heart lust, and impure thoughts and imaginations.

305. Are even occasions of lust, unnecessarily used, forbidden? Ans. Yes; as gluttony, indecent pictures, and whatever tends to excite impure thoughts in ourselves or others.

§ XXVI.—306. Does not the universal prohibition of impurity, in this command, necessarily imply universal chastity, in heart, speech, and behaviour? Ans. Yes.

307. Wherein lies the sin of unchastity? Ans. Besides the general reason, that it is contrary to the command of God, we may observe, (1.) Among the married, it is a breach of faith and of the marriage vow. (2.) It is, among all classes, injurious to society. (3.) It unfits the heart for communion with God. (4.) It is an abuse of the body; 1 Cor. vi. 18. (5.) It is abusing the purchase of Christ; 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. (6.) It is sacrilege, taking from God what we owe him—both body and heart; 1 Cor. vi. 13, 15.

308. Is the law of God more strict now than it was under the old dispensation, in respect to this command; or is it, under the New Testament, enlarged in its prohibitions or requisitions? Ans. No.

309. How, then, understand the allowing of polygamy, and of divorce for lesser causes, of old? Ans. In the body politic, such things were permitted, and punishment not executed, by civil power, but the law of God was the same; Matt. xix. 8, "From the beginning it was not so." Our Lord explains the moral law as it had always signified. These evils were suffered in the judicial law, but neither commanded nor approved in the moral law.

§ XXVII.—*Of the Eighth Precept.*—310. What is the special object of this commandment? Ans. Property.

311. Does not this command imply, not only the existence of distinct claims to property, but the lawfulness of having distinct rights? Ans. Yes; otherwise there would be no occasion for theft, or need of this command.

312. Is the example of the early Christians, in making a community of goods, (Acts ii. 44; iv. 32, 34,) condemnatory of this distinct right of property? Ans. No; because (1.) That was a singular case, and was not continued. (2.) The apostle Peter even then admitted, that had Ananias kept his whole property, he would not have been guilty, Acts v. 4. (3.) Without a distinction of property, they could not have made a community of goods, at that time, so efficiently as they did; nor would the transaction have been recorded, if community of goods had been the practice. (4.) All Scriptural injunctions of charitable gifts, imply distinctive claims to property.

313. Does Christ's demand of the young man, to sell all, &c., require a community of goods in civil society, and forbid distinct and exclusive rights? Ans. No; the command to the young man was singular, and for his trial; Matt. xix. 21.

314. Does our Lord's declaration, Matt. xix. 23, 24, of the difficulty of a rich man's entering into the kingdom of heaven, imply a condemnation of distinct, exclusive right to property? Ans. No; it is explained, (verse 26, "all things are possible with God;" and Mark x. 24,) that *trust* in riches is the evil that hinders entrance into heaven; and, accordingly the making an idol of them.

315. What would be some of the evils of a community of goods in society, which would prove from Scripture and reason, the impropriety of it? Ans. (1.) The indolent would be encouraged in indolence, and the wasteful in wasting. (2.) The industrious and prudent would be discouraged. (3.) Heart-burnings and hatred of the industrious against the indolent and wasteful, would be produced, and, in return, hatred and resentment of the indolent against their reprovers. (4.) None would have property to bestow in charity, to those really needy, or for the general good.

§ XXVIII.—316. What is the evil of theft? Ans. (1.) It is covetousness. (2.) It is injustice. (3.) It is want of brotherly love. (4.) It is idolatrous love of the world. (5.) It is a distrust of God, and want of godly fear. (6.) It disturbs and injures society.

317. Should theft be punished by the civil magistrate? Ans. Yes; because it is a tangible crime, and a violation of social rights.

318. Should it be punished with death? Ans. No; unless it be the aggravated crime of stealing a human person; Gen. xxi. 16.

§ XXIX.—319. Is the taking from our neighbour, knowingly and purposely, anything whatever that is justly his, and without his knowledge and consent to his loss, to be considered theft? Ans. Yes.

320. Is such an abstraction of our neighbour's property to be considered theft, whatever be the manner in which it is done? Ans. Yes; whether done by force or fraud.

321. Is robbery, then, included in theft? Ans. Yes.

322. If we can obtain our neighbour's property by over-reaching him in a bargain, purposely deceiving him in what we give him, or purposely inducing him to undervalue what he sells us, is it theft? Ans. Yes.

323. If we can obtain our neighbour's property by law, without giving him an equivalent, and while we know we have not a moral right to it, is it theft? Ans. Yes.

324. Is it not equally theft, whether our taking of property not our own be sacrilege, or peculation, defrauding private individuals or the civil community, or kidnapping, or the driving away of cattle? Ans. Yes.

325. Is the taking of interest on money loaned, to be accounted theft, or a breach of this command? Ans. No; unless it be unreasonable interest, obtained by taking advantage of our neighbour's necessities.

326. How, then, understand Psa. xv. 5? Ans. (1.) That text reproves exorbitant profits—or interest, by taking advantage of our neighbour's necessities. (2.) It refers to the Jewish law

against lending to an Israelite, and not to the lending to a stranger on interest, which was allowed; Deut. xxiii. 19, 20. (3.) And, therefore, it forbids all oppressive and unjust exactions, and requires the exercise of charity.

327. How may it be shown that it is lawful to take moderate interest on money loaned? Ans. (1.) Because, although God forbade one Israelite to loan to another, on interest, he allowed it in lending to strangers; Deut. xxiii. 19, 20. (2.) Because in the parable of the talents, Matt. xxv. 27, the principle of loaning money on interest appears to be allowed. (3.) Natural equity requires interest, as justly due on the use of money, as the rent or use of houses, lands, &c. It is even on the same principle as the purchase of land, horses, cattle, &c.

328. Does this command even forbid avaricious desire? Ans. Yes; the heart-sin is forbidden, as well as the act gratifying that desire; Prov. xv. 27. This command thus coincides with the tenth.

329. Are faulty occasions of theft, or occasions effected by ourselves furnishing temptations to theft, also forbidden in this command? Ans. Yes; as idleness, prodigality, luxury, envy, covetous desire, &c.

§ XXX.—330. Can we obey this command from the heart, without performing the contrary duties, and exercising the opposite graces? Ans. No; and, therefore, this command requires those opposite duties and graces.

331. What duties does it especially require? Ans. (1.) Heart-duties; as choice of spiritual riches as the chief objects of our heart's desire, watching against covetous desires, contentment with our lot, love to our neighbour, and desire for his prosperity and comfort. (2.) Outward duties towards or in respect to ourselves, as frugality, temperance, sobriety, and industry. (3.) Outward duties towards our neighbour; as justice in all our dealings with him, active endeavours to prevent his loss and to promote his interests when occasion offers, and the exercise of charity.

332. Were not all these things required of old, as well as now? Ans. Yes.

§ XXXI.—*The Ninth Precept.*—333. What is the general object of this commandment? Ans. The maintaining and promoting of truth, and directly between men.

334. What form of the sin is here explicitly forbidden? Ans. False witnessing.

335. Is not false witnessing in judicial trials usually the worst form of lying? Ans. Yes.

336. Is all falsehood or lying forbidden under this name? Ans. Yes; all falsehood and lying is in some sense, a false witnessing. Besides all the commandments forbid the grossest sins of the class which they comprehend; and all sins of the same nature, though less heinous, are included under them.

337. What is a lie; properly so called? Ans. The wilful telling of untruth, and especially with a design to deceive.

338. Can lying be justified in any circumstances? Ans. No.

339. If a lie be told to save an innocent life, is it not justifiable? Ans. No; lying is sinful in itself, as virtually calling God to witness, and the end will not justify a sinful means.

340. But did not God approve of Rahab's lie, in hiding the spies; since the apostle classes her with believers, and makes her receiving them and sending them out another way, to be the effects of her faith? Ans. No; it was not the lie that gave her this character, but her receiving the spies and protecting them, in faith of the reports of God's works for Israel. Her lie was her sin and weakness, accompanying her faith; Jas. ii. 25.

341. Is irony suitably used—using language literally untrue—a breach of this commandment? Ans. No; Elijah used irony, 1 Kings, xviii. 27. Irony, properly used, is indeed using language literally untrue, but using it with the design to be correctly understood, and without any deception.

342. Is not a ludicrous or jocose lie a breach of this commandment? Ans. Yes; it is treating truth with levity, and without reverence for God, the Witness and Judge, and mocking at sin.

343. If we intend by our words to deceive others, who have a right to expect correct information, while we profess to give it, is it a breach of this commandment? Ans. Yes.

344. Is it a breach of this command to keep back truth, in testimony which we know to be necessary to the case, as well as to tell an untruth? Ans. Yes; because we are bound to give all that is necessary to the right understanding of the case, so far as we know it.

345. If we wish to produce a false impression, though not called as a witness, in judicial proceedings, but in the ordinary intercourse among men, and do it by telling a part of the case, and keeping back a part, on purpose to produce that impression, is it a breach of this command? Ans. Yes.

346. Although malicious, officious, and jocose lies are all breaches of this command, is there not a difference in the criminality of them? Ans. Yes; as some of these classes of lies combine with them more of the violation of other commands, than others of them do.

347. Is a false accuser, as well as a false witness, a breaker of this command? Ans. Yes; as his false accusation is a false testimony: and the Scriptures speak of the accuser, under the name of a witness; Num. xxxv. 30; Deut. xix. 15; Matt. xviii. 16.

348. May a judge, by a purposed false sentence, be guilty of violating this command? Ans. Yes; he is virtually witnessing falsely, and declaring falsehood; Deut. i. 17. So Pilate. And so advocates in a cause, by misrepresentation, may be guilty; and the accused may be guilty by denying the truth, and misrepresenting.

349. Is the accused guilty of violating this command, by refusing to acknowledge his guilt when charged, even when the charge is true? Ans. No; he is guilty if he expressly deny the truth, or make any false representation of facts; but as he is not bound

to witness against himself, and the accuser and the court have no right to expect this, he is not guilty of lying or deceiving, if he refuse to confess guilt.

§ XXXII.—350. What does this command require? **Ans.** Truth on all occasions.

351. Does this command require us to tell all the truth at all times? **Ans.** No; silence is often proper, and no deception.

352. Does not this command require us to profess and maintain God's truth? **Ans.** Yes; he calls us to be his witnesses; *Isa.* xliii. 12.

353. May we be guilty of violating this command, either by a false profession of religion, or by a defective profession? **Ans.** Yes; because God calls us to profess his whole truth, and especially to keep the word of his patience; *Rev.* iii. 10.

354. Does this command bind us to maintain the good name of ourselves and others? **Ans.** Yes; *Prov.* xxii. 1; *Eccles.* vii. 1.

355. May we be guilty of violating this command, by telling the truth unnecessarily against others? **Ans.** Yes; as such testimony manifests want of love, and is virtually declaring that the testimony is necessary, when it is not. The object of such a testimony is mischief and injury.

356. May we be guilty of violating this command, by extending the publicity of an evil report, though true, further than is necessary? **Ans.** Yes; as such testimony tends to injury, and not to good; as it manifests want of brotherly love; and misrepresents the importance of the report.

357. What is the evil of lying? **Ans.** (1.) It is a perversion of the power of speech. (2.) It is in actual opposition to the God of truth. (3.) It is irreverence to God, who is Witness and Judge. (4.) It destroys confidence in society. (5.) It is usually injury and injustice to our fellow-men. (6.) And, generally, it is the effect of the want of brotherly love.

§ XXXIII.—*The Tenth Precept.*—358. What is the special object of this command? **Ans.** The thoughts and affections of the heart—idolizing earthly things.

359. Does not this command embrace all the others, and forbid the propensity to the breach of them? **Ans.** Yes.

360. Does it forbid all desires of necessary things? **Ans.** No.

361. Does it forbid all desires of what belongs to our neighbour, and all endeavours to obtain it from him? **Ans.** No; because it is lawful to propose purchase or trade, and actually to buy and sell.

362. What, then, is the peculiar character of the sin forbidden in this command? **Ans.** Inordinate desire after earthly things, desire with envy, and desire contrary to love to our neighbour.

363. Does it forbid inordinate desires of any worldly thing, even when these desires would not interfere with our neighbour's interest, nor be accompanied with envy? **Ans.** Yes; because such desires are idolatrous, and interfere with God's claims on our heart's affections. Thus covetousness is idolatry, *Col.* iii. 5; and, accordingly, our Lord tries the young man on this commandment, *Matt.* xix. 21.

364. Is, then, an inordinate love of our own property a violation of this commandment? Ans. Yes.

365. Does this commandment forbid an inordinate desire of worldly honour, as well as property? Ans. Yes.

366. Is the habit of the heart, in inordinate desires, as well as that desire carried out into action, forbidden in this command? Ans. Yes.

367. Does it forbid the first motions of inordinate affections, as well as the consequent settled and governed affections of the heart? Ans. Yes.

368. How does it appear that these affections are forbidden in this command, and sinful? Ans. Because they are idolatrous, and contrary to supreme love to God, and love to our neighbour. And the apostle so represents these affections; Col. iii. 5; Rom. vii. 7, 14.

369. Obj. (1.) The law is the rule of actions, and not of thoughts and affections? Ans. The objection is a false, low, and unworthy view of God's law. Human laws can reach no farther than external actions; but the law of God is spiritual, and reaches to the heart; and thoughts, principles, affections, and motives, are actions in his sight, and are open and manifest to him.

370. Obj. (2.) Such habits and affections are natural to us, and born with us? Ans. It is true they are natural to fallen man, but none the less sinful.

371. Obj. (3.) Such habits are not voluntary, or do not originate in the will? Ans. The objection is not strictly true. The will coincides with these habits, and is exercised with them. Even when they are not formal determinations of the will, they are affections contrary to the will of God.

372. Obj. (4.) James (i. 15.) distinguishes between lust and sin? Ans. He distinguishes between lust as the commencement of sin, and actual sin as finished.

373. Does this command forbid discontentment? Ans. Yes.

374. Does this mean that we ought not to feel the bitterness of afflictions, or of want, or to seek a remedy? Ans. No; but not to repine, or fret, or covet, but to exercise reasonable and submissive desires, and lawful endeavours.

375. Can we avoid those sins of inordinate desire and discontentment without the opposite graces of love to God, relish for his salvation, submission to his sovereign will, and love to our neighbour? Ans. No; and, therefore, these things are required in this command.

§ XXXIV.—376. What is the sum of all the commandments? Ans. Love to God and to man.

377. How is love the sum or the fulfilling of the law? Ans. Not as a substitute for the duties of it; but it is the spirit in which the commands are to be obeyed—the principle of obedience.

378. Are not the obligations of all the commands the same under the New Testament, as under the Old? Ans. Yes.

379. Do the Scriptures require us to love our neighbour more than ourselves? Ans. No; 1 John iii. 16, does not require this, but that we will risk or expose our temporal life or comfort for promoting the salvation of others.

380. But does not the law require us to love God supremely, and more than all our temporal interests? Ans. Yes.

381. But does it require us to love God in opposition to, or in neglect of our soul's salvation? Ans. No; God has never required us to love him inconsistently with our soul's salvation, or in opposition to it. He has always connected our love to him with the salvation of our souls.

CHAPTER XIII.

OF MAN.

LECTURE X.—CREATION OF MAN AND WOMAN—UNITY OF THE RACES —CONSTITUENTS OF THE HUMAN PERSON.

§ I.—Quest. 1. From what did man (Adam) originally derive his name? Ans. From the earth—*red earth*.

2. Does the name *man* always mean the male sex? Ans. No; it often means that species of creatures which God formed in his own image, and includes both male and female. Thus it is used, Gen. i. 27, in the account of the creation. And in this sense we use it here.

§ II.—3. In defining man, of how many constituent parts should we say he consists? Ans. Of two;—soul and body.

§ III.—4. Was man a species of the creatures made by God in the first six days? Ans. Yes; Gen. i. 27, 31.

§ IV.—5. On what day of the creation was he formed? Ans. On the sixth.

6. Were mankind created a single individual, or a pair? Ans. A pair; Gen. i. 27.

7. Was the woman created on the same sixth day with Adam? Ans. Yes; because, (1.) It is said that God created man male and female, Gen. i. 27; and verse 31 closes the account as the work of the sixth day. (2.) Gen. i. 31, says of all God's works that they were very good; but Gen. ii. 18 says, "It is not good that man should be alone." Therefore, when this was said, the creation of man was not perfected; and, consequently, it was said on the sixth day, before the work of it was finished. (3.) Although the particular account of the woman's creation is given in Gen. ii. 18—22, after the account of the Sabbath, the subject of the creation is here resumed, referring to the work of the sixth day.

8. Did, then, the institution of marriage take place at the creation of the woman on the sixth day, when the parties were in their state of innocence? Ans. Yes.

9. But were the man and the woman created at the same instant of time? Ans. No; the man was created first, as it appears he gave names to the beasts before the woman was created, Gen. ii. 19, 20.

10. Was there any peculiar representation of the divine procedure in the creation of man? Ans. Yes; a council of the Trinity is expressed;—"Let us make man," &c.

11. What does this representation teach us respecting man and other animals? Ans. (1.) The superior excellence of this part of creation. (2.) That man alone, of the lower creation, was made in the image of God.

12. Was not the beast and the body of man made out of the same kind of materials? Ans. Yes;—of the earth, Gen. ii. 19.

13. What was peculiar to man in his creation, which was not in other animals? Ans. (1.) God created in him a living soul, capable of bearing the image of God; which beasts have not, although they have spirits, Eccles. iii. 21. (2.) Dominion was given him over the other creatures.

§ V.—14. Does not the creation of the man before the woman, although on the same day, intimate a certain superiority in him? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. xi. 8, 9.

15. Yet was not the woman created in the image of God, as well as the man? Ans. Yes; Gen. i. 27.

16. Did not the creation of but one of each sex at first, teach the moral doctrine that marriage should be between one man and one woman, and that polygamy is a sin, and a violation of the law of creation? Ans. Yes; Mal. ii. 15; Matt. xix. 4, 8.

17. Is it not a foolish imagination that the man was formed with a double body, male and female? Ans. Yes; it would represent Adam as a monster, and not a perfect creature.

18. Is there any weight in favour of this, in the supposition that the word translated *rib*, of which Eve was formed, should be translated *side*? Ans. No; it is properly translated *rib*; and that rib was not the woman, but the material of which she was formed.

19. Does Ps. cxxxix. 5, "Thou hast formed me behind and before," give any countenance to this imagination of the double body of Adam? Ans. No; the original word is not ירי, *Yatzar*, he formed, as the supposition falsely assumes, but נצ, *Tzoor*, he pressed, or hemmed in. David speaks of himself, and of God's continual providence in preserving and governing him.

§ VI.—20. Did not Adam give a distinct name to his wife, besides the general name *woman*, which was given to her at first, Gen. ii. 23? Ans. Yes; he called her *Eve*, Gen. iii. 20.

21. What was the meaning of both names respectively? Ans. *Woman*, because formed from *man*; * *Eve*, because she would be the mother of all living.

22. Was the name *Eve* given before or after the fall? Ans.

* *Ishah* (woman) because taken out of *Ish* (man.)

After it, and after the gospel-promise. It probably had reference to Christ, and the salvation of sinners by him, as well as of her being the mother of all men naturally; while the name *woman* was given before the fall.

23. But our author objects to the opinion that Adam had any reference to Christ or the elect in giving this name. He objects, (1.) That there is no mention made, in the gospel-promise, of life. (2.) That Adam could not be supposed as yet to understand the full force of that promise. (3.) The latitude of the expression—"all living," meaning men in their natural life; as Ps. cxliii. 2. (4.) The close connexion between the giving of the name and the promise of children. Should we consider these arguments conclusive against the supposition that Adam had reference to Christ in this name? Ans. No; because, (1.) Adam had, no doubt, reference to the literal descent of all mankind from Eve, as our author holds, but it does not follow that he had no reference to Christ. (2.) We think our author errs in supposing that Adam did not understand the gospel promise as promising life in Christ; because, without the understanding of this, he had no foundation of faith, which faith we believe Adam had in the promise. (3.) Dark as the promise was, it was the only ground of hope then given; and it was given to afford a hope; and therefore God gave a knowledge of its meaning to Old Testament believers. (4.) Adam had even more interest in this promise than in the promise of natural offspring; and it was this gospel-promise that made the promise of natural offspring interesting. (5.) Adam was, even in that early age, a prophet of the Lord, a teacher to his wife, and afterwards to his children; and this, we believe, was one of his instructions respecting the gospel. (6.) If Adam had intended natural posterity only, he would have included himself as well as Eve; but if he intended Christ, he could refer most properly to Eve, as Christ was of the woman, not by natural generation. (7.) And in the preceding promise of natural offspring, verse 16, reference is made to the husband, but in the promise of Christ, verse 15, no reference is made to the husband, but only to the seed of the woman; and with the latter, Adam's giving the name most exactly coincides.

§ VII.—24. Were there any human beings before Adam? Ans. No; 1 Cor. xv. 45, he is called "the first man Adam;" which not only refers to him comparatively with Christ, but absolutely as the first.

25. Were there any other original progenitors of the human beings created then, before or since, besides Adam and Eve? Ans. No; because, (1.) The Scriptures give no account of any others. (2.) They expressly make all human beings to be of the same family and extraction; Acts xvii. 26, "He hath made of one blood," &c.

26. Does the declaration, Rom. v. 13, that sin was in the world before the law, warrant an inference that there were men, sinful men, in the world before Adam, who had a law given to him in his creation? Ans. No; as the apostle there means the time that the

law was given to Moses, and not the law as given to Adam. For in this sense of giving the law, there could be no sin before the law was given, Rom. v. 13.

27. Does the history of Cain, fearing death from men, give any countenance to the idea of other races of human beings than those sprung from Adam? Ans. No; for that was evidently many years after the fall, when men were multiplied from Adam; and the expected increase of men in after years made him afraid.

28. Do the facts of what we call different races of men, or men being found in islands where the navigation of former ages could not carry them, give countenance to the idea of different original progenitors? Ans. No; difference of races is produced by climate, and other causes; and shipwrecks, and islands which have disappeared by changes in the ocean, may have peopled islands now remote from the early inhabited continents. The annals of Eastern nations are fabulous, and of no weight.

§ VIII.—29. Of what was the body of Adam formed? Ans. Of the dust of the ground.

30. How was his soul formed? Ans. "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul;" signifying that God created the soul immediately, out of nothing, and infused, or implanted it in the body, as a constituent part of the man.

31. Are we to believe that the creation of man occurred in the garden of Eden, or out of it? Ans. Out of the garden; as appears from Gen. ii. 8; iii. 23.

§ IX.—32. Of what was the body of Eve formed? Ans. Of one of Adam's ribs.

33. Does it not appear that, in the creation of Eve out of Adam, the creation of the first pair was different from that of the inferior animals? Ans. Yes; as we may judge that the individuals of their pairs, though created of the same nature, and from the same materials, were, nevertheless, not created one out of the other.

34. Does not this fact of the woman's creation intimate the near relation of man and wife, and the general laws of that relation? Ans. Yes; Gen. ii. 23, 24; 1 Cor. xi. 8, 9; 1 Tim. ii. 11—13.

35. Does it appear that Eve was created in Paradise? Ans. Yes; because, (1.) It was after Adam had named the beasts. (2.) The man is represented as put into the garden alone, Gen. ii. 8, 15.

36. Was not the soul of Eve created and given her in the same manner as that of Adam? Ans. Yes; because in Gen. i. 27, the creation of both is represented as one; and, in Gen. ii. 7, where a more particular account is given of the creation of man, we are to understand both the man and woman as meant; and therefore each of them became a living soul; and, consequently, each had a soul of the same nature and constituent faculties.

§ X. XI.—37. Of what constituents does the person of man consist? Ans. Of soul and body united.

38. Is not this union of two substances, so very different in their natures, into one person, incomprehensible to us? Ans. Yes.

39. Is not even the human body wonderfully made, and a singular manifestation of the wisdom, power, and goodness of God? Ans. Yes; Ps. cxxxix. 14.

40. Yet do not the inferior animals, in many things, excel man in their powers? Ans. Yes; some in physical strength; some in celerity of motion; some in sight, &c.

41. Does this intimate any defect in the wisdom or goodness of God towards man in his creation? Ans. No; because, (1.) Every thing was best, as fitted to its circumstances, its nature, its end, its mode of life, and its happiness. (2.) In man's state of innocence, he did not need these superior qualities. (3.) In any case, upright or fallen, reason in man more than supplies the place of these qualities.

42. In the human person, is the soul but one, or is it manifold? Ans. It is but one, though it has many powers, or faculties.

43. What, then, is meant, 1 Thess. v. 23, Heb. iv. 12, by "spirit and soul?" Ans. Different faculties of the soul; or the rational soul, and animal spirits, which are material, but have much influence on the soul.

44. What is the chief characteristic of the human soul, that distinguishes it from the lower animals? Ans. That it is rational.

45. Yet do not beasts give evidence of some power of reasoning? Ans. Yes; and thus prove that in their nature there is some kind of spirit—something not material.

46. Although we may not be able to settle on any one thing as the entire characteristic difference between the soul of man and of beasts, is there not a radical difference in their rational powers? Ans. Yes.

47. What are some of those radical distinctions; or some things which show a radical distinction in their rational powers? Ans. (1.) It is evident that beasts cannot improve on the knowledge obtained by their predecessors. (2.) It does not appear that they have a conscience of moral good or evil, and therefore they are not morally accountable creatures. (3.) Their reasoning powers are limited to their sensual wants, enjoyments, or sufferings, and to what belongs to their ends and uses; and are probably always under the influence or impulse of instinct.

48. Has not a human person something in common with vegetable and animal life? Ans. Yes; and he appears to have his instincts as well as animals.

NOTE:—Instinct appears to be some power of perception or thought, given and sustained by the Creator, independent of reason.

LECTURE XI.—IMMATERIALITY, SUBSISTENCE, AND FACULTIES OF THE SOUL.

§ XII.—49. Is it more difficult to understand the nature of the soul than that of the body? Ans. No; for, (1.) We cannot know either body or soul perfectly, but we can know as much of both as it is essentially necessary for us to know. (2.) We know as much

as is essentially necessary, of the soul by its operations, and of the body by its qualities.

50. As to the nature of the soul, is it wholly spiritual; or is it, in any measure, material? Ans. It is wholly spiritual.

51. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From direct Scripture assertions of its nature, Eccles. xii. 7; Luke xxiv. 39; Matt. x. 28. (2.) From the invisibility and immortality of the soul. (3.) From its admitted faculties, (as understanding and will,) which cannot belong to matter, and the operation of them.

52. But many hold the contrary, and object, (1.) That finger and tongue are ascribed to the soul, as in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 24? Ans. This must be understood parabolically; just as bodily organs are figuratively ascribed to God.

53. Obj. (2.) Souls were seen by John, Rev. vi. 9? Ans. They were seen only in emblem, as Isaiah saw the Lord, vi. 1.

54. Obj. (3.) The resemblance between the minds of parents and children proves the soul material? Ans. (1.) This is not always so. (2.) When it is so, it occurs through the close union subsisting between the soul and body. (3.) Though the mind is immaterial, no doubt the development of its powers depends much on the body, on account of the intimacy of their union.

55. Obj. (4.) We find the mind affected by the body, and the body by the mind; and we can reach the diseases of the mind by material medicine; and therefore the mind is, in some respects, material? Ans. The influence of the body and mind on one another mutually is on account of the close and mysterious union subsisting between them; and we avail ourselves of it in reaching diseases of the mind by medicine.

56. Is the soul a substance or a mere succession of thoughts? Ans. It is a substance.

57. As this is strenuously denied by many, how prove the soul a substance and not mere thoughts? Ans. (1.) As thoughts are actions, they must be the actions of a living being or substance. (2.) The Scriptures distinguish between the soul and its acts; representing the soul as punishable and rewardable for its thoughts. (3.) The soul is accountable;—thoughts are evanescent, and therefore not accountable, or capable of suffering punishment or receiving reward. (4.) The conscience not only condemns our sinful thoughts, but it condemns the soul, as a permanent, existing, and accountable being, for those thoughts. (5.) Seeing thoughts do not exist after they occur, and have no conscience, they cannot be subjects of punishment.

58. May we suppose, with our author, that at any time after the implantation of the soul, infants have no thoughts? Ans. No; because the soul is essentially active, and thoughts are its only actions. The fewness of its ideas or perceptions, and the weakness of them, are no proof that it has no thoughts.

59. How, then, is it said they have no actual sin, Rom. v. 14, or have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression? Ans.

They do not, like Adam, sin against knowledge, nor by a formal act of the will, under knowledge of the law. In this sense they have no actual sin. But, in a certain sense, even infants are guilty of actual sin, as their thoughts are sinful.

60. It is objected, (1.) That general thought or the habit of perception, impression, and ideas, should be distinguished from particular thoughts; that while the latter are evanescent, the former are permanent? Ans. The objection must imply that general thought, &c., is the soul. This is weak and unphilosophical; for, (1.) General thought is an abstraction, and no being. (2.) A habit of perception, of impression, &c., must be the habit of a being, and all these perceptions must consist of particulars; that is, they are particular thoughts of the mind.

61. Obj. (2.) Whether the mind chooses,^f affirms, or denies, it always thinks; and these actions consist of thoughts; and therefore the soul is thought? Ans. (1.) The mind or soul always exists, even when these particular exercises are not occurring. Ans. (2.) These thoughts must be the actions of the soul.

62. Obj. (3.) We know nothing of the mind besides its thoughts or operations? Ans. (1.) Besides qualities, we know nothing of the body; it does not, therefore, follow that there is no body, but qualities only. (2.) We know the fact of a body by its qualities, and the fact of a soul by its operations; although we can comprehend neither of them.

§ XIII.—63. Is, then, the soul a spiritual substance or being? Ans. Yes.

64. Have our souls the power of operating on things without them? Ans. Yes; as on the body; and, through the body, on other things.

65. Although the power of the soul of operating on the body be a manifest fact, is it not to us an entire mystery? Ans. Yes.

NOTE:—Therefore we see that an unembodied spirit, as an angel, may operate on matter, and communicate thoughts, although we know not how. But, as we are constituted with soul and body personally united, our minds are limited to operating on the body with which each one is respectively united; and therefore our knowledge or conception of the operation of spirit on matter, or of one spirit immediately on another, is limited to the operations which we experience.

66. What are the faculties that belong to the soul? Ans. They are many, and variously divided by philosophers, but still they are all powers of the same undivided, simple, and uncompounded substance—the soul or mind. We may distinctly trace the powers of perception, of judging, choosing, and refusing, of affections, of memory, and conscience. But the leading powers are the *understanding* and *will*.

67. What is the power of understanding? Ans. It comprehends the powers of perceiving and judging.

68. Is the power of perceiving simply passive? Ans. No; it appears to be also active, forming an intelligent conception or idea of the thing perceived.

69. How does the understanding act in judging? Ans. It compares different perceptions with one another, forms a judgment respecting them, and draws conclusions; and thus it reasons.

70. What is the direct object of the understanding? Ans. Truth and error.

71. What is the *will*? Ans. The power of choosing and refusing.

72. Does it not imply the affections of love or hatred, desire or aversion? Ans. Yes; these appear to be essential to the action of the will.

NOTE:—Our conception of these powers of the soul is this:—(1.) The understanding is the intellectual power; the will and affections are the moral powers, or those to which sin and holiness immediately and properly belong. (2.) The affections are the original moral powers or rather, the faculty of the affections is the original moral power which the will obeys; and they indicate the moral state of the soul; or rather, they are its moral state.

73. What is the direct object of the will? Ans. Good and evil; whether real or apparent.

74. Is good, in any sense, the object of the understanding? Ans. Yes; it belongs to the understanding to judge of the fact whether the object be good or not; that is, of the truth in question; but it belongs to the will to relish or disrelish the object, as good or evil.

75. Are not these two powers, the understanding and will, intimately connected with one another? Ans. Yes; on all practical matters, they are intimately connected and inseparable, and have a mutual influence on one another. Although, on some theoretic subjects, they are not only distinct, but separate; the judgment acting without desire or aversion to the object.

76. Which of these is the leading power? Ans. The understanding is properly the leading power: the will following the judgment.

77. How far, or wherein may it be said that the will always follows the understanding? Ans. The last practical judgment of the understanding. The exercise of the understanding in judging is divided into theoretic and practical; and, again, the practical is divided into absolute and comparative. It is the last act of the understanding, in a practical comparative judgment, that the will follows. The understanding may decide that an act, under consideration as a thing to be done, is not morally right, and even that it is not comparatively ultimately good for us, but finally judge that, for the present, it is comparatively best for us; and this the will chooses.

NOTE:—We think there is no doubt that, in fallen man, the understanding often follows the will; that, having theoretically judged that an act, under consideration to be done, is morally wrong, and comparatively and ultimately not good for us, it comes, under the influence of the affections and will, to a contrary practical, comparative judgment, that the same act is best for the present; that this last judgment is based on the relish which the mind has for the object, and on this relish the mind judges it best that the affection be gratified.

Upon the whole, we are warranted to say that, in a holy, moral

agent, the understanding leads the will, and that, in the contrary character, the will generally, or at least often, leads the understanding; and that God created the soul at first upright, giving the understanding the government; for, in a holy being, the will must relish and choose what a correct understanding judges to be good, whether absolutely or comparatively.

78. Although moral liberty be not a faculty or power of the mind, is it not a property essential to a moral and accountable being? Ans. Yes.

79. Does this moral liberty (or the liberty necessary to accountability) mean that we can do as we please? Ans. No; the will is free, though the person be not.

80. Does it mean that we can always choose the moral good? Ans. No; we may have all the liberty necessary to accountability, while we have neither the knowledge of good, nor affection for it.

81. Does it consist in indifference, or is indifference necessary to its exercise? Ans. No; God is essentially free, but not indifferent; and man is conscious of full liberty, when his affections are most earnest.

82. Is a self-determining power of the will, independent of God, and independently of motives and circumstances, necessary to liberty? Ans. No; liberty is exercised in acting under the influence of motives, under the limitation of circumstances, and under the sustaining and governing power of God.

83. In what, then, does liberty consist, or what is it? Ans. It is acting with rational complacency; the mind relishing or disrelishing, according to its nature, choosing or refusing, approving or disapproving, loving or hating, as our judgment and affections dictate, whatever may be the liberty or restraint of our action, and whatever the circumstances may be under which we are even compelled to act, 2 Cor. viii. 3; ix. 7.

84. Then, although the will exercises this liberty especially, is it not a power of the whole mind? Ans. Yes; it is not exclusively a power, property, or exercise of the will; the understanding and affections partake in it.

85. Can this liberty be lost by man in any case? Ans. No; it belongs to him in his fallen as well as in his upright state, and in his greatest restraints, as well as in his greatest liberty of action.

86. Have sinners, then, all the liberty necessary to moral accountability, although they have lost all ability to choose moral good? Ans. Yes; although sinners have lost all relish for what is morally or evangelically good, and all ability to choose it, they have all the liberty which is necessary to accountability, because they have liberty to choose according to their inclinations or taste, and they are accountable for their inclinations and taste.

87. What is *memory*? Ans. It is a power of the mind to retain the impressions made on the understanding by facts, whether these facts be physical or metaphysical, whether they be acts mental or corporeal.

88. Does not the memory include the exercise of the understand-

ing, and depend on it? Ans. Yes; memory depends on attention, perception and judgment.

89. What is *conscience*? Ans. It is a peculiar power, depending on the understanding for its exercise, but having special reference to our own actions, and it does not merely perceive them, or merely compare them with an acknowledged law, but feels their agreement or contrariety to it, and approves or disapproves of our actions and of ourselves, accordingly, Rom. ii. 15.

90. Does conscience, then, include a moral sense of right and wrong, besides simple perception and knowledge? Ans. Yes; it receives a law which the judgment approves; it applies it, and draws conclusions, under a sense of right and wrong.

91. Can conscience then, be our ultimate rule, or a safe guide, without correct knowledge and right conceptions? Ans. No; it practically acknowledges the law to be the ultimate rule, and it is a correct guide only so far as the understanding knows the law, and forms right conceptions of it.

92. Are not all these powers spiritual and immaterial, proving themselves to be the exercises of a spiritual being? Ans. Yes.

93. Yet has not the body a real and powerful influence on the affections, and, through them, on the understanding and will? Ans. Yes; and no doubt the apostle has some reference to this when he calls our depraved nature, "the flesh," and depraved affections and exercises "the carnal mind," Rom. vii. 18; viii. 7; and when he prays for the sanctification of "the spirit, the soul, and the body," 1 Thess. v. 23.

LECTURE XII.—THE SOUL NOT GENERATED—UNION OF BODY AND SOUL—ITS IMMORTALITY.

§ XIV.—94. Is the soul generated with the body; or is it created immediately by God, and implanted in every individual person? Ans. It is not generated with the body, but created immediately by God.

95. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From Scripture, Eccles. xii. 7; Zech. xii. 1; Heb. xii. 9. Thus, while God's providence respects both soul and body equally, operations are ascribed to God, in reference to the soul, as distinct from his operations in regard to the body. And these are spoken of as occurring in the case of every human person, through all ages. (2.) From reason. An action of a created being cannot give existence to a being of a nature essentially different. The action producing a natural birth is the action of matter, and cannot produce spirit.

96. But it is objected, in favour of the generation of the soul, (1.) That man generates the whole man? Ans. Though he generates the whole man, yet not the whole of man; as we may kill the whole man, yet not the whole of man.

97. Obj. (2.) It is said, Gen. xlvi. 26, that "souls came from Jacob's loins?" Ans. *Souls* are there put for *persons*, as in other places, when it is said that souls were cut off by the sword, Joshua x. 28, 30, &c.

98. Obj. (3.) The soul is compared to a lamp, Prov. xx. 27; and therefore the soul is propagated like the lighting of one candle by another? Ans. It is a gratuitous and far-fetched inference, and entirely foreign to the meaning of that text, which evidently intends to set forth the use and importance of the soul.

99. Obj. (4.) The similarity of disposition in parents and children proves that the children receive the soul through the medium of the parents? Ans. Even where this likeness is apparent, it no doubt flows from the peculiar constitution of the body, through the intimate union between it and the soul.

100. Obj. (5.) The fact that every infant body is furnished with a soul personally united to it, favours the doctrine that the soul is generated with the body? Ans. God has so ordained it, and in all things he works according to his own appointment. Natural causes do not produce their effects but by divine appointment and operation; and God's appointment without a natural cause, is as sure, uniform, and efficient, as with it.

101. Obj. (6.) We cannot account for original sin imputed, or inherent sin in the soul, unless we believe that the soul is generated with the body? Ans. (1.) The Judge of all the earth will do right, although "His way is in the sea, and his path in the mighty waters," &c. (2.) Inherent sin in the soul, when united with the body, and sin imputed to it, although it be created immediately by the hand of God, presents no more difficulty than depravity in the body and a curse lying on it, when God, in his ordinary providence, causes it to come into existence. God could form a relation without a natural instrumentality, as well as with it.

102. Obj. (7.) God's resting from creation-work on the seventh day, forbids the idea of the subsequent creation of the soul? Ans. He rested from the creation of new species or kinds.

§ XV.—103. Prove the immortality of the soul? Ans. (1.) The Scriptures directly prove it, Eccles. xii. 7; Matt. x. 28. (2.) They indirectly prove it; as the promise of eternal life, and threatening of eternal death; and the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. (3.) Reason furnishes strong corroborative evidence.

104. What are some evidences from reason? Ans. (1.) The essential nature of the soul—simple and immaterial—fitting it for an eternal existence. (2.) The excellence of man's nature above the beasts. (3.) The desire and expectation of immortality, intimating that these are innate ideas or impressions, arising from its nature and destiny. (4.) There is not a full retribution for sin in this life, nor a full enjoyment of all that is promised to the godly.

105. Is the immateriality and simplicity of the soul the reason why it is immortal? Ans. No; because this would make its existence independent, which is absurd in the case of a creature.

106. What, then, is the cause of the soul's immortality; or on what alone does it depend? Ans. The will of God is the sole cause; and his revelation of his will is the sole ground of our faith in the soul's immortality.

107. Is not the doctrine of the soul's immortality denied by many? Ans. Yes; as by the Atheists, Epicureans, and, in some respects, by the Socinians.

108. Some object, (1.) That Eccles. iii. 19, teaches that the human soul perishes, as that of the beasts; "As the one dieth, so dieth the other; they have all one breath, so that a man hath no preëminence above a beast?" Ans. This refers to the outward condition of man and beast, as both equally mortal; and to the outward appearance of these things. That this is the meaning, see verse 21, which teaches that, though the spirit of man goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast goeth downward, the outward appearance is the same.

109. Obj. (2.) The Scriptures represent the dead as not in existence, Job vii. 8, "Thine eyes are upon me, and I am not;" and that they do not praise God, Ps. vi. 5; xxx. 9? Ans. These passages are to be understood of action in the present life, and of praising God in this world, Isa. xxxviii. 18, 19.

110. Obj. (3.) The godly are said to continue for ever, and the ungodly to die? Ans. The everlasting life of the godly, as it signifies their eternal happiness, signifies also their eternal existence; and the death of the ungodly signifies their eternal misery, and, consequently, their eternal existence, Mark ix. 44, &c.

§ XVI.—111. Is there such a union between the soul and body as to constitute one individual person? Ans. Yes.

112. Is this union comprehensible to us, or within our power to explain? Ans. No; the fact of the union of soul and body in the human person is unquestionable by a sound mind, while the nature of the fact, and manner of the union is inexplicable.

113. Although the subject is incomprehensible, are there not some things, in connexion with it, plain and easily understood? Ans. Yes.

114. What things respecting this union may be clearly ascertained? Ans. Three things; (1.) That the soul has a locality in the body. (2.) That it is a natural union. (3.) That there is a reciprocal affection and influence between the soul and the body.

115. Is the soul limited, in its locality, to the body, so long as the union exists in the present life? Ans. Yes; it can neither leave the body, in life, nor act beyond it.

116. Should we believe that the presence of the soul is limited to any part of the body? Ans. No; it dwells in, or is united to the whole body, and is wholly in it, and in every part.

117. Are we, then, to believe that the soul is extended with the body? Ans. No; the soul is incapable of extension. There is, therefore, a mystery in the union of soul and body which we cannot comprehend. While we know that extension is a property of matter, and not of spirit, and omnipresence is a perfection of God alone, we have evidence of the presence of the soul in every part of the body, by its operations and consciousness.

118. If we may say its principal seat is the head, what should

we understand or mean by this? Ans. That the principal organs of the body on which it operates, or which operate on it, are there.

119. Does not this mutual union of soul and body constitute a person, which neither of them is alone? Ans. Yes; they constitute, in union, what is the peculiar human person.

120. Does this union produce a mutual communication of actions and passions? Ans. Yes; many organs of the body obey the soul, and the soul is affected by the state of the body. The soul renders the body susceptible of impressions, and capable of sensations; and the organs of the body are means of information to the soul.

121. Is this mutual communication of operations the effect of the mere appointment of God, without the instrumentality of the union of soul and body; or does he effect this mutual communication by means of that union? Ans. It is indeed by God's appointment and sustaining providence; but he has appointed that union as the natural means of effecting this communication.

122. Is this mutual communication, between soul and body, all that is meant by the union? or, is it all that constitutes the union of soul and body? Ans. No; because, (1.) It is only the effect of that union. (2.) Angels, assuming bodies, may have this mutual communication, and yet there is no personal union. (3.) In certain diseases, this communication appears to cease, and yet the union remains; as in apoplexy, syncope, paralysis, &c.

123. Is there a certainty in the knowledge thus acquired by the soul through the sensations of the body? Ans. Yes; although infidels, in order to overthrow the evidence of the truth of the Scriptures from miracles, have denied this certainty.

124. Are there not some cases of deception? Ans. Yes; as when certain organs of the body are injured or deranged; but there is no deception when in health.

125. But are we not sometimes deceived by our senses, when in their sound state; as when we suppose the sun goes round the earth, that the sun is in the very position in the heavens in which we see him, or that a straight rod in water is crooked, &c.? Ans. No; in these and such cases, the senses do not err; they report precisely the truth—the actual appearance; but, in such cases, we deceive ourselves by inferences, or false reasoning.

126. How may we prove that the senses convey the truth, and may be relied on with confidence? Ans. (1.) Because God gave them for the purpose of guiding our knowledge and actions. (2.) We are so constituted that we cannot guide ourselves without them, nor even avoid believing their truth. Even infidels believe the report of their senses in all cases, but, in some cases, reason falsely from other data, in seeming opposition to the report of the senses. (3.) Experience proves the senses to be true, but warns us to distinguish between the report of the senses and reasoning from them. Thus, the senses say that a ray of light from a rod in water, comes to the eye in a certain direction; they do not say that the whole

line is straight, from the rod to the eye; but inexperience infers that it is, ignorant that media of different densities refract the rays.

§ XVII.—127. When the soul and body are separated by death, is their union then utterly destroyed? Ans. No; it still remains in some respect; not indeed in active operation, but rather in law, and in the appointment of God; as each soul belongs to its own body, and each body to its own soul, and they shall be reunited.

128. Is there any ground for the doctrine that the soul unites with another body after the death of one? Ans. No; the doctrine is founded on imagination, is inconsistent with the doctrine of the resurrection, and human personality; as the human person consists of but one soul and one body, and shall so appear at the resurrection.

129. Is the soul, after the death of the body, a complete human person? Ans. No; it is a complete spirit; and we may suppose it accountable, as it is capable of acting in its separate state; but it is not a complete person; and we may suppose it to be desirous of re-union with the body.

§ XVIII.—130. What was the end of man's creation? Ans. The glory of God and his own happiness.

131. Do not all creatures, man with others, glorify God passively? Ans. Yes; God's wisdom, power, and goodness appear in his workmanship.

132. Can any corporeal beings but man glorify God actively? Ans. No; It is only in the human person that body is united to a rational soul, endued with moral powers.

CHAPTER XIV.

OF MAN'S STATE OF INTEGRITY.

LECTURE XIII.—MAN'S HAPPINESS AND HOLINESS—THE IMAGE OF GOD.

§ I.—Quest. 1. How manifold is the state of man? Ans. Four-fold.

2. What are these states? Ans. (1.) His state of integrity, as created. (2.) His state of depravity, as fallen. (3.) His begun restoration, in this life, in regeneration and sanctification. (4.) His state of glory hereafter; or restoration consummated. We now speak of the first, his state of integrity, in which he was created; called also his state of innocence, his state of rectitude, &c.

§ II.—In considering man in his state of integrity, we may consider his happiness and holiness, which he possessed when created, and also the way in which he was to obtain a higher state of life; or his prospects; and, first, *his happiness and holiness when created.*

3. May we not believe that the outward worldly circumstances of

man in his integrity contributed to his happiness? Ans. Yes; his constitution required worldly enjoyment, as he possessed a body with its various senses.

4. What was peculiar in his outward worldly circumstances? Ans. He was placed in a garden called *Eden*, signifying *pleasure*, adorned with every worldly delight.

5. Was this garden given to Adam for mere enjoyment and idleness? Ans. No; he was required to cultivate it, Gen. ii. 15; teaching that work was consistent with happiness, with the holy service of God, and, by divine appointment, made necessary to man's life and happiness.

6. Was this garden a matter of literal history, or an allegory? Ans. It was a matter of literal history.

7. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) The planting or forming of the garden, and the putting of the man into it, are narrated in connexion with the history of his creation, which is literal. (2.) The description of its rivers and trees, indicates a literal history. (3.) There is nothing in the account unworthy of God, or inconsistent with other Scriptures, to render recourse to allegory necessary.

8. Is it certainly ascertained where it was situated? Ans. No; as it is probable that it has been defaced by the flood, or other changes.

9. Where, according to common opinion, was its locality? Ans. In Mesopotamia; because of the rivers Euphrates and Tigris, and their divisions; and because the name is used, Isa. xxxvii. 12, and Ezek. xxvii. 23, in company with Haran, Gozan, and Ashur, places in, or near to Mesopotamia.

10. Have we any knowledge of the extent of Eden? Ans. No; but it is probable it was of considerable extent, from its including four rivers.

11. What other name was given to this garden, besides *Eden*? Ans. It is called *Paradise*; supposed to be a Persian word, signifying a *lovely garden*; in the New Testament, meaning *heaven*, but alluding to the garden of Eden, Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. xii. 4; Rev. ii. 7.

§ III.—12. In what did man's chief glory consist, in his state of integrity? Ans. In his being created in the image of God.

13. Is there any material or important difference between the words *image* and *likeness*, in their meaning as applied to man, as created by God? Ans. No; unless *image* be a stronger expression than *likeness*; as sometimes it is taken for the thing itself, as in Heb. x. 1. But in Gen. i. 26, 27, both words are used to mean the same thing, but, by repetition of the idea, to express the fact more forcibly.

14. Is there, then, any ground for the Popish distinction, that *image* refers to the nature of the soul, and *likeness* to the gracious gifts bestowed on it? Ans. No; for the word *image* is, in Scripture, used in reference to gracious gifts, Rom. viii. 29; 2 Cor. iii. 18.

15. Is not our likeness to God, in gracious gifts, as much the

work of God as likeness or image in the nature of the soul? Ans. Yes; and therefore the Popish distinction is of no avail in favour of legality, or the Pelagian doctrine of human ability to renew that likeness by our own strength.

§ IV.—16. Did this image of God consist, in any respect, in man's body? Ans. No; because God has no bodily image or appearance.

17. Some suppose that God, in creating man, assumed a body, or the form of a body, after the image of which he created man. How answer? Ans. (1.) It is a fiction without any foundation. (2.) Had man been formed in the likeness of such an assumed body, he would not have been in the image of God; as that assumed body was not God. (3.) The whole supposition substitutes a useless idea, instead of the true image of God in man—the image in the soul.

18. Others suppose that man was made in the image of the body of Christ, which was afterwards to be assumed. How answer? Ans. (1.) On the contrary, Christ was made in the likeness of man, Phil. ii. 8. (2.) Man was created in the image of God, and not of Christ as man, or of Christ's human nature.

19. But, although man's body is, in no sense, in the image of God, may we not suppose that man's erect form, and his features, indicate his superiority to the beasts, and that he possesses a soul made in the image of God? Ans. Yes.

§ V.—20. Had not man, at his creation, the image of God, both in the nature of his soul, and in its gracious qualifications bestowed upon it by God? Ans. Yes.

21. How does the nature of the human soul appear to be in the image of God; or wherein does its likeness to God consist? Ans. (1.) In its spirituality. (2.) In its immortality. (3.) In its powers, or faculties.

22. Does this natural image of God remain in man, though fallen? Ans. Yes; the essential nature of the soul remains; otherwise he would not be the same being that he was in creation, nor accountable for his apostacy.

23. How does it appear from Scripture that the image of God exists in the nature of the human soul, and still continues in fallen man? Ans. From many passages of Scripture; particularly, (1.) From Gen. ix. 6, which asserts that man was created in the image of God, and that, for this reason, murder should be capitally punished; necessarily implying that, though man had, by his fall, lost the gracious image of God, he still possessed his image in the nature of his soul. (2.) In Acts xvii. 28, 29, mankind are called "the offspring" of God, though fallen; and it is said that the Godhead is not like gold and silver, &c.; implying that man bears a likeness to God, which must consist in the nature of the soul, as his gracious qualities are lost. (3.) James iii. 9, asserts that men are made after the similitude of God; which text evidently means every one of the human family, unregenerate, as well as regenerate.

24. Obj. (1.) The Scriptures represent the image of God in man as consisting in the gracious qualifications of the regenerate; in knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10; and therefore not in the nature of the soul? Ans. (1.) That the soul is renewed in the image of God, by the Holy Spirit is true, but this does not deny that the nature of the soul is also in the image of God, according to other texts adduced above. (2.) There is a twofold image of God; the one, natural, consisting in the nature of the soul; the other gracious, into which the soul is renewed in regeneration.

25. Obj. (2.) Those that are unholy are said to be unlike God—ungodly, Ps. xlix. 20; John viii. 44? Ans. They are unlike God in moral qualities, but not in the natural, or physical qualities or powers of the soul.

26. Obj. (3.) There is an infinite distance between God and the human soul; and, therefore, there can be no likeness in their nature? Ans. This objection would be as valid with respect to moral qualities or graces, as with respect to nature. The likeness is not in infinity, and may be called analogy.

27. Obj. (4.) The mind is not the image, but the tablet on which the image is painted? Ans. The comparison is defective, and proves nothing. Not only the qualities, but the beings possessed of those qualities, may have a resemblance.

28. But, though the nature of the soul is in the image of God, is not the moral image in which Adam was created, and into which the sinner is renewed in regeneration, the more important image spoken of in Scripture? Ans. Yes; while Adam had, and the renewed soul has, both the natural and the moral image of God, the latter is chiefly noticed in Scripture.

§ VI.—29. How does it appear that Adam was created in the moral image of God? Ans. (1.) It is expressly stated, Gen. i. 26, 27, that God made man in his own image, which includes the moral; and, verse 31, all that was made was pronounced very good; which man would not have been, if unholy. (2.) In Eccles. vii. 29, it is expressly said that “God made man upright.” (3.) The term “renewed,” Col. iii. 10, implies recovery to qualities or image once possessed, but afterwards lost.

30. But Socinians object that Gen. i. 31, pronouncing man, with other things, “very good,” only means good as fitted to its end, and does not mean moral rectitude? Ans. As man was created a moral agent, and for the purpose of serving, glorifying, and enjoying God, he must have been endued with moral goodness, if he was fitted for the end of his creation.

31. In what did man’s moral image of God consist? Ans. In knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, Eph. iv. 24; Col. ii. 10.

32. How does the moral image of God consist in knowledge? Ans. (1.) In having a correct theoretic knowledge of divine truth, as far as our knowledge extends. (2.) In saving, approving, and sanctifying views of divine truth, in which the moral, as well as the intellectual powers are exercised.

33. How does the image of God consist in righteousness? Ans. In upright thoughts and deeds, conformed to the nature and will of God, as revealed in his word.

34. Does this righteousness signify a justifying righteousness, giving a claim to eternal life? Ans. In Adam, while in his state of integrity, his righteousness of life constituted both the image of God, and his claim to eternal life; but, in the believer in Christ, it is only his actual personal righteousness that constitutes the image of God. His justifying righteousness, being the righteousness of Christ, does not belong to the image of God in which he is renewed.

§ VII.—35. The Socinians deny man's original rectitude in an active and positive sense; admitting that he had a negative goodness, consisting in mere innocence, coupled with childlike ignorance. And, in proof of this, they allege that Adam and Eve (Gen. iii. 7) did not know that they were naked? Ans. Their ignorance of their nakedness was not ignorance of the fact, but freedom from shame; through their innocence, they knew no shame from nakedness.

36. They object, (2.) That our first parents fell in the first temptation, proving ignorance and want of active righteousness, or active, holy dispositions? Ans. Their fall only proved their mutability.

37. Obj. (3.) Uprightness and holy habits are acquired by frequent acts of righteousness, which Adam could not have attained at first? Ans. Holy habits, in us, are indeed strengthened by frequent holy acts; but holy habits and dispositions must necessarily precede holy acts, and these habits and dispositions God bestowed in creation, Eccles. vii. 29.

38. Did not Adam give evidence of active holiness and knowledge, before his fall? Ans. Yes; he gave names to the beasts; he knew the manner of Eve's creation, the relationship and duty of marriage, Gen. ii. 19, 23, 24. He consented to the divine law; as Eve pleads it against the serpent's temptation, Gen. iii. 2, 3. And, no doubt, he knew and consented to all his duties to God.

§ VIII.—39. Did not man's dominion over the lower creatures also belong to the image of God in which he was created? Ans. Yes; as appears from Gen. i. 26, 28, committing authority to man created in the image of God; from Ps. viii. 7; and from his giving names to the beasts, Gen. ii. 19.

40. May we not believe that man's dominion over the creatures included his right, even then, to use animals for food? Ans. Yes.

41. How does it appear that the use of animal food was then lawful? Ans. (1.) Animals were then as well adapted for food as now. (2.) Man was afterwards expressly allowed the use of animal food, and his privileges would not be increased by his sin. (3.) Man's dominion over the creatures implied it; as, after the fall, his dominion is expressly extended to this right, and, therefore, was implied in the first grant of dominion.

42. But it is objected, (1.) That this right to animal food was granted after the flood, implying that it had not been granted before? Ans. (1.) The grant was only renewed then, as the right of

dominion before given was then renewed also, Gen. ix. 2, 3. (2.) The express allowance of animal food, and the renewal of the right of dominion together to Noah, implied that dominion at first gave the right to use animals as food. (3.) The sacrificing of animals, which were to be eaten, before Noah's flood, proved a grant before the flood.

43. Obj. (2.) Herbs were expressly given as food at first, Gen. i. 29, 30, implying that animal food was not given? Ans. (1.) The gift of the one did not exclude the other, as the gift of food did not exclude drink, although not named. (2.) Because, in that early grant, the common use of herbs to beast and man was the matter spoken of.

44. Obj. (3.) It was only by the sin of man, and after it, that beasts were subjected to pain or corruption, Rom. viii. 20—22? Ans. (1.) The due use of animals for food was no more their corruption than the use of herbs was the corruption of them; and yet these were subjected to this use before man fell. Such use of herbs and animals, therefore, is not the cause of the groaning of the creation referred to in Rom. viii. 20—22; but that passage refers to the whole lower creation, inanimate as well as animate, as subjected to the curse for man's sin. (2.) The pain of animals, killed for man's food, in a state of innocence, appears as consistent with divine righteousness before man's sin, as after it; since beasts did not sin. God could, therefore, subject them to this use before man's sin, as well as after it.

§ IX.—45. The Socinians, denying the natural and moral image of God in man, insist that his dominion over the creatures was all the image of God that man possessed? Ans. (1.) The including of this dominion in the image of God, did not exclude the moral or natural image in the soul. (2.) It would have been inconsistent to give dominion to a creature possessing no moral or natural image of God; and, therefore, the grant of dominion implied a natural and moral image in man.

46. On the other hand, many deny that dominion was any part of the image of God in man. How prove that man was in the image of God in respect to dominion? Ans. (1.) From God's blessing man, and including dominion in that blessing, Gen. i. 28. (2.) From the Scriptures calling magistrates "gods," on account of their authority, Ps. lxxxii. 6; John x. 34. (3.) From man being called "the image of God," and the woman, "the glory of the man," 1 Cor. xi. 7; implying that man's authority over the woman is the image of God in man. (4.) Man's dominion over the creatures is evidently a likeness of God's dominion.

47. But it is objected, (1.) That man's dominion is not included in the image of God, as it is only a consequent or end of the image, and a proof of it? Ans. The image of God in man includes several things, and each of these is a part of the image, although the less principal may be a consequent on the principal part. Thus, the natural and moral image of God in man are the principal, and do-

minion is a consequent on them, by the appointment of God; and yet, though a consequent on these, it is a part of that image.

48. Obj. (2.) The image of God could exist in man without dominion? Ans. This may be admitted, but if God willed to add this part of the image to that of natural and moral likeness, there would be no inconsistency. That he did do so, we have seen; and it is illogical to reason thus—that, because man might have the image of God, in one of two respects, without any additional image, therefore, he did not bestow that image.

49. Obj. (3.) In future glory this dominion will cease? Ans. There is no proof of this. What dominion he will have, we know not. We can infer nothing on this point from our knowledge of the future state. But the evidence is clear respecting man's present state; and we are plainly told that he will have some kind of dominion in heaven, 2 Tim. ii. 12; Rev. iii. 21; xxii. 5.

LECTURE XIV.—THE IMAGE OF GOD—THE COVENANT OF WORKS.

§ X.—50. Having shown that man was created in the *natural* image of God, and stated that the natural image consisted in the *spirituality*, the *immortality*, and the *powers* of the soul; and as it is plain that the spirituality of the soul is in the image of God, who is a Spirit; we further inquire, How does it appear that the *immortality* of the soul belongs to the image of God? Ans. It has an eternity of existence, in whatever state it may ultimately be placed; and, therefore, its immortality is a likeness to God, who is eternal.

51. Wherein is the immortality of the soul unlike God? Ans. It is a bestowed and dependent immortality.

52. Was the whole man, body and soul, immortal, in a state of integrity? Ans. Yes.

53. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From all those Scriptures which represent death as the wages of sin, Rom. vi. 23; and as derived from sin, Rom. v. 12, 21. (2.) From the threatening of death for sin, Gen. ii. 17; and the sentence of death accordingly, on account of sin, Gen. iii. 19; which necessarily implies a promise of life, in case of obedience.

54. But the Pelagians and Socinians, in order to evade the argument for original sin, drawn from actual death, especially of infants, deny that man was created immortal in soul and body, and insist that the constitution given to man tended to death as its natural termination? Ans. The immortality of both soul and body depends entirely on the will of God, and he could as easily preserve the body immortal as the soul; and, in the future state, they shall be so preserved.

55. But they object that man was said to be *dust*, Gen. iii. 19; and, therefore, mortal? Ans. (1.) This was said after man had sinned, connecting death with the nature of his body. (2.) Though man's body, even in his state of integrity, was formed of the dust, his mortality was threatened only on the condition of sin. And

God was as able to preserve a material and earthly nature immortal, as an immaterial being.

56. Obj. (2.) The use of food was necessary to man's life, even in a state of innocence, which is inconsistent with a state of immortality? Ans. It would be inconsistent with a state of immortality consummated in heaven, but not with a begun immortality.

57. Obj. (3.) The propagation of the human race by generation, is inconsistent with immortality? Ans. There will be no occasion for the propagation of the human race in consummated immortality, yet it is consistent with begun immortality in this world. Besides, a change from natural and material bodies to spiritual bodies, and from a temporal to an eternal state, could, by the power of God, take place without death or dissolution. Such a change, no doubt, would have taken place, had man not sinned; and yet no death.

§ XI.—58. Does this image of God belong to the woman, as well as to the man? Ans. Yes; it is asserted that both male and female were created in the image of God, Gen. i. 26, 27.

59. Does Paul's declaration, 1 Cor. xi. 7, that the man is the glory of God, and the woman the glory of the man, militate against this doctrine? Ans. No; that passage only attributes this image to man in a greater degree, and that particularly in reference to his authority.

60. May this image be said to exist in, and belong to the whole man, soul and body? Ans. Yes; not as though the body itself was in any respect like God, yet as the body is a component part of the human person, and a partaker of the dignity of the soul, through union with it, it is a partaker of the image of God, in immortality, and in the exercise of dominion.

61. Are there not some remains and shreds of this image still in fallen man? Ans. Yes; that image still remains in the nature of the soul, in its spirituality, its immortality, and its constituent natural powers; but it is lost in its integrity of the natural and moral image combined.

62. May we infer that angels possess the image of God? Ans. Yes; as they are called "the sons of God," Job xxxviii. 7; and are spirits, immortal, intelligent, &c.

§ XII.—63. Was the image of God even with respect to integrity and gracious gifts, natural to man; or did these gifts belong to him naturally, as created by God? Ans. Yes; though they did not properly constitute his nature as a human being, he was endued with them, and they belonged to him as a creature; and he was consequently made immortal.

64. Was there any lust in man as created, which needed the restraints of superadded grace, as the Papists suppose? Ans. No; such lusts would have been sin; and therefore he had them not.

65. Is there any such thing as a state of pure nature, meaning that the person is neither good nor evil? Ans. No; it is a figment, suggested to support error.

66. It is objected, (1.) That there is an opposition between flesh and spirit, and the flesh or body tempts to sin? Ans. This occurs

only because we are fallen. In a state of holiness there is no opposition.

67. Obj. (2.) Man still retains his nature, and we may infer, from what we see, that there were some lusts in man originally, tempting him to sin? Ans. His natural constitution remains, though impaired, but he has lost his holiness.

§ XIII.—68. Was man, in his state of integrity, *happy*, as well as holy? Ans. Yes; his happiness would, of course, from the goodness of God, attend his holiness.

69. In what did his happiness chiefly consist, in his state of rectitude? Ans. Chiefly in the favour of God, and communion with him.

70. But was his happiness then consummated, or in the highest state of which his nature was capable? Ans. No; it was a happiness adapted to his present state, and to his capabilities, as he possessed them in this world.

71. Had God a higher happiness in reserve for him? Ans. Yes; as appears from the state of probation in which he placed him, and the promise implicitly made to him.

72. What step did God take with man, in his state of innocence, in order to raise him to a higher state of happiness? Ans. He entered into a *covenant* with him.

73. What is that covenant called? Ans. It is called by various names, according to the light in which it is viewed. Particularly; it is called a covenant of *works*; a covenant of *life*; a covenant of *nature*; a *legal* covenant; the *old* covenant, &c.

74. Why called a covenant of works? Ans. On account of its condition.

75. Why a covenant of life? Ans. On account of its promise.

76. What do the Scriptures call it? Ans. They call it generally *the law*, Gal. iii. 10; *the law of works*, Rom. iii. 27.

77. Why do the Scriptures call it the law, or the law of works? Ans. To intimate that its promise is on the condition of obedience to the law, and that, under it, life is in no measure a gift of grace, but entirely on the terms of law and justice.

78. May that covenant be properly called a *testament*? Ans. No; (1.) Because it was not an absolute, but a conditional promise of life. (2.) Because it was not confirmed by death; or because it is not a bequest to be bestowed on the death of the testator.

79. What did a covenant of works, or of life, with man, imply? Ans. (1.) That, although man was holy, he was not confirmed, but was liable to fall. (2.) That, though man was happy, he had not yet attained his highest degree of happiness. (3.) That he should come to that higher state of happiness by means of obedience, or trial.

80. Did God turn the law which he gave to man in creation into the form of a covenant? Ans. Yes; as we see by his promises to obedience and threatenings for disobedience.

81. When did he do this? or, when did he make that covenant?

Ans. Shortly after man's creation, and while he was in his state of integrity.

82. What is a covenant, as distinct from a mere law? Ans. It is properly a free, mutual contract between parties, on express terms of promise and conditions: although sometimes the term is used to express a free promise, but carrying the idea of an engagement under mutual obligations.

83. What are the parts of a proper covenant? or, what is necessary to constitute a proper covenant? Ans. Parties—a condition—a promise—and a penalty, if one or both of the parties be fallible.

§ XIV.—84. Since many deny that a proper covenant was made with Adam in innocence, how prove the fact? Ans. (1.) From Gen. ii. 16, 17, in which were parties, a condition, a penalty, and a promise implied. (2.) From Hos. vi. 7, "Like man (in the original, "Like Adam") have transgressed the covenant." (3.) From various references in Scripture to the covenant under which man naturally remains, as descended from Adam, Rom. v. 12, 14; x. 5; Gal. iv. 24; v. 4. (4.) From the comparison of Adam's representation of mankind with Christ's representation of his people, which latter representation is under a covenant. (5.) From the fact that Adam and all his posterity fell, under the penalty threatened, Rom. v. 12.

85. Who were the parties in this covenant? Ans. God and Adam.

86. What was the condition of it? Ans. Perfect obedience.

87. What was the promise of it? Ans. Eternal life.

88. What was the penalty? Ans. Death.

§ XVII.—*Of the condition.*—89. What was the law to be observed in this covenant? Ans. The whole law of God was necessarily the law of the covenant.

90. How does this appear, when nothing in the statement of the covenant is expressly noticed as the condition, but abstinence from the tree of knowledge of good and evil? Ans. (1.) Because the positive precept, respecting the forbidden fruit, had no importance except as, by the authority of God, it guarded and sustained the moral law. (2.) Because it would be utterly incongruous with the nature both of God and man, that man should have life in disobedience to the moral law. (3.) Because, in man's breaking the positive precept respecting the forbidden fruit, he broke the whole moral law, by unbelief, disregard of God's authority, idolatry, and love of sensible things. (4.) The Scriptures exhibit the condition of life as requiring obedience to the whole moral law, Matt. xix. 17; Gal. iii. 10.

91. Did not the law of the covenant necessarily include every positive precept that God might see proper to give? Ans. Yes.

92. Was there a positive precept in this covenant? Ans. Yes; the forbidding to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

93. Was there any natural-moral evil in eating the fruit of this tree? Ans. No; the evil lay in disobedience to divine authority.

94. Wherein lay the importance of this command? Ans. (1.) It was given by divine authority. (2.) It tried man's spirit of obedience to the mere will of God. It tried his faith, love, reverence, and humility. (3.) As long as this command would be obeyed, the whole law would be obeyed; and as long as the natural-moral law would be obeyed, this command would be observed also.

95. Why was the forbidden tree called "the tree of knowledge of good and evil?" Ans. Not from any virtue in the tree, but because man, in obeying, would experimentally know the good, and, in disobeying, he would experimentally know the evil.

96. Was not obedience to the whole law of God, natural and positive, the condition of the covenant of works? Ans. Yes.

97. What do we mean by the condition of the covenant? Ans. The terms on which the promise is made, and to be enjoyed.

98. Whose obedience did this covenant require, as the condition of life? Ans. Adam's obedience; not that of his posterity, Rom. v.

99. How does it appear that it did not require the obedience of posterity, as well as that of Adam, as the condition? Ans. (1.) Because the tree of life was given as the seal of the covenant, confirming the gift of life on Adam's keeping the covenant, Gen. iii. 22. (2.) Because, on Adam's breaking the covenant, the penalty fell on all his posterity, Rom. v. 12; implying that if he had kept it, the promise would have been fulfilled to them.

100. Could the condition of the covenant merit the reward? Ans. No; but it was prescribed, (1.) As man's duty, and for his trial. (2.) As a ground on which God would graciously bestow life, by paction or covenant. (3.) As an occasion on which God would, in his grace, bestow further favours.

§ XIX.—*Of the promise.*—101. As life was the promise of the covenant, what was included in the life promised? Ans. All that can be included in it; as, (1.) Temporal life—the continued union of soul and body in the favour of God. (2.) Spiritual life—the continued possession of the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness and holiness, and the enjoyment of communion with God. (3.) Eternal life—the favour, love, and gracious presence of God for ever.

102. How prove that there was such a promise in this covenant, when it is not expressly mentioned in Gen. ii. 16, 17, which gives a statement of the covenant? Ans. (1.) Because man was already in possession of this life substantially, and it was not threatened to be taken away, except for disobedience; and, therefore, it was implicitly promised in the strongest manner. (2.) Although life would not be merited by man's obedience, yet it would have been the necessary result of his holiness, through the goodness of God, and in perfect consistency with justice. (3.) Because, in the frequent reference to this covenant, in Scripture, life is uniformly represented as the thing promised, Rom. x. 5.

103. But why conclude that all these kinds of life were included in the promise? Why not suppose that the promise included only

some of them? Ans. Because, (1.) There was no exception of any kind of life, in the promise, and therefore all are included; for man was in possession of all these kinds, and, had any of them been withdrawn, it would have been death, contrary to the promise of the covenant. (2.) Because to withdraw either spiritual or eternal life, the other kinds of life would necessarily follow; and to withdraw temporal life, would have been a punishment without cause.

104. Obj. If temporal life had continued, this earth could not have sustained the whole family of man, nor could man have been raised to a higher state of life? Ans. It would not have been necessary, on the continuance of temporal life, that men should remain in the present state of existence during the term of this world. A change for a state of glory is not necessarily death, 1 Cor. xv. 51, "We shall not all sleep," that is, *die*; it is not a dissolution of the union of soul and body, to experience such a change.

105. May we believe that any superior state of life was promised in this covenant, than what Adam then possessed? Ans. Yes.

106. What superior state was promised? Ans. No doubt, heavenly glory; because, (1.) Man was then in a probationary state, but, on the fulfilment of the condition of the covenant, his life would have been confirmed; as appears by the tree of life, of which if Adam should eat, he should live for ever, Gen. iii. 22. (2.) Man was then in an earthly paradise; he should on obedience, each in due time, have been translated to the heavenly paradise; as appears from the fact of believers in Christ being thus removed to the heavenly state. (3.) The enjoyments of the earthly paradise consisted, in part of sensible temporal things; the highest enjoyments are spiritual and enduring. (4.) According to Rom. viii. 3, Christ gives eternal life in heaven; the law is weak to do this, but only weak through the flesh, not of itself. (5.) Eternal death in hell is included in the threatening, and therefore eternal life in heaven is included in the promise; and Christ so expounds the promise of the law, Matt. xix. 17.

LECTURE XV.—THE COVENANT OF WORKS—CONTINUED.

§ XXI.—*Of the penalty.*—Quest. 107. As death was the threatened penalty, what was included in it? Ans. All that can be included in death—commonly stated as death temporal, spiritual, and eternal.

108. What is temporal death? Ans. The dissolution of the union of soul and body, and that, as threatened in the covenant, under the curse.

109. What is spiritual death? Ans. Loss of the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, and of the enjoyment of him.

110. What is eternal death? Ans. Condemnation, and eternal separation from the gracious presence of God, and under his wrath.

111. Is this punishment reasonable? or, does it naturally and necessarily flow from the holiness and justice of God? Ans. Yes;

God's justice necessarily requires it; man's sin, being against God, deserves it; and there is a natural impression on man that death is the wages of sin, Rom. i. 32.

112. Is this punishment, under the covenant of works, due for every sin, even the least? Ans. Yes; Gal. iii. 10; Jas. ii. 10.

113. Is there any ground, then, for the distinction of mortal and venial sins? Ans. No; it exists only in man's blindness and depravity.

114. Can there be any ground for a dispensation of obedience to the law? Ans. No; and, least of all, for a human dispensation.

§§ XV. XVI.—*Of the persons embraced in this covenant.*—Quest. 115. Was Adam alone involved in this covenant? Ans. No; it involved all his posterity, by natural generation.

116. Was Eve an immediate party in the covenant, or, with posterity, represented by Adam? Ans. Eve was not an immediate party, but represented by Adam.

117. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Because the expression in the covenant, Gen. ii. 16, 17, is an address to the man alone, and in the singular. (2.) In the history, the covenant is represented as made when man was introduced into the garden, and Eve is represented as created afterwards, Gen. ii. 15—22. (3.) The Scriptures compare Christ and Adam as representing heads, 1 Cor. xv. 22, 47. (4.) The Scriptures represent the breach of the covenant as one offence, and the offence of one man, Rom. v. 12, 14, 18.

118. But, in Gen. iii. 2, 3, the woman speaks of the covenant obligation as equally lying on her and on Adam. Was she not, then, a representing head, or a party in the covenant? Ans. No; (1.) Seeing she was in existence while the covenant was unbroken, she was bound by it in her actions; as, no doubt, any of their posterity would have been, had they been born, and become moral agents, before the covenant was broken. (2.) Eve may be considered as one moral person with Adam in the covenant; but though she broke the covenant, the representation, in its breach, is attributed to Adam.

119. Were the promise, of Adam's fulfilling of the covenant, and the threatening, on his breach of it, made to all his natural posterity, as well as to himself? Ans. Yes.

120. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) The promise and the threatening were evidently coëxtensive, and connected with the condition of the covenant. (2.) The very penalty threatened has actually alighted on all Adam's posterity. Therefore they were included. (3.) All, without exception, are depraved, and nothing can account for universal depravity but a universal cause preceding it. And no cause could produce it but sin, and there could be no universal sin but Adam's as a representing head. (4.) Death and suffering prove previous guilt; but these sufferings occur with infants, before actual transgression, Rom. v. 13, 14; thus proving previous guilt, which could only be in Adam, and therefore in him as a covenant-representing head. (5.) The Scriptures plainly as-

sert that Adam's sin was the [cause of the] fall of all his posterity, Rom. v. 12, 19; 1 Cor. xv. 22. (6.) Christ and Adam are in Scripture compared as covenant heads; mankind dying in the one, and living in the other; showing that they acted as public heads of their respective seeds, Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22. (7.) We find that the Scriptures, in speaking of Adam, speak of him, or address him, as though he were all mankind, thus including all in him as a covenant head. Thus, Gen. i. 26—28, declares that God created Adam in his image, blessed him with fruitfulness, gave him dominion, &c.; which apply equally to his posterity; and so the covenant applies.

121. Were Adam's posterity so represented in that covenant, that they became guilty of that breach and were condemned for it? Ans. Yes; Rom. v. 16, 18, 19.

122. How long did Adam continue the acting covenant head of posterity? Ans. Till he broke the covenant.

123. How does it appear that he was no longer the representing head of posterity? Ans. (1.) Because the Scriptures ascribe man's death to Adam's one sin, and in no respect to his after sins. (2.) Because, Adam having broken the covenant, he could not procure life for posterity, which was the direct object of the covenant.

§ XXIV.—*Of the continued obligation of the covenant.*—124. But is not that covenant still binding on man in his natural state? Ans. Yes.

125. In what respect is it still binding, since Adam ceased to be the covenant head? Ans. (1.) The matter of the covenant, as a moral law, is still binding. (2.) Consequently, the requisition of personal, perfect, and perpetual obedience of each individual to God's law, as the condition of life, so long as he does not avail himself of the new covenant in Christ, still remains. The justice and holiness of God necessarily require this. (3.) The penalty is still due from every individual, not only for the first breach of the covenant, but also for every personal transgression; the covenant requiring obedience as the condition of life, must demand the penalty for personal disobedience. (4.) Also the connexion of eternal life with perfect obedience is still held out by that covenant, Matt. xix. 17.

126. But, since the covenant of works is broken, and there is now no longer an acting covenant head, why should we hold that the promise of life is still valid, on the condition of keeping the law? Ans. Although man cannot fulfil that condition, and although a penalty is required as well as obedience, yet, (1.) The Scriptures still hold out the promise on the same condition, Matt. xix. 17; Rom. x. 5; with the understanding that the penalty must also be satisfied. (2.) It also appears from the justice of God that he that was freed from the penalty and would perform all that the law requires, being thus holy and righteous, would not be condemned or damned. (3.) As God is good and gracious, such a holy creature, being in the image of God, and created for the enjoyment of him, would be made happy. (4.) Christ obtained life for his people by

the fulfilment of the condition of the covenant of works; and the two ways are set before sinners for their choice;—salvation by their works, or by the obedience of Christ—called “the law of works, and the law of faith,” Rom. iii. 27.

127. Does the continuance of the promise, on condition of obedience, give any encouragement to man to expect life in that way? Ans. No; Rom. iii. 20.

128. What purpose, then, is served by such exhibitions of the covenant of works, or of the condition and promise? Ans. (1.) To show the righteousness and goodness of God, and silence his enemies; all having the part of life which they could in justice and rectitude expect or ask. (2.) To convince man of his hopeless condition under the covenant of works. (3.) To show the plan of salvation, and the justice and grace of God in harmony; and to persuade man to believe in Christ.

129. Has God formally renewed the covenant of works with fallen man? Ans. No; he could not consistently renew it with the sinner. He still shows the old covenant to man, with all its terms. There was no need of its renewal, except declaratively; as it abides in force in the only way in which it can, in the holiness of God, be adapted to man.

130. How does it appear that the covenant of works, in its precept, is still binding on man in his natural state? Ans. (1.) From many Scriptures holding forth the terms, as Rom. x. 5; Matt. xix. 17. (2.) From many Scriptures declaring the penalty, as Gal. iii. 13; iv. 4, 5. (3.) From the righteousness of the law, which must bind man. (4.) From the impossibility of sinners being released from obligation, or of sin releasing them.

131. What obligation, then, did the covenant of works lay on man before his fall? Ans. Of obedience, perfect, personal, and perpetual, to every command that God would give.

132. What obligation after the covenant was broken? Ans. The same obligation of duty, and also that he should suffer the penalty.

133. Could even the goodness of God release man from this obligation, without an adequate satisfaction of law and justice? Ans. No; God must be just when he justifies the sinner, and this can occur only in Christ, by his satisfaction and obedience, Rom. iii. 26.

134. Could even obedience, perfect, personal, and perpetual, set us free from the penalty already incurred, or give us a title to life, without a satisfaction to the penalty? Ans. No; divine truth and obedience forbid it.

135. How long will that covenant of works bind man who is not redeemed from it by Christ? Ans. To eternity.

§§ XXI. XXII.—136. Had this covenant of works any seal? Ans. Yes; the tree of life was a seal of man's happiness and security for ever, and a pledge of it, Gen. iii. 22.

137. How did it become a seal? Ans. (1.) Before Adam fell it was a visible promise of life on his keeping the covenant. (2.) It would have been a seal of his actual security in life, on eating of it after his probation was finished, Gen. iii. 22.

138. Why was this tree called "the tree of life?" Ans. Not from any natural tendency of the tree to life temporal, spiritual, or eternal; but wholly as appointed by God as a sign and seal of life to be given on fulfilment of the condition of the covenant.

139. May we suppose the tree of life a species of trees, or an individual tree? Ans. Although an answer to this may not be conclusive or certain, and although it is not a question of much, if any practical importance, it would appear to be an individual tree, because called "*the tree*," Gen. iii. 22, "in the midst of the garden," Gen. ii. 9; and the way to it, after the fall, was guarded by the cherubim and a flaming sword.

140. Are we to suppose that the expression of God, Gen. iii. 22, "lest he take of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever," was ironical? Ans. We think it improper to call it ironical; and that it was used only to show the design of the tree, and the inconsistency, and also the impossibility, under the divine government, that man should eat of that tree as a seal of the covenant.

141. Should the tree of knowledge of good and evil be called a seal of the covenant of works? Ans. It is a point much disputed, and perhaps not very material to determine. The abstinence from this tree was certainly a part of the condition of the covenant itself, and it would appear to belong to the covenant, rather than to the seals of it. Seals, generally, are seals by participation. If this was a seal, it was to be so by abstinence; unless, as man partook of it, it would be a seal of his ruin. We prefer to avoid calling it a seal; though Witsius favours it.

142. Did it consist with the justice and goodness of God to man, to place all men under a covenant, to stand or fall by a representing head? Ans. Yes; as appears from the fact that he who is infinitely just and good, did so; and even from reason.

143. How does it appear from reason that the plan of the covenant of works, making Adam the representative head of his posterity, was the best for man? Ans. (1.) Man being created an intelligent, moral creature, both justice and goodness required that he should be placed under a moral law as his rule of life, and be held accountable to God. (2.) Justice and goodness required that man's life and happiness should be suspended on obedience to the moral law, or be on the condition of obedience, and death be the wages of disobedience. Thus man, by the law of his nature, and without a covenant, would have been in a probationary state, for the continued enjoyment of the life which he had. (3.) Thus all the successive generations of men would, even without a covenant, each individual for himself, have been in a probationary state. (4.) They would have been, even without a covenant, in this probationary state to the endless ages of eternity, and never secured or confirmed. (5.) They would have been, without a covenant, in a probationary state from their earliest youth, in all the weakness of youthful minds, and exposed to temptation, if evil had been permitted in the world. (6.) To eternity, they would have had no

claim to a higher state of existence or happiness, without a covenant. (7.) With a covenant of works, however, such as that under which man was placed, he could, after a time of trial, and that probably very short, have attained confirmation, freedom from a state of probation, and, ultimately, a higher state of existence, and higher happiness. (8.) We have no reason to believe that mankind generally, nor any of them individually, would have done better for themselves than Adam did, had they been left without a covenant, in a probationary state for themselves.

144. How does it appear that Adam gave his consent to the terms of this covenant? Ans. (1.) Man being holy, he not only submitted to this covenant, and to its terms, as the sovereign and righteous will of God, but he most cordially acquiesced in it. (2.) The woman declared to the serpent their obligation, and had no disaffection to the terms till sin entered the heart, under the temptation.

145. But how was it just and equitable to involve all mankind in such tremendous consequences, suspended on the conduct of one man, and without their consent, as they were not in existence? Ans. (1.) God had a perfect right, in his wisdom, goodness, righteousness, and sovereignty, to choose the plan on which he would try, and also govern his intelligent creatures; and his will and choice were not only just and good, but the best for man. (2.) The will of God is the best possible reason for consent. (3.) A just reason for Adam's consent was a just reason for the consent of posterity. (4.) If they were holy, as Adam was, they would have cordially consented; and the refusal of consent, by an unholy creature, is of no weight in the matter. (5.) Nothing but depravity, apostacy, and rebellion will refuse consent; and this refusal of consent no more acquits us of obligation than any other instance of rebellion.

146. Will any one really complain of God's dealing with man in the covenant of works who is reconciled to God himself, to his righteousness, truth and goodness, and to the plan of salvation by Christ? Ans. No; if not reconciled to God's will in one thing, they will not in another.

147. If any man reject the salvation of Christ by the new covenant, is not his complaint against the old covenant the fruit of a spirit of rebellion against God? Ans. Yes.

148. Is not salvation by Christ's representation of his people well adapted to man as represented by Adam in the covenant of works? Ans. Yes; if ruin comes by the act of a representing head, salvation comes also freely by a representing head, Rom. v. 15—21.

149. If the plan of the covenant of works seems to any man a hard measure, should he not acknowledge that the plan of the covenant of grace excels in grace, and completely relieves from every difficulty? Ans. Yes; and it would evidently be wiser to accept of salvation by Christ, as our representing head in the covenant of grace, than to complain of God's dealings with us in the covenant

of works. Such a complaint is a contending with God. It is not only heinous sin, but the highest folly; and reconciliation to Christ will be a reconciliation to God's ways with us.

CHAPTER XV.

OF THE SIN OF MAN.

LECTURE XVI.—ITS OBJECT, SUBJECT, CAUSE, EFFECTS, AND DIVISION.

§ I.—Quest. 1.—Having considered the first state of man—his integrity—we now inquire, What is the second state? Ans. His fallen state; called also his state of misery, and his state of nature.

2. Why called his state of nature, or natural state? Ans. Not as if it were his original state, as created of God, but in contrast with a state of grace in Christ, which is supernatural.

3. What two things are included in this state, which chiefly characterize it? Ans. Sin and punishment, Rom. iii. 23; v. 12. Our subject at present is SIN.

§ II.—4. Has not sin a variety of names in Scripture? Ans. Yes; as חטאת, *Cha-ta-ah*, ἀμαρτία, *error*; עויל, *Ev-vel*, עון, *A-vôn*, *iniquity, perversity*; פשע, *Pha-sha*, transgression; מרד, *Ma-rad*, *rebellion*; אַוּמְיָא, *breach of law*; ἀδικία, *unrighteousness, &c.*; all which names are descriptive of its character and nature. Although sin is sometimes, perhaps, put for punishment, as Gen. iv. 13, and sometimes for a sin offering, as Ex. xxx. 10, and 2 Cor. v. 21; yet we now take it in its proper sense; and as the sin of man, and not of angels, although they have sinned.

§ III.—5. What is the general nature and character of man's sin? Ans. It is a defection from the law of God, subjecting man to death, and depriving him of the proper dignity of his nature.

§ IV.—6. Is sin a positive being or substance? Ans. No; it is a defect, or want of conformity to God's law.

7. What would be the consequence of calling it a positive being? Ans. It would make God the Author of it; as every positive being or substance is necessarily of God as the Author; and, as God's work, it would be good.

8. Yet are not names given to it in Scripture, which are positive, as if it were a positive being? Ans. Yes; as "transgression," "disobedience," "enmity," &c.

9. How, then, are we to understand these names which imply something positive in sin? Ans. (1.) Sin properly is chargeable on the actions of an intelligent creature, or on his active nature. (2.) Though the sin lies in want of conformity of an action, or of an active being to the law of God, yet the Scriptures, by a kind of metonymy, give the name *sin* to the action, and thus no injustice

is done to the sinner, and the name is thus given agreeably to human conception.

10. Is a sinful action, or a sinful nature, a mere negative? Ans. No; the nature or action is destitute of conformity to the law, and consequently the action which is sinful is positive. And, therefore, sin is of various degrees of aggravation, and various degrees of punishment are due for its various aggravations.

§ V.—We shall consider sin in its object, its subject, its cause, and its effects. And, first, of its *object*.

11. What is the proper object of sin? Ans. God and his law.

12. As sin is essentially a violation of God's law, is not sin committed directly and primarily against God? Ans. Yes; Ps. li. 4; 1 John iii. 4.

13. But is not sin often committed immediately against our neighbour, against persons, society, and the laws of society? Ans. Yes; but these sins are primarily against God and his law, because they are forbidden by him; though secondarily against man.

14. Are a present knowledge of the law, a present perception of it, and its obligation, or an active purpose of the will, essentially necessary to constitute sin? Ans. No; for although these things aggravate sin, yet sin occurs in ignorance, in the habits and dispositions of the mind, and in the nature as depraved.

15. How does it appear that there may be sin in the nature, habits, and disposition, even under entire ignorance of the law which we violate, and while we are not wilfully violating a known obligation? Ans. (1.) Because God's law, the moral-natural law, written at first on man's heart, requires right habits, principles, motives, and affections; and the want of these motives and principles is sinful, and contrary to the image of God, and to his law. (2.) The ceremonial law, by prescribing atonements for sins of ignorance, shows that there is guilt and sin in ignorance. (3.) We need to be renewed in knowledge and holiness; proving that in our natural state, the heart is sinful in ignorance.

16. Is there, then, sin in the omission of what is commanded to be done, as well as in the commission of what is forbidden? Ans. Yes; even in the want of right motives, principles, and affections, in what we do.

§ VI.—*The subject of sin*.—17. Can any but a rational creature be the subject of sin, or be guilty of it? Ans. No; because irrational creatures are not subjects of a moral law.

18. Would man be a subject of sin if he were not under a moral law, and accountable? Ans. No; Rom. v. 13.

19. Could he be the subject of a moral law, if he had not understanding, will, and affections? Ans. No.

20. But is not every creature of God, even irrational animals, under a law of God? Ans. Yes; But not a moral law. By the law given to them, we are not to understand a law proposed to their understanding and will, but the nature given to them, under which they live and act, and by which God governs them in his providence.

21. Does sin belong to the soul, or to the body, or to both? Ans. Primarily and radically to the soul, but instrumentally and demonstratively to the body. The body is not directly and immediately a subject of sin, but only through personal union to the soul, it partakes, as a constituent, of the person, and stimulates the depraved soul to sin, and serves it in sin.

22. Is not the body a participant in the punishment of sin? Ans. Yes; Matt. x. 28. But it partakes only as a constituent of the person, and in active union to the soul.

23. But are not beasts, though innocent, subject to suffering through sin? Ans. Yes; Rom. viii. 20, 22, which includes sensitive creation as well as inanimate; and this suffering is through the sin of man. This is a mystery in the will and providence of God, that perhaps another state of existence may unfold.

§ VII.—*The cause of sin.*—24. Who is the proper cause or author of man's sin? Ans. Man, himself; and he is rather the *deficient* than the *efficient* cause; because sin is immediately a defect, and active sin is rather a consequence of that defect.

25. May we say that Satan and the world are causes of man's sin? Ans. No; they are rather occasions than causes of it; but faulty occasions.

26. Are not even good things occasions of sin in man? Ans. Yes; even the law of God itself is an occasion of man's sin, but an innocent and holy occasion; the fault lying only in man's depravity, Rom. vii. 9-11.

27. How is God not the Author of sin, when not only does he permit it, but his permission is efficacious? Ans. Although God is the First Cause of all created beings, and although his permission of sin is efficacious, so that his purposes are infallibly accomplished, yet he does not work evil principles or dispositions in man, but rules and overrules them, in his wisdom for good; and man, acting of his own free will in sinning, is the sole author of his sin.

§ VIII.—*The effects of sin.*—28. What are the effects of sin? Ans. The immediate effects are two-fold—*guilt* and *defilement*; to which we should add, as a remote effect, *punishment*.

29. What is the guilt of sin? Ans. It is the liability of the sinner to punishment, Rom. iii. 19.

30. Are the guilt, and the sinfulness or moral evil of sin, the same thing? Ans. No; Christ was, by imputation, under the guilt of our sin, but not under its sinfulness or moral evil.

31. Are the guilt and the moral evil of sin equally taken away in justification? Ans. No; justification takes away the guilt of sin, but not its moral evil. Though the person be justified, and perfectly delivered from all liability to punishment, his sin is still as evil morally as ever, and as hateful as ever to God, and to the gracious soul.

32. How may the guilt of sin be divided? Ans. Into potential and actual guilt.

33. What is potential guilt? Ans. It is the demerit of sin, or its deserving of punishment, which justification does not remove;

and the justified believer is conscious of it and acknowledges it with contrition.

34. What is actual guilt? Ans. It is the actual liability to punishment, in the case of the unjustified, but which is entirely removed in justification through Christ.

35. Is there any ground for the Popish distinction between the guilt of blame or fault, and the guilt of punishment? Ans. No; all our guilt arises from the fault or moral evil of sin, and it is this fault, or moral evil, that incurs punishment. And the actual guilt arising from the moral evil of our sin being taken away by justification through Christ, the fault or moral evil of our sin is graciously forgiven. The guilt or liability to punishment being taken away in justification, there remains no liability to punishment for its moral evil.

36. What do the Papists intend by this distinction? Ans. They hold that though the justified person is freed from damnation by justification, he is punished in this life for the moral-evil of his sin.

36. How does it appear that this doctrine is false? Ans. (1.) It denies justification to be complete, leaving some measure of condemnation to the justified person; contrary to Rom. viii. 1. (2.) It makes the believer's sufferings to be penal, and a measure of atonement for sin to the dishonour of divine grace. (3.) It denies the perfection of Christ's satisfaction. (4.) It misrepresents divine chastisements, holding them to be penal, when they are fatherly, for the believer's instruction and sanctification.

37. What is the defilement of sin? Ans. It is the moral debasement and deformity of the sinner by his sin, in which he loses the image of God, and puts on the image of Satan, John viii. 44. It is called "filthiness," 2 Cor. vii. 1—"wallowing in the mire," 2 Pet. ii. 22. In this debasement, the understanding is erroneous and grovelling in divine things, the affections are vile, and conscience is guilty.

38. Does justification *directly* take away this defilement? Ans. No; justification lays the foundation for its removal by sanctification.

39. Does this moral defilement arise from the guilt, or from the nature of sin? Ans. From the nature of it; from its moral evil and turpitude, and the influence of this on the sinner.

40. Was it the guilt, then, or the moral evil and turpitude of our sin, that was reckoned or imputed to Christ? Ans. It was the guilt of sin only, and, in no respect, its turpitude or moral evil. He was holy, though treated as guilty.

§ IX.—*The division of sin.*—41. How is sin usually divided? Ans. Into original and actual.

42. What do we commonly call original sin? Ans. "The guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of the whole nature."

43. But what is most properly called original sin? Ans. Adam's first sin, by which he broke covenant with God. Therefore sin may be divided into *the first sin of Adam* (or original sin,) and *the sins that arise from it.*

44. Is not Adam's first sin spoken of in Scripture as "sin," "transgression," "offence," &c., in the singular number? Ans. Yes; as Rom. v. 12—21.

45. Is it not manifest to reason that sin somehow came into the world, and among the human family, after man was created? Ans. Yes; as he is evidently not now what God made him. And even the heathen seem to have some idea of this, as appears from their mythology, as the story of Prometheus stealing fire from Jupiter, of Pandora's box, which Epimetheus opened, and from which all kinds of evils flowed out, and filled the earth; which are no doubt the glimmerings of tradition perverted.

46. But is any true knowledge of original sin obtained except from Holy Scripture? Ans. No; except by Scripture, it is unknown what that sin was, by whom committed, the occasion of it, its demerit and vileness, or its bearing on the human family.

It may be defined—The sin which our first parents committed voluntarily, at the suggestion of Satan acting in the serpent, by which they violated the positive command given them by God, and, in it, the whole moral law, subjecting themselves, and all posterity, to the curse.

LECTURE XVII.—ADAM'S FIRST SIN.

§ X.—Quest. 47. By whom was this sin of breach of the covenant committed? Ans. By both Adam and Eve.

48. Why then is it said, (1 Tim. ii. 14.) that "Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression? Ans. The apostle does not deny that they both sinned, but refers to the history of the case, to remind the woman of her part in the transaction, and to lead her to humility; and therefore he intends to deny that Adam was first seduced—or that he was seduced immediately by the serpent; and to maintain that Eve became an instrument of seducing him.

49. Why is the whole breach of the covenant, referred to Adam alone, in Rom. v. 12, &c., when Eve was also in the transgression? Ans. Because the covenant was made directly with Adam, and he was made the representing head of posterity. It was on the breach of the covenant as made with Adam, that the threatened curse came on posterity, and this is the immediate subject of the apostle in that place. Eve indeed sinned and broke the covenant, but Adam was properly the representing head. Or if Eve should be at all considered as a representing head, it was only as she was considered as one moral head with Adam; and although both sinned, the act in its substance was one and the same, and ascribed to Adam.

50. Is it a question of any moment whether Adam or Eve was most guilty? Ans. No; but yet we may observe that Eve, in sinning first, and seducing Adam, aggravated her guilt. And Adam's sin was highly aggravated, since he was the head of the woman, and the very individual with whom the covenant was made.

51. Wherein appears the heinousness of that first sin? Ans. (1.) It was immediately against God. (2.) It was a direct violation of an express and plain command. (3.) It involved the happiness of our first parents and all their posterity. (4.) It was the effect of unbelieving pride, ingratitude, selfishness, and sensuality. (5.) It was the breach of all the commands of the moral law. (6.) It was a personal and an official revolt from God to Satan.

§ XI.—52. Was the will of Adam and Eve entirely free in this sin? Ans. Yes; (1.) As appears from Ecc. vii. 29; Hosca vi. 7. (2.) From the fact that the will is naturally free. (3.) From the fact that Satan had no power to compel, but only to present motives. (4.) Because they had power and privilege of standing, and God severely forbade their sin,—therefore the deed was voluntary.

53. Did God, by withholding superadded grace, which would, if added, have secured their standing, interfere with their free will? Ans. No; as Satan could not govern the human heart, so God was under no obligation to give confirming grace.

54. Does it follow, from man's sinning voluntarily, that he had no goodness inclining him to obedience, and opposing temptation? Ans. No; it is evident from Eve's consent that she was inclined to obedience and opposed to disobedience, Gen. iii. 2, 3, but that, under the temptation, her will yielded.

55. Did God take away their former grace in which they were created before they had sinned? Ans. No; he justly took it away in consequence of sin.

§ XII.—56. What was the means or instrument employed to seduce Eve to eat the forbidden fruit? Ans. The serpent.

57. Are we to believe that it was literally a serpent that was employed on this occasion? Ans. Yes.

58. How can this appear, since the serpent is not endowed with the power of speech? Ans. (1.) In the narration of the transaction it is expressly called "the serpent." (2.) It is compared with other beasts of the field in subtilty. (3.) Paul uses the same name in reference to the temptation of Eve, 2 Cor. xi. 3. (4.) Satan might employ the organs of the serpent to speak.

59. But was the serpent alone the tempter? Ans. No; but Satan in the serpent, possessing it.

60. How does it appear that Satan was really the tempter in the serpent? Ans. (1.) Because he is called "the tempter," Matt. iv. 3, 5. (2.) From our Lord's plain allusion to this case of temptation by Satan, John viii. 44. (3.) From Satan's being called "the old serpent," Rev. xx. 2.

§ XIII.—61. Did Satan use cunning in his temptation of our first parents? Ans. Yes.

62. How or wherein did this appear? Ans. (1.) In employing a beast that Eve would not suspect of any intention of evil, and a beast that was beautiful, not appearing in his true character, which, if Eve did not yet know it, would nevertheless appear as a strange and a suspicious being to her. (2.) Attacking the woman,

the weaker person, and alone. (3.) Approaching her shortly after her creation, when she had little experience. (4.) Persuading her to violate only a positive precept, of which they could see no importance in itself, and not a natural moral law, written on man's heart. (5.) Commencing by interrogation, as if inquiring, not about the meaning of the precept, but the fact of it. (6.) Next venturing to use an open contradiction of the threatening, and alleging, from the name of the tree, that the benefit of knowledge would be attained by eating. (7.) Accusing God of unkindness, or of envy, and pretending more kindness to them than God had shown them.

63. But some suppose that to charge God before Eve with unkindness or envy, would have been too gross an attack on Eve's sensibilities and knowledge, and therefore that the serpent, in the words, "God doth know," was swearing by God that he was representing the truth. May we admit this construction? Ans. No; because, (1.) The expression is not in the form of an oath. (2.) An oath by God, denying the truth of his threatening, would have been as gross as a charge of unkindness. (3.) Even as an oath it would have carried the very same charge against God, of unkindness. (4.) The woman was now prepared, by yielding to the serpent's suggestions, to receive any charge against God, which to a blinded mind had any plausibility. Sensuality and unbelief had already arisen in her mind.

NOTE.—From this temptation and fall of our first parents, we may see, (1.) That temptations at first are generally most plausible, and as we yield they become more gross, but equally insuring. (2.) That a rule from which we should never deviate is, whatever we know to be the will of God, implicitly and firmly obey it. (3.) If we overlook divine authority, and consider only the importance of a command, according to our conception of it, as the reason of obedience, we will soon lose sight of its importance, and disregard it. (4.) People may have knowledge to discern between God's express commands, as Eve had, while they have not knowledge to discern its importance—even with this ignorance we are safe, if we duly regard the divine authority which we have.

§ XIV.—64. Who was the immediate tempter of Adam? Ans. Eve.

65. Is it not probable that Adam was seduced both by the woman's commendation of the fruit, and from seeing no evil effect on her by her eating it? Ans. Yes; God, no doubt, on Adam's yielding to his wife's suggestion, giving him as well as her up to blindness for the time, that they did not yet perceive the effect, since they had already fallen into unbelief and sensuality.

66. May we not suppose that Eve's temptation of Adam was the more influential on him, as she was given to him as his companion, and the object of his love? Ans. Yes.

67. Should we suppose, as some, that Adam, through affection for his wife, knowingly and wilfully violated God's command, without having fallen under the influence of the temptation? Ans.

No; as no such thing is revealed to us; it would have been unreasonable; and from Gen. iii. 7, it appears that they did not discover their error till the sin had been completed; and from Gen. iii. 12, that Adam fell under the temptation by Eve.

68. If Adam had eaten of the fruit from love to Eve, without having fallen under the temptation, and while he had a full perception of the sin, and its consequences, would it have been any diminution of his guilt? Ans. No; it would have been an aggravation of it.

§ XV.—69. What was the special sin committed by our first parents, in their breach of covenant? Ans. Eating the forbidden fruit. See the covenant, Gen. iii. 17, and the charge of guilt, Gen. iii. 6, 7, 11.

70. But was this external sin all that was included in their breach of covenant? Ans. No; this sin could not have been committed without the violation of the moral law—without blindness, unbelief, pride, and sensual desires.

71. In what order may we believe these internal sins were committed, or which of them was first in order? Ans. In the order just mentioned; as it appears, (1.) That they had neglected the proper exercise of their understanding, and become blinded, and the will could not come to a wrong choice, till the understanding had made a wrong judgment. (2.) Because unbelief led the way to pride, lust, and disobedience. (3.) The course of the temptation appears to indicate this order; because the tempter addressed the understanding—endeavoured to persuade to disbelief of divine threatenings, and of the goodness of God—urged to pride and sensual gratification.

72. If blindness, unbelief, pride, and lust, even preceded the eating of the fruit, why do we call the eating of the fruit *original* sin, and the *first* sin? Ans. Because this sin, with its accompanying sins, was the completion of the act expressly forbidden in the covenant. It was the sin threatened with death, and these internal sins were necessary to that special sin of eating the fruit, led to it, and were included in it.

73. Why is Adam's sin called *one* offence, Rom. v. 15? Ans. The apostle there speaks of the whole sinful action, as including all these accompaniments—the whole breach of the covenant.

§ XVI.—Quest. 74. Having before spoken of the evil of that first sin, we only here inquire, Is it known how long man stood in his integrity? Ans. No; but there is every probability that the time was short—even probable that he fell on the sixth day; Psal. xlix. 13. Though, all things were created very good, man may not have remained so till the close of the day. But it is not necessary to be positive on this point.

§ XVII.—75. What was the result of this sin? Ans. The curse.

76. Does it appear that Adam and Eve soon became sensible of their sin and fall? Ans. Yes; although it does not appear that they were sensible of their sin and loss till the external act of breaking the covenant was completed, yet, when it was done, they discovered their condition.

77. How did they manifest this sensibility? Ans. By shame of their nakedness, terror at the voice of God, and the excuses they offered.

78. Did God then denounce a sentence against them? Ans. Yes.

79. What did that sentence include? Ans. The whole threatened curse—with a sentence on the serpent, on Satan, and on his seed, which must mean his associate angels, who are under his government, and wicked men; as Matt. iii. 7; John viii. 44; 1 John iii. 8. But particularly on man, the sentence included (1.) A sentence on the woman, including her sufferings in child-bearing, and her sense of dependence on the man, and subjection to him, and to his tyranny when, through depravity, he would exercise it. (2.) A sentence on the man, including a painful and laborious culture of the earth, under difficulties, as of thorns and thistles, and a dependence on that culture for subsistence, and death temporal, not as the end, but as the entrance on the consummation of misery. (3.) All this sentence on the man and the woman, was the same sentence on all their posterity. (4.) The begun execution of the sentence, in their exclusion from the garden of Eden, and from the tree of life, by placing angels with a flaming sword to guard it. (5.) Various afflictions and sorrows of life to posterity, implied in the expression to the serpent, "Thou shalt bruise his heel;" no doubt referring to man's afflictions, though chiefly to Christ's human nature.

80. Are we to suppose that the exclusion of man from the tree of life implied that his eating of it would have recovered him to his original state after his fall? Ans. No; but it intimated the design of that tree, in the covenant of works; the use which man should have made of it, had he kept his first estate; and the benefits which, in that case, it would have secured: and therefore that God would now prevent the inconsistency of man's eating of it, when he had no life to seal, and forbid his vain hope of salvation by a broken covenant of works.

§ XVIII.—81. Did God execute the full threatenings of the covenant on our first parents when they sinned? Ans. No; he exercised forbearance and grace.

82. Was this a violation of the truth of the threatening? Ans. No; because (1.) Postponement of execution may be granted without injustice. (2.) The plan on which grace was exercised maintained both justice and truth.

83. Wherein did God's patience, or forbearance appear? Ans. In sparing man's life, for the time, (although it was forfeited,) in order to the exercise of further mercies.

84. Wherein did he show his grace? Ans. (1.) In seeking after our first parents when they had revolted, and were flying from him. (2.) In bringing them to conviction of sin, and of the impossibility of concealing themselves from his eye, or of escaping his hand. (3.) In making a gracious and free gospel offer to them.

85. What was the gospel offer? Ans. That enmity should arise

between the seed of the woman, and that of the serpent, and that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head.

86. How does it appear that this was a gospel promise of salvation to man from his fallen state, and not merely an announcement of literal enmity between man and the literal serpent race, as some suppose? Ans. (1.) Because it would have been an unimportant announcement to promise or threaten merely this temporal enmity. (2.) Because this was all the ground of faith and hope that Adam and Eve obtained at that time. (3.) Because the announcement has been fulfilled in its spiritual meaning, in the bestowment of salvation on man, through Christ, the seed of the woman. (4.) Because the whole body of the Scriptures have developed that promise in the doctrine of Christ and salvation by him. (5.) Many passages of Scripture plainly refer to it, in representing the work of Christ; as Rom. xvi. 20; 1 John iii. 8. (6.) Eve, on the birth of Cain, showed that she expected, in her seed, something more than temporal enmity with the serpent; "I have gotten a man from the Lord," or "a man the Lord." (7.) Bruising the heel, would not apply literally to the serpent's mode of operation.

87. Who is meant by the seed of the serpent? Ans. (1.) The race of literal serpents is no doubt included, as an emblem of the spiritual things chiefly intended, and as a memorial of that first temptation, and its effects. (2.) The whole class of fallen angels under the government of Satan their prince. (3.) Wicked men, who possess the spirit or disposition of Satan, are under his government, and do his service; Matt. iii. 7; John viii. 44.

88. Who are meant by the seed of the woman? Ans. (1.) Especially Christ the author of this salvation, who destroys the works of the Devil; 1 John iii. 8. (2.) True believers who are united with Christ, who under him obtain the victory over Satan, and who suffer by his malice.

89. How could the putting of enmity between the seed of the woman and that of the serpent, be accounted a good thing, and a gospel promise? Ans. Enmity is good or evil according as it is exercised. As enmity against sin, it is good, as enmity against holiness, it is sinful.

90. How are we to understand that God puts enmity in Satan and wicked men, against Christ and his people? Ans. Not by infusing enmity into their hearts against Christ and his people; but (1.) By adopting a method of grace and salvation, in opposition to the will of Satan and wicked men, and maintaining holiness. (2.) And by leaving Satan and wicked men to exercise their enmity against these things.

91. What was the enmity promised on Christ's part? Ans. His hatred of sin, and his gracious designs towards man, in his atonement, his grace, and his government as Mediator.

92. What is the enmity on the part of believers? Ans. Their regeneration and sanctification; their hatred of sin, and warfare against it.

93. What was promised in that first gospel announcement, as

the result of this enmity? Ans. The bruising of the serpent's head; including, (1.) Christ's victory over Satan, Col. ii. 15, and destroying the works of the Devil. (2.) His people's triumph in him, in their justification and sanctification through Christ, and sustaining his cause by their testimony; Rev. xii. 11.

94. Was any trial or trouble intimated as connected with this contest or triumph? Ans. Yes; the serpent should bruise the heel of the seed, including an announcement of suffering by Christ and his people.

95. How or wherein is this accomplished? Ans. (1.) In Christ's sufferings in human nature. (2.) In his people's afflictions as chastisements.

96. What did these announcements intimate as to the issue of the conflict? Ans. A deadly and effectual wound to Satan, and a temporary and lighter wound to the seed of the woman.

§ XIX.—97. Is there reason to believe that Adam and Eve believed in and accepted this first gospel promise? Ans. Yes; for, (1.) We might expect this from the promise being made by God for the purpose of giving a hope. (2.) From the pious education of this family; even Cain, as well as Abel, offering sacrifice. (3.) From the admitted piety of Abel and Seth. (4.) From Eve's expression at the birth of Cain; at least acknowledging the providence of God with gratitude; and at least acknowledging the begun fulfilment of the promise of a seed; intimating her expectation and faith that eventually her seed would bruise the serpent's head. (5.) By translating Gen. iv. 1, "a man, Jehovah," we would not understand that Eve thought Cain was Jehovah, but a pledge, that Jehovah, the Saviour, would, according to promise, come of her seed. (6.) We are not to infer from the brief history that no other light was given to Adam and Eve than the words recorded. Adam was the head of the family, and no doubt a prophet of the Lord to his generations, to unfold that promise as far as necessary to their faith; and the offering of sacrifices corroborates this view.

LECTURE XVIII.—SIN ARISING FROM ADAM'S FIRST SIN.

§ XX.—98. Having spoken of the first sin, or breach of the covenant, we come now to speak of sin as arising from it—How is sin, as arising from the first, commonly divided? Ans. Into *original* and *actual*.

99. Speaking of original sin, as distinct from Adam's first sin, what does it mean, or include? Ans. Inherent sin, called the "sin of our nature,"—"indwelling sin,"—"the flesh,"—"the old man," &c. Observe, sometimes original sin is spoken of strictly as meaning Adam's breach of covenant; sometimes as meaning the sin of our nature; and, sometimes, more largely, as Adam's sin imputed, and indwelling, or inherent sin. But, whether we include imputed guilt in the name or not, all our original and actual sin arises from Adam's sin. And taking original sin as including imputed guilt and inherent sin, we inquire,—

100. Is not original sin, in this large sense, the root and spring of all actual transgressions? Ans. Yes.

101. Does not, however, all our inherent sin spring from Adam's sin imputed to us? Ans. Yes, Rom. v. 12. That sin is the ground and reason of the curse, the covenant curse of death. To this inherent, or indwelling sin, as the immediate origin of actual sins, we now attend.

§ XXI.—102. How do we prove the truth and reality of indwelling sin, or inherent sin in all men, against Arminians, Socinians, Papists, &c. Ans. (1.) From express scriptures; as Rom. iii. 12. This universal sinfulness must have a universal cause, inherent sin. Again, Job xiv. 4, a universal declaration of inherent sin. Again, Psalm li. 5, "shapen in iniquity," an express declaration in which David puts himself for all mankind. Again, John iii. 3, 6. Here, verse 6 asserts the universal principle that the offspring is of the same nature as the parent; and the third verse declares the universal necessity of the new birth, implying that in the old and natural birth we are under sin. Again, Gal. v. 24, our natural state is called "flesh," which must be "crucified," Rom. viii. 3, called "sinful flesh," Eph. ii. 3, "desires of the flesh," and that this is so by nature. (2.) From the wickedness of all who are in their natural state, as proved by Scripture and experience; as Job xv. 16; Psalm xiv. 2, 3. (3.) From calamities and death befalling infants. (4.) From the ordinances of circumcision and baptism, for infants, implying their sin, and need of a spiritual cleansing. (5.) If indwelling sin were not universal, and therefore natural, blindness and defect in duty, and actual sin would not be universal.

103. But Arminians object, that original sin lays us under a necessity of sinning, and is inconsistent with liberty? Ans. The objection is unfounded. The sinner feels his full liberty to think, feel, and act, according to his nature. The objection supposes liberty to consist in indifference, which is false. It consists in choice or will, according to our nature.

104. Obj. (2.) That inherent sin is inconsistent with the creation of man by a holy God? Ans. The doctrine of inherent sin does not represent God as creating man a sinner, but that God acts as a Judge, inflicting punishment on his apostate creatures.

105. Obj. (3.) That all sin can be accounted for by imitation? Ans. (1.) The sin of infants cannot be accounted for in this way. (2.) The universal sinfulness of adults, even if it were by imitation, would prove a universal proneness to sin, which is inherent sin.

106. Obj. (4.) That man has still his constituent faculties in which he was created, and therefore, either his sin is not inherent, or he was created sinful? Ans. He has all his constituent faculties, but his powers are depraved, and not as they were created.

§ XXII.—107. What is the nature of this original or inherent sin? Ans. An entire destitution of original righteousness from first existence, and a proneness to evil.

108. What is its extent? Ans. It is universal, affecting all men naturally, young and old, and all their powers; Rom. vii. 18.

109. What is its cause? Ans. Breach of covenant in Adam, and that sin imputed.

§ XXIII.—110. How does it appear that the sin of our nature is properly called sin? Ans. (1.) From Scripture; as Rom. vii. 7; Ps. li. 5; Rom. viii. 7. (2.) From the fact that the law of God requires the whole man to be conformed to it, even the principles and motions and affections of the heart; Psal. li. 6. (3.) From the fact that God created man internally holy, and by his nature disposed to holiness; therefore, internal opposition to holiness, is apostasy and sin. (4.) Inherent sin bringing forth actual transgression, must be sin in the root, as well as in the fruit.

111. But Papists and Arminians object, (1.) That the apostle James, i. 15, distinguishes between lust and sin? Ans. By *sin*, the apostle means actual sin; and, therefore, actual sin being the fruit, lust must be of the same nature.

112. Obj. (2.) Children are said to be innocent, Ps. cvi. 38? Ans. They are comparatively innocent, and they deserved not death from the hands of those who sacrificed them.

113. Obj. (3.) Children, before birth, have done no good or evil, Rom. ix. 12? Ans. They had committed no actual sin, as a reason for divine purpose of mercy to one, and judgment to the other.

114. Obj. (4.) In this inherent sin there is no act of the will, and therefore no sin? Ans. (1.) An act of the will is not essential to sin: it is sin that moves the will to sinful acts. (2.) An act of the will in Adam produced this inherent sin, and the will is ready to consent and obey.

115. Obj. (5.) Our Lord said of the blind man, (John ix. 3,) "Neither hath this man sinned," &c.? Ans. He meant that this affliction was not sent as a punishment of sin, or on account of any special sin.

116. Obj. (6.) Children are said to be holy, 1 Cor. vii. 14? Ans. The apostle means an external or federal holiness—a covenant relation to God, externally—and others are unholy, or not federally holy.

§ XXIV.—117. What would be the evil of holding that sin is a positive being or entity? Ans. (1.) That God would be the Author of sin, as he is the author of all being or substance. (2.) If sin be a substance belonging to our nature, Christ must have not only assumed our guilt and punishment, which he did, but also have partaken of our sinfulness.

118. But it is objected, (1.) That sin obtains names in Scripture which imply substance; as "flesh," "body of sin," "the old man," &c.? Ans. As sin is a quality of action, or of an active nature, these names are evidently figurative, expressing the complex idea of the active powers of man, under the defilement of sin.

119. Obj. (2.) Sinful actions proceed from depravity, and therefore sin is a positive being? Ans. We must distinguish between the being, or positive existence of the action, and the sinfulness of

the action. Sin, in its formal nature, lies in the quality of the action; in want of conformity to God's law. Thus the action, abstract from its quality, is a positive existence, and is good, but, as destitute of moral goodness, it is sinful.

§ XXV.—120. Do not the Scriptures express sin both negatively and positively? Ans. Yes; they call it a want,—“not subject to the law,” “blindness,” “darkness,” “ignorance,” &c. They also express it as active and positive; as “enmity,” “alienated,” &c. Thus the Scriptures describing sin as a positive being, describe the actions of the mind, under the influence of the want of conformity to the law, under the influence of want of wisdom, holiness, and peace, which produces folly, enmity, servile fear, &c.

§ XXVI.—121. Is this depravity in the natural man total, or are there any remains of holiness, or evangelical goodness in him? Ans. It is total. There are no remains of holiness. Thus we are said to be “dead,” &c., Eph. ii. 1. Now this death is not physical, nor eternal death in hell, but spiritual death, or total want of spiritual life. And the general tenor of Scripture confirms this; as Gen. vi. 5; Rom. vii. 18.

122. Is man then, in consequence, utterly impotent to all spiritual evangelical goodness? Ans. Yes; (1.) He is necessarily so, being spiritually dead. (2.) Many Scripture texts confirm this; as Rom. v. 6; Rom. viii. 7; Jer. xiii. 23; Rom. vi. 17. (3.) The Scriptures ascribing all goodness in us to God prove the same; John vi. 44; 1 Cor. iv. 7; Phil. ii. 13.

123. But by many it is admitted that, in the natural man, there is a moral inability, while they deny that his impotence is total; as they hold that he has a natural ability to perform all his duty. How answer? Ans. Man is under both a moral and a natural impotence to holy and spiritual duties.

124. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From Scripture comparisons on this subject; as Jer. xiii. 23; in which our impotence is compared with the impotence of the Ethiopian to change his skin, and the leopard to change his spots; and the comparison of the natural man's condition with that of the dead, implied in Eph. ii. 1. (2.) From Scripture descriptions of man's inability, as 1 Cor. ii. 14, showing that his powers, as depraved, are not adapted to the performance. (3.) From the plain, philosophical fact, that there cannot properly be a moral impotence where there is a natural ability. Because if there is a natural ability to perform holy duties, that natural ability must be able to overcome and remove all the moral impotence. But if it be not able to do this, (as both Scripture and reason show) then, natural power finds a barrier to holy duties, which it cannot break or remove; and so confesses that man has not natural ability to effect the work; because the moral powers must be brought into right action, or the work is not done.

125. But it is argued, that man must have the natural constituent faculties, which are necessary to the performance of a holy action, otherwise he would not be an accountable being; as he would not be the natural creature that sinned, and fell under the sentence of the

law? Ans. It is admitted that man has the natural constituent faculties which are necessary to a holy action, but it does not follow that these faculties, of themselves, are able to change the heart, remove moral impotence, or give the necessary moral power; and unless they can do this, these natural powers are unable to perform the duty. These natural powers cannot now exercise themselves in a gracious, holy manner.

126. Would man have all his constituent faculties, and be an accountable being, if he had not a free will? Ans. No; he was created with a freedom of will, as necessary to his moral action and accountability.

127. How can man be said to have a free will, and a personal accountability, if he be absolutely unable to choose what is gracious, or evangelically good? Ans. All the free will which belongs to any moral being, even to God himself, is a freedom to will or choose according to the nature which that being possesses, who wills; and therefore all the free-will which belongs to man's constituent faculties, and which is necessary to his accountability, is simply his ability to choose, will, wish, or desire, according to the nature and disposition which he has. Now fallen man still has this freedom, and he is conscious of it, even when he is conscious of sin in his choice, and conscious of inability, and indisposition to choose what is spiritually good.

128. Is there not then a distinction between the being, or existence, or entity of the will, and its moral character? Ans. Yes; as to the being of man's will, it is free; but as to its moral character, it is in slavery to his depraved nature; and his depraved nature is in slavery to sin, Rom. vi. 16, 17.

129. But if man's nature, from which spring all the free acts of the will, be in slavery to sin, how can man be an accountable being, having no power to change his nature? Ans. (1.) Because God at first created man holy. (2.) By sin man lost his holiness of nature and will. But, (3.) He must necessarily be under the moral law of God, under which he was created.

130. Is all that moral good that unregenerate man can do, and all that moral and evangelical goodness which the regenerate do, wrought by God? Ans. Yes; all the natural moral good done by the unregenerate, is wrought in them by the common operations of the Spirit, as in the case of Balaam, Saul, Jehu, &c.; but all evangelical goodness in the regenerate is wrought by the supernatural and saving influences of the Holy Spirit, Phil. ii. 12, 13.

131. But it is objected, (1.) That the Scriptures always ascribe a free choice to man, whether believer or unbeliever, and present, for his choice, spiritual as well as natural and moral good; and therefore the Scriptures suppose man's ability to choose spiritual good; as Deut. xxx. 15, 17; Joshua xxiv. 15. Ans. These proposals from God to man do indeed imply that man has a will, and a power to exercise it answering to his nature, but they do not imply that he is able of himself to make a holy choice, or that his nature can lead him to choose the good.

132. Obj. (2.) On the doctrine of man's total inability to love, choose, and perform what is evangelically good, then God's commands and prohibitions would be useless? Ans. The inference is false, and the argument unsound, as will appear by several considerations; as, (1.) Our Lord did nothing uselessly; yet, as appears from John vi. 27-40, he offered salvation, enjoined duty, and forbade sin, to his hearers, and yet in verse 44, he asserted their inability to comply of themselves, and, verse 64, that he knew this; so Matt. xiii. 13-15. (2.) These proposals are useful, although man cannot of himself comply; useful for several purposes; as, (a.) These proposals are necessary as means by which God will enlighten and persuade his elect. (b.) They are the means of direction, and sanctification, and of comfort to his own people. (c.) They are the means of teaching unbelievers their duty; of showing their duty; of exercising their free-will in choosing good; of convincing them of sin; of rendering them inexcusable under God's judgments. (d.) They are useful as the means of setting before all, the authority of God and his law over all. These things must not be concealed and kept back, because men, through depravity, are unable to comply.

LECTURE XIX.—HUMAN DEPRAVITY.

133. Obj. (3.) That in Rom. ii. 14, 15, it is asserted that even the heathen, and therefore many unregenerate, do, by nature, the things contained in the law; and, therefore, we must infer that men have naturally the ability to do that which is good? Ans. This passage speaks only of external duties, and of some natural moral good deeds, which men may do without supernatural grace; but none of these deeds are spiritually good, or conformed to the will of God in his law. And these things are not set forth by the apostle to maintain that men are able of themselves to do what is evangelically good, but to show that natural men know enough to convince them of guilt and sin.

Q. 134. Obj. (4.) Paul, Rom. vii. 14-16, declares that he had a will to do that good which he did not perform, and to hate that sin which he did commit? Ans. Paul is not there speaking of the natural exercises of the natural man, but of the exercises of the regenerate, of himself as regenerated, and of his will to good by regenerating grace.

Q. 135. Obj. (5.) It would represent God as unjust, to command duties to man which he has no power to perform; and if man be utterly impotent to good, he is excusable in disobedience? Ans. (1.) God cannot lose his right to command, by man's sin and loss of ability; nor can the law lose its obligation, since man still retains his constituent faculties, and his natural freedom of will. (2.) Man is culpable for his inability to do good, as he lost his ability by sin, and as he freely rejects the good, while his conscience tells him that the law is just and obligatory, and that he acts freely.

136. Is it a fair representation of our doctrine on this head, to say that we hold man's inability to do good to be the same as the

inability of the blind to see, and of the deaf to hear, &c.? **Ans. No;** persons under those defects are destitute of the constitutional powers to do what they would be very willing to do; while the sinner has all the constitutional powers necessary to holy duties, but has not the will nor desire to do them, nor the ability to change his will. We may say that the sinner is no more able to do what is evangelically good, than the blind to see; Jer. xiii. 23; but his inability is under different circumstances, and the Scriptures make these comparisons in order to show the reality and completeness of the sinner's impotence, but not to show the grounds or reasons of it.

137. But what is the utility of this doctrine of man's utter impotence to good? **Ans.** (1.) To teach him his true condition before God. (2.) To lead him to renounce vain hopes. (3.) To lead him to humility. (4.) To lead him to see the gracious provisions of the gospel as adapted to his necessities, and to accept of salvation by free grace. (5.) To exalt the grace of God in Christ.

138. Does this doctrine tend to discourage faith, hope, or endeavours after holiness? **Ans.** No; it tends to discourage deceptive hopes, inefficient endeavours and efforts which would divert the mind from the true hope of salvation, and leave us in ruin and despair; but it greatly tends to promote faith and holiness in all who believe the doctrine and accept of Christ, leading them to appropriate Christ as offered, and to seek experience of the gospel promises.

§ XXVII.—139. Does this depravity or indwelling sin extend through the whole man? **Ans.** Yes; to soul and body; to the understanding, the will, and affections, and to the conscience.

140. How does it appear that it affects the understanding? **Ans.** (1.) From direct scriptures; as Eph. iv. 18, 1 Cor. ii. 14. (2.) From prayers made for light and knowledge, Psa. xxv. 45, xliii. 3, cxix. 18. (3.) From the provision made for the enlightenment of the understanding; as 1 Cor. i. 30, John xvi. 13. (4.) From the change made in regeneration, Col. iii. 10; John vi. 45. (5.) From observation and experience; as the ignorance of the heathen, the errors among gospel hearers, and the light sense of the value of divine truth and grace.

141. How does it appear that the will and affections are depraved? **Ans.** From our Lord's complaint of Jerusalem, Matt. xxiii. 37; also, Rom. viii. 7.

142. How is the conscience depraved? **Ans.** By ignorance and error, leading it to false decisions, and by being hardened and blinded by sinful affections and practices; 1 Tim. iv. 2, Tit. i. 15.

143. How does this depravity extend to the body? **Ans.** It excites and cherishes depraved affections, and executes the demands of the will.

144. Can man of himself, overcome the depravity and blindness of his understanding? **Ans.** No; no more than that of his will; 1 Cor. ii. 14. And so divine provisions are made for its renovation.

§ XXVIII.—145. Many hold that, whatever depravity there

Ans. N may be in the will and affections, the understanding is naturally poweright; how may this tenet be shown to be false? Ans. Not only ner Ls by Scripture proofs already given of the depravity of this faculty, has n as direct Scripture declarations, provisions for instruction and his w guidance and renovation, in the gospel, prayers for light, &c.; but angel also by observing that a capability of understanding natural things e cor: correctly, does not prove that we can understand spiritual things ue s: without supernatural illumination. Depraved affections and will and understood on grounds entirely different from nature's light; and it requires a spiritual discernment to understand them profitably, which the natural mind does not possess; 1 Cor. ii. 14.

146. Is a clear perception of a doctrine a test of its truth, as the Cartesians held? Ans. No; a perception of a doctrine may be very clear and distinct, and we may imagine that we clearly see its truth, and yet the doctrine be destitute of any solid foundation.

147. Have we the power of guarding against every error effectually in divine things, as the Cartesians say? Ans. No; (1.) Because we are naturally ignorant of divine doctrines and of their evidences. (2.) Because the dictates of blinded reason and depraved affections pervert our views. (3.) To hold the mind in suspense is not a guard against error: suspense may be error.

147. Has man a natural power of discerning every truth or error externally proposed, as the Cartesians held? Ans. No; because divine truths are not known by nature's light, and many of them are contrary to natural apprehension, and above the evidence of mere reason.

148. Does not all this theory depend on the Pelagian notion that man's depravity is not total? Ans. Yes.

149. Does the impossibility of obtaining saving light in divine things, and of overcoming all our blindness and error by our own efforts, and our own powers, render our error excusable? Ans. No more than the impossibility of attaining holiness by our own endeavours renders our unholiness excusable. God has provided a way of instruction in Christ, and we are inexcusable if we do not embrace it.

§ XXIX.—150. May we admit (with some) that conscience is an infallible guide, and always free from error? Ans. No; even the conscience may be defiled.

151. May there not be some things in which conscience does not err, and its dictates may be depended on? Ans. Yes; such as in certain facts experienced, in common notions, or first principles of truth, which are written on the heart by God himself; as axioms, self-evident truths, irresistible conclusions, necessary from well ascertained facts, &c.;—and in the observance of its own operations, when these are properly attended to.

152. How prove that the conscience is not an unerring guide? Ans. (1.) From Scripture speaking of it as a deceived and a deceiving heart; Jer. xvii. 9; of a defiled conscience, Tit. i. 15; of a seared conscience, 1 Tim. iv. 2; conscience of the idol, 1 Cor. viii.

7. (2.) From the fact that the conscience is a power of the mind approving or disapproving of our own actions, according to the law of God. It therefore cannot be more sure or infallible than the understanding upon which it depends, or than the conceptions which the mind forms of truth and duty. (3.) From daily experience, which shows that conscience often errs respecting past actions, by failure of memory, and present actions, by inattention, by ignorance, self-deception, and mistaken apprehension of our own motives.

153. The arguments for the doctrine of an unerring conscience, and objections against its fallibility, are generally too frivolous to deserve an answer, but we shall notice two or three of them. It is objected, (1.) That conscience is a witness and a judge in the name of God within us? Ans. It is so; and when rightly informed, and in proper exercise, it is faithful, decisive, and inflexible; but, like all the other powers of the soul, it is impaired in fallen man.

154. Obj. (2.) If we deny the rectitude of conscience, we deny all certainty of things? Ans. (1.) This consequence no more follows from denying that conscience is infallible, than denying the infallibility of the understanding or judgment. (2.) People naturally incline to indulge indolence, and therefore they will rather venture to trust in some supposed infallible guide, though erroneous, than live in suspense, or use diligence, humiliation, prayer, and faith in God, the truly infallible guide, in seeking direction. (3.) But though conscience may, and often does err, there is a method of attaining assured knowledge—the use of divine means.

155. Obj. (3.) Conscience means knowledge; the very name given to it in Scripture, signifying knowledge, intimates that it is unerring? Ans. The name rather teaches what the conscience ought to be, than what it is in fallen man. When it acts correctly, it is with knowledge. So the understanding signifies knowledge; but it does not always know; and the memory signifies remembering, but it does not always remember correctly.

§ XXX.—156. Are all mankind, (except Christ's human nature,) affected with this inherent sin? Ans. Yes; the conduct of all men proves it; and Scripture fully asserts it; Rom. iii. 10—19; Ps. li. 5; Job. xiv. 4.

157. By what means are all mankind, since Adam, affected with inherent sin? or by what rule does it descend to them? Ans. By ordinary generation.

158. How does it appear that inherent sin descends by this rule? Ans. (1.) Scriptures plainly assert it; as Job xiv. 4; Psal. li. 5; Eph. ii. 3; John iii. 6. (2.) Inherent sin belongs to the covenant curse, and that curse alights on all men according to this relationship. Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22.

159. Why then, as Christ was truly man, did the curse not alight on him, so as to affect him with inherent sin? Ans. Because his human nature did not come by natural generation, but by the immediate and extraordinary operation of the Holy Spirit. Luke i. 35.

160. Was Mary, the mother of our Lord, after the flesh, exempt from this inherent sin? Ans. No.

161. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) She came by natural generation. (2.) She erred, as others, by unbelief and misapprehension; Luke i. 34; ii. 45; Matt. xii. 46—48. (3.) She was saved by Christ, as other believers; Luke i. 47.

162. Did the honour of Christ require that the mother of his flesh should be without sin? Ans. No; his office and work required that he, according to the flesh, should come of sinful fallen man. If this had subjected Christ to sin, then, in order to his holiness, Mary and all her progenitors, in an unbroken line, back to Adam, must have been immaculate. But he came of a sinner, and was thus related to mankind, but himself uncontaminated, because conceived, not by ordinary generation, but by the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit.

§ XXXI.—163. What is the cause of this depravity in all men? Ans. Adam's first sin, reckoned to posterity.

164. As this doctrine is opposed by many, is contrary to their ideas of justice, and has no proper parallel among the affairs of men, how shall we prove its truth? Ans. (1.) Its truth is proved from many scriptures; as 1 Cor. xv. 22; Rom. v. 12—19. (2.) From the fact that the curse threatened for breach of covenant has actually alighted on all men, and, with other things, sin inherent, proving itself by universal sinfulness of conduct.

165. How does 1 Cor. xv. 22, "In Adam all die," prove it? Ans. (1.) As Adam did not immediately die a natural death, cutting off posterity from existence, so that must mean a legal death in Adam, procuring natural, spiritual, and eternal death to posterity. (2.) As universal death must have a universal cause, so the apostle, in this text, shows that the cause was in Adam. (3.) The text does not simply assert that all men died in consequence of Adam's sin, but that they died in him; which proves that his act in breach of covenant, is the legal and procuring cause of death, and therefore it is imputed to posterity.

166. How does Rom. v. 12—19, prove this doctrine? Ans. (1.) In ver. 12, the phrase $\epsilon\phi\ \omega$ may be translated two ways—"in whom," or "for that;" either of which proves death to be by imputation. "In whom" means, all sinned in Adam, which could occur only by representation and imputation; and this sinning in Adam is given as the reason why all died. The phrase $\epsilon\phi\ \omega$ is elsewhere used in this sense, as Mark ii. 4; Acts ii. 26; Acts ii. 38, " $\epsilon\phi\ \tau\omega$ "—"in the name of Jesus." Or take it as in our translation "for that"—it comes to the same thing; giving the reason of death; declaring that that reason was in Adam, and that men, even infants, had sinned before, which could only be in Adam. (2.) The 13th and 14th verses, may be paraphrased thus:—From Adam to Moses death did reign in the world; but death is the wages of sin; therefore sin was in the world from Adam to Moses. But sin is not counted as sin, without a law of which it is the violation; (in

other words, no act is sin unless it is the violation of a law;) therefore as death proved sin, so sin and death proved a law under which all died, even before the giving of the law on Mount Sinai. Moreover, death reigned over infants, from Adam to Moses; therefore infants were under sin, though they had not sinned by actual transgression, and consequently were under a law which held them under sin. That law could be no other than the covenant of works, which gave sentence of death; and the breach of that law was not personally by infants, therefore it was by Adam. Add to this, that depravity is a misery, an infliction, therefore sin must precede it, as the reason or cause. But actual sin of infants could not precede their depravity; therefore the sin of Adam preceded and procured inherent sin in his posterity as imputed to them. (3.) From verses 16th and 18th we see that judgment of condemnation is given on the offence of one, or on one offence; that is, of Adam; which unequivocally makes Adam's sin the ground of judgment to us, or the cause, as imputed, of our inherent sin, as well as other miseries. (4.) Ver. 17th asserts that death, (which is the wages of sin,) reigned by one, that is Adam. (5.) Ver. 18th declares that mankind are made or constituted sinners by one man's disobedience. All which clearly maintain the doctrine that Adam's first sin, imputed to posterity, is the cause of our inherent sin.

167. Why is Adam's sin visited on his posterity, by imputation, and infliction of the curse? Ans. Because, as their natural parent, he stood by God's appointment, in the covenant of works, for them, and represented them.

168. Are all Adam's sins imputed to his posterity, for their condemnation? Ans. No; only the first, which was the breach of the covenant, and is called in the singular, "disobedience, offence," &c.

169. Why was only the first sin of Adam imputed to posterity? Ans. (1.) Because it was the breach of the covenant, on which were suspended the life and death of himself and posterity. (2.) Because the covenant being broken, Adam no longer stood in a representative capacity to his posterity; he could not represent them in any of his future acts.

LECTURE XX.—HUMAN DEPRAVITY.—ACTUAL SIN.

§ XXXII.—170. But Socinians, Arminians, &c., deny Adam's sin to be the procuring cause of our inherent sin, and of our punishment, and object, (1.) That such representation by Adam, imputation of his sin, and infliction of punishment, are inconsistent with the justice of God? Ans. (1.) God's thoughts are above ours. We cannot comprehend that relation which God established between Adam and his posterity. More knowledge might clearly show us its equity. But God is just; he has done this; as Scripture and facts show; and his justice and wisdom cannot be measured by our conceptions. (2.) Had all posterity been present, and consented to the arrangement, we would admit the justice of it. Adam did consent, because he was holy; and we, if holy, would consent, and

therefore, it is just. (3.) Man must have lived or died by such an arrangement, or else each individual must have undergone the trial for himself, from infancy, and forever. Therefore the plan adopted was the best.

171. Obj. (2.) Such imputation of Adam's sin to posterity, and punishment of it in them, is contrary to God's declared will; Ezek. xviii. 4, 20? Ans. That passage is speaking of the ordinary relation of father and son, and not of Adam's relation to posterity as the covenant head; and is an answer to the complaints of the people that their fathers had sinned, and they suffered for them; thus denying their own sin, as the procuring cause of their sufferings.

172. Obj. (3.) Adam's sin was but one, and committed long before we existed, and, therefore, should not involve posterity in guilt and misery? Ans. (1.) Although the act was one, its guilt was sufficient to involve Adam and all posterity in misery. (2.) Though long past, the guilt remains, to all who are in their natural state.

173. How is the impurity of the soul to be accounted for, since it is created immediately by God, and not generated with the body? Ans. God acts not only as Creator, but as Judge, inflicting punishment according to the covenant with man in Adam. Besides, God could connect the souls which he designed for human bodies, respectively, with Adam, as well as the bodies naturally generated.*

174. May we suppose that God, acting as a Judge, and inflicting this punishment, of inherent sin, actually infuses unholy principles into the soul? Ans. No; but he withholds that original righteousness in which man was at first created, and therefore the soul, acting without original righteousness, and under guilt, acts sinfully.

§ XXXIII.—175. The propagation of inherent sin by natural generation having been spoken of, § XXX., we only further inquire, why depravity is propagated by natural generation, and by that only? Ans. (1.) Because God so connected Adam and his posterity, in the covenant of works; he connected no created being with Adam, in that covenant, but his natural posterity derived from him by natural generation, according to the appointed order of production. (2.) Man cannot possibly give to his posterity a nature, or powers, which he has not himself. Having no saving grace in his nature, he cannot communicate it, and therefore cannot withhold that depravity which is inherent in his nature, and derived by virtue of the covenant curse, John iii. 6.

* It is weak and unreasonable to suppose that God could form no relations between things but what we see and comprehend. There is no relation between things but by God's appointment. Whatever relation he appoints is just and good. Such relations as we see in nature, we acknowledge not only to be real, but wise and good; and conscience would feel compelled to acknowledge the same of relations which we do not yet see or understand, if once we saw them clearly. Therefore we must infer that God has established a relation between Adam and the souls of all his posterity, as really as between Adam and the bodies of posterity. There is, therefore, no moral difficulty in the subject. There is no difficulty but its depth and mystery.

176. But if parents are regenerated, why do they not communicate grace as well as depravity by natural generation? Ans. Because ordinary generation is a natural and not a supernatural action; therefore, it can communicate only what belongs to nature, John iii. 6; Rom. vii. 18.

§ XXXIV.—177. What is the punishment due to this inherent sin? Ans. Death temporal and eternal, under the covenant curse.

178. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Direct Scripture declarations; as Rom. iii. 19; vi. 23; v. 14; Eph. ii. 3. (2.) As inherent sin is apostacy from God, a departure from our original holiness, and a contrariety to the law of God, its punishment must be death.

179. Do not actual transgressions, however, aggravate the guilt and punishment? Ans. Yes.

180. What is the Popish doctrine about the punishment of inherent sin, when unattended with actual transgression, as in the case of infants? Ans. A mere fiction, unsupported by any evidence,—a *limbo infantum*—a prison for infants, in which they suppose that infants dying without baptism are placed, and where they are punished only negatively, with loss, but without positive misery.

181. What is the doctrine of Arminians on this point? Ans. Some suppose that the punishment of infants dying in infancy is merely negative, as the Papists hold; others suppose that infants are innocent, and therefore happy; and others that they are all redeemed by Christ.

182. They object, (1.) That it is only actual sin that procures death, according to James i. 15? Ans. James is tracing the influence of lust, as ruinous to the soul, terminating in actual sin and death; while he does not deny that inherent sin itself does procure death. His doctrine does not contradict Eph. ii. 3; Rom. v. 14.

183. Will it follow that because human courts cannot punish heart-sin, and must limit their sentences to actual transgressions, therefore, God will not punish the depravity of our nature? Ans. Certainly not; his law requires the heart; his omniscience sees it; and his justice must punish its sins.

§ XXXV.—184. How long does this inherent sin continue in man? Ans. In the case of the damned it continues to eternity; and in the case of believers, till death; Rom. vii. 17—19; Gal. v. 17.

185. How long does its dominion or total power continue in the elect? Ans. Till regenerated, Rom. vi. 14.

186. How does it appear that believers will be entirely set free from inherent sin at death? Ans. (1.) From direct Scriptures, 1 John iii. 2; Heb. xii. 23. (2.) Believers at death enter heaven, Luke xxiii. 43; but nothing unclean, or that defileth, shall enter there, Rev. xxi. 27.

187. But it is objected against the doctrine of inherent sin remaining in believers, (1.) That there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ, Rom. viii. 1? Ans. (1.) There is a wide difference between justification and sanctification. The first is perfect

at once, as well as irreversible; the second is imperfect at first, and is progressive. (2.) Justification takes away the guilt of inherent sin, but not the being of it; sanctification removes its being and pollution.

188. Obj. (2.) Baptism cleanses away all the being and pollution of sin? The objection is an entire error respecting the doctrine of baptism. Baptism is only a sign and seal of the taking away of sin, and that both in its guilt and being; but it does not actually take away either; and it signifies and seals the gradual removal of inherent sin, because it seals what is promised.

189. But some perfectionists object, (3.) That Paul declares that he did not commit sin, Rom. vii. 17, "It is no more I that do it," &c.? Ans. (1.) Paul is there distinguishing between his renewed will and remaining corruption, and denies that it is the renewed will that sins; but in the same place he acknowledges indwelling sin:—"sin that dwelleth in me." (2.) Even when the dominion of sin is removed in believers, they complain of a law in their members warring, &c., and even bringing into captivity to sin, Rom. vii. 23; and of sin prevailing, Ps. lxxv. 3.

190. What is the difference between sin's dominion, and sin's prevailing, Rom. vi. 14; Ps. lxxv. 3? Ans. Sin's dominion is when indwelling sin is the governing principle in us, and when there is no opposition of heart to it; no opposition except a natural conscience; but sins are prevailing when they lead us to actual transgressions, in motive, principle, word, or action, while the new nature opposes and grieves; sin is like an enemy in war, who may prevail for a time, while he does not obtain dominion, nor a termination of the war.

191. Are we to suppose that sin remaining in believers, remains only in the sensitive appetite and understanding, or also in the will? Ans. It remains in all the powers of the soul. There remains a natural will to sin, Rom. vii. 18—*no good thing in the flesh*—the corrupt nature, called the *old man*, implying that depravity dwells in the whole natural man;—and the injunction to put on the new man, to be renewed in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, refers not only to regeneration but to progressive sanctification, Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10. Even David, after regeneration, prays for the clean heart and right spirit, Ps. li. 10, intimating the need of further renewal in sanctification in all his powers of will, as well as affections and understanding.

§ XXXVI.—192. What is *actual* sin, in contradistinction from sin inherent? Ans. It is the want of conformity to God's law, in our actions, while sin inherent is the want of conformity of our nature and heart to that law.

193. What classes of sins are included in actual sin? Ans. All classes of sins committed, or duties omitted, under the influence or operation of a rational mind; as sins in bodily actions, in words and in thoughts, in will and in active affections; and sins of omission as well as of commission.

194. From what does actual sin proceed? Ans. From sin inherent, Matt. xv. 19.

195. Is not actual sin more aggravated than merely inherent sin? Ans. Yes; it is an addition to sin inherent; and the Scriptures designate actual sin as distinct from sin inherent, and for the purpose of setting forth its aggravations; as Matt. xv. 19; James i. 15.

§ XXXVII.—196. What is the general nature of all sin? Ans. A negation—a defect—a want of conformity to God's law.

197. Should not this definition of sin in its formal nature be carefully observed? Ans. Yes; and particularly in order to distinguish between the matter (or being) of an action, and the sinfulness of it.

198. Are not all actual transgressions the acts of rational beings, and directed by reason on known objects? Ans. Yes.

199. Do not actual sins include thoughts, affections, and will, as directed by reason, as well as the performance of our thoughts? Ans. Yes; and therefore they may be distinguished into actions formally directed by reason and reflection, as thoughts, affections, and will, and efficient actions, as words and deeds of the body.

200. Can infants, who are not come to the exercise of reason or reflection, or to any knowledge of right or wrong, be guilty of such actual sin? Ans. No; and of them, in reference to such actual sin, Paul speaks, Rom. v. 14, "After the similitude of Adam's transgression," and Rom. ix. 11, "the children not having done any good or evil," &c.

201. Does not Paul, in reference to Jacob and Esau, Rom. ix. 11, plainly teach that, in respect to sin, they were perfectly equal? Ans. Yes; it was his design to teach this equality, after they possessed souls, till they were capable of moral reflection.

202. May we not infer from this that original sin is at first equal in all men? Ans. Yes; as imputed guilt, so inherent sin is equal.

203. And does not Rom. ix. 11, teach that those infants, though sinful in their nature, had not committed actual sin? Ans. Yes; because no two persons, committing actual sin, are perfectly equal in their guilt.

204. Are children, then, before they come to knowledge and reflection, morally accountable for their actions? Ans. No; they are not accountable for their actions, although they are accountable for the inherent sin of their nature. Rom. ix. 11, acquits infants of accountability for their acts, while Rom. v. 14, with Psal. li. 5, shows that they are accountable for inherent sin as well as imputed guilt.

205. But may not children come to commit actual sin at a very early period? Ans. Yes; as soon as they are able to distinguish between moral right and wrong.

206. But it is objected that infants may be guilty of actual sin, as sin is ascribed to them in Scripture; as Psal. li. 5; Isa. xlvi. 8, called a transgressor from the womb? Ans. These texts refer to original sin, not to actual. In infancy the very nature is in a state of transgression against God.

207. Obj. (2.) Gen. vi. 5, and viii. 21, declare that "all the imaginations of the thoughts of the heart are evil continually, and

from youth;" which must include infants? Ans. It refers to actual transgressions from early life, and if it include infants, it refers to inherent sin, from which actual transgressions spring.

208. Obj. (3.) Gal. v. 17, asserts that the flesh, or depraved nature lusts, and as infants possess that depraved nature, or flesh, so they are guilty of actual sin by lusting? Ans. The apostle is there directly speaking of adults; but it is true of infants, as far as inherent sin tends to the actual sin of lusting, when they come to the use of reason. They too may in infancy lust for what is unlawful, but so long as the lusting is the dictate of the sensual appetite, without perception of any law forbidding it, inherent sin may be acting, but not under the direction of reason and moral perception, and it is not actual sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression.

LECTURE XXI.—ACTUAL SIN—CONTINUED.

§ XXXVIII.—209. Having considered actual sin with regard to the subjects of it; viz., the actions of a rational being, in which actions the sinfulness consists, we next consider it in its causes and effects. From what then does actual sin proceed? Ans. From original sin; and immediately from sin inherent; Matt. xv. 19; Jas. i. 15.

210. What are the effects of actual sins? Ans. They are twofold. (1.) They mutually produce and promote one another. (2.) They deserve and procure greater punishment.

211. How do they mutually produce or promote one another? Ans. (1.) They do it efficiently; one sin leading to another; 2 Tim. iii. 13. (2.) They do it meritoriously; provoking God to give the sinner up to the power of his sin; Rom. i. 23, 24.

212. What was the doctrine of the Stoics respecting the evil and the punishment of sin? Ans. That all sins were equal, both in reference to their moral evil, and to their punishment.

213. How prove this position to be false? Ans. (1.) Although all sin is a violation of God's law, and is committed against the same God, yet the Scriptures manifestly make a difference in the guilt and moral evil of sins; as Matt. v. 22, where our Lord is pointing out the reality of some sins generally overlooked, but of less aggravation, as anger, and opprobrious epithets, which are sins, but less than actual murder; and Matt. vii. 3, where sins are compared to *beams and motes*; and Matt. v. 19, our Lord expressly notices the distinction between breaches of the least and the greatest commands. (2.) Although every sin deserves eternal death, yet different degrees of punishment are allotted to different sins; proving different degrees both of sin and of punishment; as Matt. xi. 22, 24; xii. 47, 48.

214. What are some of the considerations which make the difference in the guilt or moral evil of sins? Ans. Various things; (1.) The standing of the person sinning, as having more influence than others—a weightier example. (2.) His attainments; more knowledge; sinning against greater light; more experience, and sinning against it. (3.) The nature and character of the sin, as

against the first or second table of the law; more or less injurious to religion, to society, &c. (4.) The degree or extent to which it is carried. (5.) The manner of the sin; the circumstances of time and place. (6.) The end in view; if for malignant and injurious purposes, &c., it is aggravated.

215. Is it then allowable to sin wilfully because it is otherwise a comparatively small sin? Ans. No; the wilfulness of sin greatly aggravates it.

216. What is the Popish doctrine respecting the aggravations of sin? Ans. That some sins are mortal, and others venial.

217. What do they mean by *mortal* sin? Ans. Simply, that it deserves hell.

218. What do they mean by *venial* sin? Ans. The word means *pardonable*; but they do not mean, simply, that it is pardonable through Christ, but without the blood of Christ; that even without Christ, it would not incur the punishment of hell; that it is excusable.

219. How prove this an error? Ans. (1.) Express Scriptures, Gal. iii. 10; Rom. vi. 23. (2.) Because every sin is against God; it is therefore infinitely evil; and justice must necessarily punish with eternal judgment, unless atoned for by the blood of Christ.

220. But Papists object, (1.) That, according to Matt. v. 22, all sins are not threatened with hell fire? Ans. Our Lord there shows that sins which many counted small, or overlooked altogether, were violations of the sixth command; and that there were different degrees of sin and punishment; and illustrating these things by allusion to the civil punishment then in use, of which the severest was burning in the valley of Hinnom: he shows that all these sins, if unatoned for, must be punished in hell, but some of them more severely than others.

221. Obj. (2.) Some sins are compared to motes, Matt. vii. 3, and are therefore venial? Ans. Although some sins are so called, it is only comparatively with others, but they are not thereby declared excusable, or undeserving of hell.

222. Obj. (3.) In 1 John v. 16, it is said, "there is a sin not unto death?" Ans. The apostle is there distinguishing between sins that will not be pardoned, to which the blood of Christ will not be applied, and sins which shall be pardoned through his blood.

223. Obj. (4.) In 1 Cor. iii. 11—13, it is asserted that he who builds *wood, hay, stubble*, on the foundation, shall be saved, and, therefore, these sins are venial? Ans. The passage means that those who are built on Christ indeed, may be guilty of such sins, but as they are in Christ, they shall not perish, while otherwise both they and their works would perish.

§ XXXIX.—224. How is actual sin divided? Ans. In many respects; as (1.) Sins of commission and omission. (2.) Sins that are so in themselves, and sins that are so by concomitants of the action. (3.) Sins of heart, and sins of action. (4.) Sins of the spirit, and sins of the flesh. (5.) Sins against God, and sins against

creatures, ourselves, or our neighbour. (6.) Sins of contumacy or presumption, and sins of infirmity; in the last of which are included sins of ignorance, whether of law or of fact. (7.) Sins open, and sins secret; hidden from others, or even from ourselves. (8.) Sins flagrant, eminently calling for vengeance; and sins less flagrant. (9.) Sin reigning, and sin not reigning, though indwelling.

225. With respect to sins of commission and of omission, which are the most heinous and aggravated? Ans. Although sins of omission may be as heinous in their nature, and be attended with as ruinous effects as sins of commission, yet the latter are usually most heinous, because committed with the most formal and intense purpose of the will against the authority of God.

226. May a thing good in itself, and agreeable to the law of God, be done in a sinful manner? Ans. Yes; as when the heart is not right with God in the doing of it, and that either through wilful hypocrisy, or through error.

227. Is an action sinful, if either the thing done be contrary to God's law, and that even with good intention, or if the thing done be according to his law, but done in a wrong spirit? Ans. Yes; as God's law is the rule, both for the deed, and for the heart in doing it.

228. What is the difference between sins of the flesh and sins of the spirit, spoken of 2 Cor. vii. 1? Ans. Sins of the flesh are sins more directly connected with the body; sins of the spirit are mental sins, as pride, envy, unbelief, &c.

229. What is the difference between presumptuous and secret sins, spoken of Ps. xix. 13? Ans. A presumptuous sin is a sin committed against knowledge, and of which we are conscious. A secret sin, is one committed without knowledge, or one that we have not noticed, and of which we are not conscious.

230. Are all errors through ignorance innocent? Ans. No; the heart may commit such a sin through the most sinful motives and affections; and sins of ignorance of old required atonement.

231. Are all errors, however, sins? Ans. No; an error with respect to the fact may for the time be invincible, and we cannot know it from the law of God. And even ignorance of the law, in some cases, is innocent, where there is no opportunity of knowing it; as ignorance of the gospel by the heathen, excuses from the sin of unbelief.

232. Although a sin of ignorance be really a sin, when we had opportunity of knowledge, yet is it as heinous as a sin against knowledge? Ans. No; if it be not continued by enmity to the truth. The sin of knowledge is presumptuous, 1 Tim. i. 13.

§ XL.—233. What further remarkable division of actual sin do we find in Scripture? Ans. Pardonable and unpardonable.

234. Is any sin unpardonable, as beyond the merits of the blood of Christ? Ans. No; the merits of his blood are infinite; capable of cleansing from all sin.

235. Why then is any sin unpardonable? Ans. (1.) Because

God is pleased to express his abhorrence of such a sin by holding it unpardonable. (2.) Because it is a sin in which, under the awful judgment of God, the person committing it perseveringly rejects the only remedy—the blood of Christ—and is left in unbelief, and impenitence, Heb. vi. 4—6.

236. How is this sin designated in Scripture? Ans. (1.) The sin against the Holy Spirit; Matt. xii. 31, 32. (2.) The sin unto death; 1 John v. 16. It is therefore commonly called, (3.) The unpardonable sin, from these Scripture descriptions.

237. Is all sin against the Holy Spirit unpardonable? Ans. No; (1.) For all sin whatever is against him as God. (2.) All sin against gospel privileges is sin against the Holy Spirit's economical operations and grace. Therefore, (3.) Even believers sin against the Spirit and his peculiar work; Eph. iv. 30; 1 Thess. v. 19; Isa. lxiii. 10. And sins of unbelievers which may yet be pardoned, are called sins against the Spirit, Acts vii. 51. Yet Paul was in that company there addressed, verse 58, chap. viii. 1.

238. As this sin is eminently against the Holy Spirit, did it belong only to the times of his extraordinary gifts? Ans. No; because sin against these was not absolutely unpardonable; witness the conversions on the day of Pentecost; Acts ii. verse 23, compared with verses 37—41.

239. Do not the Scriptures speak of it as one special kind of sin? Ans. Yes; as, Matt. xii. 31, 32; 1 John v. 16.

240. What do the Schoolmen say of this sin? Ans. That there are six species or kinds of it, which they say are thus distinguished, (1.) Spiritual presumption. (2.) Desperation. (3.) Opposition to the truth known and acknowledged by them. (4.) Envy at the grace bestowed upon others. (5.) Obstinacy. (6.) And final impenitence. These, generally, we hold to be ingredients in this sin, but not different kinds of it.

241. What then is the peculiar character of this sin? Ans. It is a presumptuous and malicious rejection of divine truth brought home to the heart and conscience, and of the grace exhibited by it; and thus it is peculiarly against the Holy Spirit and his work.

242. How does it appear to be a sin against clear light and conviction? Ans. Matt. xii. 31, 32, referring to the undeniable evidence of Christ's divine character and grace; Heb. vi. 4, 5; x. 26; describing it as against special light and conviction, by the common operations of the Spirit, even giving a kind of experience of the truth.

243. How does it appear to be a presumptuous and malicious sin against light and grace? Ans. From Heb. x. 26, 28, 29; thus it is wilful, against knowledge; it is treading Christ under foot; counting his blood a common thing, and doing despite to the Spirit of grace.

244. What are some of its peculiar concomitants, by which it may be distinguished? Ans. Especially two; (1.) Final impenitence; a persevering impenitent spirit, Heb. vi. 6. (2.) Fear and terror of divine judgments, without penitential sorrow; Heb. x. 27.

245. Is all terror or fearful expectation of divine wrath a decisive evidence or characteristic of this sin? Ans. No; God's people may experience such distressing terrors; as Heman, Psa. lxxxviii. 16; but it is a peculiar kind of terror, "*ris*;" a terror working not only despair, but enmity, wrath, and impenitence in the soul, without desire of God's favour; while the terrors of divine wrath, in God's people, are attended with desires of his favour and mercy.

246. Why do these terrors increase wrath and impenitence in the soul? Ans. Because God leaves them to the operations of their depravity.

247. Is not blasphemy, or evil speaking of Christ and his salvation, described as an accompaniment of this sin? Ans. Yes; Matt. xii. 31, 32. There is an inclination to express their feelings against the truth and grace of God.

248. Has a person reason to believe he has committed this sin, if he desires pardon, reconciliation, or repentance? Ans. No; such desires are absolutely wanting under this sin. No one entertaining these desires is excluded from mercy.

§ XLl.—249. Can this sin be committed by heathen, or by any who do not know the gospel? Ans. No; Heb. vi. 4—6; it must be against light received.

250. Can this sin be committed by any one without such light as produces conviction of the truth, and some persuasion of its goodness? Ans. No; Heb. vi. 4, 5.

251. But is the illumination from which they fall away, or which they hate and reject, a saving or supernatural work of the Spirit? Ans. No; those who enjoy such a work are purchased by Christ, united to him, and therefore cannot perish. Sin shall not have dominion over them; they are born of God, and therefore "cannot sin," 1 John iii. 9. But their illumination is such, that their opposition is against conviction and persuasion of the truth, and is wilful and malicious.

252. Have fallen angels committed this sin? Ans. Although their sin possesses many characteristics of this sin, as knowledge, malice, impenitence, and that it is unpardonable, yet it is a sin that belongs to man alone, as rejecting the gospel.

253. Did Adam commit this sin in his breach of covenant? Ans. No; although he sinned against clear light and persuasion, yet his sin was by temptation, and not against the gospel, nor against the Spirit in his operations by the gospel.

254. Why were Paul, before his conversion, and Peter, in denying the Lord, not guilty of this sin? Ans. (1.) Paul was not so enlightened at that time as to be able to commit it; 1 Tim. i. 13. (2.) Peter did not deny his Lord with malice or hatred.

§ XLII.—255. Is it necessary to the commission of this sin that we have made a formal profession of religion? Ans. No; the act consists in a rejection of the gospel, in heart and expression, whether we have made a profession of faith in Christ or not. Thus, many have declined from their profession and come to repentance

afterwards; and, on the other hand, the Pharisees, who made no profession of faith in Christ, committed this sin; Matt. xii. 31, 32.

§ XLIII.—256. Can this be committed through mere infirmity? Ans. No; as the Scripture expressions describing it, represent it as a sin against clear knowledge and conviction, and with malignity, hatred and determined purpose; Heb. vi. 4—6; x. 26, 28, 29.

257. How is this wilful sin against light, and even internal and heart-convincing light, consistent with the fact that the will follows the dictates of the understanding? Ans. The will does not always follow the deliberate, theoretic dictates of the understanding, but the last, practical and comparative dictate; and such a dictate generally accompanies, and often, if not always, obeys the affections.

258. Must we believe that the famed Francis Spira committed this sin? Ans. We think not. Because, although he had made a public renunciation of the reformed religion, against light; and although in his distress he was oppressed with horror and despair, and sometimes, in his distraction, used blasphemous expressions, it does not appear that he made his renunciation through settled malice against the truth, but through weakness; he regretted his sin; he desired and prayed for mercy; he desired to serve God, and to glorify him, by a confession of the truth; he exhorted to a confession of the faith, and to steadfastness, and he was grateful to his friends for endeavouring his relief by the gospel.

§ XLIV.—Spoken of before.

§ XLV.—259. Can we certainly know, in the present age, when others have committed this sin? Ans. No; although we may see strong symptoms of it, it is perhaps not possible to know it with absolute certainty.

260. Why then, if we cannot certainly know it in others, does John say, (1 John v. 16,) that we should not pray for it? Ans. (1.) The warning may be considered as adapted to that age of discerning spirits. (2.) John, then, does not there treat of the person guilty, but of the sin itself as unpardonable, and therefore as a sin for the pardon of which we should not pray.

261. How then should we act in suspected cases? Ans. We should pray for the person suspected, in the hope that he has, nevertheless, not committed this sin, and on condition that he has not.

262. Why should we not pray for the person who is known to have committed this sin? Ans. Because God has declared his will unequivocally concerning it; he has left no promise respecting it to warrant faith in such a prayer; he has forbidden faith and hope in that case.

263.—May a person know this sin in himself? Ans. He, perhaps, may, but still he is liable to err.

264. Can this sin be committed in the present age? Ans. No doubt it may, as there is a high privilege of light, both objective and subjective, (as external and internal,) and the depravity of man is the same as ever; and the judgments of God may be at any time exercised in giving sinners up to it.

265. Does it appear that extensive doctrinal knowledge is necessary in order to its commission? Ans. No. If we know the doctrines of grace correctly and convincingly, though not extensively, it may be committed.

266. What especially endangers the committing of this sin? Ans. Indulgence in sin, and neglect of faith; Heb. iii. 18, iv. 1.

267. What is the path of safety? Ans. Immediate faith in Christ.

CHAPTER XVI.

OF THE PUNISHMENT OF SIN.

LECTURE XXII.—ITS NATURE, DESIGN, DURATION, &C.

§ § I. II.—Quest. 1. Do not both the Scriptures maintain, and the natural conscience admit, that punishment is the wages of sin, and due on account of it? Ans. Yes.

2. What are some of the names by which punishment of sin is designated in Scripture? Ans. The Scriptures call it *evil*, the *curse*, *judgment*, *destruction*, *death*, &c.

3. Is not the word punishment often used in Scripture, in a large sense, for any evil or suffering, sent on account of sin? Ans. Yes; as Lam. iii. 39; iv. 6.

4. What is its strict and proper meaning? Ans. Any suffering inflicted by God, as a satisfaction to divine justice—a suffering of vengeance.

5. How manifold is the death which is the proper punishment of sin? Ans. Threefold; temporal, spiritual, and eternal.

6. Is the punishment of temporal death limited to death literally, or to the dissolution of soul and body? Ans. No; it includes all the sufferings of a man's temporal life; because these occur to him, as mortal, on account of sin.

7. Are temporal death, and all preceding temporal afflictions, in all cases, now the proper, or vindictive punishment of sin? Ans. No; they are not proper punishments to those who are redeemed from the curse of the law through Christ.

8. Yet are they not, in some respects, punishments of sin, or flowing from sin, although not vindictive, nor proper punishment? Ans. Yes; as none would have suffered affliction, had they not sinned.

9. How are such afflictions to be understood as on account of sin, and yet not proper punishments of it? Ans. They are not inflicted as vengeance, nor under the curse; but as disciplinary, and for good, as means of turning us from sin.

§ III.—10. The subject now before us is any evil or suffering flowing from sin, whether penal or disciplinary. Is not all affliction, or suffering, evil, or injurious of itself, whatever the object be; and though God bring good out of it? Ans. Yes; Heb. xii. 11.

11. As the afflictions of believers are, in the matter of them, evil,

and would not have occurred had it not been for sin, wherein do they differ from proper punishment? Ans. (1.) They are not vindictive, but disciplinary; while proper punishment is vindictive, and sent as the execution of the penalty of the law, and as satisfactory to divine justice. (2.) The afflictions of believers are the results of sin, originally required by the law as punishments. But Christ having redeemed them from the curse of the law, these afflictions are no more vindictive to them, but remembrancers of their sin, and for their profit.

12. Is there any good in proper punishment to the person suffering it? Ans. No; nothing but the curse—nothing but evil.

13. Yet must we judge that afflictions to the wicked, in this world, have no good tendency towards them? Ans. No; in the goodness and forbearance of God, he sends afflictions on the wicked as means of convincing them of sin and judgment, and of leading them to repentance; Rom. ii. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 9, 15; so that their afflictions in this life, are generally disciplinary; although, as long as they remain impenitent, the curse of God is in their afflictions, but its execution is suspended for the time, to alight on them in full when God finally gives them up.

14. Does God punish sin, in any measure, in the present life? Ans. Yes; as, (1.) He punishes national sins by national judgments; and public church sins, by public church afflictions; as these bodies do not, as such, exist in another world. (2.) Chastisements and manifestations of his displeasure with the sins of his people are, in a sense, the punishment of sins. (3.) God restrains the wicked by punishment; their afflictions have the curse in them; and he cuts them off in their sin by death. (4.) He punishes many by giving them up to delusion, and a reprobate mind; Rom. i. 24, 26, 28; 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12.

15. Is there any certainty that a wicked man is, in this life, suffering the execution of the curse, purely as vindictive punishment, and without any disciplinary tendency or design? Ans. We should not be rash in judging of the design of God's providences towards the wicked; as he may bring them to repentance. But when the wicked are falling under blindness, soul-ruining delusion, and a reprobate mind, the evidences are peculiarly dark against them.

16. Does God ever punish the sin of one person or people by the sin of another? Ans. Yes; as of David by Absalom; Israel by Nebuchadnezzar.

17. But does he ever punish sin in a person, by giving that person up to further sin? Ans. Yes; so Pharaoh; so, Isaiah vi. 9, 10; 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12.

18. Is not this one of the most dangerous signs that the person is under judicial judgment, and vindictive punishment? Ans. Yes; Hos. iv. 17; Rev. xxii. 11.

19. Is God's providence efficacious in this kind of punishment, or merely permissive? Ans. As God's providence is never *merely* permissive of the actions of his creatures, so it is efficacious in

this mode of punishment. Although God is not the cause of the sin, yet he not only leaves the sinner to his depravity, (Psal. lxxxii. 12.) but he directs and governs that depravity to such a course as he sees proper, Isa. vi. 9, 10; so Pharaoh; so the Jews in crucifying Christ, Acts iv. 27, 28.

20. But Arminians, as they deny the decrees of God, and make man in some way independent, so they object to the doctrine that God punishes a man's sin often by leaving him to sin, and say, (1.) That sin and punishment are entirely different in their nature, and therefore the same thing cannot be both sin and punishment? Ans. It is true that sin, as sin, is different from punishment; yet sin can be viewed in different lights. Sin is itself a misery, as well as a sin, and produces suffering; sin and depravity belong to that death which was threatened by the law.

21. Obj. (2.) Men sin voluntarily, but suffer involuntarily? Ans. It is not always so. (1.) They often suffer voluntarily, through present insensibility to the misery under which they are. (2.) They often sin under the impulse of certain inclinations and lusts, with terror and consciousness of misery in so doing. If the sin be voluntary in one respect, it is involuntary in another, and under conscious misery.

22. Obj. (3.) All punishment is of God, and to punish sin by leading into further sin cannot be of God? Ans. It is true that all punishment is of God; nor does he lead any men into sin by working sin in them; but he leaves them to their depravity, and directs it to certain ends; so Pharaoh; so the Jews crucifying our Lord.

23. Obj. (4.) A righteous judge among men would not punish an offence by leading into another sin; and therefore the righteousness of God would not adopt such a course? Ans. It is not the province of a human judge to do so. But God is the absolute Governor of all. The heart is in his hand, and he can judge and punish sins righteously in ways in which men have neither the authority nor the power to do. There is no comparison in the cases. The heart is under God's government, and all our powers are given and sustained by him.

§ IV.—24. Is all punishment from God, whatever instrumentality is employed? Ans. Yes; as he is the righteous Judge and Ruler, Amos iii. 6.

25. In what character does God act in the proper punishment of sin? Ans. As Judge and Ruler; and therefore as God essentially considered: though economically ascribed to the Father and the Son, Heb. xii. 23; Matt. xi. 25; 2 Thess. i. 7, 8.

26. By what methods does he punish sin in this life? Ans. (1.) Sometimes immediately by his own hand, as in terrors of conscience, by miraculous interpositions, and in hell. (2.) Sometimes mediately, by the creatures; as by angels, good and bad; by natural and material things; and by men.

27. When God employs men as instruments of punishment, do

they always act righteously in so doing? Ans. No; although God may employ magistrates to punish by executing righteous judgment, and even individuals, yet he often employs wicked agents; as *Isa. x. 5—7*.

28. But, so far as the punishment is of God, is it not always righteous and good in its aims and effects, whatever wicked instrumentality is employed? Ans. Yes.

§ V.—29. Who are the proper subjects of the punishment of sin? Ans. Rational creatures, and they only.

30. But does not the evil of suffering which is the consequence of sin, alight also on irrational and sensitive creatures? Ans. Yes; it does so for man's sake, to increase his calamities, and to manifest God's displeasure against sin, *Gen. iii. 17; Rom. viii. 20*.

31. Are any rational creatures punished without being, either personally, or by imputation, sinners? Ans. No; because sin is the only proper cause or ground of punishment.

§ VI.—32. What is the supreme end of the punishment of sin? Ans. The glory of God, *Rom. xi. 36; Ezek. vii. 9*.

33. Is the punishment of sin necessary, or does it depend merely on the will of God to punish sin? Ans. It is necessary, *Rom. iii. 26*; justice, truth, and holiness necessarily require it.

34. What is the immediate end of proper punishment, as subordinate to the supreme end? Ans. The satisfaction of divine justice, and the honour of the law thereby, and the maintaining of divine truth in the threatening, *Rom. iii. 25; Isa. xlii. 21*.

35. Is not sin punished sometimes for man's salvation and benefit, and in order to the glory of God thereby? Ans. Yes; as in the punishment of Christ; and also in the providence of God defending his church by the punishment of the wicked.

36. As the sufferings of believers are called punishments, in a large sense, what are the immediate ends of them, as subordinate to the glory of God? Ans. They are many. They are chastisements for the believer's good, and the good of the church; (1.) For their reformation and the purging away their sins, *Rev. iii. 19; Heb. xii. 11; Isa. xxvii. 9*. (2.) For their trial, in order to manifest the reality of their grace to themselves and others; as Abraham, Job, &c., *Prov. iii. 11, 12*. (3.) For their instruction and preparation for further duties, *Ps. cxix. 67, 71*. (4.) For the good of others; as the sufferings of martyrs, *Acts v. 41, Phil. i. 29*; and other sufferers, in order to manifest divine grace and the glory of God; *John ix. 3*.

37. How are justice and law honoured in the case of the believer who escapes the sword of justice? Ans. By the perfect atonement of Christ for him, *Rom. x. 4*.

38. Are the believer's sufferings in this life, in any measure, inflicted as satisfactory for sin, or proper punishment? Ans. No; because, (1.) They are not under the law, but under grace. (2.) Their temporary sufferings could not satisfy for sin. (3.) Such a design in their sufferings would not consist with their relation to

God as children, and interest in his favour. (4.) Because it would be injustice to require any penalty of them after Christ had perfectly fulfilled that penalty for them. (5.) It is dishonouring to the perfect atonement of Christ, to assert that the sufferings of his people are necessary as a satisfaction for sin.

§ VII.—39. Although the primary design of the punishment of sin be the satisfaction of divine justice, and the honour of the divine law, yet were not public punishments inflicted on mankind in this world, in order to subserve some secondary ends? Ans. Yes; they were designed as warnings to others, for their good; so 1 Cor. x. 6, 11. Such were the secondary designs of various judgments on Israel of old; the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah; of Lot's wife; the deluge, &c.

40. Was the deluge universal over the whole earth? Ans. Yes; Gen. vii. 19—23, in which passage it is asserted that even the high hills were covered, under the whole heaven, and that every living substance upon the face of the ground was destroyed, even to the fowls.

41. But if man and beast inhabited but one or two continents, might it not be allowable to suppose that the flood covered only those parts of the earth? Ans. No; (1.) Because there is no necessity for explaining away, or holding the language of Moses as an hyperbole, when he says the flood covered the high hills under the whole heaven. (2.) There is no evidence that but one or two continents were inhabited, when they might all have been peopled during nearly 2,000 years, when men lived to so great an age. (3.) If but a part of the earth were covered, many fowls might have escaped, and the ark would not have been absolutely necessary. (4.) The power of God was sufficient for the universal deluge. (5.) Subsequent divine history represents the world as peopled by the sons of Noah, Gen. ix. 19; x. 32.

§ § VIII. IX.—42. How is the punishment of sin divided? Ans. Into temporal and eternal; and also into corporeal and spiritual.

43. What is the difference between temporal death, as the proper punishment of sin, and temporal death, as a chastisement to believers? Ans. As a punishment of sin, it is suffering as a curse, and an end to all alleviation of misery, and to all mixtures of enjoyment; as a chastisement it is without the curse, and an end of all unhappiness.

44. What is eternal death? Ans. The eternal separation of the person, soul and body, from the gracious presence of God, and the suffering of eternal misery.

45. Does not proper punishment, both temporal and eternal, include both corporeal and spiritual punishment? Ans. Yes.

46. How may corporeal and spiritual punishment be distinguished and distinctly described? Ans. (1.) Corporeal punishment is that which affects the body directly, as painful labour, weariness, pain, diseases and death; all which affect the sensibilities of the mind. (2.) Spiritual punishment more directly affects the mind, such as

its depravity or sinfulness, inherent and actual; blindness, hardness of heart, and the increase of these; guilty conscience, and terror of impending wrath, &c.

47. How did Adam's continued life in this world, or that of any unbeliever, consist with the threatening in the covenant of works, which said "In the day thou eatest, thou shalt surely die?" Ans. Adam then died spiritually, was laid under death legally, was subjected to temporal and eternal death, and temporal death was begun in afflictions, and the seeds of disease.

48. How can sin inherent or actual be called punishment, when it is sin and deserves punishment? Ans. Sin, both inherent and actual, is punishment as well as sin. (1.) Because it is a spiritual death, and therefore the execution of the penalty of the broken covenant. (2.) Because it is so represented in Scripture; Psal. lxxxi. 12; Eph. ii. 1. (3.) Sin is a misery, as a degradation of the soul, unfitting for enjoyment and producing disquietude of mind and conscience; and is a want of spiritual life, and an incapacity of actions spiritually good.

§ X.—49. When is the full infliction of punishment for sin in the reprobate? Ans. In hell, after death.

50. Is this punishment eternal? Ans. Yes; Matthew xxv. 46; Mark ix. 43—48.

51. What are the reasons why the punishment must be eternal? Ans. (1.) The infinite evil of sin, as committed against the infinite majesty of God. (2.) The impossibility of a creature making an atonement by his sufferings, or of satisfying divine justice by a limited period of suffering. (3.) The impossibility that suffering should change the heart, or sanctify it, or reconcile it to God. (4.) Because suffering cannot fulfil the precepts of the law; and it is impossible that a creature, under the curse, and under the vindictive punishment of sin, could obey the law perfectly, and in love to God. (5.) Because sin still continues in the damned, adding to their guilt.

52. But why might not the sinner be pardoned and regenerated by the grace of God, after a limited period of suffering, and so the punishment be ended? Ans. (1.) Because there is no promise of such exercise of mercy; but, on the contrary, the uniform declaration that the punishment shall be eternal. (2.) Because pardon cannot be granted without a full satisfaction to justice, and a perfect fulfilment of the law. (3.) None could do this but Christ. (4.) Christ's atonement being rejected, during the only time in which it is offered, it cannot avail the sinner in hell; Heb. x. 27.

§ XI.—53. But as hell, or eternal punishment is called *death*, might not this punishment consist in annihilation, and be but a negative punishment? Ans. No; (1.) Because the conscience expects eternal torment, and justice requires it. (2.) Because the sinner is represented as wishing annihilation in vain; Rev. vi. 16. (3.) Because in annihilation, there are no degrees of punishment, but there are in hell; Matt. xi. 22, 24. (4.) Because in annihilation there would be no sense of suffering, but the Scriptures describe hell as

a place of torment, of wailing and gnashing of teeth; Matt. xiii. 42; as an undying worm, a fire unquenched; Mark ix. 43—48. (5.) Because then it could not with propriety be said that it would have been better for them, if they had not been born, Matt. xxvi. 24. It would then be the same thing, after they had, in this world, enjoyed some positive comforts.

54. But Socinians object, (1.) That permanence is attributed only to the godly, 1 John ii. 17? Ans. It is a permanent blessedness.

55. Obj. (2.) In favour of annihilation; that the Scriptures describe the punishment of the wicked, as destruction and perdition, which would be fulfilled by annihilation? Ans. The Scriptures also describe it as eternal torment, unquenchable fire, &c., which necessarily implies existing natural life, and powers of consciousness and sensation. And eternal misery may well be described as perdition, as lost to all happiness.

56. Obj. (3.) It would be unjust to punish eternally for a temporary sinning? Ans. This is a weak conception of a blinded mind, to entertain such a light view of sin, for, (1.) The infinite evil of sin, as against infinite majesty, even requires eternal punishment, as a finite creature cannot atone by suffering, or satisfy justice in a limited time. (2.) The sufferer in hell is still sinful and sinning, and, therefore, there is no reason for release to eternity.

§ XII.—57. In what does the punishment of hell consist? Ans. (1.) In eternal exclusion from the gracious presence of God, and in want of every kind and degree of enjoyment. (2.) In casting down into hell as a place of confinement and torment, and against their will, and their fears. (3.) In a sense of divine wrath, Matt. xviii. 34. (4.) In hopeless despair, Mark ix. 43—48. (5.) In torments of conscience, and torture by devils, Matt. xviii. 34. (6.) In torment of the body, as again united with the soul.

58. Will the body suffer by literal fire in hell? Ans. It is perhaps not possible for us yet to know this with certainty, (from the use of figures to describe hell-torments.) But there may be fire adapted to the peculiar state of the risen body.

§ XIII.—59. Do the Scriptures represent that there will be different degrees of punishment in hell? Ans. Yes; Matt. xi. 22, 24.

60. Why should there be different degrees? Ans. Because there are different degrees of sin, and justice requires that, in the time of final retribution, punishment be proportioned to sin.

61. In what are these degrees of punishment different, in extension or in intensity? Ans. In intensity, not in extension; as, in all cases, it shall be eternal.

62. Are we to suppose, with Papists, that, to effect these different degrees of punishment, some shall suffer only the punishment of loss, without the punishment of sense? Ans. No; the punishment of all is represented as torment, a lake of fire, &c. And the

conscience must be sensible of sin, of loss, and want, and of divine wrath.

§ XIV.—63. Do not all the reprobate suffer all that is included in death, viz. ; death temporal, spiritual, and eternal? **Ans. Yes;** they suffer this under the curse, as the penalty of the law, and as satisfactory to divine justice.

64. Did not Christ suffer all this death, so far as it constituted mere punishment under the broken covenant? **Ans. Yes;** he was made under the law, to redeem, &c., Gal. iv. 4, 5; and under the curse; Gal. iii. 13.

65. Did Christ in any sense suffer spiritual death? **Ans. Yes;** so far as this death consisted in the hiding of his Father's countenance, but not as it consisted in depravity or sinfulness.

66. Did he suffer despair, which to man is included in the penalty of the law? **Ans. He suffered despair of escaping death under the penalty, but not despair of his Father's love, of victory and happiness.**

67. Did he suffer eternal death in substance? **Ans. Yes;** not in duration, but in suffering the penalty under the curse of the law.

68. Since much of man's suffering under the penalty of the law, consists in sin, or want of the divine image, unbelieving despair, and alienation from God, how did Christ suffer the penalty in man's stead, when he could not fall under the pollution or power of these sins? **Ans. There is a distinction between what constitutes the penalty and punishment, and is essential to it, and the consequences of that penalty, in the person who suffers it. Thus, suffering under the wrath of God against sin, and under the curse, is essential, and this Christ suffered in our stead; but sinfulness, alienation from God, utter despair, and eternity of punishment, are but consequences of the curse on the rational creature, which were not, and could not be consequences in Christ.**

CHAPTER XVII.

OF THE COVENANT OF GRACE, THE GOSPEL, AND THE VARIOUS ECONOMY OF IT.

LECTURE XXIII.—THE TERM, COVENANT: THE PARTIES; THEIR PARTS; ETC.

§ I.—Having spoken of *man*, of his *state of integrity*, of *his sin*, and of the *punishment of it*; we now come to speak of his restoration from the ruins of the fall, as revealed in the gospel.

Quest. 1. As God determined to restore a portion of mankind to peace, to holiness, and happiness, by his own Son, what method did he adopt for this purpose? **Ans. He made a covenant for this end.**

2. What is that covenant usually called? **Ans. THE COVENANT OF GRACE.**

3. Is it called expressly by this name in holy Scripture? Ans. No; this name is given to it by the church, as expressive of its nature and character, as revealed in the Scriptures.

4. By what names is it called in Scripture? Ans. *A covenant; a covenant with God's chosen; a new covenant; an everlasting covenant; a better covenant.*

§ II.—5. What is the Hebrew name of a covenant? Ans. ברית, from כָּרַת; in Pihel, *he cut, he selected*; or אָרַת, *he ate, selected or chose*. We prefer the latter.

6. What is the Greek name? Ans. Διαθήκη, *a disposal, a testament.*

7. As the expression *to cut a covenant*, is common in Scripture, for making it, to what custom or rite does it refer? Ans. To the cutting a calf in two, and passing between the parts of it; Gen. xv. 9, 10, 18; Jer. xxxiv. 18.

8. What was the meaning of this rite? Ans. It was twofold. (1.) On man's part, imprecating vengeance for unfaithfulness. (2.) In allusion to the sufferings of Christ, as confirming the covenant of grace; Psal. l. 5.

9. Does the word *covenant*, in Scripture ever mean a *command*? Ans. Yes; as Jer. xxxiv. 13, 14.

10. Does it ever mean an *unconditional promise*? Ans. Yes; as Jer. xxxi. 31—34; Isa. lix. 21.

11. But what is its strict and proper meaning? Ans. An agreement between two parties, containing a promise and a condition.

12. When, however, God calls his command, promise, or bequest, *a covenant*, has it not still a reference to a proper covenant? Ans. Yes; when God calls his command, promise, or bequest, *a covenant*, he intimates that he gives it under a covenant arrangement, and pledges himself by promise, and demands our consent. We now, however, view the covenant of grace as a proper covenant.

§ § III. IV.—13. What is that covenant which the Scriptures call the everlasting covenant and a covenant with God's chosen, and which we call the *covenant of grace*? Ans. It may be thus defined: it is a covenant made in eternity, between the glorious persons of the Godhead, for the salvation of elect man, and to the glory of God, in which God essentially, in the person of the Father, gave a certain number of fallen men to Christ the Son, that they might, in due time, be saved, on the condition of his fulfilling all righteousness, as their Surety; the Holy Spirit concurring, as the Applier of the purchased redemption.

14. What objections may we justly raise against our author's definition of this covenant? Ans. Many; particularly, (1.) That he makes it a covenant between God and man, while the covenant of grace was made between God the Father, and God the Son; Psal. lxxxix. 3. That Christ, not David, is properly the person here intended, appears from the promise of his throne to all generations; and, verse 19, "I have laid help on one mighty and raised out of the people;" and from Acts xiii. 34, where the apostle shows that Christ

was the sure mercies of David; so Gal. iii. 16, 17. (2.) Our author, therefore, must necessarily make this covenant to begin in time, if it be between God and man, while the covenant of grace with Christ was made in eternity; Heb. xiii. 20; and as appears also from what is said of the eternity of its matter, Eph. iii. 11; Tit. i. 2, not only purposed but "promised" before the world began. (3.) Our author makes faith and repentance, at least in some degree the conditions of the covenant, and Christ a Mediator to procure, in some way, salvation on these conditions, while the covenant of grace promised this salvation solely on Christ's fulfilment of all righteousness; Isa. liii. 1; Zech. ix. 11. (4.) As our author's definition represents God as covenanting to give grace and glory to the believing and the penitent, and that he covenants with these believers, as between God and man; so it requires faith and repentance, in order to the making of the covenant, and consequently does not provide faith and repentance as blessings of the covenant, but leaves man to attain them by some other means, so as to fit him to be one of the contracting parties; while the covenant of grace is with Christ, and promises, through him, faith and repentance as free gifts to the sinner; Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26. (5.) His definition makes Christ not the surety-righteousness of the covenant, but somehow a Mediator to procure the making of a covenant with man, to secure the promises to him; and to be Surety for man's obedience, while, according to Scripture, Christ is Surety for none of these things, but only to fulfil the condition of the covenant in his own person.

NOTE.—We do not charge these sentiments on our author in these obnoxious features, but we say that his words convey all these errors; and are calculated to ensnare men into the most erroneous notions. Therefore, we utterly reject his definition.

15. Why is this covenant called a covenant of grace? Ans. (1.) In contradistinction from the covenant of works. (2.) Because it was entered into in pure grace, and is to the praise of grace. (3.) It is the exercise of pure grace in the fulfilment of it to man.

16. Are there, as some suppose, three covenants respecting the happiness of man—a covenant of works, a covenant of redemption, and a covenant of grace? Ans. No; the Scriptures reveal only two covenants; of works and of grace; or that with Adam and that with Christ, to which the apostle has some reference, Gal. iv. 24.

17. But do not the Scriptures speak of God's making a covenant with man, and a gracious covenant? Ans. Yes; as with Noah respecting the safety of the world from another flood; with Abraham, Gen. xvii. 2, 7, 10; with David, 2 Sam. xxiii. 5; and with the church, Jer. xxxi. 31.

18. Why, then, may we not say that the covenant of grace was made between God and man? Ans. (1.) Because the covenant of grace is, in Scripture, spoken of as one, as the everlasting covenant; but God's covenant with man is as numerous as the elect; it is a covenant with each believer. (2.) The covenant of grace was made in eternity; God's covenant with man is in time. (3.) The cove-

nant of grace is with a certain individual, Ps. lxxxix. 3, 34, which is Christ, Acts xiii. 34—37; but God's covenant with man is with every one of the elect. (4.) The covenant of grace had a proper condition, Isa. liii. 9, 10; but God's covenant with men is a free and unconditional promise, Jer. xxxi. 31. (5.) The Scriptures speak of the covenant of grace as ratified by the blood of Christ, Zech. ix. 11; Heb. x. 29; xiii. 20; and to this Moses refers, Ex. xxiv. 8. Now all these must refer to the covenant with Christ, ratified by his blood, and not a covenant with man. (6.) The Scriptures speak of Christ as the Surety of the covenant, Heb. vii. 22; but he is not Surety of the promises made to man. God the Father is the Author of these promises, and he is Surety for their fulfilment. Christ was Surety in the eternal covenant of grace, for the condition on which the promises were made.

19. As, then, the Scriptures do speak of God's gracious covenant with the church, Jer. xxxi. 31, &c.; and with individual believers, as Gen. xvii. 3, 7; 2 Sam. xxiii. 5, what is the nature of this covenant? Ans. (1.) It is God's gracious engagement to sinners, to bestow on them freely the blessings purchased by Christ in the covenant of grace. (2.) It is, therefore, a free promise, through Christ, and for his sake. (3.) It is called a covenant because he engages himself, his grace, and faithfulness to men, according to the terms of the eternal covenant of grace. (4.) In such a covenant God also commands duties, and engages the people to himself, in faith and obedience.

20. Do not the Scriptures speak of man's covenanting with God also? Ans. Yes; as Jer. l. 5; Ps. l. 5.

21. Is this a covenant of grace? Ans. No; It is a covenant of duty.

22. What is the nature of such a covenant? Ans. It is man's engagement to accept the promises in Christ, and to perform his duties to God as his God in Christ.

23. Is not the covenant of grace, then, a peculiar and distinct covenant from all these? Ans. Yes; and it ought not to be confounded with any of these.

Taking up, then, the subject of the covenant of grace, as the one everlasting covenant made with Christ, and ratified by his blood, we shall consider it distinctly and separately from the exhibitions of it to man, made by way of offer and promise.

§ V.—The doctrine of this section we also reject, as to the covenant being *diplouron*, between God and man, and God's taking man's engagements to faith and repentance; all which belongs to another covenant; and, instead of it, we shall consider the following things. (1.) Our warrant to call the eternal transaction between the glorious persons of the Trinity, for man's salvation, a *covenant*. (2.) The parties in the covenant. (3.) Their several parts in it. (4.) Man's concern in that covenant.

24. Is this covenant set before us, in Scripture, as a purpose or counsel of God? Ans. Yes; as Eph. i. 4; iii. 11; Zech. vi. 13; that is, the purpose or counsel of the Three-one God.

25. Are we warranted to call that purpose or counsel *a covenant*?
 Ans. Yes.

26. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From direct Scripture expressions, calling it so; as Ps. lxxxix. 3, 34; Gal. iii. 17; Heb. vii. 22. (2.) From the promise and condition found in it, Isa. liii. 9, 10; and Christ's accepting the condition, Ps. xl. 7, 8. (3.) From the parties in the covenant, John vi. 37.

27. How may we know that Psalm lxxxix. 3, 34, speaks of the eternal covenant with Christ for the salvation of the elect, and not merely of a covenant with David, respecting the kingdom of Israel? Ans. (1.) It promises to establish his seed for ever, and as the sun; verses 4, 36, which is more than was literally true of David and his seed, with respect to the throne of Israel. (2.) Paul, Acts xiii. 34—37, explains "the sure mercies of David," spoken of in this Psalm, of Christ.

28. How does it appear that Gal. iii. 17, means the eternal covenant of grace with Christ? Ans. (1.) Although the apostle there speaks of God's covenant with Abraham, yet he says it was "*confirmed of God in Christ*;" that is, the covenant with Abraham was the promise secured in the eternal covenant with Christ. But, (2.) Lest we should suppose that Christ was only the Mediator of the Abrahamic covenant, or the executor of it, the apostle says the promise was made to Christ, verse 16; so the promise to Christ in the eternal covenant, secures the promise to Abraham or any believer.

29. How does it appear that Zech. vi. 13, speaks of this covenant? Ans. (1.) *Counsel* refers to persons. (2.) The persons here spoken of are the Lord, in the person of the Father, and the Branch, in the person of the Son; and that it is the Son is evident from the offices and the work ascribed to him; and he is elsewhere called *the Branch* from the root of Jesse, Isa. xi. 1. (3.) It is a counsel respecting the building of the temple, the church, which can refer only to Christ. (4.) The future tense is here used, in speaking of this counsel; not only because that covenant or counsel is from eternity to eternity, but it refers to Christ's future work, after his atonement is made, which he shall perform, as a priest on his throne, according to the eternal covenant; that covenant or counsel shall be the measure or rule, by which he will proceed.

30. Who were the *parties* in this eternal covenant? Ans. God, in the person of the Father, and the Son, immediately, and the Holy Spirit concurring, Ps. lxxxix. 3; Isa. xlii. 6; Heb. viii. 6; xiii. 20. And as all parts of our salvation are performed according to that covenant, so each person of the Trinity performs his part according to the economy of the covenant. The Father is represented as sending his Son, &c.; the Son as making the atonement, &c.; and the Holy Spirit as applying the purchased redemption.

31. For whom did the Father stand in that covenant? Ans. For the Three-one God; sustaining heaven's claims of honour to divine justice and law.

32. For whom did the Son stand? Ans. For man; particularly

the elect. He stood in their stead, under the law as a broken covenant.

33. Although the Scriptures speak of the work of the respective persons of the Godhead, was there any different will or interest among these glorious persons? Ans. No; the will of all the three persons is one; the Father exercising the same love and goodwill to man as the Son and Holy Spirit, and the Son and Spirit as jealous for the honour of truth, law, and justice, as the Father.

34. What is the Father's part in the covenant of grace? Ans. Sending his Son, in our stead, under the law; preparing for him a human nature; laying our iniquities on him; promising him a seed, on condition of his atonement; employing him to accomplish the purposes of salvation; assisting and sustaining him in his work; accepting his offering, or atonement; raising him from the dead; exalting him; giving all power into his hands; and giving him success, &c.

35. What was the Son's part in that covenant? Ans. Accepting the promise and condition; assuming our nature, our place in law, and our guilt; making the atonement; interceding for his people; ruling and acting as their Head.

36. What was the Holy Spirit's part? Ans. Applying the purchased redemption, in enlightening, renewing, sanctifying, comforting, &c.

37. Was Christ a Surety in this covenant? Ans. Yes; Heb. vii. 22.

38. In what office was he Surety? Ans. As Priest, Heb. vii. 22.

39. Was he surety for God to man, that God would perform his promises? Ans. No; God needs no surety; nor would such suretyship be the part of a Priest; God's faithfulness is our assurance, since the condition is fulfilled.

40. Is he surety to God that man will obey the law? Ans. No; this would not be the part of a Priest. Man, when in Christ, is not under obligation to obey the law as a covenant; Christ having, in his suretyship, fulfilled this in the elect's stead. And as to the believer's obeying the law, as in Christ, it belongs to the promise of the covenant, for which the Father is Surety, Jer. xxxii. 40.

41. For what was he surety? Ans. He was surety for man to God, that he would himself satisfy law and justice in man's stead.

42. Was, then, Christ a representative in this covenant? Ans. Yes; he represented, or stood in the place of his people, in the covenant.

43. Wherein was he their representative? Ans. (1.) In his engaging to answer the claims of law and justice in their stead, under the broken covenant of works, and therefore to suffer the penalty, and obey the conditional precept; Gal. iv. 4, 5. (2.) Therefore to bear their guilt; Isa. liii. 5, 6. (3.) In receiving the promises for them, which were all made to him as their Surety and representing Head. (4.) And as their Intercessor, claiming the promised blessings for them.

44. What necessarily follows on this representation by Christ, of his people? Ans. (1.) That the sins of the elect were all imputed to Christ; 2 Cor. v. 21. (2.) His righteousness is imputed to them, and their justification effected; 2 Cor. v. 21. (3.) The promises of the covenant were all made to him as his right, on account of his performing the condition. (4.) That therefore the promises are all sure and unconditional to them. (5.) And therefore his people are one with him in law; their sins became his by imputation, that he might bear the guilt and punishment of them. His mediatory righteousness becoming theirs, by imputation, gives them a right to the promises. Therefore, (6.) From this representation and oneness, Christ and his people are called by the same name; as "the seed of the woman;" Gen. iii. 15; "Jacob," Psal. xxiv. 6; "Israel," Isa. xlix. 3. They have the same promises; Psal. xci. 11, 12. They are crucified with him; Rom. vi. 6; and justified in him; Isa. xlv. 25.

45. How is it said, Tit. i. 2, that "eternal life was promised to us before the world began?" Ans. On account of Christ's representing his people in the covenant of grace; God therein making the promises to him for us; 2 Tim. i. 9.

46. Since we see the parties in this covenant, especially and directly the Father and the Son, and the parts which they were respectively to perform, do not the proper parts of a covenant also appear in it? Ans. Yes; the promise and condition are expressly stated.

47. Was there any penalty in this covenant? Ans. No; a penalty is not an essential part of a covenant. It has place only where one or both of the parties are fallible.

48. Did Christ, in the making, or in the execution of this covenant, purchase the making of the promises? Ans. No; Not the making of the covenant, nor of the promises in it, but the blessings promised. The fulfilment of the promises was, in the covenant, suspended on the condition to be performed by Christ, but the making of the promises was of the free, unmerited grace of the Three-one God.

49. Was the promise of the covenant subordinate to the condition; or the condition subordinate to the promise? Ans. The condition was subordinate to the promise; that is, the promise of salvation was the primary object in the covenant, and the condition was proposed and adopted in order to the fulfilment of the promises.

50. Did the making of the promises in the covenant arise from the offices or work of Christ? Ans. No; The mediatorial offices of Christ were appointed in order to the effecting the gracious purposes of God, and the fulfilment of the promises.

51. How was *man connected with this covenant*, in the making of it? Ans. Of course, not by taking any active part in it, nor in performing any part of the condition of it; but, (1.) The condition which should have been performed by man, was performed by Christ, in their name and stead, as their representative. (2.) The pro-

promises of the covenant, for their benefit, were not made directly to them, but to Christ as their representative, and the rightful claimant, and to be theirs in their union to him. Therefore, (3.) The promises, which were conditional to Christ, are free to them. (4.) Their salvation is sure, by joint-heirship with Christ; Rom. viii. 17. Therefore, (5.) They must, through union to Christ, persevere infallibly in a state of grace; because the law is satisfied in their name, cannot make a demand for a second payment, nor lay them under condemnation; the faithfulness of God is pledged, on the condition wrought by Christ, to give them final salvation, and all that is necessary in preparation for it.

LECTURE XXIV.—NATURE AND REVELATION OF THIS COVENANT.

§ VI.—52. Is it the law or the gospel that exhibits this new covenant to us? Ans. It is the gospel. The law can exhibit nothing but duty, obligation, a promise on condition, and the penalty for disobedience.

53. Are the law and the gospel properly opposed to one another? Ans. No; they happily agree; the gospel honouring the law; Rom. iii. 31; and the law, in its precept, requiring submission to the gospel. Yet, as modes or methods of salvation, they are opposed. He that embraces the one, rejects the other, as the way of salvation.

54. While the law should accompany the gospel, to show its necessity to us, and our obligation to embrace it, does not the gospel show the use of the law to believers? Ans. Yes; it promises grace and strength to keep the law, as a rule of life, and acceptance in that obedience.

55. Is the gospel a new law, either more perfect, or defective? Ans. No; strictly taken, it is no law at all, but free promises.

56. Is the covenant of grace, as it exists in the secret counsels of God, and as it is revealed in the gospel to us, in any respect different? Ans. Not in its principles and provisions; but, in the secret counsels, it contains the names of the elect; 2 Tim. ii. 19; as revealed, it does not contain the names; but, instead of this, it offers salvation to all, and includes all who embrace it; Deut. xxix. 29.

57. Does, then, the covenant of grace, as revealed, warrant every gospel hearer to trust on Christ's satisfaction to the law and justice of God, as his own, and as the ground of his justification, pardon, and acceptance? Ans. Yes; Acts xvi. 31; Isa. xlv. 24.

58. Is it necessary that the sinner be first a believer and penitent, before he is welcome to the salvation of the covenant of grace? Ans. No; for then none would ever be welcome; no one can have faith before he is warranted to believe; no one has true repentance till he believes and is united to Christ. On this supposition, salvation would not be free; Christ would not be the end of the law for righteousness to him; some part of righteousness being necessary to his interest in Christ's work; and some of the blessings promised

as faith and repentance, on the condition of Christ's atonement, would be unnecessary, as they must come some way without the covenant.

59. Can faith and repentance, then, be conditions of the covenant of grace? Ans. No; they are blessings promised in the covenant, on the condition performed by Christ. The whole condition of that covenant was performed by Christ.

60. Are they then conditions of welcome or right to the blessings of the covenant? Ans. No; for the right or welcome is free to the sinner.

61. Are they then conditions of possession of the blessings of the covenant? Ans. Not properly; for they are themselves the possession of blessings promised; and they are promised, in the covenant, to be given on the condition performed by Christ. They are indeed necessary means of attaining the consummation of salvation, just as holiness of heart and life are necessary to the enjoyment of heaven; but not conditions on which it is granted. Conditions in a covenant imply that those who perform them are party contractors; and the conditions are either really or legally meritorious. Therefore, faith and repentance are not conditions of salvation, nor of the covenant.

§ VII.—62. What does the word *gospel* mean? Ans. *Good news*.

63. Does not the gospel, largely taken, include both law and promise? Ans. Yes; as Rom. ii. 16; Rom. i. 1.

64. Do the commands to believe, to hope, to rejoice in God, belong to the gospel strictly taken, or to the law? Ans. They belong to the law; for the law commands all duty. The perfection and the nature of the law teach this.

65. What does the gospel, strictly taken, contain, as good news? Ans. It testifies what God will do for sinners, for Christ's sake, and the gracious provisions he has made for them in Christ.

NOTE.—The Old Testament contains a gospel of promise. The New, in contrast, a gospel of impletion, fulfilment, or history. The former, is gospel largely—the latter strictly.

66. Does the gospel, strictly taken, contain any good news about the law? Ans. Yes.

67. What good news about the law does it contain? Ans. (1.) That the law, as a covenant, is fulfilled for us by Christ, and has no further claims on us for penalty or obedience; Rom. vi. 14; vii. 1—6; x. 4. (2.) That the law, as a rule of life, is the same holy and perfect law it ever was, and is the whole rule of duty. (3.) That the law is not to be obeyed by us as a ground of justification. (4.) That grace and strength are provided to enable us to obey. (5.) That acceptance of our persons and of our obedience is attainable in Christ.

§ VIII.—68. Who alone could reveal this gospel? Ans. God.

69. Is it revealed by any other means than the written word of God? Ans. No; Rom. xvi. 25, 26.

70. To whom is it revealed? Ans. Not directly to angels, but as they learn it in their ministry; not to Adam before the fall, as he had then no need of it; but to fallen men.

71. Has it been revealed to all men? Ans. Although all are welcome to the revelation, and to its blessings, and although the commission warrants the revelation of it to all to whom we have access, yet, in divine sovereignty, it has not reached all.

72. To whom is it revealed effectually? Ans. To the elect, and to them alone; Matt. xxii. 14.

73. Does it follow that, because it is externally revealed to unbelievers, and their duty of faith prescribed, they are able to embrace it? Ans. No; it may serve for conviction to them, and for their further condemnation. It comes with the offer of strength and of faith, implying that they have not strength themselves.

§ IX.—74. Were all mankind included in the eternal covenant of grace, or represented by Christ in that covenant? Ans. No; it was only his seed, his sheep, the elect.

75. What evidence have we of this? Ans. Many evidences; particularly, (1.) All are not saved, but all that Christ represented must be saved; 2 Tim. ii. 19. Christ's representation fulfilled the condition of the covenant, the condition of the promises. In it, he received the promises, and in it he intercedes, and governs. (2.) All that Christ represented were all that the Father gave him by covenant; and all these do actually come to Christ in time; John vi. 37. (3.) It would be a blasphemous charge on Christ of ignorance and folly, to die for any that were not given to him in that covenant, and given on the condition of the covenant. (4.) The fact, that the gospel, in nearly all ages, so far, has been limited to a part of mankind, confirms this doctrine.

76. But does the withholding of the gospel from any people, prove that they are not saved, and are not included in the covenant of grace? Ans. Yes; Prov. xxix. 18; Eph. ii. 11, 12; iv. 17, 18.

§ X.—77. But some suppose that there is a common grace remaining in all men, and that this amounts to a gospel call to them; how answer? Ans. It is a mere imagination, contrary to Scripture testimony of man's depravity, and unworthy of special refutation.

78. Some suppose that all men are under a gospel call, through their parents, because in some distant preceding age, their parents were called? Ans. Children are, indeed, under a gospel call, through their immediate parents, but this is lost to future generations through the intervention of unbelieving parents. And a parent interested in the covenant of grace does not represent his posterity in that covenant, as Adam did in the covenant of works.

79. Some suppose that common providence reveals as much of God as is necessary to salvation, and is a gospel call; how answer? Ans. The works of creation and common providence give no hint of the new covenant; Prov. xxi. 18; Rom. ii.

80. But Universalists and Arminians object, (1.) That the goodness of God demands that an opportunity of salvation be given

to all? *Ans.* God is under no obligation, even by his goodness, to bestow favour on sinners. It might as well be said that his goodness demands that equal favour, and actual salvation, as well as gospel privileges, be bestowed on all; yet we see it is not the case.

81. *Obj.* (2.) In Titus ii. 11, it is said that "the grace of God hath appeared to all men?" *Ans.* It means, to all classes of men; giving authority to publish the gospel to all men, and making all to whom it comes welcome, and not to limit the privileges, as of old, to the Jews. For, even under the New Testament, it has not actually appeared to all nations or individuals of mankind.

82. *Obj.* (3.) Melchizedec, Job, &c., of old, and the Syrophenician woman, the centurion, &c., under the New Testament, had the knowledge of the gospel, and were saved, though not in the visible church? *Ans.* (1.) Job, Melchizedec, &c., were of the church, though not of Israel. At that time the distinction between Israel and other nations was not completed, nor all others than Israel excluded from the church. The revelation of the gospel still remained with some. (2.) Others, in the beginning of the new dispensation, enjoyed light by the Jews and their Scriptures. The word of the gospel had actually reached them.

83. *Obj.* (4.) The Gentiles, by their sacrifices, showed that they knew the gospel? *Ans.* Their sacrifices only proved some conviction of sin, and of their need of atonement. They derived the practice of sacrificing by tradition, but they had lost the knowledge of its original use. They supposed their sacrifices were atonements.

§ XI.—84. When was the revelation of the covenant of grace first given? *Ans.* Immediately after the fall, in paradise; and it was further revealed through all the old dispensation.

85. How does this appear? *Ans.* (1.) From the first gospel promise, made in the garden of Eden. (2.) From many passages of the New Testament directly; as Gal. iii. 8; Heb. iv. 2, 6; 1 Pet. iv. 6,—“gospel preached to them that are dead;” referring to men before the flood. (3.) From texts which represent the knowledge of the gospel as attainable from the Old Testament itself; as John v. 39; 2 Tim. iii. 15. (4.) From their having, of old, the same Mediator as we; Acts iv. 12; 1 Tim. ii. 5. (5.) The Old Testament saints had the same benefits of grace and glory; Matt. xxii. 32. (6.) They had the same exercises; of faith, repentance, and a holy life; Romans iv. 3, 9; Heb. vi. 12; Heb. xi. &c. (7.) They had sacraments signifying and sealing the same things as ours; Romans iv. 11; 1 Cor. v. 7. (8.) Their faith and practice are recommended for our imitation; Heb. vi. 12. (9.) And from the doctrines, promises, and ceremonies of the Old Testament; and the gracious exercises of the Old Testament saints, as set forth in the Psalms, and elsewhere.

§ XII.—86. Were the Old Testament worship, ordinances, and promises, of a carnal and legal nature, and destitute of spiritual meaning, and without the gospel of Christ, as many represent? *Ans.* No; they had, as we have seen, the gospel as well as we.

87. What is the evil of holding such views of the Old Testament dispensation? Ans. (1.) It is utterly perverting the Scriptures of the Old Testament, rejecting their true meaning, and denying the true Scripture distinction between the two dispensations. (2.) It tends to lay aside the Old Testament, as unnecessary to us now, and as affording us no direction to our faith and practice, contrary to Rom. xv. 4, and many other texts. (3.) It either maintains that there were no believers, or saints, in that age, contrary to the testimony of both Old and New Testament Scriptures, or that they were saved on different principles, and different grounds, from the salvation of saints now. (4.) If they were saved on different principles, or on different grounds, from the salvation of believers now, it denies the character of God, and is profanity and blasphemy, and denies the Scripture doctrine of man's condition since the fall.

88. But Socinians and others object, (1.) That the gospel, in Old Testament times, was only promised, not given; Rom. i. 2, 3; and, accordingly, that it was hidden in that age; Rom. xvi. 25, 26; and only began to be preached under the new dispensation; Heb. ii. 3; how answer? Ans. (1.) The hiding of the gospel, so far as the Old Testament church was involved in it, signified the comparative darkness of that age; and the preaching of the new dispensation signifies its greater clearness, after the promise of the Saviour's advent had been actually fulfilled. (2.) That darkness, or hiding, also referred to the Gentiles, to whom the privileges of the gospel, in Old Testament times, were not extended. (3.) Even Rom. xvi. 25, 26, shows that, though the gospel was then hidden, yet it was contained in the Old Testament Scriptures; but now made clearer by Christ's coming. (4.) The promise of the gospel, of old, does not mean a mere promise of a future revelation, but a promise that Christ would come, that a clearer light would be given on his coming, and in the mean time a promise of salvation through Christ, then to be applied and enjoyed. (5.) These objectors deny the unity of the church, the unity of the way of salvation in all ages, the unchangeableness of God, and the real nature and design of the old dispensation. (6.) To maintain their doctrine, they reject the plainest expressions of Scripture, and put a forced construction on passages not so plain, in contrariety to that which is clear.

89. Obj. (2.) Christ is the Mediator under the New Testament, and Moses, under the Old; Heb. viii. 6; Gal. iii. 19? Ans. The mediation of Moses was only typical and instrumental; Christ, as the anti-type, is the true Mediator. What was promised by the mediation of Moses, in type, is now fulfilled by Christ the anti-type.

90. Obj. (3.) The promises are, in the Old Testament prophecies, and elsewhere, declared to belong exclusively to the grace of the New Testament dispensation; Jer. xxxi. 31, 33; Heb. vii. 22; viii. 6? Ans. (1.) The promises of grace are not spoken of in these and such texts, as belonging only to the New Testament, but as belonging to the covenant of grace, in opposition to the covenant of works; and, (2.) The more clear, full and extensive exhibition of them

under the new, than under the old dispensation. (3.) And in special application of these texts to the old and new dispensation in contrast, it is not the matter of the gospel that is contrasted in these dispensations, which is the same in both, as we have seen, but the form of dispensation. And they especially teach that Christ is not the mediator of salvation conferred by outward forms, but by spiritual blessings.

91. Obj. (4.) Under the Old Testament God required personal obedience as the condition of life; Levit. xviii. 4, 5; but faith only is required in the New Testament, Gal. iii. 23, 24? Ans. (1.) Levit. xviii. 4, 5, may be considered as a statement of the covenant of works, for conviction of the impossibility of salvation by it; so Rom. x. 5, 6, contrasting the law and grace. (2.) It also means, that the keeping of God's statutes and judgments, and doing them, includes faith in Christ, love to God, and communion with him, as well as other duties; and that although the performance of these is not the condition of salvation, it is the course of life in which free salvation by Christ is to be enjoyed. (3.) Gal. iii. 23, 24, signifies the very opposite of the objection; viz., that under the Old Testament the people were, by the whole law, shut out from hope of salvation on any other ground than that which that law taught respecting Christ, and that is more fully set forth in the New Testament; that is, free salvation through Christ received by faith. Besides, in this passage, faith does not mean the grace of faith, but the doctrine of faith, more clearly revealed.

92. Obj. (5.) The faith of Old Testament saints, described in Heb. xi., had not Christ for its object? Ans. This is false; an assumed position to support a favourite hypothesis; for, (1.) The apostle had, in the preceding chapters, been urging faith in Christ, and, in Chap. xi. he enforces it by examples. (2.) He closes the exhortation, and citation of examples, in Chapt. xii., verses 1, 2, by express application to Christ. (3.) The faith of the Old Testament saints was founded on the gospel which their ceremonies and their Scriptures taught. (4.) No faith in God ever was, since the fall, acceptable to him, except faith in him as a God in Christ; John xiv. 1; Acts iv. 11.

§ XIII.—93. What was the doctrine of the Papists respecting the state of the Old Testament saints after death? Ans. They invented the doctrine that there was an infernal prison, a *limbus patrum*, in which the Old Testament saints, after death, were detained till the death and resurrection of Christ.

94. On what ground did they pretend to found this doctrine? Ans. On the error that the gospel of Christ was not given to the Old Testament saints; that their religion was a religion of works, without faith; and that the atonement of Christ could not actually save any till it was actually made.

95. What are some of the other errors which have been maintained, by various sects and persons, on this notion that the Old Testament church had not the same gospel as we, nor the same

ground of faith? Ans. (1.) That the Old Testament sacraments were but shadows and types of ours; so the Lutherans maintain. (2.) That Christ was not the surety of his people under the old dispensation. (3.) That the way of salvation by Christ was not known to them. (4.) That remission of sins by Christ's blood, regeneration, and adoption, &c., did not belong to them.

96. Are not all these points contrary to Scripture testimony, and in general contrary to the expressed faith and experience of the Old Testament saints, as set forth in the Psalms? Ans. Yes.

§§ XIV. XV.—97. How many dispensations of the gospel has God been pleased to give? Ans. Two; called, generally, the old and the new.

98. What was the special difference between these? Ans. Not in the things dispensed; these were the same in both; but, (1.) In the means of dispensation; by the word, and types, of old; but by the word, and without types, now. (2.) In the greater clearness of the revelation and a less laborious outward service now than of old. (3.) In the limitation of gospel privileges for a period of the old dispensation to one nation, and the universal gospel offer and right to all nations to enjoy gospel privileges now.

99. Were the ages before Moses, and after him, till the coming of Christ, different dispensations? Ans. No; the dispensation from Adam to Christ was the same, but progressive in light, and means of grace. During all that time they lived on the promise of the Saviour, and were taught by types.

100. Were the gospel and church privileges, during all that time, limited to one nation? Ans. No; only from Abraham till Christ.

101. Is it proper to distinguish the old and the new dispensations by the names of *legal* and *gospel* respectively? Ans. No; because the old was a gospel dispensation. The difference was not in the matter, but the manner.

102. How does it appear that the one old dispensation embraced the whole time from Adam to Christ? Ans. (1.) Because but one old dispensation is spoken of, in Scripture, as done away. (2.) Because Abraham lived in the same Old Testament dispensation with Moses, though long before him. Moses only enlarged its ritual and laws. (3.) The apostle, Acts xiii. 32, says, the promise made to the fathers was fulfilled in raising Christ from the dead. And this includes the first gospel promise to Adam, that to Abraham, &c., as well as others afterwards made. (4.) The apostle, Heb. ix. 15, declares that Christ's atonement was made for the transgression of believers, under the Old Testament, but that atonement was made for Adam, Abel, Seth, Noah, and Abraham, as well as for Moses, David, &c., and consequently the Old Testament extended from Adam to Christ.

103. What errors have generally been joined with the division of divine dispensations into three; that before Moses; that from Moses to Christ; and that of the new? Ans. (1.) They hold that the ceremonial law was given as a punishment for making

the golden calf. (2.) That the people under the Mosaic dispensation were under a servile subjection to angels. (3.) That the testament and covenant of grace were quite different; whereas the Scriptures make them the same; each name conveying the idea of the covenant of grace confirmed by the blood of Christ. (4.) That the Old Testament promise was chiefly of Canaan, &c; whereas, although it was promised indeed, it was chiefly a type and pledge of heaven. (5.) They hold that, besides the Old and the New Testaments, there is a third one which is eternal; whereas, that epithet is given to the covenant of grace itself; Heb. xiii. 20.

§ XVI.—104. Would it agree with Scripture, or with the nature of the different dispensations, to make all the different stages of the development of the covenant of grace distinct dispensations? *Ans.* No. Because, (1.) This would lead us to as many distinct dispensations as there were distinct revelations of the will of God, even when they produced no alteration on that which was past. (2.) The leading grounds of the two distinct dispensations of the gospel are plain and important; such as that the first was an age of promise, and of type and shadow; the latter is an age of history, of antitype, and of the reality of what had been shadowed forth.

§ XVII.—105. But they who deny that God has employed but two dispensations of the covenant of grace object, (1.) That Moses says, Deut. v. 2, 3, that the old covenant was not made with the fathers, and therefore they hold that the Mosaic covenant was entirely different from that made with the fathers before Moses. How answer? *Ans.* (1.) The fathers there referred to were the Israelites at Mt. Sinai. (2.) Like many similar passages of Scripture, the negative, in this text, does not mean absolutely a negative, but comparatively: it means that the covenant was not made with the fathers exclusively, but also with their children, whom Moses was addressing.

106. Obj. (2.) The old covenant, meaning the old dispensation, was entered into with Israel in the wilderness, according to Jer. xxxi. 32, and therefore it was different from the dispensation of the previous ages? *Ans.* That passage means that the dispensation was then most fully unfolded, and the covenant renewed.

§ XVIII.—107. Is not the dispensation, since the coming of Christ, called a new covenant, or New Testament? *Ans.* Yes; Heb. viii. 13.

108. Does this mean that the substance or matter of it is different from the old? *Ans.* No; but only a new dispensation, or manner of dispensing the same things; dispensing the covenant of grace without the types and shadows of the old, and with some new ordinances.

109. How may the New Testament dispensation itself be subdivided? *Ans.* (1.) Into its beginning, in the incarnation of Christ.

* The old dispensation is divided into three periods;—the beginning, from Adam to Abraham; the progress, from Abraham to Moses; the complement, from Moses to Christ.

(2.) Into its progress, in the preaching of John the Baptist, and of Christ. (3.) Its consummation at Christ's death, when the obligation to observe the typical services ceased; and at the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost.

109. How long is this new dispensation to continue? Ans. To the end of the world; Matt. xxviii. 20; Acts iii. 21.

§ XIX.—110. Is it not the same covenant of grace that was dispensed under the old dispensation, and is now dispensed under the new? Ans. Yes; and therefore the dispensations are one in substance, although different in manner.

111. How may it further appear that the two dispensations are one in substance? Ans. Because, (1.) The same unchangeable and holy God could not give salvation on different grounds since the fall. (2.) The same Saviour was promised to Adam as to us, and set forth in all the Old Testament doctrines, promises, and types. (3.) The church is one in all ages, because built on the same foundation—Christ and the eternal covenant; and equally built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets; Eph. ii. 20. (4.) Believers are now required to follow the footsteps of the Old Testament saints; Heb. vi. 12. (5.) The Old Testament is still the rule of faith to us; Rom. xv. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 16. (6.) The types, ordinances, and promises led the Old Testament saints to the same Saviour as we believe in; Gal. iii. 23, 24. (7.) The New Testament constantly refers to the Old, as setting forth the same Saviour as the New, and even refers to the Old as established and tried authority for the doctrines and promises of the New; John v. 39, 46; 2 Pet. i. 19.

CHAPTER XVIII.—LECTURE XXV.

OF THE MEDIATOR.

§ I.—Q. 1. Did the covenant of grace provide salvation for man without a Mediator? Ans. No; it could not, consistently with the glory of divine perfections. The righteousness of the covenant of grace depends on the Mediator.

2. Or was Christ a Mediator without a covenant? Ans. No; We conceive this could not take place, as the will of Christ is one with the Father's; and therefore the object of his mediation was equally the object of the three glorious persons of the Trinity.

3. May we, then, suppose that his mediation preceded the making of the covenant? Ans. No; His mediation was the consequence of his appointment in that covenant.

§ II.—4. What, in general, is the office of mediator? Ans. A mediator is one who undertakes to reconcile two disagreeing parties.

5. Does it not sometimes, in Scripture, mean a messenger between two parties? Ans. Yes; As Moses at Sinai; Gal. iii. 19; Compare Deut. v. 5.

Q. 6. But strictly and properly, what is the office of Mediator, as applied to Christ? **Ans.** As Mediator between God and man, in order to reconciliation, (1.) By an atonement he satisfied the justice of God, and magnified the law in man's stead; and purchased for men, not only peace and children's privileges with God, but regenerating and sanctifying grace, and eternal glory. (2.) By his grace, he actually reconciles man's heart to God, and brings him into communion with God, and to eternal glory; and is the medium of communion between God and man.

7. How does it appear that the mediation of Christ includes a satisfaction to divine justice, as the ground of all our privileges with God? **Ans.** (1.) From the use of the word in Scripture, as applied to Christ, Heb. ix. 19; xii. 24. In both which texts, Christ's death and blood are represented as the means of mediation; 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. (2.) A mediator, to be efficient, must adapt himself to the parties, and to the state of disagreement between them. Therefore, as divine justice and law had claims against the sinner, which could not be dispensed with, and man could not satisfy, so Christ, as Mediator, satisfied them for man. (3.) It also appears from Christ's being called the Surety of the covenant; Heb. vii. 22; which suretyship he sustains as Priest, in making the atonement.

8. How does it appear that his mediation includes his turning men to God, in regeneration and sanctification? **Ans.** Because, (1.) As Mediator, in making the atonement, he obtained the promises for his spiritual seed, including their regeneration and sanctification. (2.) He accordingly intercedes for the bestowment of these graces; John xvii.

9. How does it appear that his mediation includes his acting as the medium of communication between God and his people? **Ans.** Not only as he purchased these privileges for them, but, as Intercessor he obtains them, and is the way of communication, John xiv. 6.

10. In what offices does Christ act as Mediator? **Ans.** In the offices of Prophet, Priest, and King.

11. In which of these offices does Christ act in satisfying divine justice, and laying the foundation of peace between God and man? **Ans.** In his priestly office.

12. In which does he act in reconciling man's heart to God, and in renewing and sanctifying the heart, and in being the medium of their communion with God? **Ans.** In all his offices; laying the foundation of all this sanctification of the soul, and communion with God, in his atonement, as Priest, and, in the same office, pleading men's cause; in communicating instruction as Prophet; and in ruling the heart, and communicating blessings, as King.

13. Does the mediation of Christ consist in bearing testimony, as the Socinians suggest, from 1 Tim. ii. 6? **Ans.** No; That text declares that Christ is the Mediator as a ransom or atonement, and that this is a matter of the gospel testimony.

§ III.—**14.** Was a Mediator between God and man necessary, in order to man's salvation? **Ans.** Yes.

15. Why necessary? Ans. Because, (1.) Peace with God could not be restored to fallen man without a satisfaction to divine justice, which man could not render. (2.) God could not hold communion with fallen man, nor bestow grace, without a Mediator, who was able to appear in the presence of God for him.

16. But was there any necessity, on God's part, either to save man, or to appoint a Mediator? Ans. No; it was all the exercise of free and sovereign grace. But, on God's determining to save man, justice, truth, and holiness, rendered a Mediator necessary.

17. Would not nature, unbiassed, teach the necessity of a Mediator for man's restoration to divine favour? Ans. Yes; and the sacrifices of the heathen prove this.

§ IV.—18. As it belongs to the mediation of Christ to take away man's enmity, and to reconcile his heart to God, how does Christ as Mediator, effect this work? Ans. (1.) By making the atonement, as the meritorious ground on which the work of the Spirit of Christ is employed for regeneration and sanctification. (2.) By presenting to the view of the sinner, the atonement, and other works of Christ's mediation, as motives of reconciliation and turning to God. (3.) Christ, as Mediator, is the medium of communicating grace to the elect.

19. Did the Mediator interfere to move God to mercy towards man? Ans. No; mercy to man originated in the sovereign love of God, and the appointment of Christ as Mediator was the consequence. And therefore, Christ's mediation did not move the mind of God towards the sinner; it could not change it; and there was no necessity for it.

20. What effect then had the mediation of Christ in effecting man's peace and salvation? Ans. According to the eternal purpose and covenant, it took away sin, the cause of divine wrath. It did not directly take away wrath itself, but the cause of wrath, which was sin; and therefore God is unchanged, while the case of the sinner, and his relation to God are changed.

21. Is it not necessary to our right understanding of the plan of salvation, and to the maintaining the honour of the divine character, that we maintain the absolute immutability of God in the salvation of the sinner? Ans. Yes.

22. As the whole plan of redemption originated in the sovereign love and purpose of God, and as the mediation of Christ was the result of that love and purpose, as the method of accomplishing the divine counsels of mercy, does it not follow that the mediation of Christ effects no change in God, in the justification and salvation of the sinner? Ans. Yes.

23. But it is objected by the Socinians that God is never, in Scripture, said to be reconciled by Christ to man. Is not this true? Ans. Yes; they speak only of reconciling man to God; Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18—20; Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 20, 21.

24. Does this fact forbid the idea that Christ, by atonement, took away the cause of divine wrath? Ans. No; this the Scriptures abundantly teach, and call it man's reconciliation to God.

25. What is the object of the Socinians in pleading that the

Scriptures never speak of God's being reconciled? Ans. They mean to deny that Christ made a proper atonement, satisfying divine justice, taking away guilt, and the cause of divine wrath.

26. Does it necessarily follow from the error of the Socinians, denying the proper atonement of Christ, that they also err in asserting that the Scriptures never speak of God's being reconciled by Christ to man? Ans. No; they assert the truth, but make an inference from it utterly unfounded, in direct opposition to the Scripture doctrine of the atonement. An errorist does not necessarily hold error on every point. And we will act weakly and foolishly, if we deny all the premises on which an error is supposed to be founded, merely because an error is assumed to be based upon them. Let us rather examine the connexion between the premises and the conclusion, and not rashly deny the premises, lest we undermine the precious truths of the gospel, and give the adversary the advantage.

27. What is the meaning of the word *reconcile*, in ordinary use? Ans. It means a change of mind in the person reconciled.

28. Can it in this sense be applied to God? Ans. No; Mal. iii. 6.

29. What is its peculiar meaning in Scripture? Ans. A change of state, or relation, of the person reconciled, by taking away the cause of displeasure entertained against him; Matt. v. 23, 24, compared with Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18—20. Here remark, (1.) The person giving the offence must be reconciled; that is, the cause of the displeasure of another against him must be taken away. (2.) In ordinary cases, the offender must do this himself; and without a Mediator, this is what man is bound to do towards God. (3.) But, in the glorious scheme of redemption, God himself does this, by the Mediator; and hence the ordinary expression in Scripture, on this subject. It is, therefore, better to follow the Scripture expression on this subject, ascribing to Christ the taking away of sin, the cause of wrath; ascribing to God himself this work of reconciling sinners to himself by Jesus Christ; as this presents God in his true character, and the way of salvation in its true light; and because there is a natural tendency in the mind of man to suppose that God is somehow changed in mind, by the mediation of Christ; and the expression that "God is reconciled," cherishes this natural God-dishonouring notion.

30. Does the Scripture declaration, that God gave the Saviour, in love to the world, militate against the necessity of a proper atonement, in order to man's salvation, or against the doctrine of God's displeasure against sin? Ans. No; because in love to man, he gave his Son to make the atonement, in order that the mercy intended might reach man, and a love of complacency be exercised towards him.

NOTE.—The premises in both the above Socinian objections are to be admitted, but their conclusions rejected, as unfounded and unscriptural.

§ V.—31. As the work of mediation between God and man is

peculiar, was it not necessary that the person of the Mediator should also be peculiar, and adapted to the work? Ans. Yes.

32. What was the constitution of the Mediator? Ans. God and man, in one person.

33. What was the necessity that the Mediator should be *man*? Ans. (1.) That he might be capable of obeying and suffering, which as God, he could not be. (2.) That his sufferings and obedience might be the very thing which the law required—the sufferings and obedience of man.

34. What was the necessity that the sufferings and obedience of the Mediator should be those of a man? Ans. (1.) That the truth of God might be maintained in man's salvation. He had promised life to man for obedience, and threatened death to man for disobedience. (2.) That justice might be maintained, that the nature that sinned, and not another should suffer; and that the same nature should obey.

35. What was the necessity that the Mediator should be *God*? Ans. (1.) That he might be able to give value and dignity to his sufferings and obedience, sufficient to atone for sin, satisfy justice, and merit the salvation of the sinner. (2.) That he might be able to confer such blessings as the sinner needed, in his advocacy, and in his prophetic, and kingly offices; such as destroying sin in his people, communicating grace to them, and giving them glory; as well as ruling all things for their benefit. (3.) That he might be able to deal with God for his people. And (4.) That he might be able to be the Lord of his people, and their happiness and portion.

36. Why was it necessary that the Mediator should be one person, while he had two distinct natures? Ans. (1.) That the works proper to each nature might be the works of the same person, in accomplishing, or carrying out, and perfecting our salvation. (2.) That the same person might accomplish the whole work, however diversified its nature might be; as, for example, that he who is God, and as such could not suffer, or obey the law, might, in his human nature, yield these requisitions, and give them infinite value.

37. Why was it necessary that he should be perfectly holy? Ans. (1.) That he might be fit to approach unto God as Mediator. (2.) That he might be acceptable in his service. (3.) That his whole atonement might be for sinners, and he need none for himself; Heb. vii. 26, 27. (4.) That his obedience might be what the law required—a sinless obedience.

38. Did the Old Testament Scriptures point out the Mediator as God and man, in one person, and of perfect holiness? Ans. Yes; as God, Psal. ii. 7, xlv. 6; as man, Gen. iii. 15, Isa. ix. 6; the unity of his person, Isa. vii. 14; his holiness, Isa. xlii. 1; the sacrifices without spot or blemish, prefiguring his holiness; and he is called "the Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel;" Isa. xliii. 14; xlvi. 17; liv. 5.

§ VI.—39. Is it becoming to inquire whether it was possible for God in his wisdom and power, to save sinners by some other means

than his own Son as our Mediator? Ans. No; it is sufficient to say, that God chose this method alone; and there is no other way known to us, or conceivable by us.

§ VII.—40. Since the heathen and infidels do not acknowledge the authority of the Scriptures, what arguments may be used with them to prove that Jesus Christ is truly the Mediator? Ans. (1.) Besides the Scripture declarations which may convince, we may urge the holiness of Christ's doctrines, their harmony, and their efficacy. (2.) His kingly power, appearing in the erection, the government, the preservation, and defence of his church. (3.) His miracles, which even his enemies could not deny. (4.) The Old Testament Scriptures respecting him, so remarkably fulfilled, as undoubted history attests. (5.) The need of such a Mediator between God and man.

§ § VIII. IX. X.—41. What arguments may be used against the Jews, to prove that Jesus is the promised Messiah? Ans. There are many; as, (1.) The time of his advent, which, according to Old Testament prophecy, must be past; as Gen. xlix. 10;—the Sceptre and the Lawgiver have departed from Judah. Dan. ii. 44;—those kings have come and gone, in whose days the kingdom of Christ was to be set up. Dan. ix. 24—26; Daniel's "seventy weeks," in which the Messiah should come, are long since expired. Hag. ii. 7, 9; The temple to which the Desire of all nations should come, and to which Christ did come, is long ago destroyed; and to the same purpose, Mal. iii. 1. (2.) We may argue from the place of Christ's birth, as predicted in the Old Testament Scriptures, and with which the history of the birth of Jesus agrees; as Micah v. 1, compared with Matt. ii. 1, 5; John vii. 42. (3.) From the stock or family of which Christ was to come; from Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, Jesse, David; and especially to be born of a virgin, Isa. vii. 14; all which occurred in the case of Jesus Christ, as history teaches, and Jews did not deny.

§ XI.—42. Are we bound to believe that Mary, the mother of Jesus, still remained a virgin, and had no children afterwards, by natural generation? Ans. No; for (1.) Scripture is silent on this subject, showing that it is a matter of no importance to us. (2.) The Lord's brethren, several times spoken of, prove nothing conclusively, as other near relations are in Scripture called *brethren*; yet it is probable that Mary had other children afterwards.

§ XII.—43. We have said that the prophecies respecting Christ, fulfilled in Jesus, are proofs that he is the Messiah. What are some of these prophecies to which we may refer in proof? Ans. (1.) Prophecies that Christ should be expected before his advent, and a preparatory personage before him. (2.) Prophecies concerning the state, the doctrines, and the work of Christ. (3.) Prophecies concerning the consequences of his coming. (4.) Prophecies respecting the rejection of Christ by the Jews, and their fall from their privileges.

44. What prophecies respecting the expected advent of Christ and a preparatory personage, have been fulfilled? Ans. Mal. iii. 1; Hag. ii. 7; Isa. xl. 3. These were fulfilled, as Simeon, and no

doubt other believers were waiting in expectation; Luke ii. 25, 38. This also appears by the questioning among the people, whether John the Baptist were the Christ; Luke iii. 15. Moreover John the Baptist was undoubtedly the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Is. xl. 3, compared with Mark i. 3; the Messenger before Christ; Mal. iii. 1, compared with Mark i. 2; Matt. xi. 10; and the promised Elijah, Mal. iv. 5, 6; compared with Matt. xi. 14. And this appears, not only from these testimonics, but because he answered the predictions of his appearance, of his spirit and manner, and of his office, by his baptism, and his testimony to Christ.

45. What prophecies respecting the state, the doctrines, and the works of Christ, were fulfilled in him? Ans. (1.) Of his state;—It was low in the world, and despised, Isa. liii. 2, 3;—it was afflicted, Isa. liii. 3—7. (2.) Of his doctrine; it was to be acceptable and reviving to the meek and oppressed; Isa. lxi. 1; compared with Luke iv. 18—22. (3.) Of the works of Christ; many were predicted which were performed, and performed by him alone, and his apostles, through his name: as Isa. xxxv. 5, 6; compared with Matt. xi. 4, 5.

46. What prophecies of the consequences of Christ's coming have been fulfilled? Ans. (1.) The desolation of Jerusalem, Dan. ix. 26. (2.) The overthrow of idolatry; which occurred in part in the ceasing of heathen oracles, Zech. xiii. 2; and partly by the conversion of the Gentiles. (3.) The calling of the Gentiles was foretold, as the effect of the coming of Christ; Gen. xlix. 10; Isa. lv. 5; lxxv. 1.

47. Was the rejection of Christ by the Jews, and their fall, foretold? Ans. Yes; Isa. viii. 14; Psal. cxviii. 22; Deut. xxxii. 21, compared with Rom. x. 19.

§ XIII.—48. Although the Messiah was to be a great king, according to prediction, was his worldly state and appearance to indicate a worldly kingdom, as the Jews supposed? Ans. No; his kingdom is spiritual, which the blinded Jews did not perceive. His kingdom is not of this world, John xviii. 36. His worldly appearance was to be "meek and lowly;" Zech. ix. 9; Matt. xxi. 5.

49. The Jews object that the Messiah is not yet come, because he was to be the king and leader of the Jews; that he was to come in the end of the days and after Elijah; and that great works, not yet done, were to be done by the Messiah, on his coming? Ans. (1.) Christ was to be king of the Jews, but not of them only, nor of all even of them; as they would reject him. (2.) His kingdom was to be spiritual, not worldly. (3.) The latter dispensation is the latter day, or end of the days, Dan. viii. 17. (4.) Elijah is come, in John the Baptist. (5.) The great works of Christ were spiritual, and not perceived by the Jews. Some of them, as miracles, he did perform; others, as destroying Gog and Magog, are yet to come; and the light of the moon being as the light of the sun, &c., are to be understood spiritually. (6.) The leading error of the Jews is their ignorance of the real design of the Messiah; through this error they mistake the nature of his work; take that to be worldly which is spiritual; and they see not the need, nor the value of his spiritual

work; therefore they did not know Christ when he came, nor can they under such carnal views, understand their own Scriptures.

§ XIV.—50. What is the doctrine of the Socinians respecting the Mediatorial office of Christ? Ans. They deny his proper mediation as our atoning priest; and they hold that he is a Saviour only by way of teaching and example.

51. How may we account for such a view of Christ's mediation, so contrary to express teachings of Scripture? Ans. From their blindness and enmity at the gospel. They do not see the justice and holiness of God, nor relish them; they do not see the evil of sin, nor hate it. Not seeing the need of a proper atonement, and mediation, nor relishing such doctrines, they, according to their blinded conceptions, explain away the express teachings of Scripture.

52. What is the Popish doctrine of Christ's mediation? Ans. That although, Christ is a mediator, yet his righteousness is not our sole justifying righteousness; that he is not the sole author of grace, and that there are other intercessors.

53. Wherein is the evil of believing in other mediators than Christ? Ans. (1.) It charges imperfection on Christ's mediation. (2.) It ascribes a work to others to which they are utterly inadequate. (3.) None can be intercessor who has not an atonement to plead, as the ground of his intercession. (4.) It leads to an utter rejection of Christ and his salvation, and to rest on a delusion.

54. Is Christ Mediator in both his natures? Ans. Yes; He is Mediator in his whole person, as God and man, and not in either nature exclusively of the other.

55. Is not the work of each nature necessary to the perfection of every part of his work? Ans. Yes; his work as man, in suffering and obeying, would have been insufficient without the dignity of the Godhead; and the dignity of the Godhead, and the operations of his power, would not have been the righteousness which the law required for the salvation of man.

56. Yet are not some of Christ's works of mediation most directly the works of one nature, and some of them of the other? Ans. Yes; suffering and obeying were directly the works of the human nature, yet ascribed to the divine person; as Acts xx. 28; and government and intercession, the works of the Divine nature, though ascribed to the whole person.

57. Is it any objection to this doctrine that the Mediator is, in 1 Tim. ii. 5, called the *man* Christ Jesus? Ans. No; it is the person who gave himself a ransom who is there meant. And from the union of both natures in the one person, and in the Mediatorial work, he is called by either name appropriate to each nature.

58. Is it any objection to our doctrine that Christ, as mediating in his divine nature, would not be distinguished from God, the party offended by man's sin? Ans. No; for as God-man Mediator, in his official capacity, he is distinct from God the Judge; and as Son, he

is distinguished from the Triune God, and from the Father, as sustaining the character of God in the economy of redemption.

59. Is it any objection to this doctrine that Christ as God could not suffer, or obey the law? Ans. No; because he suffered and obeyed in the human nature, through personal union of the two natures. Thus the whole Mediatorial person of the Redeemer suffered and obeyed in human nature, and this condescension of the Son of God was voluntary, and by the economical arrangement.

§ XVI.—60. Of whom is Christ the Mediator? Ans. Of the elect from mankind, and of them only.

61. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From direct Scripture; as Matt. i. 21; John x. 15; Eph. v. 23. (2.) From the Scripture doctrine of the covenant of which he is Mediator. It was a covenant giving a seed as the reward of his work.

62. Why is he not the Mediator of holy angels? Ans. They had no need of a Mediator, having never sinned.

63. Is every one saved, for whom Christ mediates? Ans. Yes; because they were given to him in the covenant of which he is the Mediator.

64. Is there any difference of privilege in the mediation of Christ, on account of age, sex, or worldly condition? Ans. No; Gal. iii. 8.

65. Was Christ as really Mediator of his people under the old dispensation as under the new? Ans. Yes; 1 Tim. ii. 5; John xiv. 6; Acts iv. 12; Heb. xii. 8. Christ then taught as Prophet; he was then the Lamb slain, in purpose, from "the foundation of the world," Rev. xiii. 8; and was the king and Lord of his church.

66. But has not Christ fulfilled some things belonging to his mediation under the New Testament, which were not fulfilled under the Old? Ans. Yes; he has actually obeyed and died; but on this ground, he saved Old Testament saints, as well as those under the New.

§ XVII.—67. By whom was Christ constituted Mediator? Ans. By God, economically, in the person of Father; John x. 18; Heb. vii. 21, 22.

68. How was he constituted Mediator? Ans. (1.) By counsel, (decree or covenant); 1 Pet. i. 20. (2.) By appointment and oath; Ps. ii. 6; cx. 4; Heb. vii. 21, 22; v. 4. (3.) By anointing with the Spirit; Isa. lxi. 1.

69. What did the Father require of the Son in this appointment and covenant? Ans. Obedience and death, in the stead of his people; Isa. liii. 10.

70. What did he promise to him in it? Ans. A seed, including all that was necessary to their salvation; and his own mediatorial dominion over his church, and over all things for his church; Psal. ii. 8; Eph. i. 22.

71. Did the Son engage to fulfil the stipulated condition? Ans. Yes; Psal. xl. 6—8.

72. Did he accept the promise as his reward? Ans. Yes; John xvii.

73. Did Christ purchase a reward for himself? Ans. It does not appear to be a scriptural view of the matter. Christ purchased his people. His people was his reward; and his exaltation as Mediator, was connected with it, and followed of course. At all events, he did not purchase exaltation for himself, abstractly from his people's salvation.

§ XVIII.—NOTE.—Our author appears not to be very favourable to the idea of representing the plan of salvation, entered into in eternity, under the notion of a covenant; although he has himself set it forth as between the Father and the Son, by way of condition and promise; and perhaps his indifference on this point is one reason why in the commencement of the former chapter, (17th) he confined the idea of the covenant of grace to a covenant between God and man. In his *Compend* he observes that, to speak of the plan of salvation under the notion of an eternal covenant, is more insisted on latterly than formerly. There is reason for this, as on other subjects; when error has been maintained, there is a call for more exactness both in matter and expression.

He objects here that texts brought to prove this eternal transaction have respect rather to the temporary execution of the covenant than to the covenant itself. We reply, We may expect, and we do find that, on this subject, and on that of decrees also, the Scriptures take occasion to speak of those eternal transactions from their application to passing events, but in such applications they refer to the eternal transaction. Thus, for example, if, in Tit. i. 1, the apostle speaks of the present faith of God's *elect*, we must believe, nevertheless, that the election was in eternity. If, in Tit. i. 2, the apostle speaks of our present hope of eternal life, and refers to the ground of that hope, being the promise made before the world began, he must refer to the covenant promise to Christ, in eternity; or to take an example adduced by our author, if, in Gal. iii. 17, the apostle refers to God's promise to Abraham, as "*confirmed before of God in Christ*," we must believe, that it was not a confirmation in time which had no existence in eternity. So we have this point before treated in chap. 17th.

§ XIX.—74. Was Christ appointed to be the Mediator forever? Ans. Yes; Psal. cx. 4.

75. Can this appointment be ever changed? Ans. No; because of the immutability of both the Father and the Son.

76. When was Christ first set forth to man as the Mediator? Ans. In the first gospel promise.

77. Was there not a gradual advancement in the exhibition of Christ as Mediator, under the old dispensation? Ans. Yes; by prophecies, promises, and types.

78. What were the various kinds of types? Ans. (1.) Eventual, or events, as Abraham's offering of Isaac, supply of manna and water supernaturally, &c. (2.) Real;—as sacrifices, ark, altar, &c. (3.) Personal;—as Moses, Aaron, Samson, David, &c.

79. How did types exhibit Christ as Mediator, or what purpose

did they answer in setting him forth? Ans. They were (1.) Explanatory. (2.) Promissory. (3.) Prophetical. (4.) Pledges and assurances of the antitype, as visible signs.

80. How was Christ set forth as Mediator, under the New Testament? Ans. (1.) By his actual mission with all its evidences. (2.) By his special anointing at Baptism. (3.) By the execution of his Mediatorial office in the world. (4.) By the preaching of the gospel to all nations. (5.) And he will be set forth as the Mediator at the final judgment.

81. When did Christ commence the administration of his Mediatorial office? Ans. Immediately after the fall.

82. Did he not more visibly enter on it in his incarnation, preaching, miracles, death, resurrection, ascension, and sending of the Spirit? Ans. Yes.

83. Does not the preaching of the gospel ever since Christ's ascension, belong to his administration of this office? Ans. Yes.

PART IV.

CHAPTER XIX.—OF THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST.

LECTURE I.—HIS NAMES AND NATURE.

§ I.—QUEST. 1. In attaining a knowledge of the Mediator's person, what things should be noticed? Ans. Names, natures, the union of these natures, and the effects of that union; and, first, OF NAMES.

2. What is the ordinary use of names among men. Ans. To distinguish.

3. Was it usual with the Hebrews to use significant names? Ans. Yes.

4. Do the names of the Mediator serve, not only to distinguish him from others, but to designate his character and office? Ans. Yes.

§ II.—5. What are the special names of the Mediator given in Scripture? Ans. *Jesus* and *Christ*.

6. Are these names significant? Ans. Yes.

7. From what language is the name *Jesus* derived? Ans. The Hebrew, יֵשׁוּעַ or יְהוֹשֻׁעַ.

8. What is its meaning? Ans. *He saved*;—*the Saviour*.

9. Is this name given to the Mediator in Scripture to signify his office? Ans. Yes; Matt. i. 21.

10. What salvation does the name indicate? Ans. Salvation from sin—its guilt, its power, and its pollution.

11. Does not salvation from sin imply the bestowment of positive blessings, lost by the fall? Ans. Yes.

12. Would it be consistent with this name to hold that his death secures the salvation of none, but merely renders it possible, or that he only saves by moral suasion and example? Ans. No.

13. Was not this name common among the Hebrews? Ans. Yes.

14. Was this name given to the Saviour in the Old Testament? Ans. Yes; Is. xliii. 11; Zech. ix. 9.

15. Does Phil. ii. 10, signify that we should bow or kneel at the mention of this name? Ans. No; not at the naming of the word, but to the person; so Isa. xlv. 23, signifies, from which the apostle quotes.

§ IV.—16. Of what language is the name *Christ*? Ans. The Greek.

17. What its meaning? Ans. *Anointed*, χριστός.

18. What was the Hebrew name answering to this? Ans. Messiah.

19. With what was Christ anointed? Ans. With the Spirit.

20. Does not this anointing refer to his whole mediatorial office, as his qualification for it? Ans. Yes.

21. How does it appear that his anointing by the Spirit was his qualification for his office? Ans. (1.) John iii. 34, represents his "speaking the words of God" as flowing from his anointing by the Spirit. (2.) Because the types of him, in his work and office, were anointed of old; as Prophets, Ps. cv. 15; Priests, Ex. xxx. 30; Kings, as Saul, David, and Solomon.

22. Were all the kings of Israel anointed? Ans. It does not appear that they were, but following in the regular order, without contest for the throne, they were considered as anointed. Thus Josiah, Lament. iv. 20; and thus Cyrus, Isa. xlv. 1.

23. What did the anointing of prophets, priests, and kings signify? Ans. (1.) Their destination of God to the office. (2.) Their qualification for it by the Spirit.

24. Does Christ sustain these three offices? Ans. Yes; *Prophet*, Acts vii. 37; *Priest*, Heb. v. 6; *King*, Ps. ii. 6.

§ V.—25. When was the Mediator anointed? Ans. (1.) In eternity, by divine appointment, or destination of God, Prov. viii. 23; Ps. ii. 6. (2.) In time, by a public exhibition of himself, by gifts conferred, as signified by the visible miraculous sign, Matt. iii. 16, 17; Ps. xlv. 8.

26. Was this real anointing instantaneous in all its fulness, or gradual? Ans. Gradual, Luke ii. 52.

27. In what character was Christ anointed? As God? Ans. No; as such he had no need.

28. Was it as man he was anointed? Ans. Yes; so far as to qualify his human nature for its work.

29. But was it only as man he was anointed? Ans. No; as Mediator, God-man, John iii. 31—35.

30. What need had Christ of anointing as Mediator, when he was the all-sufficient God? Ans. (1.) To show the concurrence of the Trinity. (2.) His qualifications as man were properly the work of the Spirit, in the economy of grace. (3.) Christ, though God, was, as Mediator, the Father's servant, and under his appointment. (4.) He could not have a right to exercise mediation, but by appointment and anointing.

31. Why are believers called Christians? Ans. (1.) Because the followers of Christ. (2.) Because they partake of the same Spirit, by spiritual anointing, 1 John ii. 20, 27.

§ VI.—32. Had not the Mediator many other names in the Old Testament? Ans. Yes.

33. What did "Immanuel" mean, Isa. vii. 14; viii. 8? Ans. *God with us—God in our nature*; John i. 14.

34. What other names? Ans. Such as those contained in Isa. ix. 6.

35. Did these names predict and point out his character and office? Ans. Yes.

36. In the New Testament how were the names "Galilean,"

“Nazarene,” “Son of David,” “Son of Joseph,” used respecting him? Ans. “Son of David” was always used honourably. The others, when used by the people, were used in contempt.

37. Yet was it not predicted that he should be a Galilean, and a Nazarene? Ans. Yes; Isa. ix. 1; Matt. ii. 23.

38. Where is the prophecy that he should be a Nazarene? Ans. Samson and the order of Nazarites, as types.

§ VII.—39. How many natures has the Mediator? Ans. Two; divine and human.

40. Is he, in his divine nature, truly God? Ans. Yes; Rom. ix. 5.

41. Did Christ cease to be God in assuming the human nature? Ans. No.

42. Was his divine nature, in any respect, changed by the assumption of the human? Ans. No; it could not be.

43. Is the divine nature a divine person? Ans. Yes; it always was, and must be.

44. Has Christ a two-fold personality, as well as a two-fold nature? Ans. No; he is but one person.

45. How does this appear? Ans. He is always spoken of as one; he speaks of himself as one person, whether he speaks of his human or of his divine nature; and he is one Mediator, 1 Tim. ii. 5.

46. Was it the divine nature, or the divine person, that became incarnate? Ans. The divine person.

47. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) God is said to send his Son, not the divine nature, Gal. iv. 4; 1 John iv. 14. (2.) The divine nature belongs equally to the Father and the Spirit, who did not become incarnate. (3.) The nature could not become incarnate, as this would be a change in that nature.

48. Did not the whole Trinity concur effectively in the incarnation of the Son? Ans. Yes.

49. Though Christ is God, and the same in nature with the Father, and thus the Holy Spirit, should he not, as the mediatorial person, be distinguished from God, as reconciling sinners by Christ? Ans. Yes.

§ VIII.—50. Was Christ's human nature truly and really the human nature? Ans. Yes.

51. What errors have been held on this head? Ans. That Christ had only the appearance of a human nature, but not the nature really. Those heretics, called, in general, *Docetæ*, from the Greek verb *dokein*—to seem, but who were of different sects, as Simonians, Marcionites, Manichees, &c., taught so.

52. What led them to deny the reality of Christ's human nature? Ans. Unbelief in the mystery of the Hypostatical union.

53. Did they not, as other errorists, pretend authority for their opinion from Scripture? Ans. Yes.

54. They object, Rom. viii. 3, and Phil. ii. 7, 8, as ascribing to Christ only the likeness of flesh and of men? Ans. (1.) Rom. viii. 3, asserts the likeness of sinful flesh; does not deny the reality of his flesh, or human nature. (2.) Phil. ii. 7, 8, declares his likeness to other men, implying that he had really their nature.

55. They object, Luke xxiv. 31, that Christ vanished, as though he had not a body? Ans. (1.) It may mean that he withdrew. But, (2.) This was after his resurrection, when he had a spiritual body.

56. They object, John xx. 19, that Christ appeared among the disciples, the doors being shut, as if only a spirit? Ans. (1.) The doors being shut, may only be told to show that it was at night, or that they had them shut through fear of the Jews; or, (2.) His body being now spiritual, he may have come in miraculously.

57. How prove that he was really man? Ans. (1.) He is always so called, 1 Cor. xv. 21; 1 Tim. ii. 5. (2.) He is called the Son of man, agreeably to the first gospel promise, and many predictions. (3.) He is said to be of the seed of David. (4.) The whole history of his birth, life, actions, sufferings, death, &c., shows it. (5.) The whole plan of redemption required that he should be really man; that he might be our Goël; that he might set us an example; and that he might satisfy law and justice really in our stead.

58. Is not the doctrine of the reality of Christ's human nature an essential doctrine of our faith? Ans. Yes.

§ IX.—59. Did Christ take our whole human nature, both soul and body? Ans. Yes.

60. Is not the Scripture evidence that he had a real body conclusive? Ans. Yes; as his birth of the virgin; his bodily growth; his hunger and fatigue; his sufferings of body, &c.

61. Have not some, as the Apollinarians, denied that Christ had a proper human soul, and held that the divine nature supplied its place? Ans. Yes.

62. Did not this opinion arise from unbelief in the mystery of the Mediatorial person? Ans. Yes.

63. If Christ is said to be made flesh, is not this a common figure in Scripture, of a part for the whole? Ans. Yes.

64. How answer their objection that, if Christ had a human soul, the human and divine will would disagree? Ans. The human will is perfectly subjected to the divine.

65. How answer the objection that, as we admit, the human nature had no human personality? Ans. Personality is only a state of the nature, and does not belong to its integrity. This want is compensated by union to the divine person.

66. How prove a real human soul in Christ? Ans. (1.) He is called man, which he would not be without the soul. (2.) He increased in wisdom. (3.) He was sorrowful in trials. (4.) Without the human soul, he could not have obeyed the law, nor have suffered the curse. (5.) Justice could not have been satisfied, nor truth maintained, in man's salvation, unless Christ had a real, human soul.

LECTURE II.—NATURES OF CHRIST.

§ X.—67. Did Christ, with our nature, take its qualities and infirmities? Ans. Yes.

68. What kind of infirmities, sinful, or only painful? Ans. Only painful.

69. Mention some of them? Ans. Sadness, hunger, thirst, fatigue, &c.

70. Did he then take those painful infirmities which arise from sin in man? Ans. Yes; as hunger, thirst, fatigue, &c.

71. Was it necessary to the atonement that he should take our sinful infirmities? Ans. No.

72. Was it even possible for Christ to sin? Ans. No; because of the personal union of the human nature with the divine, and the unction of the Spirit.

73. Objections—If Christ could not sin, his holiness was necessary, and his obedience was not an exercise of liberty, or free will? Ans. It is an error to make liberty consist in indifference. Indifference to good or evil, is rather bondage. None can be so free as God, who is necessarily holy. No creatures are so free as holy angels and glorified saints, who cannot sin.

74. Obj. The temptations that Christ suffered were useless, and but pretence of trial, if he were impeccable? Ans. (1.) He did suffer by the temptations, and (2.) They proved his perfect holiness, and impeccability.

75. Obj. Christ was made like to us, except with respect to actual sin; Heb. ii. 17? Ans. The exception of only actual sin is gratuitous. He was holy and separate from sinners, Heb. vii. 26.

76. Had not Christ's human nature all the essential qualities of it? Ans. Yes; such as dependence, limited knowledge, limited powers, the body limited in presence to a particular place.

77. Does he still possess these qualities in his glorified state? Ans. Yes.

78. What would be the error of denying this? Ans. It would impute divine perfection to his human nature.

79. Did Christ's human nature also possess any of those qualities, which in us, arise from sin, or from our fallen state? Ans. Yes; as hunger, thirst, &c. These are imperfections of our nature, and as essential qualities, are called limited perfections of our nature.

80. But though Christ took our nature as fallen, and infirmities which in us arise from sin, and thus was made in the likeness of sinful flesh; did he take any infirmity that was sinful, or implied sin in him? Ans. No.

81. Was it the universal infirmity of our nature he took, or did he take those infirmities which are peculiar to individuals, from particular causes, as bodily diseases, defect of mental powers, &c.? Ans. Only universal infirmity; not particular.

§§ XI. XII. XIII.—82. Did Christ receive his body by immediate creation, or by birth? Ans. By birth.

83. Was it truly of the substance of the virgin? Ans. Yes.

84. What proof have we of this? Ans. Luke ii. 7; Gal. iv. 4; Rom. i. 3.

85. Do Scripture assertions that Christ came from heaven, (John iii. 13, vi. 33; Eph. iv. 9,) contradict this doctrine? Ans. No; As God, he came from heaven; and he was the gift of God as Me-

diator; and his divine nature is as much our bread as his human nature.

86. Is there any weight in the objection that Christ would have been impure if really of the substance of the virgin, according to Job xiv. 4? Ans. No; because Job speaks of ordinary generation, and Christ was not so born. Sin descends by the law of imputation and covenant; by natural generation, not by physical nature or relation.

87. Obj. Believers do not know Christ after the flesh, 2 Cor. v. 16? Ans. This means a natural and external knowledge.

88. Were the birth of Christ and the growth of the body in the virgin natural? Ans. Yes; as his body was formed of the body of the virgin; it grew gradually as others, as the time of gestation was the usual time; Luke ii. 6. She had pain in the birth, as inferred from its usual effects, acknowledged by Mary's purification, Luke ii. 22.

89. Is the belief of the doctrine that Christ's body was really formed of the substance of the virgin, necessary? Ans. Yes; because (1.) It was necessary to the satisfying justice, magnifying the law, and maintaining truth, that the nature that sinned should die; that the nature which was under the law should obey it, and that it should be the very nature which was under the law, &c.; which would not be the case, if a being of a similar nature had been created, who was not of the very class of beings that had sinned. (2.) It was necessary that Christ, sanctifying us, by atonement and influence, should possess the same nature with us; Heb. ii. 11. (3.) That he might be our Kinsman Redeemer.

90. Why was it necessary that Christ should be born of a virgin? Ans. That he might not partake of original sin.

91. How did Christ derive his human soul? Ans. As others, immediately from God, according to the fixed law of connexion between soul and body.

92. Does Heb. ii. 14, prove that Christ's human nature was of the human family by birth in our nature? Ans. Yes; As the children, so he partook, and partook of the same; and this was necessary to his being our efficient, and sympathizing high priest. Moreover, that he might (verse 17th,) "*in all things be like his brethren.*"

§ XIV.—93. But was not the generation of Christ, in some things, supernatural? Ans. Yes.

94. Wherein? Ans. He was conceived in the womb of the virgin by the immediate and miraculous work of the Holy Spirit.

95. Does *the Spirit* here mean the divine nature of Christ, or the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity? Ans. The Holy Spirit; as he is distinguished from him that was born of the virgin, and he is expressly called by his usual appellation, Matt. i. 18, 20.

96. Did the Holy Spirit communicate any thing of his divine nature to the human nature of Christ, by this miraculous act? Ans. No; his divine nature is incommunicable; and the human

nature was incapable of it, and if it had been possible, the nature would not have been human.

§ XV.—97. Is the precise time of Christ's birth stated in the Scriptures? Ans. No; the description is general.

98. Does not this forbid a memorial of it, such as Christmas? Ans. Yes.

99. Is it even certain how many years from the creation till the birth of Christ? Ans. No.

100. When did they begin to count the time from the birth of Christ? Ans. About the year 532, after Christ, in the reign of Justinian; introduced by Dionysius.

101. May we not judge that the birth was at night, from Luke ii. 6—11? Ans. Yes.

§ XVI.—102. What was the direct object or end designed in Christ's assuming our nature? Ans. Man's salvation from the curse of the law; Gal. iii. 13; 1 Tim. i. 15.

102½. Would Christ have become incarnate if man had not sinned? Ans. No.

103. Socinians and others (as the Scotists, Osiander, &c.) hold that if sin had not entered, Christ would have become man, because he is the fountain of every blessing; Eph. i. 3? Ans. Christ is the fountain of every blessing to fallen man, restored by him. As God he would have been the fountain of blessing to upright man, but not as incarnate, and as Mediator.

104. They say man was created mortal, and needed Christ to save him from death? Ans. Man was not subject to death in his innocence; it is the punishment of sin.

105. They say Christ appeared, under the Old Testament, without suffering; and therefore he would have come, if sin had not entered? Ans. (1.) His appearances then were preludes to his actual incarnation; and, (2.) They supposed the entrance of sin, on account of which he would come in the flesh.

106. Are not all such opinions fancies, without the support of Scripture? Ans. Yes.

107. How does it further appear that the design of his incarnation was to save man from sin and wrath? Ans. (1.) Besides direct Scriptures, as quoted, he was eternally predestined to this end; 1 Pet. i. 19, 20. (2.) He was so promised, after the fall, Gen. iii. 15. (3.) This end was declared when he came; Math. i. 21. (4.) All his actions in human nature showed this, as his teaching, and his sufferings.

LECTURE III.—THE UNION OF THE DIVINE AND HUMAN NATURES.

§ XVII.—108. What kind of union took place between the divine and human natures of Christ? Ans. A personal or hypostatical union.

109. Is this the same with the mystical union between Christ and believers? Ans. No.

110. Wherein does it differ from that? Ans. (1.) The mystical union is a union in law, but this is personal. (2.) The mystical

union is by the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ in believers, which does not make them one person; but the hypostatical union constituted the two natures one person.

111. What is the difference between the hypostatical union of the natures of Christ, and the union of the persons in the Godhead?

Ans. (1.) The latter is uncreated and necessary; the hypostatical is created and voluntary. (2.) The latter is a union of persons in the same nature; the former, a union of two natures in one person.

112. What is the difference between the hypostatical union, and the human union between soul and body? Ans. (1.) Death dissolves the union between soul and body, but not the personal union of the two natures of Christ; even in death the soul and body of Christ were united to the divine person. (2.) The divine and human natures are separately capable of personality; the human body is not capable of this.

113. Is, then, the personality of Christ but one? Ans. Yes.

114. Are, then, the actions of these several natures in Christ the actions of the same one person? Ans. Yes.

115. To which of his natures does personality originally and properly belong? Ans. To the divine nature.

116. Had his human nature ever possessed human personality? Ans. No.

117. Was this actual union eternal? or from eternity? Ans. No.

118. When did it begin? Ans. In his actual incarnation in time; John i. 14; 1 Tim. iii. 16.

119. Did Christ *assume* our nature into personal union with the divine? Ans. Yes.

120. Is this a scriptural expression? Ans. Yes; Phil. ii. 7.

121. Is it not also called a participation? Ans. Yes; Heb. ii. 14.

122. Is Heb. ii. 16, expressive of the assumption of our nature into personal union with the divine person? Ans. No; because (1.) The word signifies to "lay hold of, to help;" so Matt. xiv. 31. (2.) The word *nature* of angels has to be supplied, while its contrast is *seed* of Abraham; not applicable to angels. (3.) Assumption, or participation of the seed of Abraham would be an improper limitation. It is not the seed of Abraham, but the nature of man he assumed into personal union. (4.) The apostle had, in verse 14, asserted the assumption of our nature, and there was no need to repeat it here. (5.) The saving the seed of Abraham, and not angels, was the object and result of the assumption of our nature.

§ XVIII.—123. What were the errors of the Nestorians on the subject of the personal union in Christ? Ans. (1.) They say Mary was not *Theotoken*, *conceived of God*, or *bearing, or bringing forth a person who is God*; that is, Christ had two persons; the one human, born of Mary, crucified, &c.; the other was divine, and not personally united with the human. (2.) They say Christ was

Theophoros; that is, that the man Christ carried God, or the divine nature dwelt in the human, as in a temple; but not personally.

124. What do we hold in opposition to this? Ans. (1.) That the divine and human natures are personally united in Christ; so that they cannot be separated into two separate subsistences, or persons; and (2.) They cannot be divided, and are not, even in his death.

125. What proof have we of this? Ans. (1.) Scriptures declaring the oneness of the Mediator; 1 Tim. ii. 5; Eph. iv. 5. (2.) Those scriptures which ascribe to Christ, denominated as God, such things as are proper only to the human nature; such as "born of a woman," Gal. iv. 4; Luke i. 35; "sprung of David," Matt. xxii. 43; "blood of God," Acts xx. 28. These things, ascribed to God, show that there is a proper personal union, so that the person who is God is man also. (3.) The execution of his Mediatorial offices, as ascribed to him in Scripture, makes the doctrine of the personal union necessary. Thus, the atonement was made by the action and sufferings of the human nature; but, unless these actions and sufferings belonged to the divine nature, they were insufficient, and they could belong to that nature and possess divine value only by personal union. These and such are the *apotelesmata*—the completions, accompaniments, and objects of the incarnation and works of Christ incarnate.

126. Does the doctrine of the personal union destroy the difference of the natures? Ans. No; the closest union does not confound the constituents.

127. Does want of human personality destroy the integrity or perfectness of the human nature? Ans. No; personality is not the nature. Human nature must have personality in us, because it has in us no other mode of subsistence. Not so in Christ.

128. Do not all these objections confound personality with the natures of Christ? Ans. Yes; they limit the constituents of the Mediatorial person to the constituents of a human person.

§ XIX.—129. What are the errors of the Eutychians and Meonites, on this head? Ans. That, by the personal union, the natures were both changed, and the distinct natures confounded.

130. On the contrary, were not the natures of Christ, after their union, perfectly distinct? Ans. Yes.

131. Did either of them acquire any property from the other? Ans. No; Christ remained truly God and truly man.

132. Prove the truth of these doctrines? Ans. (1.) The two natures, after their union, are, in Scripture, represented as distinct; as Rom. i. 3, 4; ix. 5; Heb. ix. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 18. (2.) It was necessary that Christ should possess both natures distinctly, in order to execute his office of Mediator. The human nature must obey and die; and the divine nature give value to the work, (3.) It was absolutely impossible that the two natures should be confounded; impossible that the divine nature could change; impossible that the human could become divine.

133. Was not unbelief of this great mystery the reason of these errors? Ans. Yes.

134. How understand John i. 14,—“*Word made flesh*,” if the natures continue distinct? Ans. (1.) That, by personal union, he who was only God now became man. Not that the nature became man, but the person became man, as well as God; so Gen. ii. 7, “Man became a living soul;”—the dust or body did not, but the man, or person did. (2.) The following words in John i. 14, “he dwelt (or tabernacled) among us,” shows how he was made flesh—by personal union or indwelling.

135. Was, then, the person of the Mediator human as well as divine? Ans. Yes.

136. But it is said, Phil. ii. 7, 8, that Christ, though in the form of God, “*emptied himself*;” how understand this, if the natures were not changed? Ans. This is not spoken of the nature, but of the person of the Son; and means, *veiling his glory*.

137. But attributes, both human and divine, are ascribed to the same person. How is this, if the natures were not changed? Ans. (1.) The attributes described are perfectly human, or perfectly divine; proving the natures perfectly distinct, and without change. (2.) Each attribute ascribed to Christ belongs to the whole mediatorial person, but does not describe all that is in Christ.

§ XX.—138. Does the divine person, in this union, sustain the human nature? Ans. Yes.

139. Does the divine person supply the want of personality in the human nature? Ans. Yes.

140. What would be the effect of a composition of the divine and human natures, in the person of Christ? Ans. That he was neither God nor man, but a person of a different nature altogether; neither God the object of worship; nor unchangeable; nor man under the law for obedience and suffering.

141. Is this union a coalition of the natures, so that there are in Christ two persons, the divine person of the Son only dwelling with the human person? Ans. No.

142. Is it such a union that the Son of God would not be a person without the human nature? Ans. No.

§ XXI.—143. When did this union begin? Ans. In Christ’s incarnation.

144. Did the human nature subsist, even a moment, without union to the divine person? Ans. No.

145. What would be the result, if it had subsisted before union to the divine person? Ans. It would then have been a human person, under the law for itself; and Christ assuming it would have become two persons. While in the womb, Elizabeth acknowledged him as her Lord.

146. Will this union ever end? Ans. No; he abideth a priest forever.

147. Was it even interrupted in the death of Christ? Ans. No; both soul and body, though separated for the time, remained united to the divine person.

148. But some object to the doctrine of the union of the Divine person of the Son of God with the human nature beginning at his incarnation, and hold that his human soul existed from eternity, or before the creation of the world, and that this union then took place? Ans. (1.) The Scriptures do not teach the preëxistence of Christ's human soul. (2.) The creation from eternity is absurd; a creation is a beginning, not eternity. (3.) He was made like us, in all things; Heb. ii. 17; but, had the soul preëxisted, it would not have been like us; it would not have existed according to the law of human nature. (4.) A spirit created before the world, would not have been of the human family; not like us; not our kinsman. (5.) It is an utter perversion of the Scriptures to apply those passages that speak of the personality of the Son, or his operations as Mediator, under the Old Testament, to the supposed preëxistent human soul. It is denying the Godhead of Christ taught in those passages, or ascribing divinity to the human nature.

LECTURE IV.—OF THE EFFECTS OF THIS UNION.

§ XXII.—149. What are the effects of this Hypostatical union? Ans. They are fourfold; a communication—of gifts, of works, of properties, and of honour.

150. Did the human nature of Christ become a partaker of special gifts by its union with the divine nature? Ans. Yes; the gifts of the Spirit were given abundantly; Psal. xlv. 8; John iii. 34; Isa. xi. 2—5; lxi. 1.

151. Of what gifts did the human nature partake, by this union? Ans. Of all good and necessary gifts, natural, moral, and gracious; as of wisdom, understanding, knowledge, counsel, might, fear of God, &c.; Isa. xi. 2.

152. Were these gifts to be perpetual? Ans. Yes; his happiness as man, and his operations required this.

153. Were they bestowed instantaneously, or by degrees? Ans. By degrees; as Luke ii. 52.

154. Were there not different periods of his anointing? Ans. Yes; as appears from his early life; Luke ii. 46, 47; Matt. iii. 16.

155. But were these gifts of the Spirit, to the human nature, infinite; or did he, as man, acquire divine perfections? Ans. No; (1.) Divine perfections could not be communicated to a creature. (2.) The human nature was not capable of receiving them. (3.) It would not then have been a human nature.

156. Does the expression of John the Baptist, respecting Christ, John iii. 34, signify that the gifts were infinite? Ans. No; it only means abundantly; not sparingly,—as much as was necessary for his work and station; so the expression is figurative, for *not sparingly*; as Ezek. iv. 11.

157. Do the expressions, Col. i. 19; Col. ii. 9, signify gifts to the human nature? Ans. No; there the person of Christ is signified, and Mediatorial gifts.

158. Did Christ, in human nature, exercise faith and hope? Ans. Yes; Psal. xvi. 8, 9; xxii. 9, 10.

159. Did his unction remove the weakness proper to human nature? Ans. No; Mark xiii. 32; Matt. xxvi. 38.

160. Was there any inconsistency in the weakness of humanity, in union with the divine person? Ans. No; that weakness was even necessary.

§ XXIII.—161. Was there, as an effect of this union, a communication, or participation of both natures in Christ's Mediatorial works? Ans. Yes; some works were immediately the works of one nature, and others of the other; as, obedience, suffering, faith, hope, of the human;—miracles, government, &c., of the divine. Or, What are we to understand by communication of works? Ans. Works of each nature belong to the person;—and works of one nature belong to the other by personal union.

162. But did not each nature partake in all these works by reason of the personal union? Ans. Yes; the blood of Christ is the blood of God, Acts xx. 28; the man Christ Jesus is Mediator, 1 Tim. ii. 5. They were the works of the person of the Mediator; each nature operating in its own way.

163. Should we, however, understand that the works proper to one nature were performed immediately by the other? Ans. No.

§ XXIV.—164. Is there a communication of properties of the two natures of Christ? Ans. Yes.

165. What do we understand by this? Ans. That the properties of each nature are ascribed to the one person of Christ. The person of the Mediator possesses both divine and human properties.

166. Is not the person of Christ sometimes, in Scripture, denominated from one nature, and sometimes from the other? Ans. Yes; he is sometimes called God, Rom. ix. 5; sometimes man, 1 Tim. ii. 5. Sometimes the same person is denominated by each of the natures; as Isa. ix. 6, "a child—mighty God." This is a direct predication of properties.

167. But when the person of Christ is denominated from the properties of one of the natures, does this deny the other nature to his person? Ans. No.

168. Is not the Mediator sometimes denominated by one nature, and an attribute or work of the other ascribed to him? Ans. Yes; as Acts xx. 28; here denominated *God*, yet blood ascribed to him. This is an indirect predication of properties.

169. But do the Scriptures ever ascribe to one nature, in the abstract, the properties of the other? Ans. No; to say, for example, that the divine nature was sorrowful, hungry, &c., or that, as man, he knew all things, &c., would be false and blasphemous.

170. Is not the proper personal union of the two natures, then, the foundation on which the properties of each nature are ascribed to the person of Christ? Ans. Yes.

§ XXV.—171. How prove that omnipotence, though ascribed to Christ, (Isa. ix. 6,) is, in Scripture, denied to the human nature? Ans. From Heb. v. 7.

172. How prove that omniscience, though ascribed to Christ, (John xxi. 17,) is denied to the human nature? Ans. From Luke ii. 52, Mark xiii. 32.

173. How prove that omnipresence, though ascribed to Christ, (Matt. xxviii. 20; John iii. 13,) is denied to the human nature? Ans. From John xi. 15; Matt. xxviii. 6.

174. How prove that vivifying power, though ascribed to Christ, (John v. 21,) is denied to his human nature? Ans. From his weakness, 2 Cor. xiii. 4; and from his death.

§ XXVI.—175. How answer, at once, all the objections of adversaries, who hold that divine perfections were communicated to the human nature, and who plead their doctrine from texts ascribing such perfections to Christ? Ans. (1.) They falsely ascribe to the human nature what is, in Scripture, ascribed to the person of Christ, who, as Mediator, does possess them truly, because he is God. (2.) Divine perfections cannot be communicated to a creature, or possessed by it. (3.) If Christ's human nature possessed divine perfections, he would not be man—God in our nature.

§ XXVII.—176. Is not this union the foundation of honour to the human nature? Ans. Yes.

177. Is worship due to the human nature, as such, because of its union with the divine? Ans. No; Matt. xix. 17, intimates that, as man, he is not to be worshipped.

178. What is the true ground of worship to Christ? Ans. His Godhead; Psal. xcvii.

179. May we hold that Christ is to be worshipped as Mediator? Ans. Yes.

180. Why, and under what view? Ans. (1.) Not in virtue of his office, or appointment; thus, he is the Father's servant. But, (2.) because, as Mediator, he is God.

181. Though the human nature is not the object of worship, does it not partake of the honour? Ans. Yes; as personally united to the divine nature; and Christ is not now worshipped without it.

CHAPTER XX.

THE OFFICES OF CHRIST.

LECTURE V.—GENERAL REMARKS.—PROPHETICAL OFFICE.

§ I.—1. What is the general office of Christ, as the Saviour of sinners? Ans. *Mediator*.

2. Is this a Scripture name of his office? Ans. Yes; 1 Tim. ii. 5.

3. What is the general nature of the office of Mediator? Ans. To reconcile parties at variance.

4. Between what parties is Christ Mediator? Ans. God and man.

5. How does Christ's Mediatorial office differ from that among men? Ans. In its origin and execution?

6. How in its origin? Ans. (1.) He did not interfere by his own offer. He was appointed, Heb. v. 4, 5. (2.) God, the offended party, appointed him; not the offender, as among men.

7. How does it differ in its execution? Ans. (1.) Men generally mediate by counsel and persuasion; Christ by merit and satisfaction. (2.) He mediates by intercession, on the ground of his own merits. (3.) By changing the heart of the guilty. (4.) By gracious communications from God to man. (5.) Giving access to God. (6.) By government. (7.) By continuing forever the Mediatorial Head of his people.

8. Is Christ's mediation always saving to those for whom he exercises it? Ans. Yes; Heb. vii. 25.

9. Is this office of Christ represented in Scripture as a burden laid on him? Ans. Yes; John x. 18.

10. How was it a burden or duty? Ans. He was appointed, and he engaged.

11. Is it represented also as an honour? Ans. Yes; Heb. v. 4, 5.

12. Wherein an honour? Ans. (1.) To treat between God and man. (2.) To be chosen of God to such a work. (3.) To be acknowledged by man as Mediator, &c.

§ II.—13. By what particular offices does Christ execute this general one? Ans. The offices of Prophet, Priest, and King.

14. Do these three offices include all that he does as Mediator? Ans. Yes.

15. Where is he called a Prophet? Ans. In Deut. xviii. 15, 18; Luke xxiv. 19.

16. Where is he called a Priest? Ans. In Ps. cx. 4; Heb. v. 5; vii. 24.

17. Where is he called a King? Ans. In Ps. ii. 6, compared with Matt. ii. 2.

18. Are not several of these offices ascribed to him in the same passage of Scripture? Ans. Yes; as Ps. cx. 2-4; Zech. vi. 13.

19. What evidence arises from our condition, that Christ sustains these offices? Ans. From our ignorance, guilt, and bondage, needing these offices.

20. Are there not three Mediatorial acts, or works of Christ set forth in Scripture, answering to these necessities in us, and implying the exercise of these three offices? Ans. Yes.

21. What are these? Ans. Teaching, purchasing, and applying.

22. What three effects of his work towards us, are there, which imply these offices in Christ? Ans. Calling, justifying, and sanctifying.

§ III.—23. Are these offices of Christ distinct from one another? Ans. Yes.

24. Is it not virtually denying the fulness of Christ's Mediatorial office, to make one of these offices comprehend the whole? Ans. Yes.

25. How is this sometimes done? Ans. (1.) By the Socinians, who deny the proper atonement, and make his obedience and death an instructive example only; making his government consist in persuasion only; and thus denying Christ any office but that of Prophet; and disparaging that office, to the level of such an office in man; attributing to him no saving, or Almighty power in teaching. (2.) By the Arminians, who deny Christ's atonement, as the full and only ground of our justification, and who plead human ability, in self-conversion, and self-sanctification, thus denying Christ's kingly government in us.

26. As the Scriptures ascribe these offices distinctly to Christ, so is there not a distinction in their nature? Ans. Yes; teaching, purchasing, and government, are clearly distinct.

27. Can we rightly receive Christ in any of his offices, if we divide them? Ans. No.

28. When do we divide them? Ans. When we ascribe to Christ the office of teaching without atonement; atonement without the office of saving teaching; or atonement without government to make his instructions or pardon effectual.

29. Could any one office of Christ profit us without the others? Ans. No; teaching is useless without atonement; and atonement useless without teaching; and all useless without saving government.

30. Are they not all united in the person of Christ in Scripture?—Ans. Yes; not only called distinct;—Prophet, Priest, and King; but the effects of these offices ascribed to him; as 1 Cor. i. 30.

31. Are merit, power, and wisdom, all necessary to the effectual exercise of Christ's work in our salvation? Ans. Yes; thus Christ is a Priest on his throne, Zech. vi. 13.

32. Should we suppose that the two, between whom the counsel of peace is said to be, Zech. vi. 13, are the Priestly and Kingly offices of Christ? Ans. No; counsel is not appropriate to offices, but to persons. It is rather between the Father and the Son.

§ IV.—33. Were any of the types of old capable of fully exhibiting Christ's person, offices, and work? Ans. No; it was necessary that there should be a combination of types.

34. Did any man, as a type of Christ, properly sustain all the three offices of prophet, priest, and king? Ans. Not properly; David and Solomon were prophets and kings, but not priests. The priests of old were priests and teachers, but not kings properly, except as rulers in the house of God.

35. But as Moses was a prophet and king in Jeshurun, and sprinkled the blood on the tabernacle, and on Aaron, and his sons, Ex. xxiv. 6, Lev. 8; and is said (Ps. xcix. 6,) to be among the priests, did he not possess all these offices? Ans. He did, on an occasion, act as a priest from the necessity of the circumstances; but when Aaron was installed, it does not appear that Moses acted as Priest, or that he sustained the office.

§ V.—36. Is not the priestly office the foundation of the other offices of Christ? Ans. Yes.

37. Why is it so? Ans. (1.) Christ would have no salvation to exhibit, had he not made an atonement. (2.) On the ground of his atonement, he teaches savingly, and rules as Mediator.

38. But which of these offices is first in execution? Ans. Properly the Prophetical. Christ revealed himself in the gospel, before he made the atonement, and he teaches us before we appropriate the atonement.

§ VI.—39. From what language is the term *prophet* derived? Ans. From the Greek.

40. What is its meaning? Ans. Literally, to foretell.

41. Did not the office of prophet include much more than foretelling future events? Ans. Yes; it included the declaring the mind of God respecting present truth, duty, and sin; as well as future events; so Moses, Jeremiah, Isaiah, &c.

42. Did it not include the explanation of Scripture, as well as giving it? Ans. Yes; so the evangelists, apostles, &c.

43. What then is included in the office of a prophet, in a larger sense? Ans. To teach, or instruct in divine things.

44. What was the matter of the prophet's teaching? Ans. The will of God; especially for man's salvation. This is directly, or indirectly, the matter and object of that office; John i. 18; xx. 31.

45. Was not the office of prophet originally and properly a supernatural office? Ans. Yes.

46. By whose agency were mere men endowed with this office? Ans. By the agency of the Holy Spirit; 2 Pet. i. 21.

47. Could man possibly exercise this office without the special influence of the Spirit? Ans. No.

48. Did Christ depend on the inspiration of the Spirit, as other prophets? Ans. No; he was anointed with the Spirit for this, as well as for his other offices; Isa. lxi. 1; yet he spake from his own knowledge, and by his own power; John iii. 32; vii. 29; viii. 38.

49. What does this office of Christ imply respecting our condition? Ans. (1.) That we are ignorant. (2.) That in ignorance we perish. (3.) That we cannot obtain knowledge without Christ as our instructor.

50. Is not this office of Christ, important and necessary to us? Ans. Yes.

51. Could Christ have executed this office without an appointment? Ans. No; John vii. 16; xii. 50.

52. Could he have executed it without an atonement? Ans. No; it is on the ground of his atonement that he instructs us for our salvation; John xvii. 4—8.

53. Could he execute it if he were not God? Ans. No; John i. 18; unless he was God he had not sufficient knowledge; nor could he reach the heart with power.

54. Does Christ bear any other names which designate to some office? Ans. Yes.

55. What are they? Ans. (1.) Counsellor, Isa. ix. 6. (2.) Witness, Isa. lv. 4. (3.) Interpreter, Job xxxiii. 23. (4.) Apostle,

Heb. iii. 1. (5.) Wisdom, Prov. viii. ; 1 Cor. i. 30. (6.) Shepherd, or Pastor, Ps. xxiii. ; 1 Pet. ii. 25; Ezek. xxxiv. 23.

56. As he was promised to be raised as a Prophet like Moses; Deut. xviii. 15, 18, wherein is he like him? Ans. (1.) He was of his brethren, or was man. (2.) He was under opposition and danger. (3.) In the excellence of his instruction and works. (4.) In like faithfulness. (5.) In like subjection of Israel. (6.) He was raised, as God raised Moses, by his will, his power, and peculiar presence with him.

57. Though, in these things, like Moses, was he not superior? Ans. Yes; Heb. iii. 3, 5.

LECTURE VI.—PROPHETICAL OFFICE.—CONTINUED.

§ VII.—60. What are the qualities of Christ as a prophet? Ans. Infinite power, and wisdom, and compassion, and authority.

61. What necessity for his power in this office? Ans. (1.) To confirm his teaching by miracles. (2.) For changing the heart.

62. What necessity for infinite wisdom? Ans. (1.) To teach unerringly. (2.) To know all truth, and teach fully all we need. (3.) To know the heart which is to be moved.

63. Does this wisdom belong to his Deity, or to his humanity? Ans. To his Deity; for it was infinite; and a finite but extraordinary wisdom was given to him as man.

64. What is the notion of the Socinians on this point? Ans. That Christ, being man only, was taken up to heaven, in the time of his temptation in the wilderness, to obtain instruction, &c.

65. On what grounds do we reject this notion? Ans. (1.) No such thing is stated in Scripture. It is unfounded. (2.) Christ's ascension after his death and resurrection, is the only ascension spoken of in Scripture; Eph. iv. 9, 10. (3.) The Scripture asserts that in his temptation he was in the wilderness, and not, therefore, in heaven; Matt. i. 13. (4.) That scene in the wilderness was for a trial, and not an enjoyment. (5.) Christ had no need of such a mode of communication; being God, and moreover, as man, anointed with the Spirit, and led and instructed by the Divine nature.

66. Obj. That Christ while on earth, is said to have ascended into heaven; John iii. 13? Ans. Christ there refers to his Godhead having come down from heaven, as manifested in the flesh; and the exceptive particles "εὐ μὴ" are often used adversatively; as Matt. xii. 4, "except for the priests;" that is, *but* for the priests; so Luke iv. 27; Naaman was not in Israel. So here the meaning is, No man hath ascended, but the Son of man is in heaven, and therefore he has personal knowledge, &c.

67. Obj. The examples of Moses and Paul? Ans. (1.) Moses was not taken to heaven to be instructed. (2.) Paul was taken up, and no doubt to be instructed; but he needed these instructions, while Christ did not. His case is no proof that Christ was taken up.

68. What necessity for compassion in Christ as Prophet? Ans. To give the necessary instruction to the ignorant, unbelieving, and unwilling sinner; Heb. v. 2.

69. Is authority a quality of Christ as a Prophet? Ans. Yes; Matt. vii. 29.

70. On what does this authority depend? Ans. On his appointment; Deut. xviii. 18, 19; and on his own person as God; Heb. ii. 3.

71. What are we to understand by his authority as a Prophet? Ans. (1.) That he has a right to teach. (2.) That he is capable. (3.) That his instructions bind us to faith and submission; Deut. xviii. 18, 19; Heb. ii. 3. (4.) That his word is with power on the heart.

72. Could Christ teach savingly without this authority as a prophet? Ans. No.

73. Do his authority and power make his instructions effectual to salvation? Ans. Yes; on those who are given to him of the Father; John vi. 45.

74. Wherein is Christ's prophetic authority exercised on those who do not believe? Ans. (1.) His instructions lay them under obligation to faith and obedience. (2.) They subject them to judgments for disobedience. (3.) They often come, even to them, with an irresistible power for conviction.

§ VIII.—74½. Wherein does the exercise of Christ's Prophetic office differ from that of inspired prophets and apostles? Ans. (1.) In its origin; his knowledge is eternal and underived,—theirs, derived. (2.) In the fulness of his knowledge; having perfect knowledge of all things; their knowledge limited to the matter communicated. (3.) And his teaching reaches the heart, and is irresistible; while their teaching can reach no further than the understanding.

75. May not Christ's teaching be considered as twofold,—external and internal? Ans. Yes.

76. How manifold are the acts of Christ's external teaching? Ans. Twofold;—declaring and confirming.

77. What is the matter of his external teaching? Ans. The law, in its fact, and its meaning; the gospel of salvation; and future events respecting the world, the church, and himself.

§ IX.—78. By what means does he teach externally as prophet? Ans. (1.) Mediate. (2.) Immediate.

79. By what media, or means, has he generally taught? Ans. (1.) By extraordinary ministers; as Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, &c. (2.) By ordinary ministers; as pastors and teachers, given to his church; Eph. i. 11.

80. What was peculiar in the extraordinary means of Prophets, &c. (1.) Their knowledge was supernatural—by inspiration. (2.) They delivered the standing rule of instruction to the church,—the Scriptures.

81. What is the office of the ordinary teachers, as pastors, &c.? Ans. (1.) To study and understand the Scriptures, 1 Tim. iv. 13—16. (2.) To explain and apply them; Rom. xii. 6—8.

82. How was instruction communicated to the extraordinary teachers? Ans. By inspiration of the Spirit; 2 Pet. i. 21.

83. How was Christ the prophet of the church in giving the Scriptures, when the Holy Spirit was the immediate author of them? Ans. He sent the Spirit to inspire those teachers. He had authority to do this, by his appointment on the ground of his atonement.

84. How does Christ now act as Prophet, in external teaching? Ans. (1.) By his word. (2.) By ordinances, public and private.

85. When did Christ commence the exercise of his prophetic office? Ans. In the first gospel promise.

86. How did he carry it on, in successive ages? Ans. (1.) By inspired prophets delivering his word. (2.) By instituting and maintaining ordinances in his church. (3.) By giving the ceremonial law, as types, which were instructive, promissory, and prophetic. (4.) By his own personal ministry and works. (5.) By the clearer light of the New Testament.

87. How did Christ act as Prophet before his incarnation? Ans. He, in his divine nature, acted as Mediator on the foundation of the atoning work to be performed by him: so 1 Pet. iii. 19. On this text notice, that the 18th verse distinguishes between the human and divine natures of Christ: the latter is called the Spirit, his divine nature, and in that Spirit he preached to the antediluvian world; that is, the Son of God sent the Spirit. He preached by the instrumentality of Noah.

88. Are not the Scriptures his great outward means of teaching now? Ans. Yes.

89. Do they contain all the matter of his teaching? Ans. Yes; 2 Tim. iii. 15—17.

90. Can man or angels add anything to them? Ans. No; Rev. xxii. 18, 19; Matt. xv. 9.

91. Are they as effectual for saving instruction as living teachers, the apostles, prophets, or even our Lord, in his personal ministry? Ans. Yes; 2 Tim. iii. 15—17.

92. Did not Christ, for a time, teach immediately himself in person? Ans. Yes.

93. But does not that personal teaching come to us mediately, by the Spirit and inspired men? Ans. Yes.

94. When Christ taught personally, was the mere outward teaching by himself effectual for changing the heart, any more than that of prophets and apostles? Ans. No; many believed not.

95. Does not the apostle, Heb. i. 2; ii. 3, intimate a superiority in Christ's personal ministry, and in its action on us, over that of inspired men? Ans. Yes.

96. Wherein did that superiority lie? Ans. (1.) The instructions were immediately from himself, the source of knowledge and authority. (2.) His instructions were those of the preceding prophets. (3.) It was a manifestation of his great condescension. (4.) His personal appearance in the ministry, with his works and death confirmatory of his doctrine, made a greater display of authority and grace than ever before.

§ X.—97. How did Christ as a prophet, confirm his doctrines? Ans. By his death, his holy life, and his miracles.

98. How did his death confirm it? Ans. As a martyr, proving his sincerity, and the importance of his doctrines; Rev. i. 5.

99. Would the death of a martyr among men, conclusively of itself, prove the truth for which he died? Ans. No; only sincerity.

100. But did not the sincerity of Christ, manifested by his death, conclusively prove the truth and importance of his doctrines? Ans. Yes; from the abundant proofs that he gave of his infinite wisdom and goodness.

101. How did Christ's holy life confirm his doctrine? Ans. (1.) His doctrines and his life agreed. (2.) This perfect holiness showed that he loved the truth, and would teach no error. (3.) He proposed himself as a pattern of holiness, and thus he taught by practice.

102. How did his miracles confirm his doctrines? Ans. A true miracle is necessarily wrought by God. As he wrought them by his own power, so being God, he necessarily is true; or if wrought by apostles, or prophets, God, by the miracle, attested the truth of their mission of God, the truth of the doctrines which they taught, in favour of which the miracle was wrought.

103. Does Christ appeal to his miracles as proof of his true character and doctrines? Ans. Yes; Matt. xi. 4, 5; Mark xvi. 17; John v. 36, "The works I do, witness."

104. Though we may be deceived by pretended miracles, were not the miracles of Christ and his prophets and apostles beyond doubt? Ans. Yes; enemies acknowledged them.

§ XI.—105. In what period of Christ's life did he perform his miracles? Ans. Chiefly during his public ministry.

106. Did he perform none in his private life and youth? Ans. None on record.

107. Did he perform none after his resurrection? Ans. The draught of fishes might be considered a miracle, to confirm the disciples' faith. But his public ministry had then ceased.

108. Why did Christ require that some of his miracles should not be published at the time? Ans. (1.) Most probably that the persecution by the Jews might not be prematurely raised. (2.) That he might fulfil prophecies; as Isai. xlii. 1, 2; Matt. xii. 16, 21. (3.) Because at another time, the publication might be more useful. (4.) And perhaps sometimes as a secret judgment of God, to keep evidences from a people that abused and perverted them.

109. Do miracles alone, of themselves, prove the truth of a doctrine, in favour of which they are wrought? Ans. Yes; a true miracle does.

110. Why so? Ans. Every true miracle is necessarily of God, and he will not employ his power to confirm a lie.

111. How then understand Deut. xiii. 1, 2; or 2 Thess. ii. 9? Ans. These are not true miracles; but signs that we may not, at

the time, be able to detect; so 2 Thess. ii. 9, the apostle calls them "lying wonders."

112. Cannot Satan perform a true miracle? Ans. No.

113. Why not? Ans. It requires creative power—omnipotence.

114. Do we need miracles now? Ans. No.

115. Why not? Ans. Because the truth of the Scriptures is sufficiently confirmed already.

116. On what occasions were miracles chiefly needed? Ans. (1.) At the making of a new revelation of what is not taught by nature's light; for convincing us of the truth advanced. (2.) At the setting up of a new dispensation of the gospel, or on making some important additions. (3.) At the removal of a divine dispensation of the gospel.

117. What is the design of a miracle? Ans. To convince and persuade.

118. When did miracles cease? Ans. The precise time is perhaps not known; but it was about the time that the canon of Scripture was completed.

119. Are not the pretended miracles of Papists now unnecessary for any good purpose? Ans. Yes; and therefore are lying wonders.

120. Might not a real miracle be useful in settling important points of controversy? Ans. Indolence or impatience, might desire it; but the truth may be certainly known by the Scriptures or the proper use of means; and even a miracle would not reconcile an enemy to the truth; and the friend of truth does not need it.

§ XII.—121. Is not Christ the original teacher of all divine truth? Ans. Yes.

122. Is it not his prerogative to employ teachers under him? Ans. Yes.

123. Ought not gospel ministers, heads of families, and individual believers to teach, under Christ, in their respective stations? Ans. Yes; Eph. iv. 11; Deut. vi. 6, 7; Col. iii. 16.

124. What renders it requisite that Christ should sustain the office of Prophet or teacher to the church? Ans. (1.) The things to be taught, and necessary to salvation, are not made known by nature's light. (2.) Our minds are blinded to divine truth, and could not discover it without a supernatural revelation. (3.) Our minds are at enmity, and will not receive it by ordinary teaching.

125. Was it then necessary that this office be sustained by him who is God? Ans. Yes; not only to be capable of understanding all the truth, and what was necessary to be revealed, but to make his teaching effectual.

126. Was it sufficient for our salvation that the truth is taught externally? Ans. No; we must have internal teaching also.

127. Does this internal teaching belong to Christ's office as Prophet? Ans. Yes; our understanding must be renewed, Col. iii. 10; our minds or hearts must by teaching be transformed into God's image, 2 Cor. iii. 18; the Son of God must be revealed in us, Gal. i. 15, 16.

128. Does the word of Christ profit any who do not understand, believe, and receive it in love? Ans. No.

129. Are all who have the external teaching of Christ persuaded by it? Ans. No.

130. Has the word the power of itself to enlighten savingly, or persuade? Ans. No.

131. Had even the external teaching of Christ in person, on earth, the influence to persuade and sanctify? Ans. No.

132. Why was this? Ans. (1.) Not want of power in him; but, (2.) He only acted, in teaching in person, as a minister of the word; it was even then the work of the Spirit to bring the word home with power; and Christ then, in sovereignty, as now, gave the Holy Spirit to whom he pleased.

133. Is, then, the Holy Spirit Christ's agent for saving teaching? Ans. Yes; 2 Thess. ii. 13.

134. Can any resist the light, or refuse compliance, when the Spirit brings home the word, for regeneration or sanctification? Ans. No; John vi. 45.

135. Does not a new creation always accompany the Spirit's saving teaching? Ans. Yes; 2 Cor. iii. 18.

136. Does the Holy Spirit teach savingly without the word? Ans. No; Prov. xxix. 18; John xvi. 14.

137. If, then, the Holy Spirit alone teaches savingly, how is Christ the Prophet? Ans. He gives the Spirit to teach.

138. Does Christ make every one welcome to his teaching? Ans. Yes; Matt. xi. 29.

139. Into what disposition of mind does the Holy Spirit bring every one whom he savingly teaches? Ans. (1.) To be meek and lowly; Ps. xxv. 9. (2.) To love the truth, and prefer it to all things; Prov. ii. 3—5. (3.) To obey the truth; John vii. 17. (4.) To embrace the truth, though it bring persecution, or require us to deny ourselves of all idols; Gal. i. 15, 16.

LECTURE VII.—CHRIST'S PRIESTLY OFFICE.

§ XIII.—140. Was Christ, in the Old Testament, called a *Priest*? Ans. Yes; Zech. vi. 13; Ps. cx. 4.

141. What is the Hebrew name for priest? Ans. *Kohen*, Co-hen.

142. Did this Hebrew name always mean a *priest* in the religious sense of the word? Ans. No; also a prince; as 2 Sam. viii. 18. No doubt the word had both meanings, from the ancient form of the patriarchal government. The patriarch was both civil governor and priest.

143. But is not Christ in the New Testament called plainly a priest, in the religious sense of the word? Ans. Yes; as Heb. vii. 24; viii. 4; A High Priest, Heb. iii. 1; Great High Priest, Heb. iv. 14.

144. What is the general office or work of a priest? Ans. To deal with God for man.

145. To what in the condition of the sinner does this office im-

mediately refer? Ans. To guilt and condemnation; Heb. ix. 11—14.

146. With what perfections of God has the priest immediately to do? Ans. Justice, truth, and holiness; Psal. lxxxv. 10.

147. Why has he especially to deal with these perfections? Ans. To satisfy justice as the ground of peace and communion with God; maintain the truth of the promise and threatening in the covenant of works, in man's salvation; and thus glorify holiness in the salvation of the sinner.

148. Could a priest deal with God for man without satisfying justice? Ans. No; Heb. ix. 22.

149. Must all his dealings with God for man be on the ground of that satisfaction? Ans. Yes; Heb. ii. 14, 15; ix. 11, 12, 23.

150. Were the Old Testament priests types of Christ? Ans. Yes; Heb. ix. 6—14.

151. Had their priesthood any power to take away sin? Ans. No; Heb. ix. 9; x. 4.

152. What end did those priests and their services answer? Ans. To instruct the people in the doctrine of Christ's priesthood; to pledge him to us; to lead to faith in Christ; Gal. iii. 23, 24; Heb. ix. 8—11; and to purge ceremonially.

153. Wherein were the priests of old like to Christ as a Priest? Ans. (1.) In their appointment of God; Heb. v. 4. (2.) Offering sacrifices. (3.) Offering incense.

154. Was Christ's appointment necessary to his acceptable exercise of the office? Ans. Yes; Heb. v. 4.

155. Why was it necessary? Ans. God was under no obligation to accept a ransom for the sinner, but on his own choice and appointment.

156. When did God appoint him? Ans. In eternity, in making the covenant with him; Eph. iii. 11; Prov. viii. 23.

157. Were the typical Priests installed with such solemnity as Christ? Ans. No; Heb. vii. 20, 21.

158. Why was Christ installed with an oath? Ans. (1.) To testify the reality and efficiency of his Priesthood, while the typical priests could not atone for sin; Heb. vii. 20—22. (2.) To testify that the appointment was irrevocable and unchangeable; Heb. vii. 23, 24. (3.) To give assurance to our faith in him.

159. Though the Aaronical priests were types of Christ, was he a priest of this order? Ans. No; Heb. vii., viii. 4.

160. Why not of the Aaronical order? Ans. If he had been, he would have been priest under the same law, and therefore typical, and not real. He could not have been priest of that order, as he was of another tribe, Heb. vii. 12, 13.

161. Of what order was Christ a priest? Ans. Of the order of Melchisedec; Heb. v. 6.

162. But was not Melchisedec also a typical priest? Ans. Yes.

163. How then was Christ after his order? Ans. (1.) As Melchisedec was not of the order of Aaron, under the Jewish dispensation.

(2.) As he was in some respects a more eminent type of Christ, signifying eternity of office; Ps. cx. 4; a King as well as priest.

§ XIV.—164. Who was Melchisedec? Ans. He was truly and properly a man.

165. What opinions have been formed of him? Ans. (1.) Some think he was Christ himself. (2.) Some, that he was an angel. (3.) Some, that he was a man created immediately, and not of the race of Adam. (4.) Some, that he was Shem, or Ham, or Enoch.

166. How does it appear that he was not Christ himself? Ans. (1.) Because the type must be distinguished from the antitype. (2.) He was made like the Son of God; Heb. vii. 3; and therefore not he. (3.) Melchisedec was a real priest on earth; a typical priest; and, therefore, not Christ, who did not offer material oblations. (4.) Melchisedec was a real earthly king, and Christ was not. (5.) Christ is a priest after his order, and therefore was not the same.

167. How does it appear that Melchisedec was not an angel? Ans. (1.) Because he was a real earthly priest and king, which an angel is not. A priest is chosen from among men; Heb. v. 1. (2.) It would have been useless to tell us, if an angel, that he was without father or mother, or end of life. (3.) It would not be true that he was without beginning of days. (4.) It would not be true that the angel was made like to Christ; he had neither divine nor human nature.

168. How does it appear that Melchisedec was not a man immediately created of God, unconnected with Adam? Ans. (1.) Melchisedec was a priest, and a type of Christ; but a priest is chosen from among men, and must be of the family of those who are to be redeemed. (2.) God has made all men of one blood, Acts xvii. 26.

169. How does it appear that Melchisedec was not Shem, Ham, or Enoch? Ans. Because, of all these, we have account of their birth.

170. How does it appear then that Melchisedec was a proper man? Ans. (1.) Because Moses so describes him. (2.) Because none but a proper man could be a priest, and a type of Christ; Heb. v. 1. (3.) Because he lived among the Canaanites, was one of that people, and a real king in one of their cities.

171. Why have so many hypotheses been adopted respecting Melchisedec? Ans. From what is said of him by the apostle, Heb. vii., answering literally to no man.

172. How then are we to understand those things said of Melchisedec by the apostle, Heb. vii. 3, if he was a mere man? Ans. (1.) Some literal statements of Melchisedec as a man, are given, Heb. vii. 1, to show that he was a type of Christ, but not of the order of Aaron. (2.) A farther resemblance is drawn from the silence of Scripture respecting his birth, death, and parentage; or, (3.) Rather, the want of father and mother, of descent, of beginning of days, or end of life, refers to his want of a predecessor or successor in his office, which the Aaronical priests had. (4.) His abiding a priest continually refers to the silence of Scripture about

his death, leaving the description of him as King and Priest before us.

173. Why was such a mode of representing Christ necessary? Ans. Because no man could fully, by actual facts, typify Christ.

174. How are we to understand Melchisedec as king of righteousness and of peace? Ans. Not that he was so, more than some others, but that his proper name signified "king of righteousness," and *Salem* meant *peace*, and thus his name, and the name of the city he governed, meant what Christ was in reality.

§ XV.—175. Wherein did Melchisedec act as a priest in his interview with Abraham? Ans. (1.) In receiving tithes. (2.) In blessing Abraham.

176. Did his blessing Abraham imply any divine power? Ans. No; he blessed as a priest, by praying for a blessing, or pronouncing a blessing, as other priests.

177. How then did his blessing Abraham imply superiority, as the apostle alleges, Heb. vii. 7? Ans. It implied superiority in office.

178. Wherein did he act as King? Ans. In bringing forth refreshments.

179. Does the bringing forth bread and wine signify that he offered these as an oblation to God? Ans. No; simply that he brought them.

§ XVI.—180. Wherein, then, was Melchisedec like to Christ? Ans. (1.) In his name "King of righteousness." (2.) In the name of his kingdom. (3.) In his person, as drawn from the silence of Scripture respecting his birth and his death. (4.) In the continuance of his office, drawn from the silence of the Scriptures—no predecessor, and no successor.

LECTURE VIII.—PRIESTLY OFFICE. CONTINUED.

§ XVII.—181. Was not Christ the reality of all sacerdotal types? Ans. Yes; John i. 17.

182. What did the truth or reality of Christ's priesthood require as to his power? What qualities? Ans. Dignity and holiness.

183. Why did it require dignity? Ans. (1.) That he might deal with God for man. (2.) That his atonement, as well as all his mediation, might possess sufficient value.

184. Wherein consisted his dignity? or what was the source of it? Ans. His Deity.

185. Why did his priesthood require holiness? Ans. Without perfect holiness, neither his sufferings nor obedience could be acceptable.

186. As Melchisedec was a type of his dignity, what, in the ceremonial law, typified his holiness? Ans. (1.) The ceremonial purity of the priests. (2.) The victims for sacrifices were without blemish. (3.) The consecration of the altar, and that it should be undefiled by any tool.

187. What did this holiness include? Ans. Holiness of nature and holiness of life, or righteousness in his conduct.

188. How is the righteousness of Christ, for our justification, divided or distinguished? Ans. Into active and passive.

189. What is his active righteousness? Ans. His obedience to the law.

190. What is his passive righteousness, or obedience? Ans. His sufferings.

191. Can the active and passive obedience or righteousness of Christ be separated? Ans. No; they may be considered distinctly, but not separated.

192. In what did the active obedience of Christ consist? Ans. In his holiness of nature and righteousness of life.

193. Was then his holiness merely a personal requisite, and necessary only to his own perfection and acceptance in his work? Ans. No; it was also necessary as a fulfilment of the law in our stead.

194. Was it then an ingredient in the justifying righteousness which he wrought out for us? Ans. Yes.

195. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Holiness of nature was required of us by the law, as essential to our righteousness or obedience. (2.) Christ being under the law, that law required holiness of nature in him, as an essential ingredient in his obedience. Therefore, (3.) Holiness of nature was not merely a qualification of his person, but a quality of his obedience. (4.) This was typified by the ceremonial holiness and purification of the priests, the integrity and soundness of the victims; and by the sanctification of the Levites, instead of the first-born of Israel.

196. But, as many hold that Christ's sufferings, or passive obedience, constituted our whole justifying righteousness, how does it appear that his active obedience to the law belongs to his justifying righteousness? Ans. (1.) Because Christ's atonement is frequently in Scripture, called his righteousness and obedience. Now active obedience to the law is more directly called righteousness or obedience, than sufferings are. And as his righteousness consists of two parts, active and passive, his whole atoning work is sometimes called by the one name, and sometimes by the other, by a usual figure in Scripture, called Synecdoche,—a part for the whole. (2.) This obedience is said to be imputed to us for our justification, as opposed to the disobedience of Adam; Rom. v. 18, 19. (3.) Christ's obedience is said to make or constitute his people righteous; Rom. v. 19. Christ's sufferings alone could only set us free from guilt, but could not, of themselves, be that active righteousness which the law requires of us; so 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. iii. 9; Jer. xxiii. 6. (4.) It appears from the necessary connexion between Christ's sufferings and active obedience; Phil. ii. 8. In obeying, he suffered; and in suffering he obeyed. (5.) It appears from the fact of our being under the law for obedience, as well as for penalty; our guilt and punishment could not relieve us from obligation to obey, and to obey as the condition of life. Therefore Christ's sufferings alone, could only set us free from punishment, but not

of themselves, set us free from obligation to obey for life. (6.) It therefore appears that Christ's active obedience to the law belongs to his justifying righteousness, because he is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, Rom. x. 4; one end of the law was obedience, as a ground of justification. (7.) It appears also from the revealed truth, that Christ was made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law; Gal. iv. 4, 5. Therefore, as man was under the law, commanding obedience as the condition of life, Christ must have been made under the law to the same extent, or he could not, by his righteousness, redeem us. (8.) It appears also from the revealed truth, that believers are dead to the law, by the body of Christ, Rom. vii. 4, and the law dead to them, verse 6; which under the holiness, justice, and truth of God, they could not be, if Christ had not obeyed its precepts in their stead. The precepts of the law as a covenant, would still bind them. (9.) It appears also from the revealed truth, that there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus; which could not be the case if the believer were still under the precept of the law, as a covenant for life; because, unable to obey perfectly, he would still, by sin, fall under condemnation. To set him free from condemnation, one of two things was necessary—either that God would set aside the claims of his law, or that they be fulfilled perfectly. Divine justice and holiness could not set them aside; man could not fulfil them; therefore because Christ has fulfilled them in the believer's stead, by active obedience, there is no condemnation, &c. (10.) It appears also from the fact that believers, through Christ, have a claim to eternal life; Tit. i. 2; 1 Tim. vi. 19. Now if mere sufferings could deliver from a penalty, they could not give title to life, which by the terms of the covenant of works, was suspended on obedience: therefore the believer's claim to life is because Christ performed the condition of life by active obedience.

197. What would be the effect of denying Christ's active obedience as included in our justifying righteousness? Ans. (1.) Either to hold man still under the covenant of works, to purchase life by his obedience; or (2.) To suffer in hell by disobedience.

198. Are not the doctrines that our own righteousness, at least in part, is the ground of our justification and claim to eternal life, and of the saints falling away from a state of grace, logically connected with the denial of Christ's active obedience? Ans. Yes.

199. Therefore does not the doctrine of Christ's active obedience, as in part our justifying righteousness, annihilate those errors—of legalism, and of believers falling away? Ans. Yes; because not under the law.

200. Do not genuine Arminians always oppose this doctrine of Christ's active obedience? Ans. Yes.

201. How answer their objection that our salvation is ascribed in Scripture to Christ's death and sufferings? Ans. (1.) When, in any text, our salvation is ascribed to Christ's death, it is by synecdoche,—a part for the whole,—or the whole named for one part.

But, (2.) Our salvation is also ascribed to his obedience and righteousness; Rom. v. 16—19; x. 4; Phil. iii. 9.

202. How answer the objection that we are still bound to personal obedience? Ans. Our obedience is required as our personal holiness; but not as our justifying righteousness, or ground of claim of heaven; and to this personal obedience, or holiness, we are redeemed by Christ's atonement.

203. Are we bound to a full obedience to the law? Ans. Yes; the law knows no mitigation or diminution of its demands. If it did not demand full obedience; the law would be defective and unholy.

204. If the law demands full obedience of believers in Christ, how are its demands answered, since they are never fulfilled by us? Ans. Its demands of a legal or justifying righteousness, are fulfilled by Christ perfectly; and its demands for personal holiness are not fulfilled by us, till perfect in glory; and our present defects are pardoned, and final perfection attained, through Christ's atonement, intercession, and government.

205. How answer the objection that Christ owed obedience for himself? Ans. He was never a human person, and never did owe obedience for himself, except as the voluntary substitute for sinners. Christ's subjecting himself to the law was a personal act. But he was not a human, but a divine person. The divine person, as such, could not be subject to the law. It was therefore as united with the human nature, that he subjected himself to the law; subjecting himself in human nature, for his people, not for himself.

206. How answer the objection that the sufferings of Christ were perfect and of infinite value. Is it fair to argue from this that active obedience was unnecessary? Ans. No; they were of infinite value, and all sufficient for their object; that was to fulfil the demands of justice for sin; but it was not their object either to satisfy or annul the law's claims for obedience. In a word, Christ came, in man's place, under a broken covenant of works, to redeem man from it, which he could do only by fulfilling what man was bound to fulfil, and becoming the end of the law for righteousness.

207. But did not Christ, in consequence of his engagement as our surety, owe obedience; and was not that obedience the condition of his acceptance and acquittal as our surety? Ans. Yes; but the obedience to which he engaged, which therefore he owed, and on which he was accepted and acquitted, was a vicarious obedience,—an obedience in the stead of his people.

208. What was Christ's passive obedience? Ans. His sufferings.

209. What sufferings did this include? Ans. All his sufferings in our world.

210. Did these sufferings partake of the character of obedience? Ans. Yes; Phil. ii. 8. They were required, by the Father, of the Son, according to the covenant; John x. 18.

211. Was not obedience an ingredient in their value? Ans. Yes.

212. Do not then, the active and passive obedience of Christ answer different purposes, though individual and inseparable? *Ans.* Yes. His passive obedience satisfies formally the penalty of the law, and his active, the precept of it. The passive formally removes guilt, and the active procures a title to heaven.

LECTURE IX.—PRIESTLY OFFICE CONTINUED.

§ XVIII.—213. What are the acts of Christ's priesthood? *Ans.* His oblation, and his intercession.

214. Does benediction or blessing belong to Christ's priestly office? *Ans.* So far as it is intercessory it does, but so far as it is preaching or pronouncing a blessing from God, it belongs rather to his prophetic office. The priest of old, acted as teacher, as well as priest, and so pronounced the blessing.

215. What is the Socinian view of Christ's office of intercessor? *Ans.* To be but a benediction, and that such intercession is all that constitutes or belongs to his priesthood; denying his proper oblation.

216. When did they allow that Christ's priesthood began? *Ans.* At his ascension.

217. Could Christ be a priest, or make intercession without atonement? *Ans.* No.

218. Why? *Ans.* He would have no ground of plea.

219. When did Christ make the atonement? *Ans.* Heb. i. 3; x. 10; v. 1; viii. 3; Eph. v. 2.

220. Does the declaration, Heb. v. 5, 6, that the Father glorified Christ in making him high priest, signify that he discharged the office only after his ascension? *Ans.* No; The office itself is glorious; and it is to this that that text refers.

221. Does the expression, Heb. viii. 4, that if Christ were on earth, he should not be a priest, signify that he did not execute the office of priest on earth? *Ans.* No; it means that his priesthood could not be of the order of Aaron, because a priesthood of that order must be of the family of Aaron; and Christ was not of that family. Therefore his priesthood was of a higher order. They offered the shadow, he the reality.

222. The Socinians object that Christ's sufferings and death were his preparation for entering heaven, and not his exercise of priesthood itself. How answer? *Ans.* They were indeed his preparation, just as the offering of the sin-offering by the priests of old, was their preparation for entering into the most holy place. They went in with the blood of the sin-offering; and so Christ entered heaven with his own blood; and thus, first, as priest, made the atonement; Heb. ix. 7—12.

223. What then did the High Priest's entering once a year into the most holy place signify? *Ans.* That as he first offered the sin-offering, as an atonement, he represented Christ as offering himself as an atonement, and entering heaven on that ground, to make intercession for us; Heb. ix. 7—12.

§ XIX.—224. Was any type of old sufficient fully to set forth Christ's priesthood? *Ans.* No.

225. What method was adopted to remedy this defect? *Ans.* A multitude of types were employed, one to represent one thing, and another, another.

226. Wherein did Christ's Priestly office differ from the types? *Ans.* (1.) In the unity of his work; never to be repeated. (2.) In its efficiency. It took away sin; the types did not. (3.) In respect to the sins for which Christ's atonement was made; for all sins, except the unpardonable sin. (4.) In respect to the persons for whom it was made; only for the elect, and for the elect of all nations. (5.) In that Christ united in himself the Priest, the victim, and the altar.

227. Who was the Priest in the atonement of Christ? *Ans.* Himself; Christ gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice, Eph. v. 2.

228. Were both natures of Christ engaged in this work of offering himself? *Ans.* Yes; the person of Christ as God and man.

229. What was the victim or offering? *Ans.* Himself, in his human nature, soul and body; Eph. v. 2.

230. Could his divine nature suffer? *Ans.* No.

231. Was not the suffering of the human nature the fulfilment of the penalty? *Ans.* Yes.

232. What was the altar? *Ans.* His divine nature.

233. How does it appear that the divine nature was the altar? *Ans.* (1.) The design of the altar was to sanctify the gift, Matt. xxiii. 19; and was more valuable. (2.) Christ's divine nature sanctified the offering, and gave it infinite value, Heb. ix. 14.

234. Why was the altar of old to be of rough stones; and no tool to be used in building it, as a tool would defile it? *Ans.* Because the altar represented Christ's divine nature. Nothing human could give value to it, and his divine person was to be acknowledged according to revelation, and not according to human nature.

235. May the cross on which Christ suffered be called the altar? *Ans.* No; for (1.) The typical design of the altar was to sanctify the gift; and the cross did not. (2.) The Scriptures never call it the altar. (3.) The altar of old was not designed to represent any material thing on which Christ was offered. (4.) The cross was a symbol of the curse under which Christ suffered, Gal. iii. 13; but the altar was no symbol of a curse.

236. Do not the Papists hold the cross to be the altar, and an object of worship? *Ans.* Yes.

237. Is not this idolatry? *Ans.* Yes; it is worshipping a creature, a stock, and a symbol of a curse, when even the altar of old was not an object of worship.

238. Since the altar was a type of the divine nature of Christ why was it not worshipped? *Ans.* Because it was but a sign, a shadow, and not the divine nature itself.

§ XX.—239. When did Christ's actual oblation begin? *Ans.* In his incarnation.

240. How long did his atoning sufferings continue? *Ans.* All his life.

241. How does it appear that all his sufferings in this world were his atoning or substitutionary sufferings? Ans. (1.) When the Scriptures speak of his atonement, they speak of his sufferings in general, as belonging to it; as 1 Pet. ii. 21-24; Isa. liii. 2-5; thus "griefs," "stripes," "wounds," "blood," "reproaches;" "death;" are all spoken of. (2.) Christ was made under the law, to redeem us, &c., Gal. iv. 4; and he was under the law from his incarnation in man's stead. Therefore all he suffered was under the law, and in our stead. (3.) His people are by nature under the curse, and all their sufferings, in their natural state, are therefore the effects of the curse, and consequently Christ under the law in their stead, endured all his sufferings under the curse for us. (4.) Justice would not allow an innocent person to suffer anything, but for a consideration that was adequate. All his sufferings, therefore, not being for himself, were on account of imputed guilt, and belonged to the atonement.

242. Why then is our salvation so often ascribed to Christ's death? Ans. (1.) Because it was the prominent, the chief, and the completing scene of his sufferings for us. (2.) Because, as all the sinner's sufferings are parts of the threatened death, so Christ's death included all his sufferings.

243. Is there, then, any ground for the supposition that Christ's atoning sufferings were all included in the last three hours, when the preternatural darkness covered the earth? Ans. No; the chief scene does not exclude the lesser ones.

244. Is there any ground for excluding from Christ's atonement, his previous sufferings through life, on the supposition that they were endured for the purpose of convincing men of sin? Ans. No; they were endured for this purpose indeed, but not for this as the only, or chief purpose, but as incidental to the main purpose of atonement.

245. Could they answer the purpose of convincing men of the evil of sin, if they had not been endured as atoning sufferings? Ans. No; it is only under the view that Christ was suffering under imputed guilt, under the load of sin, in our stead, that his sufferings could set forth the evil of sin. The idea of an innocent being suffering, without sin imputed, as the reason of them, would convey only the idea of injustice and cruelty.

246. If then Christ's sufferings all his life were under the curse for us, why were his sufferings at last, the most severe? Ans. (1.) It pleased God then to inflict the punishment with more severity. (2.) There are degrees of suffering under the curse; and they may be more severe at one time than another, in the same individual.

247. What rendered Christ's sufferings so intense? Ans. A sense of the wrath of God,—divine desertion; Ps. xxii. 1; lxix. 1, &c.; Matt. xxvi. 38.

248. It is objected (1.) against Christ's atoning sufferings including all the sufferings of his life, that he is said to have suffered once, Heb. vii. 27; 1 Pet. iii. 18; and that the iniquity of the land

is removed in one day, Zech. iii. 9. How answer? Ans. The doctrine that he suffered once, is a statement of the contrast between Christ's sufferings and the typical sacrifices; his one offering was effectual, while the typical sacrifices were but shadows; and Christ's one offering included his whole sufferings and obedience: and the removal of the iniquities of the land in one day, expresses also the perfect efficiency of Christ's atonement.

249. Obj. (2.) Christ said "it is finished" before death? Ans. He could not, in the nature of things, say this after death; and he spake it in anticipation, by a plain figure; as Paul, "I have fought the good fight," &c., 2 Tim. iv. 7.

250. Obj. (3.) Christ had signs of divine favour during his previous life, and even in his agony in the garden, but none in the hours of darkness? Ans. (1.) It was not necessary that Christ's sufferings should be always equally intense; punishment admits of degrees. (2.) Although the sinner under the curse cannot enjoy divine favour and communion with God, it was not so with Christ; he himself was innocent, holy, and beloved of God, although our sin was imputed to him for punishment.

251. Obj. (4.) Believers must still suffer death and other evils, and why so, if Christ's afflictions and death were penal, and in our stead? Ans. Believers' afflictions and death are not proper punishments of sin, nor sufferings under the curse of the law, but are chastisements. Christ's sufferings were to satisfy justice; ours as chastisements.

252. Obj. (5.) Under the ceremonial law the priests were not admitted to the full discharge of their office till their thirtieth year, and therefore the antitype may be supposed to act as atoning high priest only after that age? Ans. (1.) The types were not designed to answer the antitype in every particular, because of their defects. Thus their atonement for themselves—their death—their succession in office, the apostle even notices as contrasts to Christ, Heb. v. 3; vii. 23. (2.) Though the requisition of the law, that the priests should be thirty years of age before they entered on the full discharge of their office, was owing to human defects, yet it typically shadowed some things;—as, that Christ should be perfect, and that he would enter on the public execution of his office at about thirty years of age.

§ XXI.—253. What was the procuring and meritorious cause of Christ's sufferings? Ans. The sins of his people.

254. Could those sins have procured Christ's sufferings unless he had assumed them, and they had been reckoned to him? Ans. No; but when he did assume them they procured his sufferings.

255. Could justice have allowed that he should suffer merely as an example? Ans. No.

256. Could justice inflict the punishment on him unless he had assumed our sins, and they had been imputed to him? Ans. No.

257. Do not his sufferings for sin, then, imply that his sufferings were for the sinner, and substitutionary? Ans. Yes; as (1.) To suffer for sin would answer no purpose, unless he suffered for the

sinner. (2.) If he suffered for sin and not for the sinner, there would be a useless and unrighteous waste of suffering; as then the sinner must still suffer, and the sufferings of the innocent Saviour were utterly beyond the demands of justice—a suffering for nothing.

258. What then was the true character and design of Christ's oblation or sufferings? Ans. (1.) They were substitutionary for his people. (2.) They were the very penalty of the law denounced on the sinner, and suffered for the satisfaction of divine justice.

LECTURE X.—PRIESTLY OFFICE,—CONTINUED

259. What proofs have we of the substitutionary sufferings of Christ? Ans. (1.) Texts which assert that Christ suffered for us; as Rom. v. 6, viii. 32; Math. xx. 28.

260. Do not these propositions, *δια*, *περι*, *υπερ*, and *αυτι*, generally mean *in the stead of*, or substitution? Ans. Yes; especially *αυτι* always means this.

261. But some argue that such texts only mean *for our good*, by way of example, instruction, display of justice, &c.; and not substitution. How answer? Ans. (1.) In some cases this would be unmeaning, or even absurd; as Matt. xx. 28; "*αυτι*" "instead of the good of many." (2.) Death for instruction, or example, is too costly a means of mere instruction; justice would not permit it. (3.) Some passages of this description, as John x. 15, must mean substitution, as Christ there presents himself as the contrast of the unfaithful Shepherd; he would give his life instead of the sheep.

262. What argument for the substitution of Christ's sufferings is contained in those texts, which teach that Christ suffered for our sins? Ans. He could not suffer for the good of our sins, but for us on account of them; and suffering on account of sin, which procures our condemnation, is to suffer in our stead; as 1 Cor. xv. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 18.

263. What evidence for the substitutionary nature of Christ's sufferings may be drawn from passages speaking of Christ as *a ransom*, and as giving himself a ransom, &c.; as Matt. xx. 28; 1 Tim. iii. 6? Ans. A ransom supposes the paying a price of redemption, and necessarily signifies that it is vicarious. It is from *λυω*, to *loose*, *pay*, *redeem*.

264. What evidence for substitution is drawn from passages asserting that Christ bare our sins; as Isa. liii. 4, 6; 1 Pet. ii. 24? Ans. (1.) That our sins were imputed or reckoned to him, as the cause or reason of his sufferings. (2.) That he suffered them in our stead; referring to the scape-goat, Levit. xvi. 21, 22; on which the sins of the congregation were laid. Thus Christ bore in reality, as the cause of his sufferings, what was signified by the type. With this, connect various expressions in Isa. liii.; as verse 15, "Bruised for our sins;" verse 6, "Laid on him iniquity;" verse 10, "His soul an offering for sin."

265. What evidence of substitution from passages representing Christ as made a curse for us; as Gal. iii. 13? Ans. That he suf-

ferred under imputed guilt, and instead of the sinner accursed. On no other ground of suffering could he suffer as a curse.

266. What evidence arises for substitution by the Scriptures declaring that he was made under the law; as Gal. iv. 4? Ans. The law from which we needed redemption demanded the penalty of us, and Christ being made under it to redeem us, must be under the penalty from which we needed redemption; therefore his sufferings were substitutionary.

267. What evidence for substitution arises from texts calling Christ *a surety*; as Heb. vii. 22? Ans. (1.) It is only as Priest he is called a surety; and therefore he was a surety for us to God, and a surety only as Priest for atonement; not for our sanctification or obedience, for that is his work, as Prophet and King. (2.) As God demands of us the penalty of the law, so Christ, in being surety, bore the penalty, and suffered in our stead.

268. What evidence arises for substitution from the fruits of Christ's sufferings, ascribed to them in Scripture? Ans. Many fruits of his sufferings are described in Scripture which directly and necessarily show that his sufferings were substitutionary; and in no other way can these fruits be ascribed to them; as—(1.) Purchase of the church by his blood; Acts xx. 28. (2.) Expiation; Heb. i. 3. (3.) Propitiation, Rom. iii. 25; 1 John ii. 2. (4.) Reconciliation, Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. (5.) Redemption from the curse by his being a curse, Gal. iii. 13. (6.) Salvation ascribed to his sufferings, Eph. v. 23—25. (7.) Healing and peace by his sufferings, Isa. liii. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 24. (8.) End of the law for righteousness, Rom. x. 4.

269. Was there a necessity for substitutionary sufferings on the supposition that fallen man should be saved? Ans. Yes.

270. What was the necessity? Ans. (1.) The perfections of God required such a satisfaction of man, the offender. Divine holiness cannot but hate sin, and manifest hatred of it in its punishment. Divine justice must punish disobedience. Without punishment justice would be in fault, as the sinner would not receive his due. Divine truth required it, to fulfil the threatening of the broken covenant. (2.) It follows that the same perfections must require the same punishment, as the condition of acceptance and redemption, whether the satisfaction be given by the sinner or his surety.

271. Must we not then conclude, from the necessity of a satisfaction to justice in order to the sinner's salvation, that Christ's sufferings, being the sole condition of our peace and deliverance from the curse, must have been a strict satisfaction to divine justice, and substitutionary for us? Ans. Yes.

272. Is Christ represented in Scripture, as the Representative of his people? Ans. Yes; as Rom. v. 15—19; 1 Cor. xv. 22.

273. What is meant by representing? Ans. To act in the stead of another.

274. Does not his representation of his people prove that his sufferings were a proper satisfaction to justice for them? Ans. , otherwise he did not really represent them.

275. Wherein was Christ our Representative? *Ans.* (1.) In guilt, by imputation of our sins to him, Isa. liii. 6. (2.) In obligation to the law as a covenant, Gal. iv. 4, 5. (3.) In rendering the atonement satisfactory to law and justice by suffering and obedience. Rom. v. 15—19; 2 Cor. v. 21. (4.) In receiving the promises for us; Col. i. 18—20; ii. 9, 10; Gal. iii. 16. (5.) As our intercessor entering heaven for us; Heb. ix. 24; vi. 20.

§ XXII.—276. Is the doctrine of Christ's substitutionary atonement a doctrine necessary to our consolation? *Ans.* Yes.

277. Wherein? *Ans.* (1.) It presents a ground for faith, which no discovery of the holiness, justice, or truth of God can shake; as justice is satisfied. (2.) On this ground we can plead justice as well as mercy for our salvation. (3.) On this ground believers are free from the law as a covenant; and therefore there is no condemnation to them—no falling away from a state of grace. (4.) It makes the believer's salvation sure.

278. Is it a doctrine glorifying to God? *Ans.* Yes.

279. Wherein? *Ans.* (1.) It presents the perfections of his justice, holiness, and truth, in a clearer light than any other doctrine can do. (2.) It presents his mercy and grace and wisdom as most glorious and holy.

280. Yet is not this doctrine much denied? *Ans.* Yes.

281. By whom? *Ans.* By Socinians and Arminians, of which class are Hopkinsians.

282. Do they all deny it on the same grounds? *Ans.* No; Socinians deny it, by denying the atonement altogether; Arminians, &c., deny a proper vicarious and definite atonement, yet acknowledge an atonement of some kind.

283. What end do Socinians allow that Christ's death answers? *Ans.* That it confirmed his doctrines, was an example of charity, fitted him for sympathizing with us from his own experience of affliction, and acquired for himself a glorious government over other creatures.

284. But would justice allow an innocent being to suffer for such purposes alone, without sin imputed? *Ans.* No.

285. What end do Arminians allow that the death of Christ answers? *Ans.* (1.) It brought man into a salvable state. (2.) Rendered it consistent in God to save as many or as few as he pleases. (3.) That Christ glorified justice by dying for sin, but not for the sinner.

286. But would death for sin, and not for the sinner, glorify or maintain justice? *Ans.* No; sin has no existence but in connexion with the sinner. Justice demands no punishment for sin, except in the punishment of a person.

287. If Christ's death only brought man into a salvable state, did it secure his reward, or the salvation of any one? *Ans.* No.

288. Could such an object in Christ's death consist with his infinite knowledge of the fruits of his death, or with his unchangeable purpose and will? *Ans.* No.

289. The Socinians object, (1.) That the justice of God would not allow of a substitutionary satisfaction to justice, and allege Ezek. xviii. 4, "the soul that sinneth it shall die," as a proof of their position. How answer? Ans. (1.) Though no one has a right to give his life for another, unless he has a supreme authority to dispose of it, Christ had that right, and therefore justice would allow it. (2.) Ezek. xviii. 4, speaks of ordinary cases, and God's dealings with men as individuals, and in their ordinary relations to one another. (3.) This passage in Ezekiel is not set forth as the full exhibition of God's dealings with men in their ordinary relations to one another, but his actual dealings with the Jews in that case. (4.) This passage, taken literally, and in its strict sense, would say, (a.) That every sinner must perish, and, (b.) That Christ, who was innocent, should not die; neither of which are true. Therefore it only applies strictly to the case of the Jews, as they were at that time.

290. What requisites are necessary to render it consistent with justice to punish an innocent person with death, as a substitute for a sinner? Ans. (1.) A supreme and perfect right, in the person giving his life, to dispose of it at his own will. (2.) That he voluntarily give his life for another. (3.) That he is able to satisfy the law in his undertaking. (4.) That he is able to give that satisfaction without perishing himself. (5.) That he be able to change the heart of the culprit, and make him righteous; as it would be unjust that the innocent should die that the wicked might live in sin. (6.) That the satisfaction, or substitution, be made with the full consent of him that has the authority to demand and receive it. (7.) That the substitution be in the same nature that sinned; otherwise, the satisfaction could not be given to justice, and in accordance with law and truth.

291. Are not all these things found in Christ, rendering his substitution consistent with justice? Ans. Yes.

292. They object, (2.) That God is said to forgive our sin; while it is not forgiven, if the full price that justice demands is paid? Ans. (1.) The apostle joins forgiveness and free redemption together; Rom. iii. 24, 25. (2.) Though the atonement is made, it must be applied; and we actually acquitted on the ground of it; and this is our forgiveness.

293. Obj. (3.) The Scriptures ascribe other objects to Christ than atonement; as "a witness," 1 Tim. vi. 13; a shepherd, 1 Pet. ii. 21, &c.? Ans. The lesser object does not exclude the greater. Christ had several objects, and the same passages, as well as others, show that Christ had, besides these lesser objects, the fundamental one of satisfaction, or atonement.

294. Obj. (4.) Our doctrine supposes things unsuited to Christ, and that are impossible to him; such as that the penalty of the law required eternal punishment, and despair; that one death could not satisfy for all the redeemed; that Christ could not both suffer the penalty and merit life by obedience; and that his satisfaction must be to Satan, and to himself? Ans. (1.) Eternity of punishment

was owing to the imperfection of the sinner. (2.) Despair was an infliction that belonged to man, on account of his inability to satisfy; and Christ despaired of escaping the curse. (3.) The dignity of his person rendered his one offering infinitely valuable. (4.) He did obey, and merit life, as well as suffering, and his one life of obedience was of infinite value, from the dignity of his person. (5.) No satisfaction was due to Satan; the offence was not against him. (6.) Christ indeed, as God, received the satisfaction, and as Mediator, gave it.

295. Obj. (5.) Our doctrine of satisfaction to justice by substitutionary atonement, tends to security in sin? Ans. Not so; as appears (1.) From 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; Rom. vii. 6. (2.) None embrace this grace without the indwelling of the Spirit. (3.) It furnishes the only motives that ever avail to induce holiness. (4.) The fact has always proved that a saving faith in this doctrine produces godliness, and rejection of it produces irreligion.

§ XXIII.—296. For whom did Christ make satisfaction? Ans. For his elect.

297. Did he satisfy for angels? Ans. No.

298. Why not? Ans. Not for sinning angels, because of God's sovereign will;—not for holy angels, as they had no need; Heb. ii. 16.

299. Did he satisfy for all men? Ans. No; only for the elect.

300. How prove this position? Ans. (1.) From the typical atonement being limited to Israel, the emblem of God's children. (2.) From texts limiting his atonement to the *many*; in contradistinction to *all*; as Matt. xx. 28; xxvi. 28; Rom. v. 15, 19; Heb. ii. 10; ix. 28; limiting it to Christ's sheep, John x. 15; his people, Matt. i. 20; the church, Acts xx. 28; his body, Eph. v. 25. (3.) From the consideration that his intercession is expressly limited to his people, John xvii. 9, and his death and intercession are of equal extent; his death being the sole foundation of his intercession; John xvii. 4. (4.) From the revealed fact that Christ's death flowed from the special love of God, which is inconsistent with its being endured for the objects of his wrath; Rom. viii. 32; John iii. 16; xv. 13; Rom. v. 7, 8. (5.) From the fruits or effects ascribed to the death of Christ;—as salvation, justification, reconciliation, Rom. v. 9, 10; sanctification, Tit. ii. 14; and these not only as possible by Christ's death, but infallibly sure; Rom. viii. 32—34. (6.) It appears from the absurdities which flow from the doctrine of a universal atonement, while there is not a universal salvation; such as these,—(a.) Christ might have been unrewarded for his work by the salvation of a soul. (b.) That God receives a double satisfaction for the same debt—one by Christ, another by the damned. (c.) That man owes his salvation to himself. (d.) That Christ died for those that are not the objects of his love;—to whom he never gave the means of grace; and even for those who were damned when he laid down his life. (7.) Christ died under a covenant condition and promise, Isa. liii. 10, 11; and therefore he knew his reward, and must have in-

tended them in his death; and, moreover, he paid the stipulated price of their redemption, with perfect assurance that they would be saved on that ground. (8.) From the consideration that his death must either be effectual to save all for whom he died, or it would save none; something else being necessary to salvation besides its application; but the application was secured in the covenant, to every one given to him, and for whom he died; John vi. 37. (9.) From the doctrine of faith, which should be a faith of assurance, Heb. x. 22. Now faith has nothing to fix on assuredly, if Christ's death on which we are to rest, is not effectual to salvation: we could then have but the hope of an uncertainty.

LECTURE XII.—PRIESTLY OFFICE,—CONTINUED.

§ XXIV.—301. Do not many oppose the doctrine of a definite atonement as limited to the elect? Ans. Yes.

302. Must not the doctrine of a vicarious or substitutionary atonement, and a limitation of it to the elect, stand or fall together? Ans. Yes; and the advocates or opponents of the one, are the advocates or opponents of the other.

303. What are the chief different opinions held on the subject of salvation by a universal atonement? Ans. (1.) That it is universal;—that all are saved. (2.) Arminians and Hopkinsians hold that all are not saved; but only those who distinguish themselves by a good improvement of privileges. (3.) Lutherans hold that all are not saved, nor are any saved by their own free will; but that the grace of God applies the general or universal atonement, to those who are saved.

304. Does not this latter idea suppose that the atonement was made with a covenant or a fixed purpose of particular salvation? Ans. Yes; because if the application of Christ's death, by free grace, to any individual, was agreed on by covenant, and decreed by a fixed and unchangeable purpose, then Christ died for those individuals intended, and for no others; and the Father gave his Son to die for them, under the purpose to save them by his death.

305. What then is the difference between the Lutherans and us on this point? Ans. (1.) While they and we agree that there is no actual salvation by the death of Christ unless it be applied, and that it is applied only by the free grace of God, yet we hold that Christ, according to covenant and decree of election, died under the intention or purpose that his death would be infallibly applied to the elect for their salvation. The Lutherans deny this definite purpose in Christ's death. (2.) We hold that Christ's death was rendered as the condition on which this free grace of God would apply the death of Christ to the elect; John vi. 37; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Gal. i. 4. The Lutherans deny this definite design of the death of Christ.

306. It is objected that many Scriptures assert that Christ died for all—2 Cor. v. 15; Rom. v. 18; and for the world, and the whole world; as John i. 29; 1 John ii. 2? Ans. (1.) The word *all* is often used, when a restricted sense is evidently intended; as Matt.

xii. iv. 23; Acts x. therefore the use of it can be no solid foundation for any doctrine unless the subject or the context decide it. (2.) In many passages in which it is used respecting the death of Christ, the context shows that it means all the *elect*; or some of all nations, or classes of men;—or some of all ages. (3.) It may sometimes mean that the death of Christ is applicable to all, and welcome to all, and that there is no salvation for any but by his death; as 1 Tim. ii. 6. (4.) It generally is used in reference to the death of Christ in opposition to the Jewish notion, that the Messiah and salvation were limited to that nation.

307. Obj. (2.) Texts of Scripture which represent some of the redeemed as perishing—even some for whom Christ died; as Rom. xiv. 15; John xvii. 12; 2 Pet. ii. 1, 20. How answer? Ans. (1.) In the case of those that perish they were not redeemed; because none shall pluck them out of his hand, John x.; but by profession they were redeemed, and in the judgment of charity were so; or, (2.) The redemption was offered to them; or, (3.) They had a common grace, leading them to acts of outward Christianity, and to hopes of salvation; and from this they fell away; or, (4.) The expression may not mean actual perdition, but the tendency of scandals to produce apostacy; as Rom. xiv. 15; or, (5.) These expressions are intended to warn us of danger of perdition on the one hand, and the danger of ruining others; that we may be watchful, &c. Observe, John xvii. 12, does not mean that Judas was given to him to be saved, but that he was the son of perdition; (the preposition being taken adversatively.) 2 Pet. ii. 1, does not mean that Christ actually purchased them with his blood, but that his purchase was offered to them, and they professed hope in him. Verse 20th does not mean a saving escape, or real sanctification, but an external reformation. IIcb. x. 29, does not mean that the apostate had been regenerated, in virtue of Christ's blood, but through profession of faith in it, he had become a visible church member, and had attained some measure of outward holiness.

308. Obj. (3.) It is incumbent on every one to believe that Christ died for him in particular; and this cannot be done except on the doctrine that he died for all? Ans. (1.) It is not the duty of the gospel hearer to believe in the first place that Christ died for him in particular, or intended secretly his actual salvation; but to believe the sufficiency and suitableness of the blood of Christ to himself—that it is offered to him freely, and to accept the offer, and on the ground of the offer, to rest on that blood to save him. (2.) To believe that Christ died for us, and that his death secures the salvation of none, could not relieve the convinced conscience, as faith in the efficiency of his blood does; such belief of Christ's death for us could afford us no more relief than the faith of gospel truth can remove doubt.

309. Obj. (4.) The universal offer of the gospel would be illusory, if Christ did not die for all? Ans. (1.) It is not illusory, because the offer and promise will be true to all who accept. As it

is not illusory to advise the sick to the use of medicine, while there is hope, although it is unalterably decreed whether he shall recover or not, so it is not illusory to press sinners to accept the offered salvation, and especially when the promise is absolute that on believing they shall be saved. (2.) The object to be believed is not a secret intention, but an actual promise, which will be true to all who accept. (3.) But it would be illusory to preach salvation by a death that does not save; and to press on sinners to believe that Christ died for them intentionally, while this remains an unrevealed secret.

310. Obj. (5.) The merit of Christ is sufficient for the salvation of all; and to hold that it is not for all, is to suppose that God exacted a payment beyond the debt? Ans. (1.) Christ's merit is indeed sufficient for all; but that sufficiency does not lie in the intention of Christ to die for all, but in his having, as God-man, fully answered the demands of the law lying on man. It is wholly necessary to each sinner, and nothing more is necessary for all sinners. (2.) The infinite value and sufficiency of Christ's death and obedience arise from the dignity of his person, which was necessary in order to save one sinner.

311. Obj. (6.) The doctrine of a definite atonement is discouraging to a sinner in seeking salvation? Ans. (1.) The sinner may feel discouraged by not understanding the gospel on this point; but not if he rightly understands it. He should know that the ground of his faith is neither the doctrine that Christ died for all, nor the discovery of the secret intention of Christ respecting him, but the offer alone; and that is full. (2.) He may justly be more discouraged by the doctrine that Christ died for all, but that his death secures the salvation of none.

312. Obj. (7.) A great benefit accrues to the world in general by the death of Christ, and therefore he died, in some sense, for all;—such benefits as the preaching of the gospel, putting down of idolatry, and the continued standing of the world? Ans. (1.) True, great benefits do accrue to the world at large by the death of Christ, while these benefits which are not saving, are not purchased by his death; they are incidental to his death, and to the sovereign government of his church. (2.) He did not purchase the preaching of the gospel, nor the common operations of the Spirit. These things belong to the system of means adopted by God in sovereignty, in the eternal counsels, for carrying on the work of salvation to his church.

313. Did Christ purchase the common benefits of life? Ans. No.

314. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Nothing is to be accounted as of the purchase of Christ, but what the vindictive justice of God could not admit without a satisfaction. (2.) The continued existence of the world, the temporal life of the wicked, and their enjoyment of the means of it, God could grant, in his sovereignty, without any satisfaction to justice, or any dereliction of it. (3.) Whatever Christ died for, he satisfied justice for it,

took away the curse from it, and delivered it from vindictive justice and wrath; but wicked men still are under the curse in all their enjoyments. (4.) Whatever Christ purchased, by satisfying justice, he purchased for his people. (5.) Whatever he purchased for his people is itself a blessing to them, and not depending on a superadded blessing to make it a real benefit to them. Thus, we do not read of a blessing on pardon, justification, or sanctification, to make them good to us, as though without a blessing they would be useless. (6.) All that Christ purchased is spiritual, not material. (7.) All that Christ purchased for his people is received and enjoyed by faith alone. (8.) All that he purchased for us is applied by the Spirit; as the purchasing and application by the Spirit are of equal extent. (9.) A blessing on temporal benefits to believers was purchased by Christ, because it was necessary in order to their enjoyment of this, that justice be satisfied for them. (10.) The gift of these common benefits to believers in covenant love and favour, is a fruit of the purchase, because it was necessary, in order to their receiving them in such a way, that justice be satisfied. (11.) Christ has the government and disposing of all things, as Mediator to his people, and many of these things he did not purchase; as, the fruits of common providence, angels good and bad, &c.; but in order to dispose of them for the benefit of his people, he satisfied divine justice.

§ XXV.—315. Did Christ die for all his elect? Ans. Yes; in no other way could they be saved; they were given to him on that condition; John vi. 37; xvii.

316. Did he die for his people under the Old Testament? Ans. Yes; Rom. iii. 25, 26.

317. Why die for them after they had obtained salvation? Ans. To lay that ground actually, on which they had been saved.

318. How was it consistent to save sinners of old on a satisfaction not given? Ans. It was on the merit of that which was to be done; it was as present to God then as now; it was before the people by promise and type.

§ XXVI.—319. Did Christ suffer for all the sins of his elect? Ans. Yes; otherwise they would lie against them; 1 John i. 7.

320. Is there any ground for the Popish distinction of mortal and venial sins? Ans. No.

320½. Are not all sins mortal, if unatoned for? Ans. Yes; Matt. xii. 36.

321. Are any sins atoned for by our sufferings or afflictions? Ans. No.

321½. Did then Christ take away the blame or faultiness of our sins, leaving us to bear the punishment of them? Ans. No; our afflictions, if in Christ, are not vindictive, or properly punitive.

322. Were there not some sins, under the law, for which atonement was not made? Ans. Yes; Num. xv. 27–31.

322½. Of what class were they? Ans. Presumptuous sins.

323. Does this signify anything in reference to Christ's atonement? Ans. Yes; (1.) The unpardonable sin, which is presump-

tuous; but this his people have not. (3.) That sin is not pardoned while presumption continues.

324. Did "no atonement," Num. xv. 30, mean *no pardon*? Ans. No; but, (1.) No pardon while presumptuous. (2.) No relief, by atonement, from the temporal penalty.

§ XXVII.—325. Was Christ's atonement a proper equivalent to justice for our sins? Ans. Yes; Rom. x. 4; Gal. iii. 13.

326. What do the Remonstrants, or Arminians, and Hopkinsians say on this? Ans. That Christ only suffered as a specimen of the punishment under the law, as a mere manifestation of divine justice against sin; and that God accepted this as a compromise.

327. Would such an atonement be consistent with justice or substitutionary? Ans. No.

328. Would it not be the denial of the infinite value of the blood of Christ? Ans. Yes.

329. If a compromise of suffering had been all that was necessary, would not a less sacrifice than that of Christ have been sufficient? Ans. Yes.

330. But it is objected that if Christ suffered the perfect equivalent for our sins, there is no mercy in our salvation, nor suffering spared? Ans. (1.) It was not the end of the plan of redemption so much to spare suffering, as to save sinners. (2.) It was still mercy; because the Saviour, not the elect, suffered.

331. But it is objected that, if a proper equivalent was rendered by Christ, there is no need of pardon? Ans. Pardon does not consist in acquitting sins to the dishonour of justice; but in remitting sins to the believer, on account of the justice-satisfying righteousness of Christ.

332. Are we to understand that the abundance and superabundance of grace, spoken of in Scripture, Rom. v. 15, &c., signifies that Christ suffered more than was necessary? Ans. No; It means perfect sufficiency, such as no guilt can exhaust.

333. Where do the Papists allege that they derive their treasures of merit for indulgences? Ans. Partly from this supposed redundancy of grace in Christ, and partly from the supposition that eminent saints exercise more grace than is necessary for themselves.

334. In holding that Christ's atonement was a proper equivalent for our sins, are we to suppose that it was just proportioned to the number of the elect, and the number and aggravation of their sins? Ans. No.

335. Why not? Ans. (1.) Such an idea would deny the sufficiency of Christ's merits for the whole world. (2.) It would deny the infinitude of the value of his atonement, setting its limits by the number of the elect, and the number and aggravation of their sins. (3.) It is not a manner of comparison or computation appropriate to a moral satisfaction. (4.) It misrepresents the nature of the atonement, which is one offering, and one course of obedience, all of which is necessary for any one sinner, and sufficient for all.

336. Wherein then lies its sufficiency? Ans. In the dignity of the person who made the atonement, Heb. ix. 14; Matt. xxiii. 19.

LECTURE XIII—PRIESTLY OFFICE.—CONTINUED.

§ XXVIII.—337. Were Christ's sufferings infinite in degree? Ans. No; only infinite in value, by the dignity of his person.

338. What are the effects of Christ's oblation? Ans. Reconciliation and salvation.

339. Do these flow with infallible certainty from Christ's atonement, so that no one of the elect can possibly come short of them? Ans. Yes; John vi. 37.

340. What is the reason of this absolute certainty? Ans. (1.) Election, or the covenant of grace. (2.) The purchase of Christ, according to covenant, being sufficient, and by covenant, intended for them. (3.) The faithfulness of God to fulfil his purposes; 2 Tim. ii. 19.

341. But though these fruits are sure, as flowing from Christ's atonement, will the elect attain them without the application of Christ's death to them? Ans. No.

342. Does the necessity of the application imply any defect of sufficiency in the atonement, or of the security it gives? Ans. No; the application is no part of the atonement, and adds nothing to its sufficiency, but is a part of the whole plan secured by God's faithfulness in connexion with Christ's purchase.

343. What do Arminians and Hopkinsians hold on this point of Christ's satisfaction actually procuring these fruits? Ans. That the atonement only rendered God reconcilable, and made it consistent with justice to enter into covenant with sinners, and with as many or as few as he pleased.

344. Wherein does the fallacy of this appear? Ans. (1.) It denies a covenant. (2.) The infallible purpose of God. (3.) The gift of a seed to Christ as his reward. (4.) The satisfaction of justice by Christ. (5.) The believer's deliverance from the law. (6.) It maintains that faith in Christ has no definite object. (7.) It makes room for our works as necessary to justification.

345. Obj. (1.) In favour of the doctrine that our salvation is made to depend in part on our works, and not wholly on Christ's righteousness, that Paul said, Col. i. 24, that he filled up that which was behind of the sufferings of Christ? Ans. It means his sufferings for the name of Christ.

346. Obj. (2.) Expiation and redemption are ascribed to human works, Prov. xvi. 6; Dan. iv. 27? Ans. These mean no more than the proper effect of reformation. They relate not to atonement.

347. Obj. (3.) Believers offer a proper oblation, Rom. xii. 1, 2; 2 Tim. iv. 6? Ans. It is an offering of thankfulness, not of atonement.

348. What error is there in the Papists' doctrine of the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass? Ans. (1.) It is unbloody. (2.) The blood of Christ, as offered by himself is the only atonement. (3.) He offered it but once; the Mass is offered often. (4.) It is a profanation of the Supper.

§ XXIX.—349. Having spoken of Christ's oblation, what is the other part or act of his Priestly office? Ans. *Intercession*.

350. Are we to suppose that Christ actually makes requests in heaven for his people, by words? Ans. No.

351. In what do we understand his intercession to consist? Ans. (1.) That it is a representation of his oblation, and that God from regard to it, supplies our wants, and answers our prayers. Appearing in the presence of God for us, Heb. ix. 12, 24. (2.) Willing, (according to the eternal covenant, and his purchase,) the application of redemption to us, John xvii. 24.

352. Are we then to understand such prayers as he made for himself, while in the flesh, such as referred to Heb. v. 7, as the exercise of his priestly intercession? Ans. No; such prayers proceeded from his proper humanity.

353. In what character does Christ intercede for his people? as man? as God? or as Mediator? Ans. As Mediator, God and man. As man alone, he could not approach to God, as intercessor. As God, he could not ask the Father. But as Mediator, he can intercede as well as suffer.

354. Does Christ's intercession belong at all to his kingly office, as the Socinians suppose? Ans. No; as appears, (1.) From the nature of the office—procuring at the will of another person, and on a meritorious ground. (2.) From the Scriptures ascribing it to his priestly office; Heb. vii. 24—26. (3.) From the ceremonial law, appointing the priests to pray for the people; Numb. vi. 23; Joel ii. 17. (4.) From the office of the high priest, entering the most holy place with the blood of atonement, and with incense, as the type of Christ's entrance into heaven, with his own blood, as intercessor; Heb. ix. 7, 12, 24.

355. Have we direct proof that Christ intercedes for his people? Ans. Yes; as, Heb. vii. 24, 25; Rom. viii. 34; 1 John ii. 1.

356. Is Christ's intercession inconsistent with his divine majesty? Ans. No; it no more implies inferiority of person to the Father than his obedience or atonement; but it implies his office.

357. What is the necessity of Christ's intercession? Ans. (1.) It was appointed by the will of God, as necessary for our necessities and wants; 1 John ii. 1; Heb. vii. 24. (2.) Against the accusations of Satan; Rev. xii. 10; Zech. iii. 1, 2. (3.) Putting us in possession of the blessings purchased for us, or procuring them; John xiv. 13, 14; Heb. vi. 19, 20. (4.) That Christ might be the acknowledged way of our obtaining salvation.

358. Will Christ possess this office forever? Ans. Yes; Heb. vii. 24, 25.

359. What need of his intercession when believers obtain heaven? Ans. Though their state is then unchangeable, yet their happiness shall still be on account of Christ and his merits.

360. Is Christ's intercession always effectual? Ans. Yes.

361. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Direct proof, John xi. 42; Heb. vii. 25. (2.) From the ground of it—his atonement; John xvii. 4; Heb. ix. 12, 24. (3.) From the infinite dignity of his person; Rom. viii. 34; Heb. vii. 25.

362. For whom does he intercede? Ans. For the elect; John xvii. 9, 20, 24.

363. Does he pray for all the elect? Ans. Yes.

364. Does he pray for any but the elect? Ans. No; John xvii. 9. The same thing appears from considering, (1.) That his prayers are efficacious. (2.) Made only on account of his atonement. (3.) Made according to the gift of them in the eternal covenant; John xvii. 9. (4.) If he prayed for others, his prayer would not be successful; it would be without a ground—it would be vain. None of which can be ascribed to Christ.

365. In what sense do the Arminians say that he prays for all men? Ans. In a general sense, or with a general affection.

366. Would this answer any purpose? Ans. No; it is unworthy of Christ.

367. Did Christ intercede for his people before his incarnation? Ans. Yes; Zech. i. 12; Job xxxiii. 24; on the ground of his oblation to be offered.

368. Did he intercede for his people in his humiliation? Ans. Yes; in a manner suited to his humiliation—in words, &c.

369. Is not his intercession in his glorified state chiefly spoken of in Scripture? Ans. Yes.

370. Why so? Ans. (1.) Not that it then commenced; it had been exercised under the Old Testament dispensation. (2.) Not as in heaven on a different ground; it was always on the ground of his atonement, but, (3.) Because then the ground of his intercession was the most manifest; because, according to the dispensation of grace, the fruits were then greatest; and to signify that now was finished, in fact, the ground on which he had always interceded.

371. Is any being whatever associated with Christ in this work or office of intercession? Ans. No.

372. Is not the Holy Spirit represented as our intercessor also? Ans. Yes; Rom. viii. 26, 27.

373. Wherein does his intercession differ from Christ's? Ans. (1.) Christ's intercession, is on the ground of his own atonement; the Holy Spirit's intercession is on the same ground—Christ's atonement. (2.) Christ's intercession is *without* us, to the Father; the Holy Spirit's is *within* us, to the Father. (3.) Christ's intercession is for us, and for the success of our prayers; the Holy Spirit's intercession is the guidance of our prayers to God through Christ; Rom. viii. 26, 27; Gal. iv. 6.

374. When the High Priest of old went into the holy place, &c., was it as an associate with Christ as intercessor? Ans. No; but as a type, leading to Christ alone.

375. When believers pray for one another, are they associated with Christ in the work? Ans. No; but as helpers of one another, making Christ the sole intercessor with God.

376. Why should we reject all associates with Christ in this work, such as angels, Mary, departed saints, &c.? Ans. (1.) Because the Scriptures hold Christ the only intercessor. (2.) Because none have ground to intercede but Christ. (3.) Christ is all-sufficient. (4.) None but he knows our wants. (5.) To employ an

intercessor with God, as mediator, is an act of worship, and due to none but Christ. (6.) To employ another is unbelief in Christ's sufficiency or compassion, or faithfulness.

377. Obj. (1.) In Rev. v. 8, we are told that the elders and the beasts have vials and odours, which are the prayers of saints? Ans. They represent the church; and the prayers are their own prayers.

378. Obj. (2.) In Rev. vi. 10, we read of souls crying aloud, and pleading with God? Ans. This is figurative;—as Abel's blood, and as the prayer of the church.

379. Obj. (3.) Kings have courtiers, by whom we approach to them? Ans. This is a mistaken view of God.

380. What is the first saving fruit of Christ's intercession for the soul? Ans. Regeneration.

381. Does he then leave his people? Ans. No.

382. How should we use Christ's intercession? Ans. By faith, desire, gratitude, application and confidence.

LECTURE XIV.—CHRIST'S KINGLY OFFICE.

§ XXXI.—383. What office does Christ, as Mediator, sustain, besides those of prophet and priest? Ans. That of King.

384. Do the Scriptures directly ascribe this office to him? Ans. Yes; as Psal. ii. 6, xlv. 2.

385. Is he not called by many names which signify the same? Ans. Yes; as "Lord," "Prince," "Head," "Ruler," &c.

386. How manifold is the kingdom of Christ? Ans. Twofold, his essential and Mediatorial kingdoms.

387. What is his essential kingdom? Ans. That which he has essentially with the Father and the Holy Spirit, called sometimes his Divine or natural kingdom, or kingdom of common providence.

388. Could this kingdom be ever given him, taken from him, or laid aside? Ans. No.

389. What is his Mediatorial kingdom? Ans. That kingdom or government which was given to him as Mediator,—as God-man, for the salvation of his church; called Mediatorial, or kingdom of grace.

390. Was this kingdom essential to Christ? Ans. No; it was given to him.

391. How are these kingdoms distinguished, or wherein do they differ? Ans. (1.) The one is essential, the other a gift and voluntary. (2.) The foundation of the first is Christ's Godhead; of the second, the covenant of grace. (3.) The object of the one is to order all things to their natural ends; of the other, to order all things to supernatural ends—to accomplish the purposes of the covenant of grace; and terminates on his church. (4.) The latter is subservient to the former.

392. Does the Mediatorial kingdom of Christ supersede his essential kingdom? Ans. No.

393. Wherein do these kingdoms agree? Ans. They are over the same persons and things; they are conducted by the same person; they effect the same ultimate end—the glory of God.

394. Do these kingdoms interfere with, or oppose one another in any thing? **Ans. No.**

395. Who gave him the Mediatorial kingdom? **Ans. The Father;** Ps. ii. 6, ex. 1; Matt. xi. 27.

396. On what account did he receive this Mediatorial kingdom? **Ans. On account of his obedience and death;** Phil. ii. 8, 9.

397. When did he receive this kingdom? **Ans. In eternity, in the making of the covenant;** Prov. viii. 23; Ps. ii.

398. When did he commence the exercise of it? **Ans. After the fall, on the giving of the gospel.**

399. When was he inaugurated? **Ans. At his ascension;** Heb. i. 3.

§ XXXII.—400. Is Christ's Mediatorial kingdom a reality, or only figurative? **Ans. It is real and proper.**

401. How does this appear? **Ans. (1.) From the name of a kingdom given to him, without any intimation that it is only figurative; and names given to him, as Ruler, Prince, &c. (2.) From the necessity of the case in carrying on his work. (3.) From the effects of his government—all things conducted for the good of his church, and his promises and predictions fulfilled.**

402. Wherein does Christ's kingly office differ from the Priestly? **Ans. (1.) It is founded on the priestly office;** Phil. ii. 8, 9. **(2.) It accomplishes the object of the priestly office, in providence. (3.) These offices differ in their acts. The one makes atonement, and procures peace; the other governs the persons purchased. The one deals with God for man; the other deals with man for God.**

403. How extensive is this kingdom? **Ans. Over all things absolutely;** 1 Cor. xv. 27.

404. But are all intelligent creatures properly the subjects of this kingdom? **Ans. No; only believers properly, and the visible church professedly.**

405. Do all believers, in all ages and places of the world, belong to this kingdom? **Ans. Yes;** Ps. ii. 8; lxxii. 8.

406. Do both soul and body of believers belong to this kingdom? **Ans. Yes.**

407. How are all creatures under Christ's kingly government, when it is only believers that are the proper subjects of it? **Ans. They are all in his hand, to be governed and disposed for the good of the church. As king of his church, he is called the Head of the church, Eph. v. 23; as king over all things, he exercises that government for the church;** Eph. i. 22.

408. Does Christ, then, as Mediator, govern all things? **Ans. Yes.**

409. But is it a Mediatorial government to any but the church? **Ans. No.**

410. What is the difference between the extent of Christ's kingdom as Mediator, under the old dispensation and the new? **Ans. No difference in extent, but in its manifestation.**

411. Is Christ's kingdom, as Mediator, spiritual or worldly? **Ans. Spiritual;** Luke xvii. 20; John xviii. 36; Rom. xiv. 17.

412. How is it spiritual, when, as Mediator, he governs all things, even those which are material? Ans. He governs temporal things for spiritual ends.

413. What do we understand by the spirituality of his kingdom? Ans. (1.) It is conducted and sustained for spiritual ends; as God's glory, salvation of his subjects from condemnation and sin, their sanctification, &c. (2.) By spiritual means; as moral laws, supernatural influences, spiritual rewards, and spiritual punishments.

414. It is objected, not only by Jews, but Millenarians, that the Scriptures describe Christ's kingdom by expressions indicating that it must possess earthly grandeur; as in Ps. lxxii. 8, and elsewhere? Ans. (1.) These must be explained by those texts which assert that his kingdom is not of this world; those which express its armour; Eph. vi. 12, &c. (2.) Christ's extensive dominion is, nevertheless, a spiritual dominion.

415. It is objected that Christ should succeed to the throne of David? Ans. This must be understood spiritually; because the civil sceptre had departed from the house of David when Christ appeared. He refused to be a temporal king. He sits on a spiritual throne, typified by David's government.

416. Does the prediction that his kingdom would overturn temporal kingdoms, intimate that it was to be temporal? Ans. No; Christ, in governing and defending his church, will, in his providence, overturn hostile civil governments; but not by maintaining a civil government himself. [See Quest. 423, &c.]

417. How long will this kingdom of Christ continue? Ans. Forever, Ps. xlv. 7; Luke i. 33.

418. Does this eternity mean a limited time, as the word sometimes means; or a certain period, or dispensation? Ans. No; it is a proper eternity that is meant.

419. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the eternity of the king. (2.) The eternity of his glory. (3.) The eternity of his subjects. (4.) The eternity of their obedience; Rev. vii. 15, 16. (5.) The eternity of their reward; 1 Thess. iv. 17.

420. It is objected that Christ, at the end of the world, will deliver up the kingdom to the Father, 1 Cor. xv. 24? Ans. He will deliver up the present administration of it, having accomplished it according to the commission given to him.

421. Obj. 1 Cor. xv. 28, declares that the Son also shall be subject to the Father, and God all in all? Ans. (1.) Christ will then no more act under the same administration. (2.) His subjection to the Father, in the Mediatorial office, will then be manifested. (3.) Christ, as God, will not be subject to the Father,—but is one with him; and his subjection is a Mediatorial subjection; and consequently his Mediatorial office is continued. (4.) God will be all in all—that is, another mode of communion between God and his redeemed people will then take place;—immediate, and not by ordinances,—in vision, and not by faith; but all through Christ.

422. But why should Christ continue as king of his church tri-

umphant, when the redemption of his people is completed? **Ans.** (1.) That Christ may eternally have the honour as **Mediator and Lord.** (2.) That his saints may always acknowledge him.

423. Does the Mediatorial government of Christ, ruling among the nations, and making them subservient to his church, destroy or diminish the spirituality of his Mediatorial government? **Ans.** No; because by his providence he directs them to spiritual ends.

424. Does Christ's government over the nations mean that he makes their civil laws, or administers them, as **Mediator**? **Ans.** No.

425. Does he not, however, give the general laws of morality, in conformity to which civil nations should make and administer their laws? **Ans.** Yes.

426. Does he do this as God, essentially considered, or as **Mediator**? **Ans.** As God.

427. How does this appear? **Ans.** (1.) This arises necessarily from God, as the moral governor, and from man's relation to him. (2.) Therefore if there had been no **Mediator**, these laws would have been given. (3.) Heathen nations have civil government as an ordinance of God: Rom. xiii. 1; and are under his law by nature.

428. Do natural things then, exist by Christ's essential, or by his Mediatorial government? **Ans.** By his essential government.

429. Does civil government originate in Christ's essential, or in his Mediatorial government? **Ans.** His essential government; Luke xii. 13, 14.

430. Yet may not these things exist by, and originate in his essential government, and be ordered and dispensed to his church by his Mediatorial government? **Ans.** Yes; 1 Cor. iii. 21, 22.

431. Has not Christ, as **Mediator**, obtained a right, by the covenant of grace, and in virtue of his atonement, to administer all things for the good of his church, which, without that covenant, could not have been governed to any such end? **Ans.** Yes; Phil. ii. 8, 9.

432. But does not Christ's Mediatorial authority lay an obligation on a people favoured with divine revelation, to acknowledge Christ as **Mediator**, and obey his law, which as **Mediator** he has given to his church? **Ans.** Yes.

433. How does this appear? **Ans.** (1.) As individual members of a nation, we are bound to acknowledge Christ as **Mediator**, and to obey his laws. (2.) In every thing we do, in civil government, as in other things, we should acknowledge him and his authority. (3.) We are bound to walk according to the best light he has given us.

434. Does it follow from these considerations that Christ has empowered civil government to rule the consciences of their subjects, and punish error by civil pains and penalties? **Ans.** No.

435. If civil government were a Mediatorial institution, however, would not this authority have been given? **Ans.** Yes; as the church must use her authority against error, by her appropriate penalties.

LECTURE XV.—KINGLY OFFICE—CONTINUED.

§ XXXIII.—436. What are the qualifications necessary to Christ's exercise of the kingly office? Ans. Infinite dignity of person; power and wisdom; independence; self-existence; and all moral perfections;—as justice, holiness, goodness and truth.

437. Could he govern without these perfections? Ans. No; his governing, therefore, proves that he is God.

438. Could the Father, consistently with his glory and government, have committed this power and glory to any being who is not God, and who is not one with himself? Ans. No.

439. Do these perfections, or this government belong to the human nature of Christ, as such? Ans. No; that nature is incapable of them; they belong to it only as personally united to the divine person; the human nature has these perfections and government in the Divine nature.

440. Are these perfections of Christ derived from the Father, or by the gifts of the Spirit? Ans. No; they are Christ's perfections essentially; they could not be derived.

441. What then was derived from the Father to the Son, for the execution of his kingly office? Ans. Authority to employ his divine perfections for Mediatorial purposes.

§ XXXIV.—442. What are the acts of Christ's kingly office? Ans. They are four;—subduing, governing and defending his people, and governing his enemies.

443. What is his work of subduing his people? Ans. As they are naturally enemies to him, and in a state of rebellion, so he subdues them to himself; Ps. cx. 3; Acts xv. 14.

444. How does he subdue? Ans. By enlightening, renewing the will and affections, and destroying the power of sin; Acts xxvi. 18; Psal. cx. 3; Mic. vii. 19.

445. By what means does he subdue them? Ans. By his word, Spirit, and providence.

446. Does not Christ employ all his offices in this work? Ans. Yes; (1.) He by his atonement, purchased his people, and laid the foundation of their persuasion, and he procures the application by his intercession. (2.) He, as Prophet, teaches by his word and Spirit. (3.) As king, he exercises his authority and power in subduing them.

447. What is Christ's work of governing his people? Ans. (1.) Giving his law, including moral laws, institutions and ordinances, and the laws respecting these, Isa. xxxiii. 22; Eph. iv. 10, 11. (2.) The internal working of obedience in the hearts of his people, leading them to holy conduct, Ps. cxliii. 10; Songs i. 4. (3.) By giving them rewards, 2 Tim. iv. 8.

448. If Christ did not exercise an internal government on the hearts of his people, would he have his reward, or any success in his work? Ans. No.

449. Does Christ, also, as King, defend his church? Ans. Yes; Matt. xvi. 18.

450. Does he defend both his church collectively, and his people individually? Ans: Yes.

451. From what does he defend them? Ans. (1.) From open persecution. (2.) From the wiles of Satan, and of wicked men, aiming to destroy her purity and existence.

452. How does he defend his church from these and all enemies? Ans. (1.) By his intercession as a Priest, Luke xxii. 32. (2.) By his Spirit enlightening, guiding, and strengthening his people. (3.) By his divine power, John x. 28; 1 Peter i. 5.

453. Does he defend his church triumphant? Ans. Yes; by removing them beyond the reach of evil.

454. Does he also govern his enemies? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26.

455. How does he govern them? Ans. By restraining them; Ps. lxxvi. 10; turning their wickedness for good to the church, and conquering them, 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26.

456. Does he not exercise his divine power for this purpose, over both the hearts and the consciences of his enemies? Ans. Yes; as Pharaoh, Saul, &c.

§ XXXV.—457. Was Christ, in all ages, the King of the church? Ans. Yes; in the old dispensation as well as the new, Isa. ix. 6, 7; xxxiii. 22.

458. Was he the king of his church in his birth, death, and in his whole humiliation? Ans. Yes; Matt. ii. 2; John xviii. 36; xix. 19; 1 Cor. ii. 8.

459. Does not this appear from the consideration both of his person and of his office? Ans. Yes; His person was always capable of being king; the church could not subsist without the exercise of this office.

460. Do the Scriptures especially represent Christ as king after his ascension, favouring the Socinian doctrine that his kingly office commenced on his exaltation; as Matt. xxviii. 18; Phil. ii. 9? Ans. No; Such texts teach (1.) That, on his exaltation, there was a greater declaration and extension of his kingdom made. (2.) That his kingly government is founded on his atonement; and that he was more openly manifested to be king at his exaltation; and that the office of king which he then more manifestly entered on, had in all preceding ages been exercised on this ground—his finished atonement.

§ XXXVI.—461. Is Christ the alone king of his church? Ans. Yes.

462. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From Scriptures ascribing the kingdom to him, and to no other; Isa. xxxiii. 22; Ps. ii. 6. (2.) Because no creature is capable of it. (3.) Because his infinite power and authority necessarily exclude all others. (4.) Because God, as an absolute God, is not the Mediatorial king of the church; as he cannot deal in mercy with sinners, but through a Mediator.

463. But might we not allow, as the Cocceians, that angels,

priests, elders, &c., were associated with Christ in the government of old? Ans. No.

464. Why not? Ans. (1.) Christ has no need of associates. (2.) All these were, and still are ministers under Christ, holding government under him, as servants and instruments.

465. If magistrates or church courts were to assume a power to make laws, annulling Christ's laws, would they not be denying Christ's authority as king, and assuming superior, or co-ordinate authority? Ans. Yes.

467. Does the obligation on the people to submit to the government of civil or ecclesiastical rulers, imply that they are associated with Christ in the government? Ans. No; only that they act in his name, and as his ministers; and their obedience to those servants is only so far as they serve Christ.

§ XXXVII.—468. Obj. (1.) The names of *gods* and *lords* were given to angels, magistrates, priests, &c., under the Old Testament, intimating that they were lords of the church? Ans. (1.) Priests were not so called. (2.) Angels and magistrates were so called, as rulers under Christ.

469. Obj. (2.) From Heb. ii. 5, it would appear that Christ committed the government of the church of old to angels? Ans. (1.) The law was given by the ministry of angels, and only in this, or such a ministerial sense, was the church of old subjected to them. (2.) But, in the new dispensation, a more glorious state of things takes place. Christ has spoken himself, and by his apostles more plainly. The design of the passage is to contrast Christ with angels in every age, and to show his superiority.

470. When our Lord, Matt. xxiii. 2, commanded the people to obey the Scribes and Pharisees, as sitting in Moses' seat, did he intimate that these officers or trustees had any independent headship? Ans. No; but as they were the constituted ministers of the word, the people should obey, so far as they taught the law.

471. How understand Gal. iv. 1-3, speaking of Old Testament saints as under tutors, and governors, &c.? Is it that priests, scribes, or magistrates, were their lords? Ans. No; but they were under the more rigid dispensation of the ceremonial law.

472. How understand Col. ii. 15, speaking of Christ's spoiling principalities and powers? Is it stripping civil or ecclesiastical rulers of a lordship held under the Old Testament? Ans. No; but Satan was stripped of his power over the elect, by Christ's atonement.

§ XXXVIII.—473. Does the declaration, Matt. ii. 7, that the priest's lips should keep knowledge, teach that they were any thing more than ministers of the word? Ans. No; and the same applies to New Testament ministers.

474. When Christ, in Luke xi. 52, speaks of the Jewish teachers taking away the key of knowledge, does it imply that they had independent authority to teach? Ans. No; no other authority than ministerial.

475. What do we understand by the key of knowledge? Ans. The Scriptures or the genuine sense of it.

476. Does the promise of saving teaching under the New Testament, made in Isa. liv. 13, and Jer. xxxi. 34, intimate that the teachers of old had independent authority, or that there would be no need of means of teaching under the New Testament? **Ans.** No; only more abundant influences of the Spirit, for saving teaching.

CHAPTER XXI.

OF THE TWO-FOLD STATE OF CHRIST.

LECTURE XVI.—HIS HUMILIATION.

§ I.—1. In what states does Christ exercise his three-fold office? **Ans.** In his states of humiliation and exaltation.

2. Were both these states necessary to the discharge of his offices? **Ans.** Yes.

3. Is not the contrast between them great and distinct? **Ans.** Yes.

4. Could created minds have conceived this two-fold state without revelation? **Ans.** No.

5. Is there not something mysterious in both states? **Ans.** Yes.

6. Is it not probable that unhumiliated and unbelieving minds would fall into error on these points? **Ans.** Yes.

7. What did the ignorant and unbelieving Jews imagine from the Old Testament descriptions of two states of the Messiah so opposite? **Ans.** They supposed there must be two Messiahs—one to be humiliated and one to be glorious;—the first to be the forerunner of the other, and to be killed in a battle with Gog and Magog;—the second to be of the seed of David, and to have a glorious temporal kingdom.

8. Did not these misconceptions prove their ignorance of the Messiah's character and work? **Ans.** Yes.

9. Did they not cause their rejection of Christ in the flesh? **Ans.** Yes.

10. Do not these different states stumble the Socinians? **Ans.** Yes; their view of his humiliation disposes them to deny his Godhead.

§ II.—11. Do the Scriptures expressly teach this two-fold state? **Ans.** Yes; as Rom. iv. 25.

12. Was this two-fold state predicted in the Old Testament?—**Ans.** Yes; as Gen. iii. 15, Psa. xvi. 10, 11, cxviii. 22; Isa. lii. 13.

13. Might we not consider Joseph and Jonah types of these two states? **Ans.** Yes.

14. Did the ceremonial law typify them? **Ans.** Y: rifices, and the Priest entering the most holy place.

§ III.—15. Is the connexion between Christ's humiliation and exaltation that of mere antecedent and consequent, or is his exaltation a proper reward of his work in his humiliation? Ans. It is a proper reward.

16. How does this appear? Ans. Direct Scriptures; Isai. liii. 10, 11, directly expresses the reward on account of his work; Phil. ii. 9, expressly grants the exaltation on the ground of his humiliation; Isai. xlix. 4; Heb. xii. 2. (2.) Because there was a covenant promise—the reward, not only of his people, for his work, but of his own exaltation. (3.) The intrinsic worth of his obedience and sufferings did merit the reward.

17. But could his humiliation merit both salvation for his people, and the reward for himself? Ans. Yes. (1.) Because there was infinite worth in his work. (2.) His exaltation and his people's salvation were necessarily, and by covenant, united. (3.) obedience and death were wholly for his people, as a fulfilment of the law, and the condition of the covenant for them. But work of Christ for the salvation of his people and the glory of God, was deserving of a reward to himself. The work he did, purchased his people, and it fulfilled his own engagement.

18. But did the divine nature stand in need of a meritorious work in order to exaltation? Ans. No; it was as Mediator that he was exalted, and not as God.

§ IV.—19. Did both the divine and human nature participate in both his humiliation and exaltation? Ans. Yes.

20. How was the human nature humbled? Ans. By being placed under the broken law, with all its consequences.

21. How was it exalted? Ans. To glory, in union to the Son of God.

22. Did not this humiliation and exaltation of the human nature imply changes in its state and condition? Ans. Yes.

23. How was the divine nature humbled? Ans. (1.) By veiling his glory; Phil. ii. 7. (2.) By subjecting himself to the Father, as Mediator, and as a servant in human nature. (3.) In appearing in human nature. (4.) In subjecting himself to the law in his human nature.

24. Did all this imply any change in the Divine nature? Ans. No.

25. How does it appear that the divine nature partook in the humiliation? Ans. From Phil. ii. 7, "he humbled or emptied himself," which could not refer to his human nature, for he is expressly described as in the form of God, and equal with God.

26. How was the divine nature exalted? Ans. In manifesting his glory—unveiling it.

27. How does it appear that the divine nature was exalted?—Ans. (1.) As the divine nature was humbled by veiling, so it was exalted by unveiling. (2.) Phil. ii. 9, speaks of the exaltation of the same nature that was humbled, and which had been described as divine; so John xvii. 5. (3.) The human nature itself was not capable of the exaltation described, Phil. ii. 10.

28. Did this imply any change in the Divine nature? **Ans.** No.

29. But was it absolute, as God, or as man, that he was humbled or exalted? **Ans.** No; but as Mediator; in which both natures partake, according to each nature respectively.

§ V.—30. Is Christ's humiliation or exaltation first in order? **Ans.** His humiliation is the antecedent, and was in order to exaltation.

31. Are Christ's emptying of himself, as expressed, Phil. ii. 7, and his humiliation, Acts viii. 33, of precisely the same import? **Ans.** They imply the same. The one immediately refers to what he was, and from what he condescended; the other to what he descended.

§ VI.—32. How many steps may be reckoned in Christ's humiliation? **Ans.** Six.

33. Which is the first? **Ans.** Incarnation; Gal. iv. 4; 2 Cor. viii. 9, &c.

34. What circumstances in his incarnation were humbling?—**Ans.** (1.) He was united to our nature. (2.) And that under subjection to the law, in its precept, as a servant, Gal. iv. 4. (3.) Under the law in its curse; Gal. iii. 13. (4.) Under our sins imputed to him; 1 Pet. ii. 24. (5.) Under weakness, poverty, and meanness, in consequence of guilt imputed.

35. Obj. (1.) The divine nature is still, even in his state of exaltation, united personally to the human;—and how then was it humiliating to be united to it? Why is he not still in a state of humiliation? **Ans.** His incarnation was under the law, the curse, and imputed guilt, and in weakness, poverty, &c., none of which exist now. And his present state, even in glory, is condescension, but not humiliation.

36. Obj. (2.) Various displays of divine majesty attended his conception and birth. How then could he be said to be humbled? **Ans.** He was, notwithstanding, in a state of humiliation; the divine glory was still veiled; and he was still under the law.

37. Obj. (3.) Humiliation presupposes a preëxisting subject; and as this was only the divine nature, which could suffer no damage, how was he humbled? **Ans.** (1.) Though the divine nature was not changed, its glory was veiled. (2.) The divine nature did, in human nature, become a servant, &c. (3.) Even the human nature preëxisting was humbled, as placed under a broken law, which it had not violated, and under guilt which it had not contracted by its own sin.

38. Did, then, Christ's atonement begin in his incarnation? **Ans.** Yes.

39. What was the second step of humiliation? **Ans.** His afflicted life.

40. Was this humiliation suffered during his private life, as well as his public? **Ans.** Yes; as his mean circumstances, flight into Egypt, labour, &c.

41. How long did his private life continue? **Ans.** Till about 30 years of age.

42. What do we mean by his private life? Is it that he was not then sustaining the public character of Mediator? Ans. No; but he had not begun his public ministry.

43. Are we not left in ignorance of the particular circumstances and actions of the greater part of his private life? Ans. Yes.

44. But should we not consider the few circumstances recorded as indicative of the manner of his whole private life? Ans. Yes.

45. What accounts have we of him during his private life, after his birth and flight to Egypt and return? Ans. (1.) That he grew in stature, and in wisdom, and that the grace of God was on him; Luke ii. 40, 52. (2.) That he was subject to his parents; Luke ii. 51. (3.) That he lived in comparative poverty—inferred from the circumstances of his birth; Luke ix. 58; John xix. 26, 27. (4.) That he had not an education at the schools; John vii. 15. (5.) That it is entirely probable that he laboured as a carpenter; Mark vi. 3.

46. Did not all these circumstances show a state of humiliation? Ans. Yes.

47. Did his remarkable conduct in the temple at twelve years of age, recorded Luke xii. 41—49, intimate that he had then entered on his public life? Ans. No; but (1.) It gave indication of his true character and work. (2.) It was his Father's business, learning, and beginning to show his character.

48. What was the use of the long, and varied, private life of Christ? Ans. (1.) To prove him a real man. (2.) That he might experience the ordinary scenes of trial and affliction. (3.) That, as truly man, he might advance from childhood to maturity.

§ VIII.—49. When did Christ's public life begin? Ans. At his baptism.

50. How long did it continue? Ans. Something over three years.

51. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the three Passovers recounted by John; ii. 13; vi. 4; xi. 55. (2.) From Dan. ix. 27. (3.) From the parable, Luke xiii. 7, 8.

52. Some have supposed that Christ's public life continued four full years, from Luke vi. 1, "*second sabbath after the first.*"—How answer? Ans. Though no doubt Luke refers to a Passover, yet it may be one of the Passovers related by John. *Deuteroprot* signifies, we think, the first sabbath after the Passover; counting the second day of the Passover, the beginning of the solemnity properly, Levit. xxiii. 6. Counting the beginning of the Passover a sabbath and the first—then the first sabbath after it was the second of that solemnity, but the first in the count of the Pentecost.

53. Wherein was Christ humbled in his life? Ans. In afflictions common to men, as poverty, hunger, &c.; and afflictions peculiar to himself, as temptation by Satan, reproach, and persecutions in his work.

§ IX.—54. What was the third step of humiliation? Ans. His last

sufferings before his death, his betrayal, desertion by his disciples, the sentence against him, &c.

55. Was this suffering both real and severe? **Ans. Yes.**

56. How does the severity of these sufferings appear? **Ans.** Besides the wrath of God—it appears, as a severity of natural suffering, (1.) From the persons causing them; as his disciple Judas betraying, and the rest forsaking him, the Jewish Rulers, the Gentiles, the Governor, and soldiers, and Satan. (2.) The multitude of evils inflicted,—he was betrayed, condemned, mocked, bound, scourged, and crucified. (3.) The severity of the kind of punishment—the cross, &c.

57. Were these sufferings necessary? **Ans. Yes.**

58. On what account? **Ans.** (1.) The justice of God. (2.) The truth of God in the threatening of the law, and in the predictions of types and promises.

59. Were they voluntary? **Ans. Yes; Psa. xl. 9.**

60. Could they be otherwise than voluntary by him who was under no obligation to engage in this work? **Ans. No.**

61. Could they be otherwise acceptable? **Ans. No.**

62. How then understand his prayers for relief? **Matt. xxvi. 39; Heb. v. 7.** **Ans.** These prayers testified the natural aversion of humanity to such sufferings; yet they were submissive.

63. Do not the sufferings of Christ directly tend to our consolation and sanctification? **Ans. Yes; as they are the ground of our peace, procured our sanctification, and are an inducement to crucify the flesh; Gal. v. 24.**

§ X.—64. What was the usual shape of the cross? **Ans. An upright post, crossed by a horizontal bar, near the top.**

65. How was the person fastened to it? **Ans. With ropes, or nails.**

66. Did Helen, the mother of Constantine, find the literal cross? **Ans. No; it is a fable.**

LECTURE XVII.—HUMILIATION CONTINUED.

§ XI.—67. What was the fourth step? **Ans. His death.**

68. Was his death proved to be real? **Ans. Yes; by the flowing of blood and water from his pierced side—John xix. 34, 35—a proof that the pericardium was broken; the testimony of the centurion, the delivering of the body to Joseph, and his burial, which friends would not have performed if he had not been dead.**

69. What is the importance of that testimony, by John, of the piercing of Christ's side? **John xix. 34, 35.** **Ans.** (1.) The proof of the reality of his death; blood and water were from the region of the heart. (2.) It was a literal performance of the prediction, **Zech. xii. 10.** (3.) It signified the atoning and cleansing virtue of his death; **John v. 6.**

70. Was the reality of his death necessary? **Ans. Yes.**

71. Why so? **Ans.** (1.) Justice required it. (2.) The truth of the threatening of the law required it. (3.) The truth of types, prophecies, and promises.

72. Was his death voluntary? **Ans. Yes; John x. 17, 18.**

73. Was it not necessary, in order to his acceptance as our atonement, that his death should be voluntary? Ans. Yes; otherwise it would not be a service of the heart; it would not have consisted with his voluntary undertaking; and it would not have been consistent with his engagement.

74. Did the time of his death suit the predictions and types of it? Ans. Yes; it was at the Passover, the season in which Israel were delivered from Egyptian bondage; and it was at the hour of the evening oblation.

75. Was there any thing in the place of his death suited to the types? Ans. Yes; the sin-offering was burned without the camp, Lev. xvi., &c.; so Christ suffered without the gates of Jerusalem.

76. Was there any thing instructive, respecting our duty, in the place where Christ suffered? Ans. Yes; Heb. xiii. 11—13. We should adhere to him, and profess his name under reproach.

77. What use should we make of his death? Ans. (1.) As the ground of our peace with God. (2.) For our consolation. (3.) For excitement to duty; 2 Cor. v. 15.

§ XII.—78. What was the fifth step? Ans. His burial.

79. Why was his burial necessary? Ans. (1.) As the fulfilment of prophecy and of types; as Isa. liii. 9; and Jonah. (2.) To give full proof that he was dead. He was buried by friends and not by enemies. (3.) To preserve decently the body from enemies, and from animals.

80. Was this step of humiliation under the curse of the law, as the preceding steps were? Ans. No; the law was now satisfied; but his burial was a proof of death, and it was the will of God that death should have dominion for a time, for this purpose.

81. What circumstances attending his burial are to be considered as the fulfilment of prophecy and types? Ans. His burial by rich men, and his continuing for part of three days in the grave.

82. How was his burial by Joseph and Nicodemus the fulfilment of prophecy? Ans. Isa. liii. 9; "with the rich in his death."

83. How understand the prediction "he made his grave with the wicked?" Ans. Various opinions are held; as crucifixion with malefactors; (but this was not burial.) The sepulchre's being near to Calvary; as if it meant that the grave was near that scene of wicked action; (this is foreign;) that his grave was with wicked keepers, &c. The original is, "he gave or set the wicked his grave, and the rich in his death." It probably means, as he gave the rich to furnish him a grave, so he gave wicked Pilate to allow him a grave, which was not allowed to criminals crucified, and that Pilate granted this from conviction that, though crucified, he was innocent; indicated by the following words, *upon* or *because* he had done no violence."

84. How was his continuing for a part of three days in the grave, a fulfilment of prophecy? Ans. Jonah, three days, &c., in the fish; and Hos. vi. 2.

85. Was he three full days and nights in the grave? Ans. No; he was buried the evening before the Sabbath, lay in the grave

during the Jewish Sabbath, and rose in the early part of the first day of the week.

86. How was this called three days? Ans. From the Jewish method of calculating, including the day of beginning and the day of ending in the same count.

87. But, in Matt. xii. 40, it is expressly said, three days and three nights? Ans. The whole twenty-four hours were called *nuchthemera*, by the Jews. The first evening was a day and a night; so the second; the third included part of the night, and was a part of the whole day.

88. What instruction do these circumstances afford? Ans. (1.) That Christ was truly the Messiah; minute circumstances predicted occurring in his case, and darkly predicted and not understood till fulfilled; the fulfilment was not to be attributed to the design of the actors. (2.) That Christ's innocency was acknowledged by some members of the great council of the Jews, as Joseph, and Nicodemus, and even by Pilate. (3.) That Christ had, even in his humiliation and death, the command of the hearts of the godly and ungodly, and had, though poor, the wealth of the world at his command. (4.) That he so ordered matters, that Joseph and Nicodemus acknowledged his high character by ointment, spices, and fine linen, such as were used among the Jews in the burial of kings and eminent men; so Jacob, Joseph, &c.

89. Were there any other circumstances attending his burial worthy of notice, and instructive? Ans. Yes; as the sepulchre in a rock,—a new sepulchre,—not his own, but a rich man's,—in a garden,—near the place of crucifixion,—and the time at which he was buried.

90. What instruction is derived from them? Ans. (1.) The sepulchre being in a rock, furnished security against a breach, and theft of the body; so that his resurrection was incontestable. (2.) It was a new sepulchre, so that it could not be alleged that it was another that arose, or that he was raised by virtue of a departed prophet, as the man was raised by touching Elisha's body, 2 Kings xiii. 21. (3.) It was not his own; he was still poor, but had the command of all wealth. (4.) It was in a garden; in a garden man sinned; in a garden Christ finished his humiliation and redemption, and in a garden he commenced his last sorrows, and in a garden he ended them. (5.) It was near the place of crucifixion;—so in an adjoining garden he openly triumphed. (6.) The time of burial,—as the Sabbath drew on; to set aside the Old Testament Sabbath, and introduce the new.

91. What connexion had this step of Christ's humiliation with our salvation? Ans. (1.) Though the work of atonement was finished on the cross, yet the acceptance of his work was not openly acknowledged till this step was taken; and therefore it is said "*He was raised for our justification.*" Thus our sin was by his burial, taken away, or buried; our sanctification was exemplified and promised, Rom. vi. 4, 5; ceremonial observances were abolished, and death, as a curse to his people, done away.

92. What was the form of sepulchres hewn in rocks among the Jews? Ans. A cavern with a floor; on each side of the floor was an excavation six or seven feet deep, containing cavities for coffins. Thus Peter, Luke xxiv. 12, and Peter and John, John xx. 5—8, went in to the floor, and stooped down to see the linen clothes, &c.

§ XIII.—93. What is the sixth step? Ans. Christ's suffering divine wrath;—its immediate infliction by the hand of God; which was not a different step in order of time, but an ingredient, especially in his last sufferings.

94. But in what sense could Christ suffer divine wrath, since he was the object of the Father's eternal love, and as God he could not suffer? Ans. (1.) God's wrath was not against him personally, but against the sin of his people, imputed to him, and assumed by him; and therefore he suffered the effects of wrath against sin. (2.) The divine nature did not suffer even the effects of wrath in itself, but in the human nature.

95. How prove that he suffered the power of God's wrath on his soul? Ans. Direct texts; as Matt. xxvi. 37, 38; John xii. 27; Luke xxii. 44.

96. But it has been argued that this trouble of soul was but the sympathy of the soul with the body in its sufferings, inflicted, or in prospect? Ans. (1.) His agony, Luke xxii. 44, producing bloody sweat, conveys the idea of an agitation and distress of soul, inconsistent with the virtue, firmness, and faith which characterized our Lord, on supposition that it was only in view of bodily suffering. (2.) His cry on the cross, Matt. xxvii. 46, decidedly declares that his soul suffered the effects of wrath. (3.) Psalm lxix. is an expression of Christ's sufferings; as appears from verse 9, compared with John ii. 14—17, Rom. xv. 3; and verse 21, compared with Matt. xxvii. 31, 48, John xix. 28, 29. But in that psalm he complains of waters coming into his soul, sinking in deep mire, and floods overflowing him, expressive of wrath. (4.) The fact that he was made under the law—made a curse for us, and justice requiring that, in order to our deliverance, that wrath must be sustained by the Saviour, proves his suffering of the curse in his soul.

97. Was it not this suffering in his soul that was the chief part of his sufferings? Ans. Yes.

98. Is it any objection to this doctrine that the Scriptures speak so much of Christ's body and blood? Ans. No; (1.) These gave the visible evidence of his sufferings. (2.) It is the visible part by *Synecdoche* for the whole, and (3.) Other places, as quoted, show that he suffered the wrath of God in his soul.

99. It is objected that ancient types and sacraments did not represent sufferings of the soul? Ans. (1.) Types could not directly exhibit soul-sufferings; as they were visible representations. (2.) Christ's sufferings, as well as his other works, exceed all types and signs. (3.) Yet, as we learn from the New Testament that Christ suffered, we can clearly see the same thing signified in the roasting of the Paschal lamb, and offerings made by fire.

100. Obj. If Christ suffered the curse in his soul, he must suffer to eternity, and suffer despair? Ans. (1.) Eternity of suffering was not necessary in a Saviour of infinite dignity. (2.) Despair of a happy event, and despair as a sinner, belongs only to a finite, and a sinful creature.

§ XIV.—101. What is the authority of the Apostles' Creed? Ans. No more than other human confessions of faith. It was not written by the apostles, though by some ascribed to them; but written by some one in early times, embracing outlines of the apostles' doctrines. Nor does it appear that in early times it contained all the expressions which it contains now; as appears from those who wrote respecting it.

102. What view should we now take of the doctrines of that creed? Ans. We should explain its articles in agreeableness to the Scriptures.

103. What do the Papists hold on the expression in the creed, that, "Christ descended into hell?" Ans. That after death he descended into hell, literally, (1.) To triumph over the powers of hell. (2.) To preach the Gospel to the spirits in prison. (3.) To deliver the Old Testament saints from *Limbo*—Purgatory.

LECTURE XVIII.—HUMILIATION CONTINUED. EXALTATION.

§ XV.—104. Did Christ descend into hell literally, for any purpose? Ans. No.

105. Why not descend in order to triumph over the powers of hell? Ans. Because he did this on the cross; Col. ii. 14, 15.

106. Why not descend in order to preach the gospel? Ans. Because the spirits in prison are not objects of the gospel offer.

107. Why not descend in order to deliver Old Testament saints departed, from purgatory? Ans. Because they were never there.

108. After Christ's death, as his body was in the grave, was not his soul in heaven? Ans. Yes; Luke xxiii. 43, 46.

109. In what sense, if in any, may we hold the expression in the creed sound, that Christ descended into hell? Ans. That it means simply *the state of the dead*,—or that Christ suffered the sorrows of hell, in his agony in the garden, or on the cross.

110. But it is objected (1.) Christ is said to be in the heart of the earth? Matt. xii. 40. Ans. It means, evidently, *in the earth*—the grave. Even the heart of the earth is not *hell*.

111. Obj. (2.) Ps. xvi. 10; Acts ii. 27, Christ says, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell." How answer? Ans. (1.) Soul is often put for the person, Acts vii. 14; and sometimes even for the body, as Levit. xix. 28. "Cuttings in your flesh for the dead," original, *עַד, soul*; Josh. x. 28, 30, 32; xi. 11. (2.) It therefore means the state of the dead, as the word usually does—*sheol* and *hades*. (3.) It was only that which could experience corruption, that was not to be left in hell. As this was only the body, and it in the grave, in the state of the dead, so Christ was not in hell.

112. Obj. (3.) What is to be understood by Christ's descending

into the lower parts of the earth? Eph. iv. 9. Ans. At all events, not hell; but, as Ps. cxxxix. 15, it may mean his incarnation; or, as Matt. xii. 40, his burial in the heart of the earth.

113. Obj. (4.) How understand 1 Pet. iii. 19, "went and preached to the spirits in prison?" Ans. (1.) That passage speaks of Christ in the divine nature, acting as Mediator, under the Old Testament dispensation. (2.) In the days of Noah, he preached, by the instrumentality of Noah, to those of Noah's time, who are now spirits in prison.

114. Would not this article be most consistently understood of Christ's sorrows on the cross? Ans. Yes; as the death and burial of Christ were stated in the former part of the creed in plain language, it would seem inconsistent to repeat the same idea in obscure language, in a brief symbol, as the creed is; and therefore we prefer to take it as meaning Christ's suffering the pains of hell, or the curse, in his agony in the garden, and on the cross.

115. Is it any objection to this, that it is mentioned in the creed after asserting Christ's death? Ans. No; it is only passing from a statement of the lesser sufferings to the greater.

§ XVI.—116. In all Christ's humiliation are we to understand that the Godhead of Christ was either in itself humbled, or the subject of suffering? Ans. No.

117. Or are we to hold, as the human nature only was in itself capable of suffering, that, by its sufferings, our salvation is procured? Ans. No.

118. How then understand Christ's humiliation and sufferings, and the merit of them? Ans. The human nature suffered in personal union with the divine person. That personal union gave infinite value to the sufferings in human nature. The divine person being personally united to the human nature, the sufferings of the latter were the sufferings of the divine person. Thus Christ, as Mediator, humbled himself, and suffered.

119. Do not the Scriptures plainly warrant these views, when they speak of God purchasing his church with his own blood, as Acts xx. 28; and of the blood of the Son of God cleansing us from all sin? 1 John i. 7. Ans. Yes.

120. Do not these and such Scripture expressions, ascribing blood to the Son of God,—to God himself, necessarily imply the personal union? Ans. Yes.

§ XVII.—121. What is the other state of the Lord Jesus Christ? ✓
Ans. *Exaltation.*

122. Is Christ, in Scripture, said to be exalted? Ans. Yes; ✓
Phil. ii. 9.

123. Is not the same thing sometimes expressed by the word *glorified*? Ans. Yes; as John vii. 39; Luke xxiv. 26; 1 Pet. i. 11.

124. Was Christ's exaltation foretold in the Old Testament? Ans. Yes; Ps. xxiv., xlvii., lxviii.

125. What was exalted? or wherein was Christ exalted? Ans. The person of the Mediator.

126. Was the human nature of Christ really exalted? **Ans. Yes.**

127. Wherein was the human nature exalted? **Ans. To happiness, and to honour, as united with the person of the Son.**

128. Was Christ exalted only in human nature? **Ans. No; the Mediatorial person was exalted.**

129. Could the human nature be exalted to possess, in itself, divine perfections, and to perform the work of the Mediator? **Ans. No.**

130. Could the Divine nature be made essentially more glorious? **Ans. No.**

131. How, then, was the person of the Mediator exalted? **Ans. (1.) In the manifestation of the divine glory. (2.) In the glorious change of the human nature from humiliation to happiness and glory. (3.) The whole person in the exercise of his office.**

132. To what was Christ exalted? **Ans. (1.) To personal glory; John xvii. 1, 5. (2.) To the enjoyment of his reward; John xvii. 1, 5; Phil. ii. 8, 9. (3.) To a glorious exercise of Mediatorial work; Heb. ix. 12, 24.**

133. To what work was he exalted? **Ans. To apply redemption; Heb. ix. 12, 23—28; to save; Heb. vii. 25.**

134. To what work is Christ exalted in applying and saving? **Ans. (1.) To intercede; Heb. vii. 25; ix. 23, 24. (2.) To send the Spirit for enlightening, sanctifying, guiding and comforting; John vii. 39; xiv. 26; xvi. 7—13. To save, by his power as king, in ruling in his people, ruling over them, and ruling for them; Is. xxxiii. 22; Ps. ii.; cx.; 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26; Heb. x. 12, 13; Eph. i. 22.**

135. What was the necessity for Christ's exaltation? **Ans. (1.) There was no need, and therefore no propriety in a continued humiliation. (2.) It was proper that he should have his reward in glory. (3.) To apply redemption; which needed not continual humiliation, and which suits well to a state of glory. (4.) To fulfil types and prophecies; as the high priest entering into the most holy place; and Ps. xlvii. lxviii. (5.) To perfect the happiness of his people, in his glorified presence. (6.) To strengthen our faith in God; 1 Pet. i. 21.**

§ XVIII.—136. Was our Lord at once raised to the highest step of exaltation to which he was entitled as Mediator? **Ans. No.**

137. Why raised by various steps? **Ans. (1.) In order to perform the various things which he had to do in each step. (2.) That his exaltation might answer to the various steps of his humiliation. (3.) And that his exaltation might be attended with sufficient evidence to support our faith.**

138. How many steps are usually reckoned? **Ans. Four; resurrection, ascension, sitting, and judgment.**

§ XIX.—139. What was the resurrection of Christ or in what did it consist? **Ans. (1.) In reviving his dead body to life. (2.) In its reünion with his human soul. (3.) And all this in the continued union of soul and body with the divine person.**

140. Did not all this imply that in his death there was a real separation of the soul and body? **Ans. Yes.**

141. But had either soul or body in death been separated from the divine nature? Ans. No; because Christ is continually the Emanuel—the Mediator; the human nature never subsisted by itself; and, even in death, Christ had power to raise his body, John x. 17, 18.

142. To whom is this work ascribed in Scripture? Ans. Sometimes to the Father, and sometimes to the Son, Acts ii. 24, 32; Eph. i. 20.

143. Why ascribed to the Father? Ans. (1.) On account of the unity of essence among the divine persons; the Three-one God acting in the person of the Father. (2.) That the order of operation might appear according to the order of subsistence. (3.) On account of the character of Judge which the Father sustains in the economy of redemption; accepting Christ's work as the fulfilment of the covenant condition; absolving his Son from the claims of the law; giving up the sinner's bond, and acknowledging Christ's claims to the promises of the covenant; and giving him his reward, Rom. i. 4; vi. 4; 1 Pet. i. 21.

144. Why is Christ's resurrection ascribed to himself? Ans. (1.) As he is God, and one with the Father. (2.) To show his right to exercise that power in his resurrection, as he had fulfilled his work, John x. 17, 18.

145. Does the ascription of this work to the Father contradict the doctrine that Christ rose by his own power? Ans. No; because he is one God with the Father; it is only on the error of the Unitarians that there is any seeming inconsistency.

146. Do the prayers of Christ, ascribed to him, Heb. v. 7, tend to invalidate the doctrine that Christ arose by his own power? Ans. No; this only showed his voluntary subjection in office to the Father, and his natural subjection and dependence in his human nature.

147. Did the Holy Spirit take part in this work? Ans. Yes; concurring with the other persons of the Trinity, as one God with them.

§ XXII.—(*Transposed.*)—148. Did Christ rise with the same body which was laid in the grave? Ans. Yes; the same numerically, and in species, and essential qualities; Luke xxiv. 39; visible, palpable, of the same dimensions and appearance; Luke xxiv. 16, 31.

149. Had his body the marks of crucifixion? Ans. Yes; John xx. 20, 26, 27; Luke xxiv. 40; Rev. v. 6.

150. But, though it was the same body, was it not in some respects changed? Ans. Yes; it was glorified and immortal; Acts xiii. 34; Rom. vi. 9.

151. Was it not a spiritual body? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. xv. 44; Phil. iii. 21.

152. Can we comprehend or understand this? Ans. No.

153. Was he then subjected to infirmities? Ans. No.

154. How explain the fact of his eating, Luke xxiv. 43? Ans. He did not eat from necessity, but to confirm his disciples' faith, while he condescended to stay with them.

155. Are we to suppose that Christ's body, after his resurrection, was immaterial? Ans. No.

156. May we suppose that while Christ remained in the world, after his resurrection, his glory was manifested as it is now in heaven? Ans. No; it was still veiled, so far as to suit his stay among men.

157. Would it be admissible to suppose that Christ's body was formed out of new matter? Ans. No; this would be a creation, not a resurrection. It would not be his own body, in which he tabernacled with us.

158. Was it the same human soul which had suffered, that was now reunited to the same body? Ans. Yes.

159. Had it all the essential characteristics of the human soul? Ans. Yes.

160. Did his human soul now partake of any divine attributes? Ans. No; it was still finite in its powers, and still dependent.

LECTURE XIX.—CHRIST'S EXALTATION,—CONTINUED.

§ XXI.—161. Is not the fact of Christ's resurrection an essential article of faith? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. xv. 14–20; as also the history of it proves, and the many evidences afforded us of the fact.

162. What evidences have we of the fact? Ans. Many;—

(1.) Is there not strong evidence from the circumstances at the sepulchre? Ans. Yes; (*a*) as in a rock; a great stone to close it, and yet found empty on the third day. (*b*) The care of the Jews to secure the body from theft; sealing the stone, and setting a guard of soldiers, Matt. xxvii. 66; and yet found empty on the third day.

(2.) What evidence did the angels give? Ans. That Christ was not there—was risen; and inviting the women to see for themselves that he was not there, Matt. xxviii. 6; Mark xvi. 5, 6; Luke xxiv. 5, 6; they went in and saw that he was not there.

(3.) Did enemies give evidence of this fact? Ans. Yes; the soldiers who kept watch, testified to the facts about his resurrection, Matt. xxviii. 11.—What evidence arose from this testimony, since they publicly reported that the body was taken away by theft? Matt. xxviii. 12–15. Ans. (*a*) In one fact they agreed with the testimony of the angels, disciples, and women, and none contradicted it, viz., that the body did not remain in the sepulchre. (*b*) They did not allege that it was taken away by a force of men that overpowered them; it was therefore removed by a force which they could not control. (*c*) The story they reported, proved its own fallacy, and a truth which they were unwilling to acknowledge. That the story was false, is evident; if asleep, they could not know that the disciples had taken him, as they alleged. But there is no reason to believe that they were asleep, because the Roman military law was severe on a sentinel; to sleep on guard was punishable by death. And there is no reason to believe that, if one fell asleep, they all did.

(4.) Was not the malignity of the Jews itself a confirming evidence? Ans. Yes; as they would have denied the fact of his removal from the grave, if they could. And they would have prosecuted the disciples, in order to recover the body, if they believed that they had taken it.

(5.) What evidence from the testimony of friends? Ans. (a.) There was the testimony of several women, that the body was removed from the sepulchre, and that they had seen a vision of angels, who said he had risen. (b.) The testimony of at least two of the disciples, that the body was removed, John xx. 6—9; and that the linen clothes and napkin were so arranged as proved that there had not been theft; for if it had been removed by theft, they would have taken the clothes, or if they were dropped in their haste and trepidation, the clothes would not have been so arranged. (c.) All the disciples saw him several times, and did eat and drink with him after he rose; Acts x. 40, 41; John xxi. They conversed with him several times; they handled and felt him, saw and felt his hands, feet and side, to recognise the wounds. (d.) Above five hundred brethren saw him at once, 1 Cor. xv. 6; which was no doubt at their meeting in Galilee. (e.) The disciples had not expected this event, not understanding the Scriptures; and therefore were unwilling to believe it, and did not, till the evidence was incontestable.

(6.) How long did Christ continue on earth after his resurrection? Ans. Forty days; Acts i. 3. Did not this afford time for abundant proof? Ans. Yes.

(7.) What evidence that the women and disciples told the truth? Ans. (a.) Some seeing him at one time, and others at other times, and telling it, they had not time or opportunity for concert by intrigue; nothing but the truth could produce their agreement. (b.) Their unwillingness to believe it, and not expecting it, proves that nothing but truth could be the basis of their story. (c.) They knew not to what use to turn the whole matter, but as they were taught of God; therefore, when they first told it, they could have no object in view but the truth. (d.) Their whole testimony was against their interest in the world, and against their safety. Nothing but the truth and their sincerity would lead them to tell it.

(8.) Was he not seen by Stephen and Paul after his ascension? Ans. Yes.

(9.) But was Christ seen by these men in the body, or only symbolically, or in a trance? Ans. We believe he was seen in the body; for Paul makes this necessary to apostleship; 1 Cor. xv. 8; 1 Cor. ix. 1.

(10.) Is it any objection to this that Christ is in heaven? Ans. No; as the apostles could be enabled even to see him in heaven.

(11.) But would not either mode of sight prove the resurrection? Ans. Yes; even if symbolically, because God would not give a false revelation.

(12.) Was not the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, a proof of his resurrection? Ans. Yes; Acts ii. 33.

(13.) Were not all the miracles performed by the apostles in his name, a proof of it? Ans. Yes; God would not by miracles sustain a falsehood.

(14.) Is not the experience, in all believers, of the power of divine grace, a proof of it? Ans. Yes; they experience and show, in their lives, what Christ promised to believers in his resurrection and ascension, and what no other means has ever effected among men.

§ XX.—(15.) Was not Christ's resurrection foretold in the Old Testament? Ans. Yes.

(16.) How foretold? Ans. (a.) By prophecy, Ps. xvi. 10; cx. 7; Is. liii. 10; lv. 3; compared with Acts xiii. 34. (b.) By types; as Joseph, Isaac, Jonah, the scape-goat, &c.

(17.) Was this a proof that Christ has actually arisen? Ans. Yes; Luke xxiv. 26, 27; and the facts answer to the prophecy.

163. But why did not Christ appear to the Jews generally, for further proof? Ans. (1.) It was God's will that he should appear only to chosen witnesses; Acts x. 41. (2.) The evidence which he chose is entirely sufficient. (3.) The unbelieving Jews, long rejecting him, were not to be favoured with a sight of him.

164. Was it not improper that Christ should always remain in his humbled state, when his work in humiliation was done, and therefore a matter of right and justice that he should arise? Ans. Yes; Acts ii. 24.

165. Did not Christ merit a resurrection in order to his reward? Ans. Yes; Phil. ii.

166. Was it not necessary that he should arise, that he might be proved to be the Son of God, and his work accepted? Ans. Yes; 1 Peter i. 21; Rom. i. 4.

167. Are not all these reasons for his resurrection proofs of the fact, corroborating the history? Ans. Yes.

168. Does reason, or the light of nature, forbid the belief that Christ rose from the dead, even though it might not prove the fact? Ans. No; Acts xxvi. 8. Reason teaches that there is a Creator, a First Cause, and that the Creator is able to raise the dead.

§ XXIV.—169. Is the resurrection of Christ useful and necessary to us? Ans. Yes.

170. Wherein? Ans. (1.) For our justification, Rom. iv. 25. (2.) For our sanctification. (3.) Comfort. (4.) Glorification.

171. Wherein necessary for our justification, when his death finished the atonement? Ans. (1.) Though his death finished the atonement, the application of it by the living Saviour was necessary in order to our actual justification. (2.) Christ's resurrection was the taking up of the sinner's bond. (3.) Christ's resurrection was the expression to us, by God, that Christ's work was accepted, and that he was then justified, or acquitted from the debt which he had taken on him for our sakes.

172. Did Christ arise only for himself, or as a public person, and as the representative of his people? Ans. As a public person, and as the representative of his people, Rom. iv. 25; vi. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 20.

173. Wherein did Christ's resurrection procure our sanctification? **Ans.** (1.) Not meritoriously; for this was finished by his death; but (2.) He rose to procure our actual sanctification, which he had purchased. (3.) Receiving life, not only for himself, but for us, as our representing head, he arose to communicate it to us, in our regeneration and sanctification; Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12; iii. 1; Phil. iii. 10. (4.) His resurrection teaches us to set our affections on things above, where Christ is; Col. iii. 1, 2.

174. How did Christ's resurrection provide for our glorification? **Ans.** (1.) Rising as our public head, secured our resurrection and glorification; 1 Cor. xv. 13, 14, 20; John xiv. 19. (2.) He rose to procure the application of redemption to us. (3.) He took possession of heaven in our name; Heb. vi. 20; John xiv. 2, 3.

175. How did Christ's resurrection provide for our comfort? **Ans.** (1.) To assure us of his acceptance in his work. (2.) Of our acceptance in him, as he arose in our name. (3.) To assure us of meetness for heaven. (4.) To assure us of heavenly rest. (5.) To be our way to the Father.

§ XXIII.—176. At what time did Christ arise after his death? **Ans.** The third day.

177. Why at that time? **Ans.** (1.) That he might give due proof of death, and yet not remain longer in the grave than necessary. (2.) To fulfil predictions and types.

178. On what day of the week did he arise? **Ans.** The first day.

179. Did not this sanctify the first day of the week to be the Sabbath? **Ans.** Yes; Heb. iv. 10.

180. At what time of the day or night did he arise? **Ans.** Early in the morning; or at the dawning of the day, Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 1.

181. Was it fully day-light? **Ans.** No; John xx. 1.

182. Why may we suppose it was that he arose before clear day? **Ans.** (1.) He did not choose that people generally should be witnesses of it. (2.) That not even the women, who came after break of day, should see it.

[In what manner did he arise? **Ans.** Gloriously, triumphantly, with signs and wonders.—Who were his attendants? **Ans.** Angels.—Did he need their assistance? **Ans.** No; they were his ministering servants.]

LECTURE XX.—CHRIST'S EXALTATION.—CONTINUED.

§ XXVIII.—183. What is the second step of Christ's exaltation? **Ans.** His ascension.

184. In what sense can it be said that Christ ascended? **Ans.** (1.) Not in his essence, as he is omnipresent. (2.) Not as God absolutely; as such he was never humbled; but, (3.) In his human nature he did ascend into heaven. (4.) In his official character as God-man Redeemer. In this character he served in his humiliation. In this character he is now exalted.

185. When his ascension is spoken of as the act of the Father, what word do we use to express it? **Ans.** *Exalted*; Acts ii. 33.

186. When it is spoken of as his own act, what is it called? **Ans.** *Ascension*; Eph. iv. 8—10.

187. Do the Scriptures, on the doctrine of his exaltation to heaven, convey the idea of the Father's receiving Christ again, by way of acknowledging him as his Son? **Ans.** Yes; as the word *αναλαμβάνειν* signifies, 1 Tim. iii. 16. As he had appeared to disown him in his humiliation, by exacting the penalty of the law of him, so, in exaltation, he openly acknowledged him as his Son, John xvii. 5.

188. How does it appear that the divine person of the Redeemer in any sense ascended, when he is always omnipresent? **Ans.** John iii. 13, asserts that he came down from heaven, and the same ascended. But the human nature did not come down. And, he that came down and ascended "is (at the same time) in heaven;" and John vi. 62, "ascend where he was before;" which does not refer to the human nature.

189. How could the divine person of the Mediator ascend, who is omnipresent? **Ans.** Just in the sense in which he descended or humbled himself. In his official character he veiled his glory, and in ascension it is manifested. He acted in humiliation—he now acts, in exaltation, as Mediator.

190. Did he ascend with a real body, though spiritual? **Ans.** Yes.

191. Was his body changed to an incorruptible body? **Ans.** Yes; though our author says it was not; we suppose, meaning that it did not lose its materiality, and become spiritual, (with which we agree.) But we disapprove of his language. Our language is justified, 1 Cor. xv. 42, 52—54, compare with Phil. iii. 21.

192. Is a spirit essentially or necessarily incorruptible, or self-existent? **Ans.** No.

193. Must a material being, by its nature, be subject to corruption? **Ans.** No.

194. But did his human nature become omnipresent? **Ans.** No; this was impossible.

195. Did it, on his disappearance, or ascension to heaven, become a spirit, so as ever after to be invisible? **Ans.** No; for "every eye shall see him."

196. To what place did he ascend? **Ans.** To heaven, Acts i. 9—11; Eph. iv. 10.

197. Is heaven a place? **Ans.** Yes.

198. How prove it? **Ans.** Bodies are there; Acts iii. 21; Enoch and Elijah are there, &c.

199. From what place did Christ ascend? **Ans.** From the earth; and particularly from Mount Olivet, where he suffered his agony; Matt. xxvi. 30; Luke xxii. 39; Acts i. 9—12.

200. Did he actually pass through the visible heavens? **Ans.** Yes; Heb. iv. 14.

201. What medium did he employ? **Ans.** A cloud, Acts i. 9.

202. Do not all these things prove that Christ ascended in a real body? **Ans.** Yes.

203. Did Christ ascend, not only for his own reward, but as a public person? Ans. Yes; he ascended for his own reward, John xvii. 5; and as our representative, Heb. vi. 20.

203½. For what purpose did he ascend as a public person and representative? Ans. (1.) To take possession of heaven in our name; John xiv. 23; Heb. vi. 20. (2.) To intercede or appear in the presence of God as our righteousness; Heb. ix. 24. (3.) To rule and govern as king, in us, over us, and for us.

204. Obj. (1.) Christ is represented as still on earth with his church, Matt. xxviii. 20; and therefore his human nature must be omnipresent? Ans. Such a passage or promise means his gracious presence as Redeemer; and this he fulfils by his Deity, and his Spirit's influences.

205. Obj. (2.) Christ ascended above all heavens? Heb. vii. 26. Ans. It means above the *visible* heavens; and so Eph. iv. 10.

206. Obj. (3.) Christ ascended that he might fill all things? Ans. (1.) Not that his human nature might be everywhere present. (2.) Not that as God he should fill more than he had before done. (3.) But that he might, as Mediator, fulfil all the prophecies respecting himself, and fill his church with gifts and graces, and, as the exalted Redeemer, fill all his offices, in a more glorious state.

207. Obj. (4.) Heaven is at such an immense distance that it would require ages for a material body to reach it? Ans. This is frivolous, and intruding into things which we have not seen. We know not what a spiritual body is, or can do; and it is folly and sin to limit Omnipotence.

§ XXVII.—208. What proof have we that Christ really ascended to heaven? Ans. (1.) The apostles, as eye witnesses, Acts i. 9—11. (2.) The testimony of angels to them. (3.) The testimony of Stephen, Acts vii. 56; of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 8; of John, the apostle, Rev. i. &c.

209. Did not the manifestation at the Pentecost prove it? Ans. Yes; Acts i. 4, 8; ii. 33.

210. Did not the miracles by the apostles prove his ascension? Ans. Yes; Acts iii. 16.

211. Did not the prophecies and types of his ascension also prove it? Ans. Yes; Ps. xxiv., xlvii., lxxviii. It was also proved by the overthrow of the Jewish nation; Matt. xxiv. 15—22; xxvi. 64.

§ XXVI.—212. What types of old predicted the exaltation and ascension of Christ? Ans. Many; especially the high priest entering the most holy place—Enoch and Elijah—Joseph, &c.

213. Was it not necessary that Christ should ascend to glory? Ans. Yes.

214. Is not the necessity of this a corroborating proof of his ascension? Ans. Yes; it makes the testimony of the witnesses stronger, and takes away all improbability of it.

215. What was the necessity that he should ascend? Ans. Besides the fulfilment of prophecies and types, (1.) That Christ should have his reward. (2.) As he was humbled, so he should be glorified.

(3.) As his humiliation was necessary only for a time, so it was becoming that, when the objects of that humiliation were accomplished, he should appear in his true character, and his glory be unveiled. (4.) For the consolation of his people, in the evidence of his acceptance for them. (5.) In order to their enjoying the privilege of the Spirit; John xvi. 7—15; Ps. lxxviii.

§ XXIX.—216. How long after Christ's resurrection did his ascension take place? Ans. Forty days.

217. How did he employ himself during that time? Ans. Teaching his disciples, and confirming their faith; Acts i. 3.

218. Did he continue all this time in their company? Ans. No; but occasionally. Probably, by his occasional absence from them, and occasional manifestation, preparing them for living by faith on him, after he had ascended.

219. As in Acts i. 14, we learn that it was from Mount Olivet that Christ ascended, how reconcile this with Luke xxiv. 50, "he led them out as far as Bethany?" Ans. The village of Bethany was fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem, John xi. 18; and Olivet nearly eight—a Sabbath-day's journey, Acts i. 12. It was the tract of country belonging to Bethany.

§ XXX.—220. Of what use is the doctrine and fact of Christ's ascension to us? Ans. (1.) For our instruction—showing that our home is in heaven—that our Saviour is capable of sustaining his station and office—that he is there as our Advocate, Teacher, and King—that he is exalted to give the Spirit, and to watch over us—and that he is accepted in his work for us, and will take us to himself. (2.) These considerations confirm our faith in his sufficiency, and in God's grace and faithfulness to us. (3.) To raise our affections to things above, Col. iii. 1, 2. (4.) And from all these considerations, it is of use for our comfort.

§ XXXI.—221. What is the third step of Christ's exaltation? Ans. Sitting at the right hand of God.

222. Is this step of Christ's exaltation often asserted in Holy Scripture, and in a variety of forms of expression? Ans. Yes; as "sitting at the right hand of God," Mark xvi. 19, and many other places—"right hand of power," Matt. xxvi. 64,— "right hand of the Majesty on high," Heb. i. 3,— "right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens," Heb. viii. 1, &c.

223. Is it not also expressed both passively and actively—as the Father's act, and as his own? Ans. Yes; Eph. i. 20; Heb. i. 3.

224. What are we taught by these two forms of expression? Ans. That the Father loves the Son—accepts his work—bestows his reward—fulfils his promises—and employs him in his work; and, on the other hand, Christ's right to the throne, and his power to take it.

225. Is not Christ sometimes represented as *being*, as *sitting*, and as *standing* at the right hand of God? Ans. Yes; Rom. viii. 34; Col. iii. 1; Acts vii. 55, 56.

226. What do these representations mean, or signify? Ans. (1.) *Being* at the right hand of God, signifies the perpetuity of his glory.

(2.) *Sitting* signifies his glory and dignity, his government, and his rest from his work. (3.) *Standing*, signifies his activity and readiness to help his people.

§ § XXXIV., XXXV.—*In what his sitting consists,—negative and positive.*—227. What are we to understand by “the right hand of God?” Ans. Not simply his power and action; as Ex. xv. 6; Psal. xlv. 3. Not a place; but a station or condition of power and authority, given by the good pleasure of God.

228. Does not the human nature partake in this honour? Ans. Yes; as personally united to the divine.

229. Does this station or honour imply, then, that the human nature is everywhere present, or omnipresent? Ans. No; it cannot be omnipresent; it must inhabit a place; but, as the right hand of God is everywhere, the human nature is at the right hand of God, though not everywhere. A city may be on the sea-shore, though not in all places where that shore is.

230. Does Christ’s sitting at the right hand of God, signify that he partakes of the divine favour and glory? Ans. No; all glorified saints partake of this.

231. Does it signify that Christ sits, in some respects, in a more honourable place than God himself? Ans. No; this is impossible and absurd, 1 Cor. xv. 27. The representation is borrowed from the practice of kings setting those whom they choose to honour, or to whom they give authority under them, on their right hand; 1 Kings ii. 19; Psal. xlv. 9.

232. Does Christ’s sitting at God’s right hand consist in his glory and government being equal to the Father’s? Ans. No; this is Christ’s essential government, which was not given to him.

233. Is it then either in Christ’s divine nature absolutely, or in his human nature alone, that Christ sits at the Father’s right hand? Ans. No; but as the Mediator,—God-man, and in his Mediatorial office.

234. What then does his sitting at the Father’s right hand signify? Ans. (1.) That, as Mediator, the God-man Redeemer is authorized to exercise his government over all things for his church; Psal. cx. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 25; Eph. i. 20, 21, 22; to do this at God’s appointment and to accomplish his designs in the covenant of grace, and (2.) That he does all this in the manifestation of his real and essential glory and character.

235. Does not all this glory and power imply, and depend on Christ’s essential character—his Godhead? Ans. Yes.

236. Is this glory and power given to his divine nature and essence, or to his divine person? Ans. To his person; as this personality distinctly belongs to himself, while the divine nature and essence belong to him in common with the other persons.

§ XXXIII.—237. What evidence have we that Christ does thus really sit at the Father’s right hand? Ans. (1.) It is proved by the frequent declaration of this by the apostles, as already quoted. (2.) By prophecies of this; as Psal. cx. 1; xlv. 6. (3.) By his being

seen by Stephen, Paul, and John, Rev. v. 6. (4.) By his own declaration, Matt. xxvi. 64. (5.) By the fruits of the Spirit; Acts ii. 38; iii. 15, 16, and (6.) By the propriety and necessity of his exaltation.

§ XXXII.—238. What was the necessity that Christ should sit at the right hand of God? Ans. (1.) That Christ should receive the reward, in the manifestation of his glory. (2.) That God's promise to him should be fulfilled; Psal. cx. 1; Psal. ii., xlv.; and the truth of God sustained in the predictions and types. (3.) From the Father's love to the Son. (4.) For carrying on the work of redemption, and bringing his people to glory. (5.) And to assure the faith of his people, and raise their hearts to heaven, Col. iii. 1, 2.

§ XXXVII.—239. Is the doctrine of Christ's sitting at the right hand of God an important article of our faith? Ans. Yes.

240. On what accounts is it so? Ans. (1.) Because it is a revealed truth. (2.) Because it is glorifying to Christ. (3.) Because it is highly important and useful to us.

241. Of what use is it to us? Ans. (1.) It is calculated to produce in us high and exalted thoughts of Christ as our Lord and Redeemer. (2.) It is calculated to raise our affections and desires to heaven. (3.) It is calculated to assure our faith in the atonement of Christ, in the love and faithfulness of God to Christ's people, and in the promise of salvation, yet to be fulfilled to us.

242. Does not even the utility of this doctrine strongly corroborate the truth of it? Ans. Yes.

§ XXXVI.—243. Are we to consider Christ's exaltation as from eternity? Ans. No.

244. But was he not, from eternity, the glorious and exalted God? Ans. Yes; he was so essentially, but not mediatorially, as this exaltation signifies.

245. Did his exaltation begin in his incarnation? Ans. No; even though displays of divine glory were then made, he was then in his humiliation.

246. When did it properly commence? Ans. At his ascension, Luke xxiv. 26.

247. But had not Christ really the same authority and power as Mediator before his incarnation, and during it, as after? Ans. Yes.

248. How then do we say his sitting at the Father's right hand commenced at his ascension? Ans. (1.) The Scriptures uniformly teach this. (2.) The manifestation of his glorious station was greater after his ascension. (3.) The Scriptures so describe it, chiefly to show the connexion between his humiliation and exaltation, and the gift of the latter as dependent on the former.

249. How long will this step of exaltation continue? Ans. Forever; Heb. x. 12; Rev. vii. 10, 17.

250. Is it any objection to this doctrine that it is said, Psal. cx. 1, "until thine enemies be made thy footstool," &c.? Ans. No; this was an *object* of his exaltation, not the limit of it; he will then give up the present dispensation of his government, 1 Cor. xv. 24; but not his government, Rev. vii. 10, 17.

§ XXXVIII.—251. What is the last step of Christ's exaltation?
 Ans. *The last judgment.*

252. How does it appear that Christ will judge the world at the last day? Ans. From plain Scripture declarations, as Matt. xxvi. 64; xxv. 31, &c.; Acts xvii. 31; Rom. xiv. 10.

253. Will this judgment be conducted by him as God-man, and Mediator? Ans. Yes; John v. 22, 27; "because he is the Son of man;" that is, because he is Mediator, and because of his humiliation.

254. Wherein can the human nature partake in the judgment? Ans. (1.) By personal union with the divine. (2.) It will give visibility to the Judge.

255. Will not this power and glory be a reward for his humiliation? Ans. Yes; John v. 27; Phil. ii. 8, 9.

256. Will not this work be unspeakably glorious to him? Ans. Yes.

257. Wherein? Ans. (1.) In his absolute power over all created beings. (2.) In the act of judging. (3.) The retinue of angels. (4.) His commission from the Father to judge. (5.) The fulfilment of his promises, in saving his people, Matt. xxiv. 30.

258. Will this detract from the glory of God in the judgment? Ans. No; it is God in the person of the Son.

259. How did he say, John viii. 15, *I judge no man*? Ans. That it was not the work of his humbled state to execute judgment.

260. Will not this be the last act of his administration on earth? Ans. Yes.

CHAPTER XXII.

DUTIES OF THE COVENANT OF GRACE.

LECTURE XXI.—NATURE OF THESE DUTIES.

§ I.—1. Does God require duties of believers under the covenant of grace? Ans. Yes.

2. What duties does he require? Ans. All duties commanded in his law; such as *faith, repentance, love, reverence, meekness, gratitude, and all obedience.*

3. Does he require the same duties under the covenant of grace, that he did require under the covenant of works? Ans. Yes.

4. And does he not require some duties now, under the covenant of grace, which had not become duties to man in innocence? Ans. Yes; as *faith, repentance, &c.*

5. But does not the same law of God given to man in innocence, require these duties now that man's circumstances are changed? Ans. Yes.

6. But does God require believers' duties to be performed with

the same design, and to the same end, under the covenant of grace as under the law of works? Ans. No.

7. What is the difference? Ans. Although man's duties were to be performed under the covenant of works, with the same reverence, love to God, delight in him, love to the law, and child-like confidence in God, as under the covenant of grace, they were also to be performed as conditions of acceptance and of the reward; or as conditions on which the acceptance and reward were suspended; but it is not so now; Rom. iv. 6; iii. 20; x. 5.

8. Were not man's duties then, under the covenant of works, properly called conditions of the covenant? Ans. Yes.

9. But are the duties of believers under the covenant of grace, properly called conditions of the covenant? Ans. No; Rom. iii. 20, 28; iv. 4, 5; xi. 6.

10. Can we perform acceptable duties ourselves? Ans. No; 1 Cor. ii. 14; Rom. viii. 7.

11. How do we obtain the ability to perform these? Ans. From Christ; John xv. 4, 5.

12. On what ground do we obtain it from Christ? Ans. By free grace; Eph. ii. 5, 8.

13. How do we obtain the privileges of that free grace? Ans. (1.) By free promise. (2.) By Christ's purchase fulfilling the condition of the covenant of grace; Isa. liii. 10, 11; John xvii. 17; Tit. ii. 14.

14. Are not all our grace and ability to perform acceptable duties provided and promised to us freely in the covenant of grace? Ans. Yes.

15. Are these graces promised to us as a means of our procuring divine favour, or as the effect of divine favour in Christ? Ans. Not as a means of procuring favour, but as the effect of it; because, (1.) These graces are promised;—(2.) All the promises to us are in Christ; (3.) They are promised in Christ because purchased by him; Tit. ii. 14; 2 Cor. i. 20. (4.) We have an actual interest in them only when united to Christ; 1 Cor. i. 30.

16. Are not all our acceptable duties, then, wrought in us, and by us, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, on account of Christ's purchase, and according to free promise? Ans. Yes; and therefore are not conditions.

§ II.—17. But it is objected that commands to perform duty, accompanied by threatenings for disobedience, imply that duties are conditional? Ans. (1.) Commands under the covenant of works imply this; but (2.) Commands under the covenant of grace do not; as the covenant of grace with Christ was not suspended on our obedience, but our obedience suspended on it.

18. What is the object and design of our duties and the command to perform them, if not conditions of acceptance? Ans. (1.) That we may glorify God; John xv. 8. (2.) That we may be actively holy and fit for happiness. (3.) That the object of the covenant of grace may be accomplished in us—in our sanctification.

19. Obj. (2.) Many promises are conditional, suspending salvation on faith, repentance, &c; as Acts xvi. 31? Ans. (1.) Even those duties called conditional, as faith, repentance, &c., are themselves freely promised; as Jer. xxxi. 31—34; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27. (2.) These duties are appointed as necessary means of enjoying the blessing, but not as conditions of receiving it. (3.) God has established an order in the bestowment of his saving benefits; and faith, and even repentance, must precede the consummation of salvation, and also precede many saving benefits to be obtained during the present life. (4.) As God will treat man as a rational, intelligent being, so, under the promise of supply, he requires him to exercise faith and repentance, making these duties means, but not conditions.

20. Obj. (3.) The very nature of a covenant requires that the promise be suspended on conditions? Ans. (1.) In ordinary covenants among men, it does; but God's gracious covenant with man is not conformed to ordinary covenants; see Jer. xxxi. 31—34. We have here promises but no conditions. (2.) God's covenant with us is testamentary; Heb. ix.

21. Obj. (4.) Even these promises, absolute in their form, imply a condition? Ans. (1.) The allegation is gratuitous, and is founded on a mistaken view of the promises, and on an imagination that God's promise is not wholly free, and must be on the principle of ordinary covenants among men. (2.) The objection is a begging of the question;—assuming what is neither expressed in the promise, nor otherwise proved. (3.) The objection is utterly contrary to the unequivocal language of Scripture—that our salvation is FREE.

22. The testamentary character of the covenant does not take away the entire notion of a covenant? Ans. True, it does not take away the entire notion of a covenant, but it does deny that the condition is any feature of the covenant—the very thing in question.

23. Why then is God's covenant of grace with man called a covenant, if purely testamentary, and not conditional? Ans. (1.) Because God pledges himself to us by his promises. (2.) He engages his people thereby to himself. (3.) The matter of his covenant promise is the very same that he promised to Christ for our benefit, and promised to him in the covenant of grace, and on its proper conditions.

24. The gospel does not mean mere promises; it is taken, more largely, to include duties under the law, as necessary to salvation? Ans. True, the gospel is often in Scripture taken largely for both the promises of the gospel, and the duties of the law, under the gospel; but never so largely as to include legal works, or duties as conditional of salvation. When taken largely to include duties, they are duties performed in faith, in childlike obedience, and in the strength of promised grace.

25. What are we to understand by the covenant of grace? Ans. It is often used in two senses; (1.) The covenant of grace properly so called, made in eternity between God the Father and God the

Son. (2.) God's covenant promises to the church, or believers, Jer. xxxi. 31, &c.; 2 Sam. xxiii. 5.

26. In the first sense, is it not absurd to speak of our duties as conditions of the covenant? Ans. Yes; Christ's righteousness is the only condition of that covenant.

27. Were not the promises of all our salvation made in that covenant to Christ on the condition of his righteousness? Ans. Yes.

27 $\frac{1}{2}$. Did not that covenant secure an unconditional salvation to us? Ans. Yes.

28. Must not the promises of salvation be made to us, then, just as they were provided in that covenant? Ans. Yes.

29. Is not God's covenant of grace with the church, or believers, just his free promises to us of the very things purchased by Christ, according to the eternal covenant with him? Ans. Yes; and thus it is entirely promissory, or testamentary to us.

30. Would it be consistent with the eternal covenant, with Christ's atoning work, with divine grace, or with divine justice, to require a second condition of us, after that performed by Christ? Ans. No.

31. In God's gracious covenant with his church, does he not lay them under obligation to duty? Ans. Yes; as is plainly implied in even Jer. xxxi. 31, &c. If they obtain the writing of the law in their hearts, it is in order to obedience.

32. But is the promise made freely, in order to the performance of the duty, or is the duty required in order to enjoy the promise? Ans. The promise is in order to duty.

But, though our author uses exceptionable terms, he maintains the truth of free grace, in contrariety to these terms, in teaching man's inability, and denying that our duties are any foundation of our right to life—that they are doubtful, or uncertain conditions, or that they take the place of the condition of the covenant of works, that is, the condition of full obedience prescribed in that covenant. But yet,

33. Is there not a danger of encouraging men to believe that, though the believer's duties are not the full condition of perfect obedience in the covenant of works, they may be, in part, the obedience required in it? Ans. Yes.

34. And is there not danger that, to call faith and repentance conditions of the covenant, may encourage the opinion that, though Christ's righteousness be the sole ground of our right to heaven, faith is a condition or ground of our right to Christ? Ans. Yes.

LECTURE XXII.—OF FAITH AND REPENTANCE—AND PARTICULARLY,
OF FAITH.

§ III.—35. Are not the duties to which we are bound, under the gospel, all the duties commanded in the law of God? Ans. Yes; as knowledge, love and all obedience; Jer. xxxi. 33, 34; fear, Jer. xxxii. 40; meekness and humility, Ps. xxv.; approach to God, Heb. x. 22; and many others.

36. But, to speak of *faith* and *repentance* as two special duties under the gospel, in one way or another comprehending all the others—Are not these two duties closely joined together? Ans. Yes.

37. Do they not imply and comprehend one another? Ans. Yes; there is no faith without repentance, and no saving repentance without faith.

38. Are these duties commanded by the law of God? Ans. Yes.

39. Though there was no occasion for faith in Christ, or repentance, to be exercised by man in a state of innocence, did not the moral law require faith in whatever God would reveal, and repentance, if sin occurred? Ans. Yes.

40. Does the gospel, strictly taken, command any duty? Ans. No; it is simply promises; but the law requires us to embrace these promises.

41. Though faith and repentance, as graces, are inseparable, and the one implies the other, yet is not the one the effect of the other, and, in the order of nature, succeeding it? Ans. Yes.

42. Which of them then is first in order? Ans. Faith.

43. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Faith is the first grace acted by the regenerated soul; because without it, no other grace can be exercised; Heb. xi. 6. (2.) It is faith that embraces Christ as offered, and unites us to him; by means of which we take an interest in him, and receive supplies from him; and therefore it is before repentance, as the means to an end. (3.) Faith is, in Scripture, represented as leading to repentance; Zech. xii. 10; Acts xi. 21. (4.) The Scriptures present the objects of faith,—the promises of grace, as motives to repentance; making faith the means in order to repentance; Jer. iii. 22; Joel ii. 12, 13; Hos. vi. 1; xiv. 1-4. (5.) Because there can be no turning to God but by Christ, and faith in him; there can be no true sorrow without love to God; but there is no true love without faith in Christ as our Saviour.

44. Obj. (1.) Repentance alone is proposed to natural men as the way of salvation; as Luke xiii. 5; Acts ii. 38; iii. 19? Ans. (1.) The Scriptures represent faith as absolutely necessary; therefore when repentance is required, it must include faith. (2.) The word *repent* or *repentance*, as a command in Scripture, generally, if not always, means the entire change—of faith, repentance, and obedience. Therefore such passages of themselves teach nothing of the precedence of faith or repentance.

45. Obj. (2.) Repentance is, in Scripture, placed before faith, as though it were first in order; as Mark i. 15? Ans. (1.) As before, we observe, repentance means the whole change. (2.) While repentance signifies the whole change of conversion and sorrow for sin, faith is mentioned as the first step in the saving change. (3.) There is a kind of repentance, before faith, which may be called *conviction*—a discovering sense of sin, danger and folly; and faith is the first step in the saving change. (4.) In Acts ii. 38, repentance is required in order to baptism, but in verse 44, these are re-

presented as "believing." Besides, they could not repent and seek remission without faith. (5.) In Acts xx. 21, "Testifying repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ," faith must be first in practice, or we deny the fundamental doctrine of the gospel, that Christ is the way to the Father. (6.) In Mark i. 4, John preached the "baptism of repentance for the remission of sins;" and agreeably to this is Matt. iii. 2, 8, 11. But this repentance included faith as its principle and spring, Acts xix. 4.

46. Is it correct to say that none but the penitent are warranted to come to Christ by faith? Ans. No; we should come to Christ to obtain repentance, Acts v. 31.

47. On the other hand, will any come to Christ, or be accepted, who are not penitents? Ans. No.

48. How explain this seeming paradox? Ans. (1.) The first acting of faith produces repentance. (2.) Repentance does not give the right to come, but the gift and promise. (3.) The right is previous to, and independent of, both faith and repentance. (4.) It is faith that embraces the right to Christ, not repentance. (5.) Repentance is the fruit of faith, of that faith which leans on the divine warrant.

49. Is not the expression that Christ will receive none but penitent sinners, calculated to deter men from coming till conscious of repentance, or to induce them to come in the way of leaning on their supposed repentance, as giving them a right? Ans. Yes; we cannot be too careful on this point, in guarding against error, and holding out the true warrant for faith.

§ IV.—*Of Faith.*—50. What is the proper ground of faith? Ans. The word or testimony of another.

51. Is not faith, or believing, represented as trusting in a person, as well as believing a word? Ans. Yes; as Exod. xiv. 31; "believed in the Lord and in his servant Moses."

52. Is faith represented as believing or trusting in a thing, as well as in a person? Ans. Yes; as Job xxxix. 12; Deut. xxviii. 66. But the most proper use of the word faith, or believing, is to believe a testimony, and in consequence to trust in the person testifying.

53. Though faith most directly means the exercise of the mind believing, yet is it not used in Scripture to signify the thing believed? Ans. Yes; as Gal. i. 23; iii. 23. We are now to speak of it as the act of the mind.

54. What is the distinction between a divine and a human faith? Ans. They are distinguished by their different grounds. A human testimony is the ground of a human faith; a divine testimony is the ground of a divine faith. We are to speak of the divine faith.

§ V.—55. How many kinds of faith do we find spoken of in Scripture? Ans. Four; that of *miracles, historical, temporary,* and *saving* faith. This division may be considered (under the general notion of the word *faith* or belief,) as a division of a genus into its several species; all the kinds having something in common,

and each having a specific difference. Or we may consider the word *faith* in Scripture as having so many different significations.

56. Have all these kinds of faith specific differences, or do they differ only in degree, being specifically the same? Ans. They are specifically *different*, as we shall endeavour to show. They differ in their *objects*, and in the *nature* of their acts.

§ VI.—57. What is the faith of miracles? Ans. To believe that a miracle will be wrought either *by* us or *on* us.

58. How is this faith of miracles designated, when it is a faith that we shall work the miracle? Ans. Active faith of miracles.

59. Have we instances of this class of faith spoken of in Scripture? Ans. Yes; as Matt. xvii. 20; 1 Cor. xiii. 2.

60. How is the faith of miracles designated, when it is a faith that a miracle shall be wrought on us? Ans. A passive faith of miracles.

61. Have we instances of this class of faith? Ans. Yes; as Matt. viii. 10; ix. 2; Acts xiv. 9.

62. Could this, or any other kind of acceptable or useful faith exist without a warrant? Ans. No; since faith rests on authority.

63. What was the warrant for faith that a miracle would be wrought on us or for us? Ans. Christ, revealed as able and willing to do it; John xi. 27, Matt. ix. 28.

64. What was the warrant for an active faith of miracles? Ans. A special revelation or inspiration.

65. Is there any ground for the faith of miracles now? Ans. No.

66. Was this faith always saving, or always attended with saving grace? Ans. No; as Judas, and Matt. vii. 22; Luke xvii. 17: so it might exist without a change of heart.

67. Although Christ generally demanded this faith when he would work a miracle, yet did he not sometimes work miracles without it? Ans. Yes; as in the case of casting out devils, even for those who were unwilling; as Luke viii. 28.

68. What analogy do Christ's miracles in favour of those who had no faith, and of those that had faith, bear to his work of grace on the heart? Ans. Christ gives regenerating grace without previous faith, but requires faith as the means of obtaining the advances of grace which we desire.

69. At the same time, was not the people's unbelief generally a hinderance of miracles among them? Ans. Yes; as Mark vi. 5; Matt. xiii. 58.

70. What analogy did the active faith of miracles bear to our faith in performing duty? Ans. As to work a miracle, the person should believe that he was authorized to do it, and that Christ would exercise the power to perform it, so we should know that what we are about to do is an authorized deed, and that Christ will enable us to do it.

71. Did not a faith of miracles always include a faith in Christ's divine power and Godhead? Ans. Yes; John xi. 27; Luke vii. 8, 9.

72. Does not this show that we may believe that Christ is God and Messiah, and yet not have saving faith? Ans. Yes.

73. What difference might be noticed between the objects of a faith of miracles, and of a saving faith? Ans. The object of a faith of miracles, was generally a thing that the person might desire without a change of heart; the object of saving faith requires a change of heart; or at least a change in the desire exercised.

74. What is historical faith? Ans. Believing Scripture histories, Scripture doctrines, commands, promises, and threatenings, in a word, the whole word of God to be true.

75. Would not the term *doctrinal, theoretic, or speculative faith* be a more universal and appropriate term, than *historical*. Ans. Yes.

76. Is this faith always saving? Ans. No; Acts xxvi. 27; James ii. 17—19.

77. Why is it not saving? Ans. Because the judgment and will do not always agree, in fallen man. Evidence may compel us to believe a truth to which our will does not consent. We may believe a truth divine without a change of heart.

78. In a mere theoretical faith, is belief founded on the testimony of God, or on natural evidence? Ans. Generally, if not always, on natural evidence, the Scriptures giving the idea, and nature confirming it. And natural evidence confirming the greater part of divine truth, there is natural evidence that the rest of the divine testimony is true.

79. But although a theoretical faith is not of itself saving, can saving faith exist without it? Ans. No; the doctrine believed theoretically, is the foundation of saving faith. Saving faith is a peculiar quality superadded to theoretic faith.

LECTURE XXIII.—OF FAITH.

§ VIII.—80. What is temporary faith? Ans. It is a theoretical faith in the gospel, with some moving of the natural affections, but without saving grace.

81. Is this faith described in Holy Scripture? Ans. Yes; as Matt. xiii. 20, 21; John v. 35; Heb. vi. 4—6.

82. Wherein does it differ from mere theoretical faith? Ans. To theoretical faith it superadds an exercise of natural affection, not only of remorse for sin, but of desire of some things proposed in the gospel, gratitude for divine gifts, according to a false conception formed of them, hope, founded on some ground supposed to be the gospel, and some apparent fruit.

83. Does the term *temporary* mean that the person will always fall from it in this life? Ans. No; it may, especially in favourable circumstances, continue till death; Matt. vii. 22.

84. Do the Scriptures describe it by the term *temporary*? Ans. Yes; it is called *προσκαιρος*, *temporary*, Matt. xiii. 21, implying that saving faith never fails till it issues in vision.

85. Wherein does it differ from saving faith? Ans. In duration; in its root and spring; in its foundation; in its exercises; and in its effects.

86. Has it not more resemblance to saving faith than any other kind of faith described in Scripture? Ans. Yes; as it includes

theoretical faith, with affections and effects bearing a strong resemblance to those of saving faith.

87. How does it differ from saving faith, in its root and spring?

Ans. It is not the supernatural work of the Holy Spirit new-creating the heart.

88. How does it differ in its foundation? **Ans.** As it builds on the general mercy of God, or on an imagination of his special love to us, or on self-righteousness, innocence, &c.

89. How does it differ in its exercises? **Ans.** It does not see the truth, as it is in Christ Jesus, being without saving illumination; it does not embrace Christ cordially as our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption; it does not lead to love God on account of what he is, to love salvation as free, or to cordially renounce all other hope.

90. How does it differ in its effects? **Ans.** It produces no fruits of new obedience; generally declines from attainments made; produces pride, self-confidence, and carnal security.

§ IX.—91. Is it important to discriminate saving faith carefully from other kinds of faith? **Ans.** Yes.

92. Why is it important to discriminate? **Ans.** That we may try our faith, whether it be genuine.

93. Is not such discrimination much opposed? **Ans.** Yes; they plead that it is perplexing to the Christian; that the Scriptures just require faith without caution or discrimination.

94. Is it true that the Scriptures make no discrimination? **Ans.** No; they describe it in its origin, Eph. ii. 8; in its exercises, Ps. xviii. 2; in its object, Acts xvi. 31; in its accompanying graces, 1 Pet. ii. 7; in its effects, Acts xv. 9, Gal. v. 6; and by warning against counterfeits, James ii. 20; and by discriminating names.

95. What are some of its discriminating names? **Ans.** "Justifying," Rom. v. 1,— "true," 1 Tim. i. 5,— "precious," 2 Pet. i. 1,— "holy," Jude 20—"saving," 1 Pet. i. 9,— "living," James ii. 26—"faith of God's elect," Tit. i. 1, &c.

§ X.—96. Is faith, as described in Scripture, the mere act of the mind, or is it a permanent habit? **Ans.** A permanent habit, as all other graces are.

97. What are we to understand by a habit of faith? **Ans.** A principle or disposition implanted in the mind, with all its necessary concomitants, which abides steadily, and, from its very nature, puts forth acts of faith, as occasion calls for them.

98. Are we to understand that the habit of faith is given as the independent source and spring of future acts of faith? **Ans.** No; it cannot act or even continue, without the indwelling of the Spirit; Eph. ii. 8.

99. What would be the error of holding that faith is merely the act of the mind? **Ans.** It would represent the mind as acting faith without regeneration or a saving change on the mind itself, and, consequently, that the person is not in a state of grace, except while the act continues.

100. How does it appear that the Scriptures describe it as a

habit? Ans. (1.) From its abiding, Col. i. 23. (2.) From its dwelling in us, 2 Tim. i. 5. (3.) From our being established in the faith, Col. ii. 7. (4.) From Christ's dwelling in the heart by faith, Eph. iii. 17. (5.) From the name given, in Scripture, to those who have faith, viz., "believers," 2 Cor. vi. 15, Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 2. Thus they retain the name from a habit; and even while they are not immediately acting faith.

101. Can we acquire this habit of saving faith by repeated acts of a natural faith? Ans. No; we may attain increase of faith by repeated acts of saving faith, as a means which God will bless for this purpose; but no repetition of acts of one character can give a habit of another character; that is, many acts of natural faith cannot produce a habit of saving faith. It is the work of the Spirit.

102. Does saving faith reside in any one power of the mind, to the exclusion of others? Ans. No; not in the understanding without the will, &c.

103. Does not a mere doctrinal faith—simply believing the truth on evidence—reside in the understanding? Ans. Yes.

104. But does not saving faith engage or exercise the affections and will? Ans. Yes; Acts viii. 37, Rom. x. 9, 10, Eph. iii. 17, 18, 1 Pet. ii. 7.

105. Is there any saving faith without approbation and choice? Ans. No.

106. Or is there any saving faith without the exercise of the understanding? Ans. No; strictly speaking, we believe theoretically, on the dictates of the understanding, and savingly on those same dictates, with the will and affections agreeing and choosing.

§ XI.—107. Who are the only subjects of this saving faith?—Ans. The elect; Tit. i. 1; Acts xiii. 18.

108. Have they saving faith till effectually called? Ans. No.

109. Why is it that none but the elect have saving faith? Ans. (1.) Faith is a grace of regeneration, given for Christ's sake. (2.) None can exercise it but those to whom it is so given. (3.) It is a grace which always ends in salvation, by the faithfulness of God to his promises. (4.) Therefore, God gives it to none but to those elected to eternal life.

110. Did the elect, under the Old Testament dispensation, possess saving faith? Ans. Yes.

111. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the general declarations of Scripture, respecting the necessity of faith; as John iii. 36; Heb. xi. 6. (2.) From what is expressly said of the faith of Old Testament saints; as Acts xv. 11, John viii. 56, Rom. iv. 18, Job xix. 25.

112. Was not the gospel preached to the fathers, as well as to us, though more obscurely? Ans. Yes; Gal. iii. 8.

113. Did not the authority of God require them to receive it in the same manner as we—by faith? Ans. Yes.

114. Did not their hope of promised blessings include a faith in the word of God promising? Ans. Yes.

115. Was not Christ the object of the same faith to them, as about to come, as he is to us, when he is come? Ans. Yes.

116. If there was some darkness or indistinctness in their faith, more than there is now, did that change the specific nature of their faith? Ans. No.

§ XII.—117. Is saving faith really the same in its objects and nature in all persons who have it, of whatever age, nation, or character? Ans. Yes.

118. Have infants who are savingly interested in Christ, any exercise of faith? Ans. Neither in act, nor in habit.

119. On what grounds may we hold this doctrine? Ans. (1.) They have no actual knowledge of the objects of faith; Deut. i. 39.

(2.) They are represented as having done no good or evil; Rom. ix.

11. (3.) The gospel is not heard or understood by them; Rom. x.

17. (4.) The want of evidence of faith, in their advanced years, till they are instructed.

120. Obj. (1.) Infants are called believers, Matt. xviii. 6? Ans. It means no doubt children in humility, or the weak in mind.

121. Obj. (2.) The instances of Jeremiah and John the Baptist; Jer. i. 5, Luke i. 15, 44? Ans. In Jeremiah it signified his separation to his office. In the case of John the Baptist, the measure was an extraordinary case, but it does not imply actual faith.

122. Obj. (3.) There is no salvation without faith? Ans. This is not applicable to infants.

123. Obj. (4.) The soul always thinks, and therefore an infant may have faith? Ans. Admitting the premises, we do not admit the conclusion: as the infant's thoughts must unquestionably be about the objects of its senses and consciousness, till capable of acquiring knowledge by other means; but these objects give no idea of Christ or his salvation.

124. Obj. (5.) Infant baptism implies faith in the infant? Ans. By no means. Baptism in infancy may be a means of promoting faith, after the child comes to a capability of understanding it; and even while in infancy, the ordinance may be accompanied by the child's union to Christ, pardon, and regeneration.

125. Obj. (6.) Infants and sucklings give praise to God, and may, therefore, have faith? Ans. The age of those called "infants and sucklings" is very indefinite. We may allow that at such an age as they are able to give praise to God intelligently, they may have faith.

126. How, then, are infants subjects of saving grace, or salvation, if they cannot have faith? Ans. As the objects of the promise of salvation, the merit of Christ may be imputed to them, and the Holy Spirit dwell in them, renewing their hearts, and making them the subjects of what is called *seminal* faith—that is, so renewing their hearts that, when Christ is revealed to them, they will love and trust in him.

LECTURE XXIV.—FAITH CONTINUED.

§ XIII.—127. Who is the author of saving faith? **Ans. God alone; Eph. ii. 8.**

128. Is it the work of all the persons of the Trinity? **Ans. Yes; of the Father, John vi. 44; of the Son, Song i. 4, John x. 16; of the Holy Spirit, 1 Cor. xii. 13, 2 Cor. iv. 13.**

129. How is faith the work of the three persons? **Ans. According to their parts in the economy of redemption. The Father and the Son give the Spirit, who works in the sinner the work of faith.**

130. Does the Holy Spirit work faith by the word, or without it? **Ans. Always by the word; Rom. x. 8, 9, 17.**

131. Are any other means used beside the word? **Ans. Yes; ordinances and providences. By ordinances, he applies the word; by providences, he awakens or draws, in connexion with the word.**

132. Does the Holy Spirit work faith merely by presenting the outward instructions of the word, and laying motives before the mind? **Ans. No; he creates the soul anew; Eph. ii. 10, 2 Cor. v. 17. He enlightens the understanding; Psa. cxix. 18, Col. iii. 10; and governs and bows the will; Psa. cx. 3.**

133. Is man, then, able of himself to believe savingly? **Ans. No; Eph. ii. 8.**

134. Yet might not man, without supernatural influence, believe even divine truth on evidence? **Ans. Yes; James ii. 19.**

135. Do not our natural ability to believe divine truth theoretically, and the doctrine that, nevertheless, saving faith is not of ourselves, prove that saving faith is essentially different from mere doctrinal belief? **Ans. Yes.**

136. Why is it that a man cannot exercise saving faith of himself? **Ans. (1.) Because faith is the exercise of the new heart. (2.) It depends on saving illumination. (3.) Saving faith approves, chooses, or takes the offered salvation.**

§ XIV.—137. What is the general object of saving faith? **Ans. The word of God; Psa. cxix. 42; 2 Thess. ii. 13.**

138. In what respect is the word of God the object of saving faith? **Ans. It is the ground or reason of faith.**

139. Is all the word of God the ground or reason of faith? **Ans. Yes; 2 Tim. iii. 16, 2 Pet. i. 21.**

140. Is there anything else than the word of God the ground of a divine or saving faith? **Ans. No; tradition, since the writing of the word is not divine, and is often false. New revelations are not given, since the canon of Scripture was finished.**

141. Yet might we not see cause to believe some divine truths for other reasons than divine testimony alone? **Ans. Yes; such as the mortality of man, from uniform facts—the judgment of God, from reason—the punishment of sin, &c.**

142. But is it a divine faith when we believe on such grounds, and not on the divine testimony? **Ans. No; it is only a human faith.**

143. While we believe on the testimony of God, is it not lawful to take other reasons into view, and allow them their weight? Ans. Yes; as the Scriptures often appeal to reason; Isa. xlv. 19.

144. Will faith, on these grounds alone, convert the soul, or draw the heart to God? Ans. No; James i. 18, 1 Pet. i. 23.

145. Does it not belong to the constitution of our nature to believe on sufficient natural evidence? Ans. Yes.

146. Is it agreeable to our nature, as fallen, to believe on the testimony of God alone, without natural evidence? Ans. No.

147. How are we led to believe on the divine testimony alone? Ans. By the new-creating work of the Spirit; Psa. cxix. 18, Col. iii. 10.

148. Will it not be as natural to the new creature to believe, on the testimony of God, as to the natural man to believe, on sufficient natural evidence? Ans. Yes.

149. Yet is not faith on the testimony of God a rational exercise, calling into exercise all the natural powers of the mind? Ans. Yes; and therefore God gives instruction and evidence, that we may weigh it, as the ground of our faith. He requires us to examine and consider the evidence which he presents; John x. 38.

150. When the Holy Spirit enlightens and persuades, does he not give a discovery of these evidences? Ans. Yes; as he works by the word, he brings home the evidences with power.

151. Is faith then, as some hold, a belief without reason? Ans. No.

152. Should not reason judge of the evidence that the Holy Scripture is the word of God? Ans. Yes.

153. But will mere rational evidence of the truth of the Scriptures ever lead us to a divine faith, or a holy persuasion that they are the word of God? Ans. No; the power of the Spirit must accompany those evidences to produce this effect.

154. In this work does the Holy Spirit lead only to the consideration of the external evidence of the truth of the Scriptures? Ans. No; he also calls our attention to their internal evidence, and gives experience of the truth on the heart; Ps. cxix. 18.

155. When we have discovered that the Scriptures are the word of God, and learned what they teach, is it the province of reason to try by natural reason, the truth of the doctrines taught? Ans. No; because reason is inadequate to such a labour; because God alone is capable of revealing his truth, and because divine veracity is above all other authority.

156. Can there be any error in divine declarations, or deception in our believing them, when rightly understood? Ans. No.

157. It is objected, that, in Jer. iv. 10, deception is imputed to God? Ans. This passage refers to God's judicial judgment, in either giving the people up to the influence of false prophets, as 1 Kings xxii. 20, Ezek. xiv. 9, or in giving them up to their deceiving imaginations.

158. Obj. (2.) Many instances of declarations which were not

fulfilled, as Adam's expecting eternal life; Abraham believing that his son would be sacrificed; David led to believe that the men of Keilah would deliver him up to Saul, &c.; how answer? **Ans.** (1.) These declarations were conditional. (2.) If they believed the event unconditionally, it was their own conjecture, unwarranted by God's word.

159. Can there be any error in divine faith wrought by the Spirit? **Ans.** No; because he is infallibly true, both in the matter of our faith, and in his secret persuasion on the heart. He is the Spirit of truth. Error indeed may accompany saving faith, but it is not the faith wrought by the Spirit.

160. Have we any other word of God, now than his written word, as the ground of our faith? **Ans.** No; 2 Tim. iii. 16; Rev. xxii. 18. 19.

161. Is the written word of God both the matter and reason of our faith? **Ans.** Yes; it is both the material and formal object of faith.

162. What in the word of God is the special object of faith? **Ans.** The Gospel; Mark i. 15.

163. When we are required to believe the Gospel, are we not required to believe in Christ and his salvation, according to that gospel? **Ans.** Yes; John xiv. 1; 1 Pet. i. 21; John iii. 16.

164. But is it not the same gracious principle of faith that believes the gospel strictly so called, and every other part of the Scriptures? **Ans.** Yes; faith acts on each part of the word, according to its instructions, and its tenor.

§ XV.—165. Is there not a distinction between believing that there is a God, believing his truth, and trusting in him? **Ans.** Yes.

166. Is the faith described by the first two expressions, always saving faith? **Ans.** No.

167. Are not these distinctions observed in the Holy Scriptures? **Ans.** Yes; as Jam. ii. 19; John xiv. 11. 12; Psal. cvi. 12—24; Isa. xxvi. 3. And if the Hebrew and Greek prepositions do not unequivocally give these distinctions, other forms of expression do.

LECTURE XXV.—FAITH CONTINUED.

§ XVI.—168. What are the acts of faith, or what is included in it? **Ans.** Three things,—knowledge, assent, and appropriation.

169. Though there may be doctrinal knowledge and belief without saving faith, can there be saving faith without knowledge? **Ans.** No.

170. How does this appear? **Ans.** (1.) From descriptions of faith in Scripture, as either described as knowledge or founded on knowledge; John xvii. 3; Isa. liii. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Tit. i. 1; Psa. ix. 10; John vi. 45. (2.) From the instrumentality of the word in producing faith; Rom. x. 14—17. (3.) From the duties which faith will lead the believer to perform, as confession, purifying the heart, obedience, &c. (4.) From the condemnation of ignorance, and commendation of knowledge; Col. iii. 16. (5.) From

the very nature of faith, requiring knowledge of the thing believed, and reason for belief.

171. Is not knowledge both of the matter to be believed and of the authority on which we believe, necessary? Ans. Yes.

172. What must be the character of that knowledge which is included in saving faith? Ans. Not only theoretical, but saving.

§ XVII.—173. What is *implicit* faith? Ans. Believing on authority, without knowing why.

174. Should we not believe implicitly the word of God? Ans. Yes; even when we know no reason for our belief but the authority of God.

175. But can we savingly believe any divine truth on the authority of man? Ans. No.

176. Why believe God implicitly, and not man? Ans. (1.) God's authority is the highest reason of faith. (2.) Man's accuracy is at best doubtful. (3.) To believe on man's authority is not a divine faith.

178. Is it either Scriptural or reasonable to hold that ignorance promotes devotion? Ans. No.

179. Obj. (4.) In Isa. vii. 9, and 1 Cor. xii. 8, 9, xiii. 2, knowledge is distinguished from faith? Ans. Knowledge is, in some respects, distinct from faith, and yet necessarily included in it. Speculative knowledge may be without faith, but saving faith cannot exist without knowledge.

180. Obj. (2.) Faith is opposed to knowledge, as in 1 Cor. xiii. 9; 2 Cor. v. 7; Heb. xi. 1? Ans. Faith is not opposed to all knowledge, though it be to some. It is not opposed to knowledge received by the divine testimony, but (1.) To reason as the foundation of faith. (2.) It is opposed to sense, as 2 Cor. v. 7 (3.) It is opposed to the perfect knowledge in glory; 1 Cor. xiii. 9. (4.) It is opposed to a comprehensive knowledge. We believe truths on divine authority, which we do not comprehend.

181. Obj. (3.) Ignorance is found in many believers; as David, Psal. cxix. 18; the eunuch, Acts viii. 30, 31? Ans. (1.) Where the ignorance is gross, there is no faith; Isa. vi. 9, 10. (2.) There is imperfection of faith and knowledge in all believers, in this life, and their faith reaches no further than their knowledge; they desire knowledge in order to faith.

182. Obj. (4.) Curiosity, arrogance, &c., arise from knowledge? Ans. From merely speculative knowledge such effects may arise, but not directly from saving knowledge.

§ XVIII.—183. But some object that knowledge is not an essential part of faith itself; that it is only a prerequisite? Ans. (1.) Theoretical knowledge, at least, is indeed a prerequisite; faith is built upon it; and saving knowledge begets faith; Psal. ix. 10; John vi. 45. But, (2.) Though it be a prerequisite, it also accompanies it, and enters into its essence. (3.) Knowledge is often used as synonymous with faith, in Holy Scripture; as 2 Pet. i. 3; Phil. iii. 8, 10; John xvii. 3.

184. Obj. (1.) Knowledge alone does not constitute faith? Ans.

(1.) Mere speculative knowledge does not. (2.) No one essential part of any complex thing constitutes the whole of it. (3.) Saving knowledge produces faith, and true faith is knowledge.

185. Obj. (2.) Knowledge can be separated from faith? **Ans.** We deny it. Doctrinal knowledge may be, but saving knowledge cannot be separated from it, in this life; that is, while faith exists.

186. Obj. (3.) In John vi. 69, and 1 John iv. 16, faith is joined with knowledge, as two distinct things? **Ans.** (1.) They are joined, in these two texts, as exegetical one of the other; intimating that they are closely united, and substantially one. (2.) Saving knowledge of any divine object includes a saving belief of it; and a saving belief is a real knowledge of it.

§ XIX.—187. Is perfect knowledge, or even a large degree of it, essential to saving faith? **Ans.** No; we cannot say how small a degree of knowledge may consist with saving faith.

188. Yet are there not some things fundamental to saving faith, without the knowledge of which it cannot exist? **Ans.** Yes; as the knowledge of Christ as the Saviour—of our necessity—of free grace, &c.

189. If there be true faith, will not knowledge be progressive? **Ans.** Yes; 1 Pet. ii. 2; 2 Pet. iii. 18.

190. Why is knowledge progressive in the true believer? **Ans.** (1.) Because faith relishes divine truth, and will seek it. (2.) Because the believer's soul has an aptitude for knowledge. (3.) Because the Holy Spirit will carry on the work begun.

§ XX.—191. Besides knowledge, is not assent, or agreement with the truth, essential to saving faith? **Ans.** Yes.

192. Is there, in saving faith, a theoretical assent to the truth of the gospel? **Ans.** Yes.

193. Does it merely assent that the things stated are true? **Ans.** No; it also assents that the promises of the gospel are good. In other words, faith assents, on knowledge and conviction, that both the Scripture statements and descriptions of the gospel are true.

194. Is the assent, in saving faith, practical, as well as theoretical? **Ans.** Yes; it assents to and desires a personal interest in Christ and his salvation; Phil. iii. 9.

195. Is not faith usually divided into saving and justifying faith? **Ans.** Yes.

196. What is the immediate object of justifying faith? **Ans.** Christ as a Priest—living.

197. What is the object of saving faith? **Ans.** Christ and all his salvation.

198. Is justifying faith ever separate from saving faith? **Ans.** No.

199. Is not justifying faith the same grace as saving faith, only directed to the one object of Christ as our righteousness? **Ans.** Yes.

§ XXI.—200. Are faith and love the same grace? **Ans.** No.

201. Or is love, although it must accompany faith, an essential act of faith? **Ans.** No.

202. Must not love always accompany true faith? **Ans.** Yes; 1 Cor. xiii. 2; Gal. v. 6.

203. How does it appear that they are distinct graces? Ans. (1.) From their distinct operations. Faith believes and trusts; love delights in, and desires union and communion; it approves and relishes its object. Faith receives; love gives affection. (2.) Faith and love are distinguished in the Scriptures; 1 Cor. xiii. 8, 13. (3.) Love is described as a fruit of faith; Gal. v. 6; 1 Tim. i. 5. (4.) Because love can (in heaven) exist without faith; 1 Cor. xiii. 8, 13.

204. Obj. (1.) Love is put for faith; as Matt. xxiv. 12; John xiv. 23? Ans. (1.) The objection is unfounded; in the passages adduced, love does not mean faith. (2.) If in any case love may seem to be put for faith, it is by metonymy—one grace out of an assemblage of graces is named.

205. Obj. (2.) Love is often joined with faith in Scripture, and therefore it is an essential act of it? Ans. Joining them together rather intimates that they are distinct, though united; as Gal. v. 6; love is the fruit of faith; so Eph. iii. 17.

206. Obj. (3.) Faith is ascribed to love, and is exercised by it, or under its influence, 1 Cor. xiii. 7? Ans. (1.) The faith or belief flowing from love, is a credence given to our neighbour, as signified in 1 Cor. xiii. 7. (2.) Even this faith or believing, as the fruit of love, is therefore distinct from it.

207. Obj. (4.) The first commandment requires both faith and love, under the same expression? Ans. Other graces are also commanded in the same precept. This does not confound graces with one another.

LECTURE XXVI.—FAITH CONTINUED.

§ XXII.—208. What is the third act of faith? Ans. *Appropriation or fiducial application.*

209. Can saving faith act without appropriation? Ans. No.

210. What are we to understand by appropriation? Ans. Taking something to ourselves, and for our use particularly.

211. May not the term "appropriation" apply to the law, and its sentence against us, as well as to the gospel? Ans. Yes.

212. Can we appropriate gospel promises without knowledge, assent, and desire? Ans. No; it requires the new heart, and those graces are included in the exercise.

213. Can we appropriate justly and satisfactorily without a warrant? Ans. No; appropriation supposes a warrant.

214. Is appropriation essential to saving faith? Ans. Yes.

215. What evidence have we that the saving faith required in Scripture is appropriating? Ans. (1.) From the gospel offer itself. It is not only an historical account of salvation—not only a declaration of doctrines, but a promise of salvation to sinners; Acts ii. 39, Heb. iv. 1; an offer of salvation to all; Prov. viii. 4, Isa. lv. 1. (2.) From the nature of faith itself—believing a testimony, trusting the word of the Promiser, and trusting in the person promising. Now, if a promise or offer be made to us, if we do not appropriate it to ourselves, we do not believe the promise or offer. (3.) It ap-

pears from the Scripture account of peace, hope, and joy, as the immediate fruits of faith; Rom. v. 1, 2, 11. Now these feelings and exercises necessarily imply that, in believing, we take an interest in the salvation for ourselves. (4.) From the declaration that the gospel is good news, or glad tidings; which could not be so, if the promise were not to us—if it did not warrant appropriation, and if faith, by which it is received, were not appropriating. (5.) From the fact that, in conviction of guilt and misery, we do appropriate the sentence of the law to ourselves; and therefore we could take no comfort from the gospel, without the appropriation of faith. (6.) From the examples of saving faith recorded in Scripture; as Psa. xviii. 2, xxiii. 1, &c., xxxi. 14, xci. 2, Gal. ii. 20. (7.) From the figurative representations of faith, given in Scripture; as looking to Christ, as the Israelites did to the brazen serpent, John iii. 14, 15; eating his flesh and drinking his blood, John vi. 53; the sacrament of the Supper, &c.

216. To what errors is the doctrine of appropriation opposed? Ans. (1.) To the error, that faith is a mere rational belief of the truth. (2.) To the doctrine, that saving faith is only a belief that Christ is the Saviour of sinners. (3.) To the error, that we are not warranted to appropriate till we have found a ground in ourselves. (4.) To the error, that the believer can attain no more than a vague and doubtful hope that he may be saved, and has no warrant for a particular application of the promise to himself till he has evidence in himself that he is an actual partaker of Christ.

217. Can the truly awakened soul take any solid satisfaction in his salvation, without appropriation? Ans. No.

218. What is the object of appropriating faith? Ans. Christ, and all the promises in him; John vi. 32, 50; Heb. iv. 1.

219. Is it saving faith unless we appropriate a whole Saviour? Ans. No; we must take him as wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.

220. Is it saving faith unless we appropriate Christ as he is offered—freely? Ans. No.

221. Does the believer appropriate Christ and all his salvation as his own? Ans. Yes.

222. Does the belief that God elected us to eternal life, or that Christ intended our particular salvation in his death, belong directly to the appropriation of faith? Ans. No; because, of this, we have no information in the Scriptures.

222½. Is it the object of appropriating faith to believe that we are already interested in Christ, and heirs of glory? Ans. No.

223. What does appropriating faith believe respecting Christ? Ans. That Christ is offered to us; that we are welcome to a personal interest in him; and that his word will be true to us in particular.

224. Does not appropriating faith, then, include an acceptance of the promise, and a trusting or leaning upon it as ours, and as true to us? Ans. Yes.

225. Can such an appropriation be rationally exercised without

a divine warrant? Ans. No; it would, without this, be irrational and presumptuous.

226. What then is the warrant or ground for this appropriation? Ans. The word of God alone, promising and giving; 1 John v. 10, 11; Rom. iv.

227. May we appropriate any further than the warrant sustains us? Ans. No; nothing further.

228. Is our love, repentance, obedience, or even our faith, even in part the ground of our appropriation? Ans. No; it is simply God's promise.

229. If these graces or attainments were, even in part, the grounds of appropriation, would we have a right to appropriate till we had attained them? Ans. Certainly not.

230. Although God might justly condemn us for the want of these graces, would he condemn us for unbelief itself, before we had attained these grounds or warrants for faith, if so be they are the grounds of appropriation? Ans. Certainly not.

231. Therefore, would not every gospel hearer be innocent of the sin of unbelief, so long as he had not these graces, if they were necessary in order to his warrant to believe? Ans. Yes.

232. But does not God condemn every unbelieving gospel hearer for his unbelief itself, while he has not these graces? Ans. Yes; John iii. 18, 1 John v. 10, 11. Therefore these graces are not our grounds of faith. We have all the ground for appropriating faith previously to our possession of these graces, and entirely independent of them—viz., the word.

233. Could any one ever have these grounds of faith before believing? Ans. No; Heb. xi. 6.

234. Is it not absurd to require faith as a ground of faith? Ans. Yes; as it would be a requisition of faith's existence, and evidence of it, before it can exist.

235. But since many who have the gospel offer shall perish, do we not need a discriminating offer of salvation to ourselves, specifically discriminating us from others of mankind, in order to warrant our appropriating faith? Ans. No; nothing but the general offer of salvation to all, which of course includes us.

236. Are we to consider the promise which warrants our appropriating faith, as an absolute promise to save all to whom it is made, at all events, whether they believe or not? Ans. No; Mark xvi. 16. If this were so, there would be no need of faith in order to salvation; as the end of the world—the resurrection of the dead—will come, whether we believe or not.

237. How then are we to understand the promise which warrants our appropriating faith? Ans. (1.) It includes a whole salvation, as a free gift, embracing in its promises all the graces which are by any supposed to be conditional grounds, or previous qualifications. (2.) It promises all this freely to sinners just as they are, helpless, guilty, and depraved; Isa. xlvi. 12, lv. 1, 2. (3.) As a promise, it makes an unconditional offer of all this salvation to us, as a means of inducing us to believe, accept, and appropriate.

238. Though faith is not the meritorious condition of salvation, nor any condition on which this salvation is offered, is it not the necessary means of enjoying the promise? Ans. Yes.

239. Is there not a confidence belonging to this act of appropriating faith? Ans. Yes; faith and confidence are used indiscriminately for one another, Psa. lxxviii. 22; it is called "liberty," "boldness;" Heb. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 12.

LECTURE XXVII.—FAITH CONTINUED.

240. Has appropriating faith *assurance* in its nature; or does assurance or confidence belong to the essence of saving faith? Ans. Yes; Heb. x. 19—22, xi. 1, 13, Psal. xviii. 2.

241. Does this mean that faith is so strong that no doubt remains on the mind? Ans. No; but that doubting is no part of faith; it is its opposite.

242. So far, then, as we have faith, have we not persuasion, confidence, or assurance? Ans. Yes; true faith is not an uncertainty, on uncertain grounds. This is the leading reason why we contend [for this doctrine.]

243. Does faith include any doubt in its nature? Ans. No.

244. Of what does the believer assure himself, in appropriating faith? Ans. That God is freely offering Christ, and all salvation in Christ, to him, making him welcome to a present personal interest in Christ and his salvation; that the promise will be true to him in particular.

245. Is it the object of this assured appropriation, that God will some time redeem us from wrath, though not now? Ans. No.

246. Is it the direct object of this assured appropriation, that we are already in a state of grace, or that we are now truly believing? Ans. No; these must be ascertained on reflection; these are not matters of direct revelation or testimony, and therefore not the object of faith itself.

247. Is it the direct object of this assured appropriation, that we were elected to eternal life, or that Christ died intentionally to save us in particular? Ans. No; these are not matters of direct revelation, and therefore not matters of immediate appropriation.

248. Might not a person doubt of his present or past actual state of grace, and yet not doubt of God's truth in the gospel offer, or of his individual right and welcome to salvation through Christ? Ans. Yes.

249. On what ground rests our assurance that we are in a state of grace, or that we have believed? Ans. On gracious attainments—experience and evidence of grace in us.

250. Is it by faith we see these marks? Ans. No; it is by sense and experience.

251. May not direct faith on the promise give much satisfactory evidence that we are in a state of grace, and are now enjoying the favour of God? Ans. Yes; but this perception is not faith, but an inference from faith.

252. Should we call this assurance that we are in a state of

grace, and that we have believed, as derived from sense and experience, "the reflex act of faith," as some do? Ans. No; it is not faith, but sense, although faith in the word of God is necessary in order to this assurance. It is not faith so far as it notices our attainments, but only so far as it believes or trusts the promise.

253. Do the Scriptures distinguish between the assurance of *faith* and the assurance of *sense*? Ans. Yes; Heb. iv. 16, x. 22, speak of the former; 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 1 John iii. 14, 2 Cor. v. 7, of the latter.

254. Is the assurance of sense, that is, the assurance that we are in a state of grace, essential to faith? Ans. No.

255. What is the sole ground of the assurance of faith? Ans. The same that is the ground of the appropriation of faith—the promise or gift of God in Christ; Heb. x. 19—22.

256. Could this assurance exist if the promise were not free and unconditional? Ans. No.

257. Is the assurance of faith previous to the assurance of sense, and independent of it? Ans. Yes.

258. What then is the assurance which is essential to saving faith? Ans. It is the confidence or persuasion of a believer that the gospel is true, which reveals and offers Christ and salvation to him—that he is welcome to Christ and his salvation—and he accepts the promise, and rests on it, that it will be fulfilled to him, because it is made to him freely by a faithful God. And though this faith may be mingled with doubts, and may be strong or weak, yet the faith itself is confident persuasion, or assurance, and the strength of the assurance is in proportion to the strength of faith.

259. To what errors does the doctrine of assurance in the nature of faith stand opposed? Ans. (1.) To the error that the offer of the gospel, being general, does not warrant personal appropriation. (2.) That the promise does not warrant appropriation and confidence, unless we know the secret purpose of God to save us. (3.) That the offer of salvation is conditional, rendering our faith doubtful, till we know we have the required conditions. (4.) That faith is only a general belief that Christ will save sinners, and not an appropriation of him to ourselves in particular.

260. Obj. Faith is represented as simply a believing that Christ is the Son of God, and that he died and rose again, Acts viii. 37; 1 Thess. iv. 14? Ans. (1.) The faith that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, as set forth in Scripture, means a faith in him as declared and offered; for the apostles preached remission of sins, &c., through him, as the Son of God; Acts ii. 38, iii. 26, xiii. 33, 38. (2.) 1 Thess. iv. 14, is not a definition of saving faith, but an argument for the resurrection.

261. Obj. (2.) Many true believers doubt, and therefore assurance cannot be of the essence of faith? Ans. (1.) The objection assumes our doctrine to be what it is not—an assurance without any doubt accompanying, respecting our warrant to believe, or our actual state of grace—while we admit that doubts may remain in

the true believer, on all these points, but that these doubts are not faith; they are its opposite. Faith itself is not doubting.

262. Obj. (3.) If the question be not respecting the state of the mind believing, but only respecting the nature of faith itself, abstracted from its concomitants, why argue; because all faith, abstracted from doubt, is confident persuasion or assurance? Ans. The premises are not granted. All faith in itself is not abstracted from doubt—it is not confidence. If its ground be doubtful, the faith itself must be doubtful. If suspended on doubtful conditions, faith is in suspense accordingly. But we hold that saving faith is suspended on no conditions, and leans on no doubtful grounds.

263. Obj. (4.) The confidence of faith is rather the effect of faith, than faith itself, Eph. iii. 12? Ans. The objection is either a mistake of the question, assuming that the assurance of faith is the assurance of our state of grace, or an illogical conclusion from the nature of faith. For faith cannot produce confidence, if it possess none. It is only when we appropriate with confidence, that we feel a confidence of faith.

264. Obj. (5.) On the doctrine of appropriating persuasion, or assurance, something becomes true which would not be true, if we did not believe? Ans. The objection is unfounded. The truth of the promise is the same whether we believe or not. But a fact occurs, on believing, which did not occur till that moment; that is, our actual interest in salvation. And this holds good in all reception or acceptance of promised gifts, where the promiser is true.

265. Obj. (6.) The faith of Abraham and other fathers did not consist in such assured appropriation? Ans. We deny the assertion. Abraham staggered not at the promise, &c. His faith in the promise to him and his seed was necessarily appropriating; and where such a character of faith is not mentioned, neither is it denied; the statement of one character does not exclude others.

266. Obj. (7.) We have no special revelation, warranting our personal appropriation or assurance? Ans. There is no need of a special revelation, designating individuals particularly. The general offer includes every individual, and warrants him to believe and appropriate with assurance, as perfectly as a specific offer to an individual could do.

267. Obj. (8.) Carnal security will be encouraged by such appropriation and assurance? Ans. It is false; (1.) Because it is only in the exercise of faith that such assurance exists, and faith's exercise purifies the heart, and engages the affections, &c. (2.) The Spirit of God working this faith promotes both comfort and holiness. (3.) This faith is the gospel method of promoting holiness. (4.) Such faith as does not appropriate Christ as offered, leaves us under the government of our depravity. (5.) A continual doubt of our salvation produces weariness, and destroys relish for holiness.

268. What is the best way to promote the assurance of faith? Ans. To look at the gospel warrant and gift as free to all, make it the only ground of faith, and appropriate and rest on that ground alone.

269. Has the sinner, then, a right to appropriate Christ and his salvation on the ground of the gospel offer, though conscious of guilt and depravity? Ans. Yes; because it is made to him as his deliverance from that guilt and depravity.

270. May the sinner, then, appropriate the promise, and allow himself to continue in sin? Ans. No; he cannot appropriate Christ to take away his sin, and allow himself in it. We cannot employ a surgeon to amputate a mortified member, and yet retain that member.

§ XXIII.—271. Are not a full assurance of our right and welcome to Christ individually, and an assured appropriation of Christ to ourselves, without any accompanying doubt, warranted and required in Scripture? Ans. Yes; Heb. iv. 16, x. 22.

272. Does our faith attain its perfection, or do we attain to all our duty, if we fall short of this? Ans. No.

273. May appropriating faith have assurance in its nature before it reach this measure? Ans. Yes; in the least degree it has it.

274. Is it correct then to say, (as Mark does,) that this confidence of appropriation is not the special or peculiar act of faith—that it is not this that justifies, but that it is a consequence of justifying faith, and belongs only to its perfection, and is not always present in faith? Ans. No; for reasons given above. Mark obviously here considers assurance as meaning the absence of all doubt, or the assurance of sense; and yet he makes fiducial application, or assurance in appropriation, one of the three ingredients in saving faith; §§ xvi. xx. xxii.

§ XXIV.—275. Might not saving faith exist in the heart without a consciousness that we possess it? Ans. Yes; it may for a time, through ignorance and darkness respecting the work of the Spirit in us, and through temptation; Ps. lxxxviii.

276. Yet is not a consciousness that we have faith and are in a state of grace, and even an assurance of it, attainable? Ans. Yes.

277. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From examples of saints, Ps. cxvi. 10, 2 Tim. i. 12. (2.) From general declarations; 1 Cor. ii. 12, 1 John iii. 14. (3.) From commands to prove and know ourselves; 1 Cor. xi. 28, 2 Cor. xiii. 5. (4.) From our duty of giving thanks, and confessing what God has done for us; Ps. lxvi. 16. (5.) From the reasonableness of the thing, that the mind may be conscious of its own acts, and may compare them with the word of God.

278. Does it not appear, from Scripture examples, declarations, and commands to know our state of grace, that it is our duty to seek sensible assurance of our state of grace? Ans. Yes.

279. Why should we seek this assurance, besides our regard to divine authority commanding? Ans. (1.) For our comfort. (2.) That we may be thoughtful. (3.) As a means of inducing us to more holiness; 1 Cor. xv. 58. (4.) That we may be led to correct errors in our life, and to see our short-comings, and to seek supplies; 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 1 Cor. xi. 28.

280. It is objected, against the attainment of assurance, that doubts are common to believers generally? Ans. These doubts are

not to be commended; nor is it always the lot of believers to lie under them. They should endeavour their removal.

281. Obj. (2.) As the heart is deceitful, Jer. xvii. 9, it is impossible to obtain a well founded assurance. Ans. The objection is not a sound inference from Jer. xvii. 9; (1.) Because God requires us to prove and know ourselves. (2.) Because God can search the heart infallibly, and make it known to us. (3.) Because we are warranted to apply to him for this favour; Ps. xix. 12, 13, cxxxix. 23, 24. (4.) His promise includes this; Ps. xxxii. 8, Ez. xxxvi. 26, John xvi. 13.

282. How should we proceed in order to this assurance? Ans. (1.) Examine ourselves by the word, comparing our sentiments, affections, and conduct with it, and examining with prayer. (2.) Appropriate Christ to ourselves, according to the gospel offer, and appropriate his promises. (3.) Engage in the performance of duty. Neglect of this will prevent and hide evidences. (4.) Seek communion with God, through Christ.

§ XXV.—283. Can saving faith ever be lost? Ans. No.

284. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Because it is a gift of God; Eph. ii. 8; and his gifts are without repentance; Rom. xi. 29. (2.) Christ's care of his people's faith, Luke xxii. 32. (3.) The indwelling of the Holy Spirit, maintaining his grace in the heart; John xiv. 16, Eph. iv. 30, 1 John iii. 9. (4.) The promise of divine keeping in the faith, 1 Pet. i. 5. (5.) The nature and provisions of the covenant of grace—promising a seed to Christ, on condition of his purchase, which includes eternal salvation to that seed, and faith as necessary to union to Christ, and justification on the purchase of Christ, and therefore divine faithfulness.

285. Obj. (1.) Threatenings of falling away, and perdition; as John xv. 26, Gal. v. 4? Ans. These threatenings only mean that if a man profess the name of Christ, and entertain a hope, without being in Christ, and bringing forth fruit, he shall perish—lose his vain hope, and perhaps his profession.

286. Obj. (2.) There are many examples of falling from faith; as the Jews, Rom. xi. 20; others making shipwreck of faith, 1 Tim. i. 19, 20? Ans. The Jews did not lose their personal faith, but the faith of their fathers; others, as 1 Tim. i. 19, 20, make shipwreck of the doctrines of faith, or of such faith and profession as they had.

287. Obj. (3.) The commands of fear and watchfulness imply the possibility and danger of falling away? Ans. (1.) It is not a servile, but a godly fear and watchfulness that are enjoined. (2.) These commands imply that men's faith may be false, and they ought to examine and watch. (3.) They imply that duties and watchfulness are, by God's appointment, connected with our keeping in the faith. (4.) This holy fear and watchfulness are not secured by the doctrine of falling from grace, as such a doctrine engenders a servile spirit; but they are secured by the doctrine of the gospel, that we shall be kept by the power of God, through faith, to salvation.

288. Does our continuance in the faith depend on the strength of grace received, or on our own light, strength, or resolution? Ans. No.

289. Though it depends on the faithfulness of God, through Christ, yet may we expect it without the exercise of faith and obedience? Ans. No.

290. When we hold that faith cannot be lost, are we to understand it of the exercise, or of the habit of faith? Ans. Of the habit; as the exercise may be left off for a time, through temptations, &c.

§ XXVI.—291. Is saving faith always attended with good fruits? Ans. Yes.

292. Why so? Ans. Because it unites to Christ, receives out of his fulness, is graciously blessed of God, and is a work of the Spirit.

293. What are the fruits of faith? Ans. (1.) The benefit of glory, Acts xvi. 31. (2.) Of grace here, Eph. iii. 17; such as good hope, Rom. v. 5; love to God and man, Gal. v. 6, &c; justification, Rom. v. 1; spiritual freedom, John viii. 32; Gal. v. 1.

294. What is spiritual freedom? Ans. Not only freedom from the curse, but liberty with God as children.

295. How are we said to be justified by faith? Ans. Not on account of it—but by the righteousness of Christ received by faith, Rom. iii. 24. As there are two ways of justification supposed—works and faith—so the way of faith is obtaining justification by the works of Christ received by faith.

LECTURE XXVIII.—OF REPENTANCE.

§ XXVII.—296. Is *repentance* a necessary duty, required in Scripture? Ans. Yes; Luke xiii. 3.

297. Is it necessary as a condition of the covenant of grace, or of the enjoyment of heaven? Ans. No; although it is necessary in order to final happiness, it is not a condition on which that happiness is suspended. It is a promised and a purchased blessing of the covenant; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 31; Acts v. 31.

298. Why then is repentance necessary? Ans. (1.) We cannot enjoy heaven in unholiness. (2.) We cannot be admitted into heaven in love of sin.

299. May repentance be called a saving grace? Ans. Yes; Acts xi. 18.

300. In what sense is it called a *grace*? Ans. It is given by grace, and is a gracious disposition.

301. In what sense is it called a *saving* grace? Ans. Not that it is atoning, nor that it is efficient to work salvation; but it is a grace accompanying salvation, and it is a preparation for eternal happiness.

302. What is the general meaning of the word *repentance*, in Scripture? Ans. A change of mind—a change of case.

303. What Hebrew words are generally used for it? Ans. תשובה, (*Teshoobhad*), a *returning*—גח, (*Nechem*), *grief*.

304. What Greek words are used for it? Ans. Μετανοια, (*Metanoia*), *change of mind*; Μεταμλεια, (*Metamcleia*), *change of case*.

And these words are used interchangeably, either for **saving** or **legal** repentance.

305. How is repentance usually divided? **Ans.** Into *legal*, and *saving* or *gracious*.

306. What is legal repentance? **Ans.** Conviction of **guilt and sin**, with grief and sorrow on account of the punishment; called "the sorrow of the world, which worketh death," 2 Cor. vii. 10.

307. Although this legal repentance be not of itself **saving**, is it not necessary? **Ans.** Yes; so far as it is a conviction of **sin and misery**.

308. Wherein is this legal sorrow, or repentance **defective**? **Ans.** In a want of faith, hatred of sin, and love to God.

309. Since this legal repentance is necessary, in some sense, is it our duty or interest to indulge in it? **Ans.** It is our **duty** to cherish conviction, but not to indulge in unbelief. In other words, it is not our duty to indulge a mere conviction, or **legal** repentance; Hos. xiii. 3.

310. Does not a **gracious** repentance, in Scripture, generally mean the whole change in conversion? **Ans.** Yes; as Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17; Acts ii. 38.

311. What graces does it, in this large sense, include? **Ans.** (1.) A change from error to the acknowledgment of the truth. (2.) From a dislike of divine things to a relish and desire for them. (3.) From opposition to persuasion. (4.) From unbelief to faith. (5.) From love of sin to hatred and sorrow. (6.) From disobedience to obedience.

312. What is **gracious** or **saving** repentance, in a more restricted sense, as a grace distinct from faith? **Ans.** "A **saving** grace, whereby a sinner, out of a true sense of his sin, and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, doth, with grief and hatred of his sin, turn from it unto God, with full purpose of, and endeavour after, new obedience."

313. How is this repentance generally designated in Scripture? **Ans.** By the words, "contrition," Psa. li. 17; "grief for sin," Psa. xxxviii. 18; "sorrowing," 2 Cor. vii. 8—10, &c.

§ XXVIII.—314. Is repentance a habit, or only act of the mind? **Ans.** It is a habit—a permanent principle and disposition.

315. Can it exist without the exercise of the understanding? **Ans.** No; in repentance we must know the law which we have violated, the grace we have abused, the vileness of sin, and the hopes set before us.

316. Are the will and affections exercised in repentance? **Ans.** Yes: the heart loves the law, approves free grace, hates sin, &c.

317. On whom is the grace of repentance bestowed? **Ans.** On the elect; on all of them, and on no others.

318. Why bestowed on the elect? **Ans.** (1.) Because they were given to Christ, for their salvation, and they were purchased by him. (2.) They are heirs of glory, and must be prepared for it.

319. Why bestowed on none but the elect? **Ans.** (1.) Because it is a **saving** grace. (2.) Because it is a blessing purchased by Christ. (3.) All the truly penitent are heirs of salvation.

320. Are elect infants the subjects of repentance? Ans. No; no more than of faith; because it requires the exercise of the understanding and will. But they may, by regeneration, have the spirit of repentance.

321. By whom is this grace wrought? Ans. By the Spirit; 2 Thess. ii. 13, Tit. iii. 5, Jer. xxxi. 18, 19, Zech. xii. 10.

322. Is his work, in this grace, irresistible? Ans. Yes.

323. Why is it so? Ans. (1.) Because the repentance of the elect is decreed; 2 Thess. ii. 13. (2.) It is purchased; Tit. ii. 14. (3.) It is promised; Ezek. xxxvi. 26. (4.) The Spirit is almighty.

324. Does the Holy Spirit use means in this work? Ans. Yes.

325. What means? Ans. The word, ordinances, and providences; Acts xi. 15, 18, 21, 2 Thess. ii. 13.

326. Is it only the law, or also the gospel, that is the means of repentance? Ans. Not only the law, but also the gospel; Ezek. xxxvi. 31, Zech. xii. 10.

327. But is repentance merely the effect of the moral influence of the word on the heart? Ans. No; it is the effect of the Holy Spirit's new creating energy; 2 Cor. v. 17.

§ XXIX.—328. Does repentance refer to both sins and duties? Ans. Yes.

329. For whose sins do we grieve in true repentance? Ans. Especially our own sins.

330. Does repentance take into view the consequences of sin, and grieve for it on this account, although this be not the only or chief consideration? Ans. Yes; Dan. ix. 7, 11, 12.

331. For what else do we grieve, in true repentance, besides the punishment of sin? Ans. Especially on account of sin as committed against God—against infinite majesty, love, grace, and kindness; Psal. li. 4, Zech. xii. 10; and for the pollution of sin, as vile; Ezek. xxxvi. 31.

332. Although we are chiefly to grieve for our own sins, will the true penitent grieve for the sins of others? Ans. Yes; Psal. cxix. 36, Dan. ix.

333. Why do we grieve for the sins of others? Ans. For their danger or ruin, for their spiritual pollution, and for the dishonour done to God and his law.

334. For what sins in ourselves do we grieve in repentance? Ans. All our sins, great and small, and especially heart sin—indwelling sin; Psal. li. 5.

335. Does the penitent content himself with a general view of sin? Ans. No; he mourns for particular sins, and the root of them; Psal. li. 4.

336. When will a sinner grieve most sincerely and deeply for his sin—in unbelief, and fear of damnation, or when he believes that he is pardoned through Christ, and has no fear of damnation? Ans. When he believes he is pardoned; Zech. xii. 10, Psal. li. 2—4, Jer. iii. 21—25. Without this, it is the sorrow of the world, that worketh death.

337. Does the true penitent turn to duties, as well as grieve for sin? Ans. Yes; there is no sincerity in his sorrow for sin, if he

do not turn to duty—no sincere sorrow for his apostacy from God, if he do not return to him; Jer. iii. 22.

338. Is the true penitent grieved for his departure from God as his enjoyment, as well as for disobeying him as Lord? **Ans.** Yes; Jer. ii. 13.

339. In the true penitent's return to God, to what does he return? **Ans.** (1.) To take God as his God, his Lord, and happiness. (2.) To duties, in a believing, childlike spirit, in love to God and to his law, in faith of free pardon, acceptance, and strength, through Christ.

§ XXX.—340. What are the special acts or ingredients in repentance? **Ans.** Sense of sin, grief, and hatred of it.

341. What is included in a sense of sin? **Ans.** Not only knowledge of it as sin, but a heart-felt discovery of it as real, rendering us guilty and vile—a consciousness, not only of its existence, but of its evil in itself; Psa. li. 5, 6.

342. Is there, at the same time, a sense, or heart-felt consciousness of our obligation to duty? **Ans.** Yes.

343. Though the penitent sees his sin, and grieves for it, does he desire to know more of it? **Ans.** Yes; Psa. cxxxix. 23, 24.

344. Though sensible of his obligation to duty, does he desire to know more of it? **Ans.** Yes; Job xxxiv. 32.

345. Is there, in true repentance, a real grief for sin, as offensive to God, defiling to our souls, and depriving us of comfort and enjoyment? **Ans.** Yes; Jer. xxxi. 19, 2 Cor. vii. 10.

346. Does the true penitent really hate his sin? **Ans.** Yes; Rom. vii. 10.

347. Can such repentance be exercised without a new heart? **Ans.** No; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 31.

348. Can we exercise this repentance without faith? **Ans.** No; because, without faith, there is no other grace—no love to God or his law, no union to Christ, no indwelling of the Spirit. Without faith the repentance is legal, and does not include hatred of sin, or grief for it as against God.

349. When is repentance given? **Ans.** In regeneration; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 31.

350. Does it not always accompany saving faith? **Ans.** Yes; Zech. xii. 10.

351. Is not repentance a continued exercise, and advancing, as sanctification progresses? **Ans.** Yes.

352. Is it a wearisome, burdensome, or reluctant exercise of the believer? **Ans.** No; he is voluntary in it; Psa. xxxviii. 18.

353. Does confession of sin always accompany true repentance? **Ans.** Yes.

354. To whom is this confession made? **Ans.** To God; Psa. xxxvii. 5, li. 3, 4.

355. Is not this confession, in true repentance, always made to God in hope of free pardon? **Ans.** Yes; Psa. li. 2, 3.

356. Though our repentance must be particular, yet does not the believer grieve for all his sins universally? **Ans.** Yes; Psa. xxxviii. 18.

357. But, besides a general sense of sin, is he not required to repent of particular sins, as he discovers them? Ans. Yes; Ps. li. 4.

358. Does not the believer exercise repentance for the sin of his heart, which he may not yet have discovered in its particulars? Ans. Yes; Psa. xix. 12. This repentance he exercises because he knows that his heart is depraved and deceitful, and that his sins are more than he can understand.

§ XXXI.—359. What is the Popish doctrine of repentance? Ans. They make it a sacrament, and hold that it includes in it three things—contrition, confession, and satisfaction by works.

360. What do they mean by contrition? Ans. That their sorrow for sin is to be estimated as equal to their sin, and that it is a kind of atonement, equal to the demerit of the sin.

361. What do they mean by confession? Ans. Auricular confession.

362. Should we not confess our sins to men? Ans. Public sins we should confess to man, to remove offences, and to glorify God; 1 Tim. v. 20; or private sins, to the few that know them; James v. 16.

363. But should secret sins be confessed, in particular, to man? Ans. No; unless for counsel, or some edifying end.

364. What is the professed design of auricular Popish confession? Ans. It is in order to priestly absolution, or to receive direction to penance, that is, some self-inflictions, or meritorious works.

365. What do the Papists mean by satisfactory works? Ans. Deeds atoning for sin—procuring pardon.

366. Does not repentance include contrition, confession and duty? Ans. Yes; but none of these for the purposes for which Popery requires them.

367. Are not all these, in the Popish sense, contrary to the nature of true repentance? Ans. Yes; repentance includes a turning from dead works.

§ XXXII.—368. What are the benefits which are always connected with repentance? Ans. Remission, Mark i. 4; good works, Matt. iii. 8; and salvation at last, Acts xi. 18.

369. Are remission and salvation properly fruits of repentance? Ans. They are properly concomitants rather than fruits.

370. Are not good works (Matt. iii. 8,) properly constituent parts of repentance? Ans. Yes.

371. Is not repentance necessary in order to the enjoyment of salvation? Ans. Yes; Luke xiii. 3.

372. What is the necessity for it? Ans. (1.) God's command. (2.) As a means of enjoyment. (3.) As a preparation for enjoyment.

373. Is repentance even a procuring means of salvation? Ans. No.

374. Is it ever too late for the duty of repentance in this life—too late to be our duty? Ans. No; Matt. xx. 9; Luke xxiii.

375. Is repentance a prerequisite in order to *judicial* pardon?

Ans. No; nothing but faith, and that only as a means of receiving it.

376. Why is it not a prerequisite? Ans. (1.) Repentance is not a receiving grace. (2.) Repentance flows from faith in pardon. (3.) If repentance were a prerequisite, pardon is not free; the gospel offer is not the sole ground of faith; the sinner would not have a right to pardon till penitent. (4.) The promise puts pardon first; Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 31.

377. Is it not, however, a pre-requisite to *fatherly* pardon? Ans. Yes; Psa. xxxii. 5; because fatherly frowns are sent in order to bring to repentance.

CHAPTER XXIII.

OF EFFECTUAL CALLING.

LECTURE XXIX.—EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL CALL,—UNION TO CHRIST, ETC.

§ I.—Q. 1. After speaking of the covenant of grace, of the Mediator, and of the duties of faith and repentance, under that covenant, we come now to speak of its benefits. What are they? Ans. Four—vocation, justification, sanctification, and perseverance; to which we might add, adoption and glory. But as these are discussed afterwards, and separately, we shall pass them now.

2. Of these benefits, which is first in order? Ans. Vocation.

3. Is this a Scripture term? Ans. Yes; Rom. viii. 28, 30.

4. Is it not the first saving benefit actually bestowed on the elect? Ans. Yes.

5. Is it not sometimes named alone in Scripture as comprehensive of all salvation? Ans. Yes; as Rom. viii. 28, xi. 29; 1 Cor. i. 9; Heb. iii. 1.

6. When the Scriptures name it as distinct from other new covenant benefits, do they not name it as the first? Ans. Yes; as Rom. viii. 30.

§ II.—7. Is not the same thing called by various names in Scripture? Ans. Yes; as "conversion," "drawing," "vivification," "new-creation," "writing the law on the heart," &c.

8. As we intend to treat the subject under the Scripture terms of *vocation* or *calling*, we inquire, Do not these words signify that God, by his word, invites us to partake of salvation, and commands us to return to him? Ans. Yes.

9. And, so far as the call is effectual, and a new creation, is it not used in allusion to God's calling all things into existence by his word? Ans. Yes; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Gal. i. 15.

10. What is the Greek word used in the New Testament for this calling? Ans. *Κλησις*, *Klēsis*; 2 Tim. i. 9, and so the collective body of believers is called *Ecclesia*, *the church—called out*.

11. Is not this term applied to office in the church? Ans. Yes; as **Ex.** xxxi. 2; **Heb.** v. 4. But we shall treat it as that benefit which belongs to all believers.

12. How is this call divided? Ans. Into external and internal.

13. Do the Scriptures make this distinction? Ans. Yes.

14. Mention some texts which speak of the external call? Ans. **Matt.** xx. 16; **Prov.** i. 24.

15. Mention some which speak of the internal call? Ans. 1 **Cor.** i. 9, 26; 2 **Tim.** i. 9; 1 **Pet.** ii. 9.

16. By what epithets do the Scriptures distinguish it? Ans. *Heavenly*, **Heb.** iii. 1; *high*, **Phil.** iii. 14; *holy*, 2 **Tim.** i. 9; *unchangeable*, **Rom.** xi. 29;—*according to purpose*, **Rom.** viii. 28.

¶ 17. What do we generally call this internal vocation? Ans. **Effectual calling.**

18. What are we to understand by this name? Ans. Not a mere external call, but real and irresistible; not a mere call or invitation, but a real change of heart, and of state, in conformity to the external call.

19. What is the external call? Ans. It is God's calling, by his word, ordinances, and providences, to turn to God, and partake of salvation.

20. May not this external call be accompanied by the common operations of the Holy Spirit, producing light, conviction, and many affections resembling the internal call? Ans. Yes.

§ IV.—21. What is the internal call? Ans. It is the irresistible and saving operation of God's Spirit, on the elect, renewing their heart, and persuading them to return to God, through faith in Christ, according to the word—an actual translation of them from a state of nature to a state of grace.

§ III.—22. Wherein do the external and internal calls agree? Ans. In their author, the means, so far as outward, the object, in what the persons are called from, in what they are called to, and in the supreme end.

23. How do they agree in their author? Ans. God is the sole author of both the external call by the word, and the internal by the Spirit.

24. How do they agree in outward means? Ans. The word, ordinances, and providences are the means in both.

25. How do they agree in their object? Ans. The object in both is sinners of mankind, although, of these, the external call is limited to gospel hearers, and the internal call to the elect among gospel hearers.

26. How do they agree in that which they are called from? Ans. Both call sinners from guilt, sin, and Satan.

27. How do they agree in that to which they are called? Ans. Both call to salvation and communion with God.

28. How do they agree in their supreme end? Ans. It is the glory of God.

29. Wherein do these calls differ? Ans. In their source, means, manner, object, subordinate end, and perseverance.

30. How do they differ in their source? **Ans.** The external flows from the common goodness of God, the internal from electing and redeeming love.

31. How do they differ in their means? **Ans.** Though both are made with the same outward means, and the external may be accompanied by the common operations of the Spirit, the internal call is, moreover, by the saving, supernatural influences of the Holy Spirit.

32. How do they differ in their mode or manner? **Ans.** The external is accomplished by rational persuasion, without effecting any real change; the internal is by the renewing or new-creating work of the Spirit on the soul, and is done effectually and victoriously.

33. How do they differ in their object? **Ans.** The objects of the external call are all gospel hearers, reprobates as well as others; the objects of the internal are the elect only.

34. How do they differ in their subordinate end? **Ans.** Though they agree in the subordinate end, so far that the salvation of the sinner is formally the end of the external call, as well as of the internal, yet the end actually attained, is the conviction of sin, in the external call, and their conversion and salvation in the internal.

35. How do they differ in perseverance? **Ans.** The mere external call leaves the subjects of it to come short of salvation; the internal call makes sure their perseverance to eternal life.

36. Does this external call warrant and even bind all who hear to embrace and accept it? **Ans.** Yes; as appears from its being made to all, Prov. viii. 4; from its being *free*, Isa. lv. 1; from the command of God accompanying the promise, requiring us to believe, 1 John iii. 23; and from the condemnation of unbelief.

37. May the gospel call be termed an *offer* or *invitation*? **Ans.** Yes; as God promises salvation in order to induce us to accept.

38. Does the offer or invitation imply our ability of ourselves to comply? **Ans.** No; no more than a command does.

39. May the external call have any temporal good effect without the internal? **Ans.** Yes; it may produce moral reformation.

40. What is God's design in giving the external call to all who hear, whether elect or reprobate? **Ans.** (1.) It is the means of salvation to the elect, by which he will enlighten and persuade them. (2.) For the conviction of gospel-rejectors, as having equal privileges with the elect, but rejecting salvation with their will. (3.) That God may glorify his justice on his enemies, and show his great mercy toward his elect—that sovereign grace redeems them.

§ X.—41. In what does this effectual call consist? **Ans.** In an actual compliance with the external call, and an actual possession of promised blessings, or heirship to them. The external call has been made effectual in an entire change.

42. How extensive is the change which is made in an effectual call? **Ans.** (1.) A change of state. (2.) A change of heart. (3.) A change of conduct.

43. In what does the change of state consist? Ans. (1.) In union to Christ. (2.) Deliverance from guilt and condemnation, to justification and acceptance. (3.) Deliverance from Satan's power. (4.) To be the children of God. (5.) A change from misery to happiness.

44. How does it appear that union to Christ is included in the effectual call? Ans. From 1 Cor. i. 9, "called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ." This is fellowship with Christ. To this we are invited; and when by faith we obey the call, we obtain the blessing promised.

45. How manifold is the believer's union to Christ? Ans. Two-fold;—*legal* and *real*.

46. What is legal union? Ans. That which takes place in justification, when Christ's righteousness is imputed to the sinner. Christ is now the believer's Head for all that righteousness, active and passive, which the law requires. Christ, in law, appears in the sinner's stead, as having answered its demands on the sinner. The believer, in law, stands justified and acquitted, as having fulfilled the demands of the law, in Christ, his Head. God acknowledges the law satisfied for the believer, by Christ Jesus. Christ and the believer are one in law; Isa. xlv. 25; Rom. x. 4.

47. What is the real union between Christ and believers? Ans. It is that union produced in effectual calling, by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in them, Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 13, by which Christ becomes the Head of real influences to them.

48. By what representations is the union between Christ and his people set forth in Scripture? Ans. (1.) By the union of the persons in the Godhead; John xvii. 21; not meaning a union of the same nature; not an essential union with God, but a real, intimate, loving, and inviolable union. (2.) By the union of husband and wife; Rom. vii. 4: intimating a legal union; and also Eph. v. 23, &c., intimating—choosing, loving, providing for, and defending. (3.) By the union of a foundation and a building, Eph. ii. 20, signifying our dependence and growth. (4.) By the union of the vine and the branches, John xv. 1, &c., signifying that Christ is the source of supply. (5.) By the union of the head and members, Eph. iv. 15, 16, v. 30; 1 Cor. xii. 12, 27, signifying that he is the vital source of supply and enjoyment. (6.) By the union of food with the body, John vi. 56, &c., signifying nourishment, growth, and refreshment.

49. Do not all these representations show that the doctrine of union to Christ is a vital and important truth? Ans. Yes.

50. What are the effects of this union? Ans. All the fruits of holiness; Eph. i. 3; 1 Cor. i. 30; John xv. 1, &c.

51. Is this union the real cause of our holiness? Ans. Yes; as really as any natural union is the cause of its natural effects.

52. Is it not wholly a spiritual union? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. vi. 17.

53. How may we understand that this union produces real effects? Ans. (1.) The Spirit of Christ dwells in his people, and effectually produces holiness in them. (2.) He does it on account of Christ's

purchase. (3.) He bestows from Christ the blessings procured for them by him. (4.) All this is done according to decree and covenant, Eph. i. 3-5.

54. Does this union invariably and infallibly produce these effects? Ans. Yes; John xv. 1, &c.; Rom. viii. 10, 11.

55. How does it produce such effects? Ans. Not by any natural influence; because the union is spiritual: not by a moral influence; for the union is supernatural: but by divine decree and covenant; Eph. i. 3-5.

56. Is the whole man united to Christ in this union? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. i. 30, vi. 15.

57. Is it to a whole Christ, in his person as God and man, that the believer is united? Ans. Yes; Col. i. 27; Eph. v. 30.

58. Is this union with Christ a personal union? Ans. No; Christ and the believer are not really one person.

59. What is the ordinary distinguishing name of this union? Ans. *Mystical*; Eph. v. 32.

60. What then are the properties of this union? Ans. It is spiritual, supernatural, mystical, real, and inviolable.

61. Are deliverance from guilt and condemnation, and a state of justification and acceptance, included in effectual calling? Ans. Yes.

62. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) To these blessings we are invited by the external call. (2.) These we are, by faith, led to accept. (3.) On faith's acceptance, we obtain the possession, or are partakers. (4.) The enjoyment of these blessings belongs to fellowship with Christ; 1 Cor. i. 9.

63. How does it appear that it is a calling from the kingdom and power of Satan? Ans. The external call invites us to it, &c., (as above,) 1 Pet. ii. 9; Col. i. 13.

64. Is it not a call to the privileges of children, to holiness, and happiness? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. i. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 9, v. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 12. It is a call actually bringing us into the possession of all salvation—to communion with the Three-one God.

65. Can there be any middle state between our state of nature from which we are called, and the state of union to Christ, and communion with him, to which we are called? Ans. No.

66. Does this call include an actual change of nature? Ans. Yes; 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. ii. 10.

67. Does it include a saving change or renovation of the understanding? Ans. Yes; Col. iii. 10.

68. Is it a change of will and affections? Ans. Yes; Eph. iv. 24.

69. Is the call accompanied with power to perform, as well as to will? Ans. Yes; Phil. ii. 12, 13.

70. Does this call include a change of conduct? Ans. Yes; Eph. iv. 1, Rom. vi. 4.

71. Does it lead to faith, and all holy duties? Ans. Yes.

72. What is the great object of faith, under this call? Ans. Christ.

73. How does faith, under the effectual call, view Christ, and embrace him? Ans. As offered—as all our salvation, as free, and as lovely.

74. Does this change, in effectual calling, consist in implanting a gracious principle, as the independent spring and cause of a holy life? Ans. No; Christ is still our life; Col. ii. 10, iii. 4.

LECTURE XXX.—MEANS, AUTHOR, AND SUBJECTS OF EFFECTUAL CALLING.

§ IX.—75. In what state does the effectual call suppose the sinner to be before it? Ans. (1.) As distant from God by apostacy and banishment; 1 Cor. iv. 9. (2.) Ignorant; 1 Pet. ii. 9. (3.) As enslaved by this evil world; Gal. i. 4. (4.) As dead in sin; Eph. ii. 1. (5.) And therefore, as unable to return.

76. Does the Scripture represent man as unable to return to God? Ans. Yes; Jer. xiii. 23, Rom. viii. 7.

77. Does it represent that whatever evangelical goodness is found in man is wrought by divine grace? Ans. Yes; Phil. ii. 13, Eph. ii. 8, 10.

78. Has the sinner, before the effectual call, any kind of merit, as the reason why he is called rather than others? Ans. No; the work is wholly of sovereign grace; Jam. i. 18, Phil. ii. 13.

79. What is meant by the merit of congruity? Ans. Not worth, or positive merit, but preparation, and qualification for receiving the call.

80. Is the sinner prepared for an effectual call by previous convictions, persuasions, and resolutions, which are effected by means? Ans. No; these are either no preparation or fitness for a call, as in the case of those who are never converted, or they are steps in the effectual call itself.

81. Is the sinner active or passive in the first moment of the effectual call, or in the saving change itself? Ans. Passive; “he is the workmanship of God,”—the clay in the hand of the potter.

82. Can any degree of light, conviction, persuasion, or resolution, effected by means, before the moment of the saving change, either deserve a saving call from God, or dispose and enable the heart to comply? Ans. No; because the work is wholly of God; it is a new creation, and a free gift of grace.

83. Are men, by the gospel call, put on a state of trial for eternal life? Ans. No.

84. Why not? Ans. (1.) When men are put on trial, they should have equal privileges; but even gospel hearers have not equal privileges. (2.) A trial, as the ground of salvation, excludes divine efficiency, and divine sovereignty. (3.) A trial leaves man to depend on his own power, and on means, and suspends his salvation on his deeds; contrary to the doctrine of human inability, divine sovereignty, and free grace.

85. May not man be put on trial by God for some purposes? Ans. Yes; as a trial of grace, to prove it, or as a means of im-

proving it, but not as a condition of salvation, or as a preparation for regeneration.

86. Is it proper to say of believers or unbelievers that they are *candidates* for heaven or salvation? Ans. No.

87. Why is it not proper? Ans. (1.) Because it signifies that God has yet to make his choice of the person to be saved. (2.) That he will choose or reject on the person's behaviour. (3.) That good behaviour itself is dependent on man, and not on divine sovereignty and free grace.

88. Are the well informed, those sound in doctrine, and the moral in their lives, any more disposed to embrace salvation before their effectual calling, than the contrary characters? Ans. No; they have more of the means which God will employ in their conversion, than others, but these means are neither meritorious in God's sight, nor in any measure efficient to their regeneration; nor do they even dispose the sinner to accept salvation; as the disposition to accept is the work of regenerating grace itself.

89. However, when God effectually calls a sinner, does he not, before actual regeneration, prepare him with knowledge, conviction, &c.? Ans. Yes; he furnishes him with those necessary things to be used by the sinner on conversion, or when God, by his new creating grace, changes the heart; but these things do not, in any degree, change the heart, or dispose it to the new exercises of the regenerate.

90. Obj. (1.) Scripture mentions examples of those that are well disposed, or near to the kingdom of heaven; as the Eunuch, Acts viii.; Cornelius, Acts x.; and the Lawyer, Mark xii. 34? Ans. (1.) The first two cases were converts before, but now brought to clearer views, and more enlarged grace. (2.) The latter case only means that his doctrinal knowledge, and natural conscience were in greater accordance with gospel truth than many others—that he had those doctrinal views which were necessary in the converted.

91. Obj. (2.) The Scriptures make promises to those who draw nigh to God, and open their hearts to Christ; and therefore these are preparations for receiving salvation, and possess a merit of congruity; as James iv. 8, Rev. iii. 20? Ans. Such texts mean the exercise of grace—the exercise of the renewed heart, as a means of further enjoyment. And they are spoken to, (1.) The believer, to continue the exercise of grace; or, (2.) To the unbeliever, as means of his conviction and persuasion.

92. Obj. (3.) If such attainments and exercises are not admitted as preparations and qualifications, we make man a mere block, without mental or moral power? Ans. By no means; for we admit that in regeneration itself man understands and wills, under divine operation. He is operated on by the Spirit, as an intelligent moral being, prepared with knowledge, and mental powers, to act as divine grace leads him, both in the moment of conversion, and ever after; Rom. viii. 26, Phil. ii. 12.

93. Obj. (4.) The word is useless, if man can do nothing of him-

self, nor coöperate with God in the work of regeneration, and in preparation? Ans. (1.) No means is useless which God is pleased to employ;—as his word in the first creation, Christ's word in raising Lazarus, &c. But, (2.) God adapts his means to man's rational nature, and makes his word the means of man's instruction and activity.

94. Obj. (5.) If man can do nothing effectually of himself, he will fall into apathy and indifference? Ans. (1.) Though man cannot change his heart, he must look for that change by divine grace, in the use of means. (2.) Though this doctrine will not lead the awakened sinner to apathy, nor the careless sinner to neglect the means, yet human inability itself, and depravity do lead to apathy.

§ VIII.—95. Does God use means in effectual calling? Ans. Yes; James i. 18.

96. What means does he use? Ans. The word; 2 Thess. ii. 13; John xvii. 17; ordinances, Eph. iv. 12, 13, 1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25; providences, prosperous and adverse, Heb. xii. 11.

97. Are not these means used with many reprobates? Ans. Yes; Matt. xiii. 3.

98. What more is necessary than these means, in order to effectual calling? Ans. The power of God applying them for enlightening the mind, persuading the will, renewing the heart, and enabling the sinner to comply.

99. Are all the external means together sufficient to convert or effectually call any sinner? Ans. No.

100. How does it appear that the means themselves are insufficient, and that the effectual call is produced only when divine grace and power are exercised? Ans. (1.) From the impotence of man; Rom. v. 6, 1 Cor. ii. 14. (2.) Holy Scripture every where ascribes conversion to God's sovereign will and almighty power; 2 Cor. iv. 6, Eph. i. 19, 20; and to the Spirit, 2 Thess. ii. 13. (3.) From its being called a creation, regeneration, quickening, making alive, workmanship, &c. (4.) From the very word *call*, which shows that it did not originate with us. (5.) From the consideration of the state from which the sinner is called, from darkness, from Satan's kingdom, and from death. (6.) From the promises of the new heart, writing his laws in our heart, &c. (7.) From the manifest errors of the contrary doctrine—as that God's decree would be uncertain—his promises could be no ground of faith—prayers for the new heart would be unwarranted, &c.

101. Does God intend the effectual call of reprobates, when he uses the means with them? Ans. No; John vi. 64; and he never gives them the grace necessary to conversion, as he passed them by in the eternal decree.

102. But it is objected by Arminians, (1.) That God is said to have done what he could for the Jewish church, Isa. v. 4, and that he expected fruit? Ans. (1.) We know from the perfections of God he could not fail in accomplishing his will. (2.) He speaks of the

external means used, that they were sufficient as means, and left the people inexcusable. (3.) His expectation of fruit must mean, that it was reasonable to expect it, and not that God was disappointed.

103. Obj. (2.) In Matt. xxiii. 37, Christ expressed a wish to gather the children of Jerusalem, and they would not? Ans. (1.) It means, not God's will of purpose, which cannot be changed, but his will of precept, and his good pleasure, and is expressive of his compassion and pity. (2.) It may refer to the teachers and rulers of Jerusalem; that, while he used means to gather the children, the rulers opposed.

104. Obj. (3.) God's external offer cannot be considered true, or serious, if man's compliance must necessarily depend on supernatural grace, and man can do nothing of himself, and yet God does not intend the salvation of the reprobate? Ans. (1.) God's secret will, of leaving sinners to themselves, and his revealed will of their duty and his grace, are perfectly consistent. (2.) The offer is perfectly sincere in giving the privileges of salvation freely, in disappointing none that accept, so that they perish wholly by their rebellion. (3.) God has a perfect right to offer salvation and yet leave sinners to their own choice.

105. Obj. (4.) The word is declared to be the power of God to salvation. How then is the supernatural work of the Spirit essentially necessary, and the means insufficient? Ans. (1.) It is the power of God to the believer; to some it is a stumbling block, 1 Cor. i. 23; but, (2.) It is the power of God only when accompanied by his power. (3.) And it is this word alone that is accompanied by his saving power.

106. Obj. (5.) If the call is inefficient of itself, there is no suitable or adequate end answered by it, nor any benefit given? Ans. (1.) It exhibits the grace of God. (2.) With the offer of final salvation, is an offer of grace to comply, and a warning of inability, which if continued will forever silence the objections and complaints of the reprobate. (3.) The salvation of the elect will still more exalt the grace of God; who, in sovereign free grace, renewed their heart, when others, left to themselves, perished.

§ V.—107. Must not the work of an effectual call be of God? Ans. Yes.

108. Why so? Ans. (1.) From the nature of the work—a new creation. (2.) From the consideration of what we are called from,—Satan's power, guilt, and condemnation, and spiritual death. (3.) From what we are called to,—communion with God,—justification and peace, conformity to the image of God, eternal glory; God alone has the right and power to call to these. (4.) From the very name of the operation—a *calling*, which is without us, or by another.

109. Is it ascribed expressly to God, in Scripture? Ans. Yes; Rom. xi. 29.

110. Does each person of the Trinity take part in the work, ac-

ording to the economy of redemption? Ans. Yes; The Father, 1 Cor. i. 9; the Son, Rom. i. 6; the Spirit, Rom. viii. 2.

111. How is it of the Father? Ans. Fulfilling his promise by sending the Spirit.

112. How of the Son? Ans. Sending the Spirit.

113. How of the Spirit? Ans. By his personal work, applying redemption, enlightening, persuading, and strengthening.

114. Did the covenant of grace provide for this work? Ans. Yes; the promise of a seed to Christ included this.

115. On what ground does the Holy Spirit perform this work? Ans. On the ground of the purchase of Christ, and according to the decree.

116. Is effectual calling a *work* or an *act*? Ans. A *work*, as consisting of many steps.

117. Although it is the work of God, is it so his work, that we have nothing to do? Ans. No.

118. Wherein is it God's work? Ans. In its authority, efficiency and power; inviting, promising, commanding, renewing, and strengthening.

119. Wherein is our part of the work? Ans. Complying with the call, under divine influence.

§ VI.—120. Who are effectually called? Ans. The elect, and they alone; Rom. viii. 28.

121. Why are none but the elect effectually called? Ans. The eternal decree, the covenant of grace, and the purchase of Christ, secured eternal life to them alone.

122. Shall any of the elect fail of obtaining this effectual call? Ans. No; John vi. 37; 2 Tim. ii. 19.

123. Is there not a great variety in the manner and circumstances of this call, in different persons? Ans. Yes; in some, there is much conviction and terror; in others, the prevalent experience is the sweetly drawing influence of the gospel; in some it is more sensible and manifest; in others, less so; in some, in early life; in others, late.

124. But, though in these and such circumstances, cases may greatly vary, is there not, in all cases, a uniformity in some things? Ans. Yes; such as discovery of necessity, and of free grace, and unreserved acceptance of salvation.

§ VII.—125. Is there a call of any kind extended to all men, sufficient to lead them to salvation? Ans. No. (See Chapter xvii.)

126. How does it appear that there is not a call to all men sufficient to lead them to salvation? Ans. (1.) Scripture expressly teaches that there is not; Rom. ii. 12; Eph. ii. 12. (2.) Faith is essential to the free and sovereign grace of God; as Matt. xi. 25; Rom. ix. 16; to divine special teaching, John vi. 45. (3.) God declares that he makes a difference, and claims it as his prerogative so to do; Matt. xiii. 11; 1 Cor. iv. 7.

127. Obj. (1.) The goodness of God requires this universal grace, not only as a sufficient revelation, but sufficient grace? Ans. (1.)

All are justly under guilt and condemnation. (2.) The fact that all are not saved—that fallen angels remain in sin and misery, proves that infinite goodness is consistent with the exercise of justice and judgment.

128. Obj. (2.) More grace is promised to those who use well the privileges they enjoy; as Matt. xiii. 12; xxv. 29; and this will apply to a good use of natural light? Ans. These passages treat of saving grace and its exercise, which will be increased; and of want of grace under privileges, which shall procure the loss of those privileges.

129. Obj. (3.) If all had not sufficient grace within their own power, God could not consistently command faith, or reprove unbelief? Ans. God cannot lose his right to command because we have lost our ability to perform.

LECTURE XXXI.—WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN EFFECTUAL CALLING.—THIS CALLING NEVER LOST.—ADDENDA.

§ XI.—130. In effectual calling does not the Spirit of God use moral suasion? Ans. Yes; that is, he uses means and arguments addressed to the understanding, the conscience, our feelings and affections.

131. But does he effect the work of effectual calling by these moral influences alone? Ans. No; he puts forth a supernatural power and influence.

132. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From express Scripture declarations; as Eph. i. 19, 20; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Jer. xxxi. 33; xxxii. 40. (2.) From the representation of the work as a new creation, regeneration and resurrection. (3.) From the fact, fully set forth in Scripture, that man is in spiritual death, and unable to do any good.

133. Is it an immediate work of the Spirit himself? Ans. Yes; seeing it is a new creation, and not the mere effect of means.

134. Can this work of the Spirit be finally and effectually resisted by the sinner? Ans. No.

135. Why can it not be effectually resisted? Ans. (1.) God decreed its efficacy. (2.) Christ purchased the benefit of an effectual call to his people. (3.) The power is almighty. (4.) It is exerted according to covenant.

136. What errors are implied in asserting that this work may be effectually resisted? Ans. (1.) That if the almighty power of the Spirit be admitted, then the work is only by means, and not a creation. (2.) That those who are converted owe the work to themselves. (3.) That there is no decree or covenant securing the work.

137. Do not the elect offer resistance to this work? Ans. Yes; Jer. xxxi. 18; in its commencement, they resist, and in every step our depraved nature is opposed.

138. In this almighty operation, is violence done to the will? Ans. No; it is enlightened, new-created, persuaded, is made willing, and the person acts with the utmost liberty.

§ XII.—139. Papists, &c., object to the irresistibility of the work of the Spirit in effectual calling, (1.) All those texts that speak of the inefficiency of means in converting sinners; as Isa. v. 4; Prov. i. 24, 25. How answer? Ans. This is our doctrine—that *mere* means, however great and well-adapted, must fail.

140. Obj. (2.) It is said, Luke vii. 30, “The Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves?” Ans. They rejected, not the secret purposes of God, but his invitations, &c., which, we admit, all will do, under the mere external call.

141. Obj. (3.) It is said, Acts vii. 51, that the Jews resisted the Spirit? Ans. The original means *oppose*. So all do oppose or resist the Spirit's outward teaching till his work of grace subdues. It means his word, and common operations.

142. Obj. (4.) To say that the saving work of the Spirit cannot be effectually resisted, takes away human liberty? Ans. (1.) Before regeneration, the will is at liberty, and exercises it in opposition to God's word and offers of grace. (2.) When the Holy Spirit calls effectually, he renews the will, and then it acts at full liberty in obeying the call. (3.) Liberty signifies the privilege of acting according to our nature. If the nature be changed to love God and his will, it is at as full liberty, in following that new nature in obedience, as it could be supposed to have been, in unholiness, disobeying God. (4.) The new creation is as consistent with our liberty as the old creation was.

143. Obj. (5.) If the saving work of the Spirit cannot be resisted effectually, then our obedience is not our act, but God's? Ans. So the Scripture teaches, Eph. ii. 8; but not in the sense that the objector intends. Our gracious acts, under this effectual call, are of God's Spirit, as the first cause, and of ourselves, as the second cause; or, God so works in us as to persuade and enable us to act graciously; Phil. ii. 13. The gracious act is as really ours, under supernatural influence, as a natural act is ours, under the ordinary influence of God in sustaining our natural powers.

144. Obj. (6.) On our doctrine, the word and other means are of no utility? Ans. Surely means may be of important use, in the hand of the Spirit, which are not efficient without him.

145. Obj. (7.) There is a continual opposition of our depravity against the Spirit of God; as appears from Rom. viii. 7, Gal. v. 17; Eph. iv. 30; 1 Thess. v. 19? Ans. This is true; but it is overcome by the Spirit, in effectual calling; Mic. vii. 19; 2 Cor. iv. 6.

146. Could that grace with which the Arminians suppose all men to be endued, be called sufficient, when it fails to effect conversion? Ans. No; because if it cannot overcome indolence and enmity, and actually produce conversion, it is not sufficient.

147. But it is objected that every man has sufficient grace and strength, if rightly used? Ans. (1.) It is not true that man naturally has any grace or spiritual life; for he is dead, Eph. ii. 1. (2.) The supposed grace is not sufficient, when it does not lead the person to use it aright.

§ XIII.—148. Will the grace of effectual calling ever be lost, or

revoked? Ans. No; this appears, (1.) From express Scripture; Rom. viii. 35—39, xi. 29; 1 Pet. i. 4—5. (2.) From the eternal covenant giving sinners to Christ for salvation; Isa. liii.; John vi. 37. (3.) From the purchase of Christ, according to covenant. (4.) From the benefit of justification through Christ; Rom. viii. 1. (5.) From the Headship of Christ; he is Head of influences; John xv. 1, &c.

149. What are the fruits of effectual calling? Ans. Faith, repentance, and all good works.

150. May a person know these fruits with certainty, and his infallible interest in salvation? Ans. Yes; 2 Pet. i. 10.

151. What is the end and object of this effectual calling? Ans. The salvation of the sinner, and the glory of God; Rom. viii. 29, 30; Isa. xliii. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 9.

ADDENDA.—*Some remarks overlooked in their place.*

1. Is not a doctrinal faith in the word of God, or a belief of its truth, pre-supposed in effectual calling? Ans. Yes.

2. But is not saving faith in the word produced in effectual calling? Ans. Yes.

3. Is there not a difference between the cause of saving faith, and the reason or ground of it? Ans. Yes; The cause is the Holy Spirit; the reason is the word itself.

4. What is the ground or reason on which the person effectually called believes the word of God with a saving faith? Ans. God's authority in the word, or the light of the word itself.

5. Can any man see that light or authority in such a manner as to produce saving faith, without a new creation by the Spirit? Ans. No; he opens the eyes to behold wondrous things out of God's law; Psa. cxix. 18, 2 Cor. iv. 6.

6. Does not the true believer, in common with others who acknowledge the truth of Scripture, take into consideration the external evidences of Christianity? Ans. Yes.

7. But is not the internal evidence the true reason of saving faith? Ans. Yes.

8. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) God generally requires faith on his authority in the word. Hence the common expressions, "Thus saith the Lord," "Verily, verily, I say unto you, &c." (2.) God refers the people to the light and power of his word, when he requires them to distinguish his word from that of false prophets; Jer. xxiii. 26—29. (3.) When miracles, or other evidences than those of the word, are demanded, they are refused as unnecessary, and the people are referred to the word itself; as Luke xvi. 28—31; Matt. xii. 38—42. (4.) The simple word, without miracles or signs, the apostle represents as the true ground and reason for faith, 1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25. (5.) The practice of the apostles generally was a simple statement of the truth; as Acts ii. xiii.; 2 Cor. iv. 2. (6.) The experience of believers,—when any truth comes home to their hearts with power, comfort, or conviction, it is

not because they saw it on any external evidence, but it was the word itself that came home.

9. Is there not a light and a majesty in God's word that is not in the word of man? Ans. Yes; Jer. xxiii. 28, 29; and this the mind can see, when savingly enlightened by the Spirit; Psa. cxix. 18, Matt. xvi. 17; and this it cannot see without the Spirit; Isa. vi. 9, 10, 1 Cor. ii. 14.

10. And is not saving faith in the word perfectly reasonable, and consistent with the proper exercise of our rational powers? Ans. Yes; our saving faith is founded on no imaginations, but on manifest realities.

CHAPTER XXIV.

OF JUSTIFICATION.

LECTURE XXXII.—ITS GENERAL NATURE, &c.

§ I.—Q. 1. What is the general meaning of the term *justification*?

Ans. Acquittal from a charge.

2. Is it then properly a law term, or forensic, as used in a court?

Ans. Yes.

3. Is justification a Scripture term? Ans. Yes; Rom. iv. 25, iii. 24, v. 1.

§ II.—4. Is the same idea expressed by other terms in Scripture?

Ans. Yes; as—non-imputation of sin, and imputation of righteousness, Rom. iv. 6, 8; constituted righteous, Rom. v. 19; not condemned, Rom. viii. 1; covering sin, Rom. iv. 7.

§ III.—5. Does the word *justify*, in Scripture, ever refer to *inherent* righteousness or holiness? Ans. We think not. The adjective *righteous* is often so used, as Luke i. 6; but when the word, as noun, verb, or participle, is used to signify the act of one person on another, we believe it is never used in Scripture to signify inherent holiness. Thus Dan. xii. 3, may be understood as speaking of leading to a state of justification, by instruction; so Isa. liii. 11. And Rev. xxii. 11, may well be considered as signifying *justified*. At all events, it usually signifies acquittal from a charge.

6. Does not justification imply a trial at law? Ans. Yes; whether it be used respecting a human, or the Divine Judge, Prov. xvii. 15; Rom. viii. 33, 34.

7. What evidence have we that justification, in the Scripture sense of it, signifies an acquittal by God, as the Judge, and according to law? Ans. (1.) From its being contrasted with its opposites, of accusation and condemnation, Rom. viii. 1, 33, 34. (2.) From its being explained to mean—counting righteousness to the believer,

imputing righteousness, forgiving iniquities, covering sin, not imputing sin, Rom. iv. 5—8. (3.) From man's necessity, in order to happiness; being guilty, &c. (4.) From the fruits of it; as heirship, Tit. iii. 7; peace, joy, and hope, Rom. v. 1.

8. Is not the word used either for acquittal, or for acknowledgment or declaration of innocence? Ans. Yes; Job xxxiii. 32; Matt. xi. 19.

9. What do the Papists mean by the *first and second* justification? Ans. The first justification is simply acquittal, or justifying; the second is God's accounting the person still more righteous, on the ground of sanctification.

10. Is there any propriety in this distinction? Ans. No; although God approves of the believer's sanctification, this is not his justification, or acquittal from the sentence of the law.

11. How is justification usually divided? Ans. Into active and passive.

12. How are we to understand this distinction? Ans. Not that there are two acts of justification, or two kinds, but when justification is viewed as the act of God, it is called *active*—God justifying the believer; and when considered as a benefit enjoyed by the believer, it is called *passive*; that is, the believer's justification which he has received.

13. (On § I.) Wherein is justification distinct from sanctification? Ans. (1.) Justification is *forensic*, or an act in law; sanctification is not. (2.) Justification is by righteousness imputed; sanctification is a righteousness imparted. (3.) The one delivers from the guilt of sin; the other, from the pollution of it. (4.) The one is without us, and changes our state before God; the other is within, and changes the heart, &c. (5.) The one is an act; the other is a work. (6.) The one is complete at once; the other is carried on by degrees. (7.) The one is equal in all believers, and at all times; the other is not equal in all, nor in the same person at all times. (8.) Justification is before sanctification, and in order to it.

14. How does it appear that justification is before sanctification? Ans. (1.) From express Scripture, Rom. vii. 6; Heb. ix. 14. (2.) From the fact that sanctification is a life of communion with God, which must be founded on union to Christ, and acquittal from the sentence of the law. (3.) From the declaration that it is the ungodly that are justified, Rom. iv. 5.

15. But are not regeneration and sanctification the same thing? Ans. Yes; in their nature, but they differ inasmuch as regeneration is the beginning, and sanctification the progress of the divine life.

16. Is justification before regeneration, as well as before sanctification? Ans. No; It follows it.

17. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From express Scripture, Rom. viii. 30. (2.) From the fact that justification is in answer to faith, and follows it, Rom. v. 1. But faith is the exercise of the new creature, Eph. ii. 8.

18. But how do we become partakers of such spiritual and saving

blessings as regeneration and effectual calling, without justification and union to Christ, and while under the curse? Ans. (1.) We do not allow a precedence of regeneration to justification in time, but only in the order of nature. (2.) Yet, in order to regeneration, there is a union to Christ in election, the covenant of grace, and the purchase of Christ, on account of which the elect are regenerated before actual formal justification; this union is maintained in John vi. 37. (3.) There is a justification of the elect, virtually, before regeneration, and as the ground of it, (regeneration) in God's justifying or accepting of Christ's work in their stead, and in Christ's intercession for them. This is a sufficient ground for the regeneration of the elect.

19. Wherein does this virtual justification differ from that formal justification usually spoken of in Scripture, and which is the foundation of actual peace with God, and of sanctification? Ans. (1.) Formal justification is the actual acquittal of the believer, at the bar of law and justice, on account of the righteousness of Christ imputed to him; the other is not an actual acquittal, but a step in order to it. (2.) The formal justification is in answer to faith; the other is the fulfilment of the covenant of grace, securing the effectual calling of the elect, before faith, and in order to it. (3.) Formal justification is a benefit actually bestowed on us, and places us in a state of peace; virtual justification is in the decree, in the covenant, and in Christ, for us, but not actually bestowed. (4.) Formal justification is the consequence of faith, and of it the Scripture speaks when we are said to be justified by faith; as Rom. v. 1. Virtual justification is the ground on which faith is given, and of it the Scripture speaks when it says, that we "obtain faith through the righteousness of God and our Saviour," 2 Pet. i. 1; or that it is given us on the behalf of Christ to believe; Phil. i. 29. In a word, God promised a seed to Christ, on condition of his atonement. He, in that covenant promise, virtually united the elect to Christ. Christ's purchase secured the fulfilment of the promise. And in fulfilling that promise to Christ, and the decree and covenant, in due time, he gives the Holy Spirit to regenerate the elect, and to bestow on them faith, in order to actual justification through Christ.

20. But how does the doctrine that regeneration is before faith and actual justification, and in consequence of the covenant of grace, agree with those Scriptures that teach that we receive the Spirit, and purification of heart, by faith; as Gal. iii. 14, Acts xv. 9? Ans. The Spirit and regeneration are received at first passively; but these passages teach, (1.) That in regeneration we entertain the Spirit by faith, as he comes as the Spirit of faith; and, (2.) That by active faith we enjoy and receive the continual influences of the Spirit, and progressive sanctification.

21. What would be the error of holding that faith is before regeneration? Ans. That faith is of ourselves—that we are not

naturally dead in trespasses and sins—that our turning to God is of ourselves, and not of God.

22. But why must effectual calling, or regeneration, precede faith and justification, and yet progressive sanctification, which is of the same nature, follow after justification and faith? *Ans.* (1.) According to the revealed will of God, and even his nature and perfections, we cannot be justified actually, without union to Christ, and faith's acceptance of him. (2.) We cannot believe, in order to justification, without regeneration. (3.) We cannot be regenerated by the Spirit, without an atonement, as the ground on which it is given. (4.) The atonement of Christ, made for us according to covenant, is a valid ground on which God can bestow the Spirit and regeneration. (5.) Progressive sanctification being the work of God, and the effect of continued communion with him, our actual justification must precede it, as the actual ground of it. *And,* (6.) Sanctification is the acting of the new nature, which is maintained by the Spirit, and is carried on by faith and union to Christ. *And,* (7.) There is necessity that regeneration be given before faith and justification, on the ground of the atonement, but no necessity that the progressive life of sanctification should be carried on, without faith and actual justification.

LECTURE XXXIII.—NATURE OF JUSTIFICATION.—CONTINUED.

§ V.—23. Whose work is it to justify the sinner through Christ? *Ans.* The work of God alone; Isa. xliii. 25, Rom. viii. 33.

24. Why must it be of God alone? *Ans.* He alone has claims of justice against the sinner. It is his law that is violated. None can absolve from the claims of his law and justice but himself.

25. How are we then to understand the commission given to church officers to remit or retain sins; John xx. 23, Matt. xvi. 19? *Ans.* These passages signify only a ministerial remission or retaining of sins; as, (1.) Declaring the law respecting them. (2.) Exercising discipline, in laying men under sentence for sin, or absolving them ecclesiastically.

26. Do these ecclesiastical sentences either change the state of the person before God, or even declare what that state is? *Ans.* No; they only change the person's state in relation to the church, or declare it.

27. What do the Papists mean by priestly pardon? *Ans.* Not that the priest himself can actually forgive sin, but that God forgives according to the priest's sentence; Christ having, (as they suppose,) commissioned them to perform such acts, and engaged to ratify them by his own act.

28. Has Christ ever given commission to his church officers to pass an act respecting the person's state before God? *Ans.* No.

29. Is this the act of all the three persons of the Trinity? *Ans.* Yes; although it is especially ascribed to the Father, as sustaining the character of Judge, yet the other persons act in the person of the Father.

30. Is this act ever ascribed to the Son and Holy Spirit, in Scripture? Ans. Yes; as Isa. liii. 11; Matt. ii. 10; 1 Cor. vi. 11.

31. In what sense is it ascribed to the Son? Ans. As making the atonement, as the ground of justification; and as interceding and administering.

32. In what sense is it ascribed to the Spirit? Ans. As the applier of redemption—leading to faith in Christ's righteousness, John xvi. 14; and communicating the knowledge of our justification, 2 Cor. i. 22.

33. When the Father justifies, does he not do it on heaven's part, as sustaining the claims of law and justice? Ans. Yes.

34. When the Son and Holy Spirit are represented, in the economy of redemption, as justifying, do they not act on man's part? Ans. Yes.

35. Can church officers do any thing in this matter, otherwise than ministering the word, or using the means of knowledge and of faith? Ans. No.

36. Can the believer do anything in this act except receive it by faith? Ans. No.

§ VIII.—37. In what state does justification suppose man previously to have been? Ans. As under a charge of guilt, and condemned.

38. By whom is man charged and condemned? Ans. By God; Rom. viii. 33, 34.

39. Does not this charge and condemnation imply that he is guilty? Ans. Yes; Rom. iii. 19.

40. Does not this charge, condemnation and guilt, imply that he is under a violated law? Ans. Yes; "for where no law is, there is no transgression."

41. What law is he under till justified? Ans. The law as a covenant of works; Gal. iii. 10.

42. Has God any other law to condemn man, than the covenant of works? Ans. No; no other law can condemn but that which promised life for obedience, and threatened death for disobedience.

43. Are all unbelievers still under that broken covenant? Ans. Yes; Gal. iii. 10.

44. What are its demands on man now? Ans. The penalty, and perfect obedience.

45. Does the precept increase man's guilt, and the penalty, while under this law? Ans. Yes; because he is depraved and sinful.

46. Is man, while unjustified, under wrath, and liable to all miseries, under the curse? Ans. Yes; Gal. iii. 10; Eph. ii. 3.

47. How are the elect under wrath and the curse, since they were redeemed by Christ, according to covenant and electing love? Ans. It is true that, in God's view, the elect are heirs of life, and shall infallibly obtain it, but, till actually interested in Christ, and justified, they are under the just sentence of the law, and under the curse; and their open, manifest state is that of wrath. They have no actual deliverance but by faith in Christ; John iii. 18, 36.

48. Does not justification by faith imply that the elect are weak and helpless? Ans. Yes; Rom. v. 6; viii. 3.

49. But does not justification suppose the sinner to have been under a gospel call? Ans. Yes; as justification is bestowed in answer to faith.

50. Does not justification imply that the person justified was effectually called, convinced, persuaded, and believing? Ans. Yes; as only such are justified.

§ IX.—51. What is done in justification? Ans. Chiefly two things; absolution or forgiveness, and giving a title to eternal life.

52. Is not justification something more than pardon or forgiveness, in the ordinary sense of the word? Ans. Yes; it is a deliverance from guilt, condemnation, and wrath, from liability to misery, or the fruits of the curse, and from the law as a covenant; and it includes acceptance, and a title to eternal life.

53. Is not justification, not only in the ordinary sense of the word, but in the Scripture use of it, an acquittal from a charge? Ans. Yes; as Rom. iv. 5—8, where justification is explained as “imputing righteousness,” and “not imputing sin.”

54. In God’s act of justification, is not the acquittal made strictly according to the law? Ans. Yes.

55. What is the law, from the claims of which, God acquits the believer? Ans. The law as a covenant of works; as this is the only law that condemns; Rom. vii. 1—4; x. 4; Gal. iv. 4.

56. Does God’s act, in justifying the believer, mean that he had not transgressed the law? Ans. No; God’s act implies that the believer had transgressed.

57. Does God, in justification, signify or hold that the believer’s sin had no moral wrong or turpitude in it, and that no guilt attached to it? Ans. No; God’s act of justification implies that he had been guilty, and that God hates his sin.

58. Does his act of justification mean that the believer had not been guilty by his sin, nor liable to punishment? Ans. No; it implies that he had been guilty, and liable to punishment, but is so no more.

59. As the essential nature of justification is acquittal from the claims of the law as a covenant of works, what are its claims from which the believer is justified or acquitted? Ans. Two claims, the *penalty* and the *precept*.

60. How does it appear that justification acquits from both penalty and precept? Ans. (1.) The law has necessarily both claims,—death for sin, and obedience for life. (2.) Scripture abundantly shows that justification acquits from all the claims of the law; as Gal. iv. 4, 5; iii. 13; Rom. vi. 14; vii. 1—4; x. 4.

61. From what penalty does justification set us free? Ans. From the whole curse, both on account of Adam’s sin and our own; because the believer is in justification freed from the law which claims a penalty for all these.

62. How prove particularly that justification acquits the believer

from the law's claims of precept? Ans. (1.) As above, this is a claim of the law on the sinner, but the believer is freed from the law. (2.) From Rom. vii. 1—4, which teaches that, by union to Christ, the claims of the law are dead, and of course not only the claim of penalty, but the claim of precept, so that we might bring forth fruit unto God. (3.) From Rom. iii. 20, iv. 5, and many such passages, which teach that the way of salvation is not by works of the law, but by faith. (4.) There could not be an acquittal from the law's penalty, without an acquittal from the claim of precept. Because if still under the precept, we must by our depravity continue renewing our guilt. (5.) It would be a mockery of the law, and actual injustice, to set a man free from the penalty, while he still remains under the precept, and by his depravity continually violates it.

63. Would it not be unjust in God to acquit man from either claim of the law, if these claims were not satisfied? Ans. Yes; most unjust, and therefore it cannot be.

64. And if both these claims are satisfied by or for any man, would it not be unjust in God to refuse to acquit that man from either? Ans. Yes; and therefore he does acquit.

65. Obj. God might leave man under the precept of the law, and daily violating it, and yet acquit him from the penalty, through the atonement of Christ? Ans. (1.) This would be trifling with the dignity and holiness of the law. (2.) It would dishonour the law, if merely its penalty be satisfied, while its precept is never honoured by obedience. (3.) The law absolutely demands perfect obedience to its precept, as the condition of life. To grant man life without these claims being satisfied, would dishonour truth, law, and justice.

66. If the believer be in justice acquitted from the claims of the law, is he not thereby set free from guilt, wrath, condemnation, and misery? Ans. Yes; Gal. iii. 13.

67. Does justification also confer a title to eternal life? Ans. Yes.

68. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From direct Scripture; Acts xxvi. 18; 1 Pet. i. 4; Tit. iii. 7. (2.) God would not acquit the believer without making him happy for time and eternity. (3.) Eternal life, in the covenant of works, was promised to obedience, and as the justifying righteousness of Christ included satisfaction to the law's claim of obedience on man, so justification gives the believer a title to life, on Christ's fulfilment of the condition imputed to him, and justice to Christ requires it to be given.

69. Does not justification then confer a title to communion with God, to all the promises, and to all covenant blessings? Ans. Yes; (1.) A right to heaven includes all this; Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iv. 4—6. (2.) There is nothing to hinder this title, when the person is justified.

70. In justification, is the sinner in himself godly or ungodly? Ans. Ungodly; Rom. iv. 5.

71. Is God righteous, as well as merciful, in this act? Ans. Yes; Rom. iii. 26.

72. As God condemns man for justifying the ungodly, how is

this act righteous in God? **Ans.** The cases are not parallel; for (1.) God's law is fulfilled and satisfied by a substitute; which is not the case in man's judging and justifying the ungodly. (2.) In man's justifying the ungodly, he judges and acts unjustly; but God acts most justly, on the satisfaction of Christ.

73. But though the believer is in himself ungodly, how is he viewed and treated by God in justification? **Ans.** As righteous; Rom. iv. 6—8, 2 Cor. v. 19, 21, Phil. iii. 9, Isa. xlv. 24, Rom. v. 19.

74. How is the believer, in justification, viewed and treated as righteous, when he is personally guilty? **Ans.** (1.) As having satisfied the penalty, and the precept of the law, in Christ. (2.) That satisfaction is imputed to him; Rom. iv. 6—8.

75. Can acquittal from the claims of the law, and from guilt, and a title to life ever be separated? **Ans.** No; Christ has acquired both by his work; the object of the whole plan of redemption was to give both; the love of God equally confers both.

76. May we not often find that by synecdoche, the one of these is put for both? **Ans.** Yes; as Rom. iv. 7, 8, where forgiveness, &c., is called a blessedness; thus showing that they are inseparably united.

77. Are not an acquittal from guilt, and accounting the person righteous, in justification, inseparably united? **Ans.** Yes; (1.) If a person be acquitted in law, he is righteous in law; there is no medium. (2.) Divine justification is an acquittal in law, and not a renovation of heart or life. (3.) Rom. iv. 6—8, the apostle quotes from Psal. xxxii. 1, 2, which expresses only forgiveness, covering, and non-imputation, yet, verse 6th, he makes it mean the imputation of righteousness.

78. Are we to understand that when God, in justifying, acquits from the claim of the precept of the law as a covenant, he sets us free from moral obligation? **Ans.** No; only from the law's claim as a covenant; that is, obedience as the condition of life. But he holds us under the law as a rule of life.

§ X.—79. Does forgiveness of sins belong to justification? **Ans.** Yes; Eph. i. 7.

80. What kind of forgiveness—judicial or Fatherly? **Ans.** Judicial.

81. What is the difference? **Ans.** Judicial forgiveness delivers from actual guilt, or liability to punishment, and secures against condemnation. Fatherly pardon relieves from chastisements; Ps. xxxii. 5.

82. Are sins so forgiven as that no marks of divine displeasure are afterwards manifested? **Ans.** No; but they are Fatherly chastisements; Psal. cxxxix. 32.

83. Are they so forgiven that no condemnation or curse can follow? **Ans.** Yes; Rom. viii. 1.

84. How is our deliverance from guilt in justification called forgiveness, when the claims of the law are all taken off us in Christ? **Ans.** By the imputation of Christ's righteousness to us our guilt is

thereby taken away. Though an acquittal is granted to us, on a full satisfaction by Christ, it is a forgiveness to us—a remission of our iniquities, so that punishment shall not be inflicted.

85. Is pardon or forgiveness, in justification, the taking away of the stain or pollution of sin? Ans. No; this is the work of sanctification.

86. Does pardon take away the intrinsic demerit of sin? Ans. Nothing can take this away; it is essential to sin, and inseparable from it; for that intrinsic demerit Christ suffered.

87. What then is pardon? Ans. Taking away actual guilt, or liability to punishment, under the curse of the law.

88. Does it deliver from all kinds and degrees of judicial punishment? Ans. Yes; there is no more wrath or curse to those who are pardoned; Rom. viii. 1, Eph. i. 6.

89. Is there such a thing as the Papists hold—a remission of blame, without remission of punishment? Ans. No; they err in supposing that chastisements are judicial punishments, as satisfactory for sin.

90. Is it a potential or conditional pardon? Ans. No; it is not a pardon on future conditions that may be revoked, as Arminians hold, to make room for the merit of good works, and for their doctrine of believers falling from a state of grace. It is wholly of grace; according to eternal purpose a covenant; on a sufficient and finished ground; certain; irrevocable; and securing us to eternal life.

91. Are all the believer's sins pardoned in justification? Ans. Yes; Ps. ciii. 3.

92. When we say that all the believer's sins are pardoned, do we understand that sins of the believer yet to be committed are pardoned? Ans. Yes.

93. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From texts expressly declaring the forgiveness of all sins; as Acts xiii. 39, Ps. ciii. 3, Col. ii. 13. (2.) From the assurance that there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ; therefore, no condemnation by future sins. (3.) From the nature and use of the sacraments, as seals of the blessings of the covenant of grace. They do not seal our interest in a part, but in all the blessings of salvation; among which is pardon; Acts ii. 38, Matt. xxvi. 28. (4.) From the fact that the believer in Christ and justification, is delivered from all the claims of the law as a covenant. Therefore it cannot demand the penalty for future sins, no more than for the past; that is, the sin is pardoned in justification; the believer is not laid under guilt, liability to punishment, or condemnation, by his after sins, but his pardon is secured in justification. We may consider that as sins are committed, the act of justification passed on the sinner's first believing, is applied to those sins. (5.) Christ made full satisfaction for all the sins of his people; in justification this satisfaction is imputed to them, and on this ground they are set free from all liability to condemnation, or judicial punishment in justification; and this must apply to future sins, as well as to the past. And this is pardon.

94. But it may be argued that sins are not pardoned till they come into existence, and yet the believer's salvation is not thereby rendered uncertain, while the purpose and grace of God secure that they shall be pardoned when committed? Ans. This security is given to the believer in justification, and is the pardon itself: deliverance from the claims of the law is pardon.

95. Obj. (1.) In various passages, forgiveness is limited to past sins; as Jer. xxxiii. 8? —Ans. There may be promises of pardon for past sins, without limiting pardon to them. The promise of pardon may be applied to particular cases without denying that it is extended to other cases in justification.

96. Obj. (2.) Under the old dispensation there was no sacrifice for future sins? Ans. This is an error. Those sacrifices were types of Christ's atonement, which was made for all the sins of all the elect. Future sins were not indeed specified as occasions of sacrifices, as there was no occasion to do so.

97. Obj. (3.) Confession, repentance, humiliation, &c., which should precede pardon, suppose that it is only past sins that are pardoned? Ans. These exercises, in reference to every particular sin, are not necessary to judicial pardon, or security against punishments given in justification. For future sins we cannot confess particularly, nor yet every sin we have committed, through ignorance of them; yet they are pardoned in justification.

98. Obj. (4.) If all future sins are forgiven in justification, believers have no occasion to pray for pardon, as our Lord teaches we should, in the form he gave? Ans. (1.) It is right to ask forgiveness even when we have it, by way of acknowledging our dependence on God for it. (2.) We should pray for the manifestation of pardon. So we are to understand Matt. vi. 14. (3.) We should pray for Fatherly pardon.

99. Obj. (5.) The fact that a believer sins publicly is justly censured by the Church, and that sentence bound in heaven, is inconsistent with the forgiveness of future sins in justification? Ans. The objection is irrelevant. The censure does not affect the believer's state before God, only his relation to the Church.

100. Obj. (6.) This doctrine will favour licentiousness? Ans. (1.) The same objection is brought against the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, and the decree of election; but it is invalid. (2.) When the believer loses his confidence in his pardoned state, the objection does not apply—the doctrine cannot be supposed to render him careless. (3.) He that really knows his state of grace by faith, &c., is in the way of holiness. (4.) The believer will avoid sin in fear of fatherly chastisements, &c. (5.) He that has the clearest faith in his pardon always lives the holiest life; for faith purifies the heart; it works by love; it draws supplies from Christ; it leads to hate sin and love holiness.

101. How may we defend the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, from the doctrine of justification? Ans. (1.) The law's claims against us for penalty and legal obedience being satisfied,

and we acquitted, there is no cause for falling from justification. (2.) Being acquitted from the law's claims of penalty, the curse is removed, so that we cannot fall into spiritual death. (3.) The Redeemer having procured for us an unchangeable, irrevocable justification, will sustain his claims to the justified person, and train him for glory.

LECTURE XXXIII.—GROUND OF JUSTIFICATION.—IMPUTATION OF CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS.

§ XI.—102. What is the ground on which we are justified? Ans. Christ's righteousness.

103. What is the ground on which divine justice would acquit an innocent person; and what is essential to acquittal in justification? Ans. Innocence.

104. In what must that innocence consist? Ans. In freedom from sins of commission, and in the perfect performance of duty.

105. Would not this have justified Adam according to the covenant of works? Ans. Yes.

106. What is required, in justice, and according to that law of the covenant of works, to justify a guilty person? Ans. Perfect satisfaction of the penalty in suffering, and perfect obedience to the law.

107. Must our justification, even yet, be on the grounds required by the covenant of works? Ans. Yes.

108. Would not our perfect compliance with these terms, if possible to be done by us, still justify us before God? Ans. Yes.

109. Whose righteousness now completely fulfils these terms? Ans. The righteousness of Christ as Mediator; Rom. x. 4, Gal. iv. 4, 5, Rom. x. 5.

110. In what did his righteousness consist? Ans. In his holiness of nature, righteousness of life, and satisfactory death.

111. Why were these required of Christ as our Surety? Ans. Because they were required of man, and therefore necessary to be yielded by the Surety.

112. Why did Christ's righteousness consist of all that was required of us by the law as a covenant, in order to justification? Ans. (1.) Because, by purpose and covenant, he became the substitute for us, under the law as a covenant, Gal. iv. 4, 5; iii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 21. (2.) Law and justice necessarily demanded a perfect satisfaction, whether by us or our Surety. (3.) God intended to show us mercy in our redemption, by maintaining truth, law, and justice, in the substitutionary atonement by his Son.

113. But how could this righteousness of Christ either deliver us, or sustain law and justice in our deliverance? Ans. (1.) By its being, by covenant and purpose, rendered in our stead, under the law. (2.) By its being imputed or reckoned of God to us, and thus we are justified by it as really as though it had been wrought by us.

114. Is it the righteousness of Christ itself, or only its effects, that are imputed to us for our salvation? Ans. The righteousness itself is imputed, and on that imputation the effects are imparted. Right-

eousness is properly the subject or matter of imputation. The effects are neither the matter nor the subject of imputation; nor would the imputation of them answer any purpose.

115. Is this imputation of Christ's righteousness a doctrine taught in Scripture? Ans. Yes; Rom. iv. 6—8; 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. iii. 9; Isa. xlv. 24; the scape-goat, &c.

116. How is it just to justify and acquit us, on the righteousness of another, even though that righteousness was perfect and adequate? Ans. (1.) Christ had a right to give himself. (2.) God had a right to accept him, as substitute. (3.) The law had no claim on him on his own account, and therefore his obedience and sufferings could be set to our account. (4.) The satisfaction was yielded by, or in, the very nature on which the law had its claim.

117. How do we obtain the imputation of Christ's righteousness to ourselves? Ans. By faith, accepting the offer and promise of righteousness to us; Rom. x. 4.

118. Is the doctrine that the righteousness of Christ is the ground, and the only ground of our justification, a necessary and fundamental doctrine of the gospel? Ans. Yes; Rom. iii. 20, 24, Gal. v. 4.

§ XII.—119. As this article of our faith is so important, how prove it? Ans. (1.) From many texts representing Christ's righteousness as ours; Jer. xxiii. 6; 1 Cor. i. 30; Phil. iii. 9; Rom. iii. 22. (2.) From texts of Scripture which make Christ's righteousness not only ours, but the very ground of our justification, as Isa. xlv. 24, 25, Rom. v. 19, Isa. liii. 5, 2 Cor. v. 21, Rom. iii. 24. (3.) From Scripture texts which exclude entirely our own works, as a ground of our justification, or any price brought by us, as Isa. lv. 1, Rom. iii. 20, 28, Gal. ii. 16, v. 4; while yet God justifies the ungodly, and him that believeth, and in justifying us, he must be just, Rom. iii. 26. (4.) From Scriptures which represent our justification as entirely of free grace; as Rom. iii. 24; iv. 4, 5; xi. 6; Eph. ii. 8, 9. (5.) From Scripture texts which teach that we are justified by faith and not by works; Rom. iii. 25—28; iv. 4, 5, 16; Gal. ii. 16. (6.) It appears from the justice of God, which could not justify us on any other ground, as all other grounds are utterly insufficient. (7.) From the condition of man, as utterly unable to render a perfect righteousness. (8.) From the fact of Christ's rendering a righteousness as our surety, which could not be rendered for another purpose.

120. Why can our works not justify us? Ans. (1.) Works, if perfect, could not satisfy the penalty. (2.) Grace cannot be exercised to the neglect of justice. (3.) There is no goodness in our works before regeneration, and all are imperfect after it. (4.) Justice requires perfection.

121. Could not our works in part justify us? Ans. No; as appears (1.) From texts; Rom. iii. 18; iv. 4; xi. 6. (2.) Christ's work is sufficient, and therefore there is no need of our works to justify. (3.) To have justification in part by our works, would dishonour his perfect righteousness. (4.) None of our works can have

that perfection necessary in a ground of justification. (5.) All the good works which we can do, are due, and therefore are not meritorious. (6.) Whatever good works we have, proceed from divine grace in us, and bestowed upon us as justified already. (7.) Justification in any measure by our works would not be suited to a state of glory, either as a foundation for enjoying glory, or as suited to the exercises in glory, where we shall sing, "To Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood," &c.

122. What are we to understand by works of the law, which are denounced as grounds of justification? Ans. Works of obedience to any law of God, rendered for the purpose of our justification or acceptance, trusted on as such by us, or treated as such by God.

123. Are we justified by faith, on account of the goodness of the act? Ans. No; this would be treating it as a work of the law.

124. How then are we justified by faith in contradistinction from works? Ans. As an instrument of receiving the righteousness of Christ, the true ground of justification. There are two supposed ways of justification,—one by our own works, the other by the righteousness or work of Christ. On the first plan, our own operation would make us possessors of the ground of justification; on the second, faith receives and makes us possessors. The first way is called *works*, the latter, *faith*.

§ XIII.—125. Adversaries, among whom are Papists and Arminians, object to the doctrine of justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ, without any works of our own as the ground of it, (1.) The word *justification* signifies the internal change of the subject,—the inherent holiness bestowed on the sinner? Ans. We have already shown that the word *justify* never does, (or very rarely, if ever,) mean, making inherently righteous; and that unquestionably it is used in Scripture as signifying an acquittal from a charge and claim of law. This is a real benefit of the covenant of grace bestowed; and of this we speak. Sanctification is indeed connected with it, as a consequence; but the apostle also speaks of justification in a law sense; as in Rom. v. 18, 19,—By Adam's offence came condemnation; and it made or *constituted them sinners*. This is utterly unaccountable without imputation. Sin inherent, (as men were not then born,) could not condemn, or constitute men sinners. And just so in the converse;—Christ's obedience justifies his people, and makes or constitutes them righteous.

126. Obj. (2.) We do not read of imputation of Christ's righteousness in Scripture? Ans. It is quibbling. If we do not read the words, in the very collocation of them, "Imputed righteousness of Christ," we read what necessarily means the same, viz.; "righteousness imputed without works," Rom. iv. 6; constituted righteous by Christ's obedience, Rom. v. 18, 19; having Christ's righteousness, Phil. iii. 9; justified by his blood, Rom. v. 9; being made the righteousness of God in Christ, 2 Cor. v. 21.

127. Obj. (3.) The Scripture representation of our justification through grace, is inconsistent with the doctrine of justification by

imputed righteousness; because if we are justified on a full satisfaction to justice, it would not be of grace? Ans. True, if justification were granted on our personal satisfaction to justice, it would not be of grace; but when our justification is not on our works, but on a satisfaction provided by God himself, and by grace imputed to us, it is then wholly of grace. The doctrine of salvation by grace, does not exclude a satisfaction to justice by Christ, but a satisfaction made by us.

128. (Obj. 4.) The imputation of the righteousness of another to us, and justifying us on account of it, is inconsistent with the perfect justice of God? Ans. The allegation is utterly unfounded, and proceeds on a mistake of the doctrine of imputation and justification. God does not impute an imaginary righteousness to us, but a real and actual righteousness. He does not, by imputation or justification, say that we are inherently holy, or that he found the righteousness in us. In justification, he counts Christ's righteousness to us, and pronounces us thereby legally righteous. He pronounces our relation to the law, as freed from its legal claims, because these have been answered for us by Christ, as our surety, appointed of God himself to this work.

129. Obj. (5.) The doctrine of imputation is attended with absurd consequences; such as, (1.) That, by imputation, Christ the holy one is made a sinner. (2.) That we are made as righteous as Christ. (3.) That the inherent holiness lost in Adam, is not to be restored. (4.) And that we are loosed from obligation to study holiness? Ans. (1.) That by imputation Christ is made a sinner? It is true, in one sense; 2 Cor. v. 21; Isa. liii. 6. But it is only by imputation, not by defilement; and God treated him under this view, by punishment; and in his case justice could not punish but on imputation of sin; so Isa. liii. 5, 6. (2.) That we are made as righteous as Christ? It is true, that in law we are as righteous; it is as completely satisfied for us, by the righteousness imputed, as it was by Christ's performance of it; 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. iii. 9. But our doctrine does not maintain that we are as holy as Christ. And though the result will be holiness like Christ's, 1 John iii. 2, yet it will not be an infinite holiness, as his. (3.) That inherent holiness lost in Adam is not to be restored? This is a misrepresentation of our doctrine, and proceeds on the blinded notion of our opponents, that inherent holiness must still be the ground of justification, and that legal righteousness and inherent holiness are not, under the covenant of grace, to be distinguished. Inherent holiness is, on the gospel plan, to be restored; this plan alone will restore it; and it will be restored to a higher state than in Adam, and maintained by divine power, and on divine security. (4.) That on the doctrine of imputed righteousness and justification by it, we are loosed from obligation to study holiness? (a.) The justifying righteousness of Christ imputed, is not a substitute for our inherent holiness, as our opponents blindly suppose. (b.) But it secures the work of inherent holiness to be carried on and perfected by the Holy Spirit. (c.)

And under this security and power, and the renovation of the heart by the Spirit, all gospel motives are influential in leading the believer to holiness, and without this state of grace, no motives or influences can ever lead to holiness.

LECTURE XXXIV.—IMPUTATION OF CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS,—CONTINUED.—SUBJECTS, EVIDENCES, AND PERMANENCY OF JUSTIFICATION.

§ § XIV., XV.—130. What is the Popish and Arminian doctrine on the ground of our justification? Ans. (1.) That we are justified, and forgiven partly on account of Christ's satisfaction, and partly on account of our own. (2.) That we are entitled to life on account of our works—either on account of their worth and proper merit, or on the ground of a covenant compact.

131. In reference to this opinion, could anything, under divine justice, procure pardon, but a full satisfaction to justice? Ans. No.

132. If forgiveness were given partly on account of our works, would it not detract from the honour of Christ's satisfaction, and imply that it was imperfect? Ans. Yes.

133. How may these Arminian errors be fairly condemned from Scripture, and our whole justification by Christ sustained? Ans. (1.) From all those passages which denounce works as the ground of our justification; as Rom. iii. 20, 28; Gal. i. 16; v. 4. (2.) From those texts which propose forgiveness through Christ alone; Acts iv. 12, compared with xiii. 38. (3.) From those texts which require that our salvation be to the glory of God; as 1 Cor. i. 29—31; Rev. i. 5.

134. What do the Papists mean by faith formed and without form? Ans. Faith in its first acts is without the accompaniments of love and good works—faith formed is when it is accompanied by these.

135. Is there any ground for this distinction? Ans. No; faith in its first actings is accompanied by love and other graces.

136. What use do they make of this distinction in the doctrine of justification? Ans. (1.) They hold that faith without love tends to justification, but does not obtain it; but that when faith is accompanied by love and other graces, it obtains justification, and has a right to it.

137. Is there, then, a real and essential difference between the Popish and Arminian doctrine of justification, and the Scripture doctrine of free grace? Ans. Yes; the Popish and Arminian doctrine makes our good works necessary as a meritorious ground of justification, pardon, and a title to life, and forbids sinners to rest on Christ alone for these benefits; while the Scriptures require us to renounce our own works, as any ground of justification, and to rest on Christ alone.

§ XV.—138. In favour of their views, they object (1.) That many Scriptures represent God as rewarding according to our works, yea, and *for* our works; as Rom. viii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 10; Matt. xxv. 32, &c., Luke vii. 47? Ans. (1.) The expression "according to

deeds," in reference to the wicked, is the same as "for their deeds," because they are deserving of wrath, and moreover, their sins are committed under the law and the curse. But with respect to the believer, it means—in agreeableness to those texts which denounce works, and place our justification on Christ's righteousness alone—that their works are done in faith, and in union to Christ; therefore, according to their works, they are in Christ, and justified by faith. (2.) Matt. xxv. 32, &c., and Luke vii. 47, only convey the same idea of judging "according to deeds." The deeds manifest the state of the person. In Luke viii. 50, the woman's acceptance is ascribed to faith, as explanatory of the preceding expressions.

139. Obj. (2.) The Scriptures speak of rewards to the righteous, Matt. v. 12; vi. 4; of working out our salvation, Phil. ii. 12; and even of merit, Heb. xiii. 16? Ans. (1.) Rewards must be understood consistently with free grace, and our unworthiness. They are so called as encouraging to us in duty and trials, and to be enjoyed in a course of duty and faith, though free gifts. (2.) Working out our salvation, implies no merit or cause of justification; but that we must use the means of grace—gives diligence to attain to faith and actual pardon through Christ,—and to evidence of this. (3.) As to merit, expressed in Heb. xiii. 16, the original word only means that these good works are pleasing and acceptable to God, through Christ, according to 1 Pet. ii. 5; the idea of merit is an error of the Vulgate translation.

140. Obj. (3.) The saints appeal to their own righteousness; as Ps. vii. 9; God is said to render to them according to their righteousness, 2 Tim. iv. 8; Ps. xviii. 24? Ans. (1.) In those passages in the Psalms, righteousness is not spoken of as the ground of personal justification before God, but of righteousness of our deeds towards men, and the justification of our cause with them. (2.) The crown of righteousness, of which Paul speaks, must be understood according to his doctrine. It is a crown procured by Christ's righteousness, and it is righteously bestowed for Christ's sake.

141. Obj. 4. In James ii. 14, 21, 22, justification is ascribed to works, and not to faith? Ans. (1.) James and Paul, both speaking by inspiration, do not disagree. James must be understood in a sense agreeing with Paul, and Paul in a sense which agrees with James. (2.) This is attained by considering the immediate object of both the writers. Paul speaks of the only ground of legal justification before God, utterly excluding works as that ground. James inquires into the character and nature of that faith which justifies, and pleads against the Antinomians. The amount of James' doctrine is that a man is justified only by such a faith as produces good works—a faith evidenced by works; and so would Paul be understood.

142. Obj. (5.) That our doctrine makes God a respecter of persons, giving favour to one who is no better than another? Ans. Respecting of persons, always implies that the persons have some claim, and that favour is bestowed because of something either seen or

imagined in the person favoured; while another, as good, is overlooked. Now this has no place in God's saving dealings with sinners. He does not bestow on account of any thing in us. Moreover, it has been long maintained that respecting of persons can have no place in matters of mere favour or grace.

143. Obj. (6.) If works are not necessary to justification, it abolishes the law, and consequently all godliness? Ans. This is an imagination of a blinded mind; for (1.) The Apostle asserts the contrary, Rom. iii. 31. (2.) Believers in free justification are the only ones who love the law, and keep it in a godly spirit. (3.) They who seek justification by their works, both deny grace, and practically reject the law.

§ XVI.—144. What is the Socinian doctrine on justification? Ans. (1.) They deny any proper satisfaction by Christ. (2.) They hold that the ground of our justification is our obedience to a new law under the gospel. (3.) That, though this obedience is not perfect, grace consists in accepting a compromise. (4.) That there is no justification till death;—then we are received to glory.

145. Is not this an entire rejection of the Scripture doctrine of justification? Ans. Yes; as (1.) Denying the satisfaction of Christ, of which the Scriptures are so full. (2.) Their doctrine denies the justice, holiness, and immutability of God, in holding that we have a new law, on the abrogation of the old. (3.) It denies the justice and holiness of God, in holding that he will justify and accept on the ground of an imperfect righteousness. (4.) It denies the nature of faith, which is a resting on the righteousness of Christ. (5.) It denies what is uniformly taught in Scripture—that believers are justified in this life, Rom. v. 1, 9, viii. 1, Ps. xxxii. 1, 5.

§ XVII.—146. Do not the Arminians hold that Christ made a general satisfaction for the sins of the world? Ans. Yes.

147. What purpose, according to them, did that general satisfaction answer? Ans. Not the certain redemption of any individual, but it procured for sinners a new covenant, and a new law, easier in its demands, so that we may obtain salvation and justification by the works of faith and new obedience.

148. Wherein is this erroneous? Ans. (1.) Christ would not then be our salvation; this would be due to our works; contrary to Rom. iii. 20, &c. (2.) It degrades the perfect law of God, and imputes to him unholiness, in changing his law; and injustice, in justifying the sinner without satisfaction to its demands of perfect obedience.

149. Obj. (1.) We are justified by faith, and faith is called a work, John vi. 29; and therefore we are justified by the work of faith? Ans. (1.) Faith may be considered as a work, in obedience to the law, but under this view it is rejected as a ground of justification, with all other works. (2.) Faith only justifies as a receiving grace; not itself, but what it receives, justifies us.

150. Obj. (2.) Faith is imputed for righteousness, Rom. iv. 3, 5; and therefore, as a work, it justifies? Ans. (1.) As a work, it

cannot justify, because it, with all other works, is denounced, as a ground of justification, and because it is not a perfect obedience, and justice could not justify on account of it. (2.) Justification on the account of faith, is not the ground of our justification that is promised, but the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, Rom. iii. 24. (3.) Faith would be disappointed if, called to rest on Christ as the "end of the law for righteousness," it should find that, instead of this glorious ground, our own work of faith is all our ground of standing before God. (4.) Faith is, in such passages, put for the righteousness which it receives. Thus, our own works, and the works of Christ are the only two supposable ways of justification. By our works we possess the one ground, by faith we possess the other—and the different grounds are denominated by the acts by which we came to possess them.

151. Do the Scriptures ever say that we are justified *on account of* faith? Ans. No; but *by* faith, Phil. iii. 9; *through* faith, Rom. iii. 30; *of* or *from* faith, Rom. iv. 16.

152. Is faith the means of our interest in Christ's justifying righteousness? Ans. Yes; Rom. iv. 5, 16, iii. 22.

153. Is no other grace than faith the means of our interest in Christ's righteousness, and our justification? Ans. No; Rom. iii. 28; yet other graces must accompany; James ii. 24.

154. Why is faith the only means of justification? Ans. (1.) Because God so appointed it. (2.) It is the only receiving grace. (3.) It is the only grace that accepts the gospel offer, rests on the promise and gift of Christ, and renounces all other grounds.

§ XVIII.—154½. Some have held that it is the essential righteousness of Christ, as God, that justifies us? Why not? Ans. (1.) The essential righteousness of Christ is not communicable. (2.) This righteousness is common to the persons of the Trinity, and the righteousness of Christ, then, would no more be our justifying righteousness than that of the Father and of the Spirit. (3.) If it were the essential righteousness of Christ, there would have been no need of Christ's humiliation and atonement. (4.) The essential righteousness of God is neither suffering nor obedience to the law under which man was placed, and therefore could not answer the ends of justice, as a fulfilment of the requirements of the law.

155. Obj. (1.) We need an infinite righteousness? Ans. Christ's righteousness is infinite in value, and perfectly adapted to our case, and we need no more.

156. Obj. (2.) Our justifying righteousness is called "the righteousness of God," Rom. iii. 21; Phil. iii. 9; and "eternal," Dan. ix. 24? Ans. (1.) The Mediatorial righteousness of Christ is God's righteousness; for, (a.) God appointed and revealed it; (b.) Christ who is God wrought it; (c.) God accepts it and imputes it. (2.) It is justly called everlasting, as undertaken from eternity, and it will be eternally sufficient as the righteousness of his people.

157. Obj. (3.) Christ and Jehovah is called himself our righteousness, Jer. xxiii. 6; 1 Cor. i. 30? Ans. In whatever sense we would

understand *righteousness* in these texts, it is evident that Jehovah or Christ is put, by metonymy, for his righteousness. And Christ, who is Jehovah, wrought our justifying righteousness.

§ V.—158. Since then justification is of God alone, on account of Christ's righteousness only, and not for our works, is it not then wholly of grace? Ans. Yes.

159. Is, then, the sinner welcome to justification, though yet in his sin, and before faith and repentance? Ans. Yes.

160. What proof that the sinner, before faith and repentance, is welcome to justification, through the righteousness of Christ? Ans. (1.) Unless it were so, he would have no warrant for faith, and could have no faith, and therefore no justification. (2.) Though faith goes before justification, yet it does not precede justification as a ground of right, but as an act of acceptance of a right bestowed by free grace. (3.) The same thing appears from the declaration that the gospel is good news, which it would not be, if the offer of justification were suspended on deeds which we could never perform. (4.) It appears from the fact that God laid our iniquities on Christ, according to eternal covenant, and Christ satisfied for them, and all this of sovereign mercy to the sinner. (5.) Because God offers Christ and all his salvation to sinners, as such, making no condition whatever, Prov. viii. 4; Acts xiii. 38, 39. (6.) Faith or repentance, before justification, as a condition, would be inconsistent with free grace, and with the covenant of grace, and the purchase of Christ.

§ VI.—161. Who are the subjects of justification? Ans. The elect, Rom. viii. 33.

162. Are any but the elect justified? Ans. No; because none can be saved but those whom God chose to save.

163. When are they justified actually? Ans. On believing, Rom. v. 1.

164. Are all the elect, without exception, justified? Ans. Yes; because none are saved without justification; and the elect are all saved.

165. But were the elect, under the Old Testament dispensation, justified, before Christ's Mediatorial righteousness was actually wrought? Ans. Yes.

166. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) They had the promise of Christ, and salvation through him, Gen. iii. 15; xvii. 7. (2.) From Scripture testimony, that individuals among them were justified; as Abraham, Rom. iv. 3; David, Ps. xxxii. 5; Rachab and others, Heb. xi. (3.) From the fact that believers were then saved, in faith and hope, as well as now; but there never was, since the fall, any possible way of salvation but by justification through Christ. Divine justice and truth could admit of no other way. (4.) From the fact that Christ's righteousness was as valid to justify before its actual performance, as after, and the same salvation, and way of salvation were exhibited by the Old Testament dispensation as by the New.

§ VII.—167. Should we admit, with our author, that the justifi-

fication of Old Testament saints differed from our justification? Ans. No; the different circumstances mentioned made no difference whatever in the justification of the people. The atonement of Christ was just as present to God, and as valid, under the old dispensation, as under the new. Typical representations exhibited the same thing as the historical facts and New Testament ordinances do now.

168. But Obj. (1.) Cocceius and others say that Christ was, under the old dispensation, only a *Fidejussor*, assuring the Creditor of payment, whether by himself, or the original debtor, and not an *Ex-promissor*, engaging to pay the debt himself, or actually standing in the debtor's place for the payment? Ans. The covenant between the Father and the Son was always the same—that Christ should engage actually for the sinner's debt. His work in time was what it was promised in the Old Testament to be. On this ground the faith and hope of Old and New Testament saints are one; the Old and New Testament church is one; and we are required to follow their faith, Heb. vi. 12.

169. But does not the Scripture, Heb. vii. 22; imply that Christ was not a Surety of the covenant under the old dispensation, but under the new? Ans. No; it is not a difference in the plan of salvation under the two dispensations that is signified by this text; but, (1.) A difference in the means of dispensing the same salvation; and, (2.) A difference between the covenant of works and the covenant of grace. The old dispensation answered two purposes—a real dispensation of the gospel to believers, and a dispensation of the law as a covenant to unbelievers.

170. Obj. (2.) The justification of believers, under the old dispensation, was not so full or real as under the new? Ans. (1.) There can be no grades in justification; and it must be real, or an entire acquittal, or no salvation at all. (2.) But they had as full promises of forgiveness as we; Isa. i. 18, xliii. 25, Ps. ciii. 3. (3.) They rejoiced in a full forgiveness, as much as we; as Ps. xxxii. 1, 2, 5.

171. Obj. (3.) The Old Testament saints enjoyed only the passing by of their iniquity, and not proper remission; as Rom. iii. 25, *pa-resis*, not *aphesis*? Ans. The assertion is false; Rom. iv. 7, Heb. ix. 22.

172. Obj. (4.) Believers under the Old Testament were still under guilt, wrath, the curse, and the power of Satan; as Gal. iii. 10, teaches? Ans. That passage conveys no such idea. It is the law as a covenant of works that is there spoken of—the only law of God which pronounces a curse; and not the ceremonial law. For Abraham's faith is there contrasted with the works of the law, although he observed in faith the works of the ceremonial law. The curse was threatened to the wicked, but not to believers.

173. Obj. (5.) The Old Testament saints were under continual fear, and had no tranquillity of conscience; which they endeavour to establish by such passages as Heb. ii. 15, x. 2, 22? Ans. (1.) They had a tranquil conscience then as well as now; see the Psalms in ge-

neral; particularly the 23rd, 73rd, &c., Heb. xi. 35, &c. (2.) The passages they quote are perverted; Heb. ii. 15, speaks of the natural feelings of *all men* about death and judgment; but by Christ's death, we have ground of deliverance. Heb. x. 2, does not mean that believers, under the Old Testament, looking through their sacrifices to Christ, had still a guilty conscience, but that these sacrifices could not themselves purge the conscience.

§ XIX.—174. Does God make known to his people their actual justification? Ans. Yes; he uses means to satisfy them of it, and gives them all an opportunity of knowing it.

175. What means does he use? Ans. (1.) Outward means; as the word and sacraments. (2.) Inward means—the Holy Spirit.

176. How do outward means convey this knowledge? Ans. The word giving ground of faith, and describing fruits of justification, as marks of grace; the sacraments confirming our faith by sensible signs.

177. How does it appear that the Holy Spirit communicates this knowledge to believers? Ans. From Rom. v. 5, viii. 16, 17.

178. How does the Holy Spirit communicate the knowledge of justification to believers? Ans. (1.) By opening the eyes to see the free grace of the gospel. (2.) Strengthening faith to appropriate. (3.) Working graces in them, and shining on these; Rom. viii. 16. (4.) Leading into communion with God.

179. What are the fruits of such communications by the Spirit, and such discoveries of our justification? Ans. Many; such as peace of conscience, Rom. v. 1; joy, 1 Pet. i. 8; love, Luke vii. 47; 1 John iv. 19; glorying, Rom. v. 2, 3.

§ XX.—180. May we then by these means obtain an assurance of our individual actual justification? Ans. Yes; as appears, (1.) From texts already set forth; such as Rom. v. 1, &c., viii. 16, &c. (2.) From the examples of believers attaining this, as Job, David, Ps. xxiii. &c. (3.) From exhortations to make our knowledge of this sure; 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 2 Pet. i. 10. (4.) From exhortations to exercise assurance of faith; Heb. x. 22.

181. Papists object, (1.) That no one is conscious of perfect purity; as Prov. xx. 9; Job ix. 2, 20? Ans. Certainty of justification may exist without perfect freedom from sin; Rom. vii. 23, 25. Freedom from the dominion of sin is necessary to this assurance, but not freedom from all sin; 1 John iii. 20, 21.

182. Obj. (2.) Repentance is not necessarily or certainly accompanied by pardon; as Dan. iv. 27, Joel ii. 14; and though we repent, we may not be pardoned? Ans. Repentance is necessary, in order to manifestation of pardon; Psal. xxxii. 5; but the uncertainty expressed in the passages quoted, refers either to the uncertainty of real repentance, or the uncertainty of removal of temporal afflictions.

183. Obj. (3.) The Scriptures recommend fear; Phil. ii. 13? Ans. The fear recommended is godly fear, fear of sin, and Christian caution—not doubts.

184. Obj. (4.) Our duty to pray for the remission of sins, implies

that we are not assured of the benefit as yet? **Ans.** (1.) Prayer for remission should be in assured faith; Heb. x. 22. (2.) We should, by praying, acknowledge our need of God's pardoning mercy, and our dependence on him for it. (3.) We should pray for the manifestation of it, and for Fatherly pardon.

§ XXI.—185. Is our justification irrevocable? **Ans.** Yes.

186. How does this appear? **Ans.** (1.) Texts; Rom. viii. 1, 30—34, xi. 29. (2.) From the ground of justification—the all-sufficient righteousness of Christ. (3.) From the nature of justification—acquittal from the claims of the law. (4.) From the covenant of grace, by which it is provided.

187. Obj. (1.) Ezek. xviii. 24, speaks of death in apostacy? **Ans.** Not the truly justified person, but one who is moral, and appears righteous.

188. Obj. (2.) Matt. xviii. 35, implies that if we fail to forgive, God will withdraw his forgiveness? **Ans.** The scope is, if we forgive not, we are not believers nor forgiven.

189. What is the effect of justification? **Ans.** Salvation; present and eternal, to the glory of God.

CHAPTER XXV.—LECTURE XXXVI.

OF SANCTIFICATION.

§§ I., II., III.—Q. 1. Is sanctification also a benefit of the covenant of grace? **Ans.** Yes.

2. Is it a Scripture term? **Ans.** Yes; 2 Thess. ii. 13; John xvii. 17.

3. Has it not many meanings in Scripture? **Ans.** Yes.

4. State some of them? **Ans.** (1.) To separate to a holy use. In this sense the tabernacle, the priests, &c., were sanctified. In this sense the church as a body, is sanctified. So infants of believers, 1 Cor. vii. 14. (2.) Preparation for a holy work; so Christ, John xvii. 19. (3.) Removing the curse from any thing; so 1 Tim. iv. 5, 1 Cor. vii. 14. (4.) Sometimes it signifies the acknowledgment and celebration of divine holiness; Levit. x. 3, 1 Pet. iii. 15. (5.) And a gracious internal change of the sinner; 2 Thess. ii. 13.

5. Is not separation to a holy use, the original meaning of the word? **Ans.** Yes; as קדש (*ka-dash*.)

6. Does not this meaning run through all the uses of the word? **Ans.** Yes.

7. Is not the gracious, saving change of the heart, an effectual setting of the heart and all its powers apart for a holy use? **Ans.** Yes.

8. What other names does sanctification obtain in Scripture? **Ans.** Such as “washing,” “renovation,” “transformation,”

“putting off the old man,” &c., “circumcision of the heart,” “holiness.”

9. Does it not sometimes include regeneration? Ans. Yes; as 1 Cor. i. 30, vi. 11.

10. When the apostle gives a catalogue of benefits of the new covenant, in Rom. viii. 29, 30, and does not name this benefit expressly, yet does he include it? Ans. Yes; in effectual calling and glorification.

11. In what special sense is the word understood as we generally use it in theological discussions, and as a distinct benefit of the covenant of grace? Ans. As a saving, internal, and real change of the heart, distinct from effectual calling, as the progress of the work of grace in the soul.

§ IV.—12. To whom is this work attributed, in Scripture, as the operator of it? Ans. To God alone; John xvii. 17, Phil. ii. 12, 13.

13. In what sense is it ascribed to the Father? Ans. It is by his authority and Spirit; so Jude 1.

14. In what sense to the Son? Ans. As purchasing, interceding, giving the Spirit; Eph. v. 25, 26, John xvi. 13.

15. In what sense to the Spirit? Ans. As immediately operating the work; 2 Thess. ii. 13.

16. Are we able then to sanctify ourselves? Ans. No.

17. How prove this? Ans. (1.) Our inability to all goodness; John xv. 5, Rom. viii. 7. (2.) From the Scripture description of our natural state; Eph. ii. 1. (3.) From the promises and provisions of the gospel; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 1 Cor. i. 30. (4.) From its being exclusively ascribed to God; Phil. ii. 13. (5.) From the nature of the work itself, called a new creation, &c.

18. Is then this work supernatural? Ans. Yes.

19. What do we understand by a supernatural work? Ans. (1.) That it is not by our own powers. (2.) That it is not merely a work of God, by ordinances and providences, employing natural or moral means only, but his work in Christ,—his creation.

20. Does it follow, then, that we have nothing to do in this work? Ans. No; Phil. ii. 12, 13.

21. How far are we passive, and how far active in this work? Ans. (1.) Passive in regeneration. (2.) In the communication of grace and power for any particular act of sanctification. But, (3.) Active in exercising the grace bestowed.

22. What error is involved, in the objection, that if the work be of God alone, and not of ourselves, then man has nothing to do in it? Ans. (1.) It involves the error, that unless man's power be original and independent, he has nothing to do when power is communicated. (2.) That he need not use the power and gracious disposition which he has received from God.

23. Are not the good works of believers really their own, though wrought of God? Ans. Yes.

24. How do believers derive or draw strength and grace from Christ for sanctification and good works? Ans. By faith, Gal. ii. 20.

25. Can sanctification be attained now under the covenant of works? Ans. No; that covenant promises no grace to the sinner. It is a benefit wholly of the covenant of grace, in Christ.

26. Though God is the sole author of the work of sanctification, may not gospel ministers be instrumental in the sanctification of sinners? Ans. Yes; Dan. xii. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 9.

§ V.—27. Who are the subjects of this work? Ans. The elect, Eph. i. 4.

28. Why are they alone sanctified? Ans. (1.) Because sanctification is a saving work, and none are saved but those whom God chose to salvation. (2.) None are sanctified but by divine grace, and therefore it is done according to purpose. (3.) Because none are sanctified but those redeemed by Christ, according to covenant.

29. Why are all the elect, without exception, sanctified? Ans. (1.) Because the decree secured their sanctification, in order to salvation, 2 Thess. ii. 13. (2.) Because their sanctification was purchased by Christ. (3.) Because God is faithful to his promise to Christ, to give him a seed, John vi. 37.

30. May even infants of believing parents be sanctified? Ans. Yes; Acts ii. 39.

31. If infants be elect, and die in infancy, are they not sanctified? Ans. Yes.

32. How may we suppose infants are sanctified, who have no knowledge or faith? Ans. They are as capable of sanctification by the Spirit, as of previous depravity.

33. How does it appear that the elect of the Old Testament church were sanctified? Ans. (1.) From their prayers, Ps. li. 12. (2.) From God's promises to them, Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26. (3.) From the exhibition of this blessing in their ceremonial rites; as sprinklings, washings, &c. (4.) From their actual attainments—of godly affections, deeds, &c.

34. Should we allow, with some, that the writing of the law on the heart, the circumcision of the heart, promised especially to New Testament times, belongs only to New Testament times; as Jer. xxxi. 33? Ans. No; these would be more eminently fulfilled in New Testament times, but not more truly so.

§ VI.—35. In what state does the work of sanctification imply the subject of it to be? Ans. (1.) Effectually called; as sanctification is the progress of the work begun in effectual calling. (2.) As justified; none being sanctified but those justified in Christ. (3.) As still sinners, and as yet imperfect.

§ VII.—36. What is done in sanctification; or how manifold is the work? Ans. Twofold; mortification and vivification; or taking away sin, and conferring inherent righteousness or holiness.

37. How does it appear that it includes these two parts? Ans. (1.) They are expressly described in Scripture, Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, Eph. iv. 22, 24. (2.) The necessity of both is obvious.

38. Are these two parts separable? Ans. No; and therefore one is often put for both, Rom. vi. 14. j!

39. Is this work instantaneous or gradual? Ans. Gradual, Prov. iv. 18, Phil. iii. 12.

40. As the work is gradual, must not the believer be imperfect in this life? Ans. Yes; Rom. vii.

41. Must not mortification of sin, and advance in righteousness keep pace with one another? Ans. Yes; as light is given, darkness is dispelled; as love is given, aversion is removed, &c.

42. Which is first in the order of nature—mortification or vivification? Ans. Vivification.

43. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Vivification is the means of subduing sin. (2.) Darkness cannot be removed, but by the light; nor hatred of God removed, but by love; nor weakness removed, but by strength.

44. When does the work of sanctification begin? Ans. In regeneration.

45. Is not the person then a new creature? Ans. Yes; 2 Cor. v. 17.

46. Does the work of sanctification include an amendment of life? Ans. Yes; Eph. iv. 22, 24.

47. But is it a mere amendment? Ans. No; it is a renovation, Eph. iv. 24, ii. 10.

48. Though sanctification begins in regeneration, is the grace given in regeneration the sufficient spring and cause of future progress in sanctification? Ans. No; it is in Christ we are complete, Col. ii. 10; we live by communications from Christ, John xv. 4, 5; Gal. ii. 20.

49. What connexion, then, has regeneration with progressive sanctification? Ans. (1.) Regeneration is the beginning of life; sanctification the progress and growth. (2.) We are first really united to Christ in regeneration; sanctification is by continued union.

50. What then is the reason that the regenerated always progress in sanctification? Ans. (1.) Because the union with Christ, begun in regeneration, continues through a life of sanctification. (2.) The indwelling of the Spirit, commencing in regeneration, continues in sanctification; 1 John iii. 9. (3.) The decree, the covenant, the purchase of Christ, and the faithfulness of God, secure the continuance of grace and supply to the regenerated.

51. After what image is the person renewed, in regeneration and sanctification? Ans. The image of God, Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10; Rom. viii. 29.

51½. In what does that image consist? Ans. In knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10.

52. Are, then, the understanding, will, and affections renewed progressively in sanctification? Ans. Yes.

53. Does this work give new constituent powers to the soul? Ans. No.

54. What does it give? Ans. New views, a new disposition of the affections, and a new inclination to the will.

55. Is each step of this work by supernatural influence? Ans. Yes.

56. But, since we must be active in sanctification, or progressive renovation, by what rule are we to act? **Ans.** The law.

57. Is it according to this law that grace renews the soul? **Ans.** Yes; Jer. xxxi. 33.

58. Is sanctification then a privilege? **Ans.** Yes; as it is recovery, by grace, to the image of God, and to a capability of duty and happiness.

59. Is it also a duty? **Ans.** Yes; as we are to be active in it.

60. What of the man is renewed or sanctified? **Ans.** The whole man, 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Cor. v. 17.

61. Does this mean that no depravity remains, while in this life? **Ans.** No; it is the whole man in all his powers, that is sanctified; not that he is perfectly holy in any of these powers—the whole as to parts, not as to degrees.

62. How is the body (1 Thess. v. 23,) sanctified? **Ans.** (1.) Its powers are willingly employed in holy actions; appetites and passions are subdued and regulated by divine power; and it is not suffered to be tempted to sin as [much as] before.

63. Do not holy actions belong to sanctification? **Ans.** Yes.

64. Is this all that is included in sanctification? **Ans.** No; the soul—the powers which perform these actions—are sanctified, 1 Pet. i. 15.

65. Since this work is of God, on what ground does he bestow this favour of sanctification? **Ans.** On account of Christ's atonement, John xvii.; 1 Cor. i. 30.

66. Does he in no case effect this work of mere grace, without connexion with Christ's atonement? **Ans.** No; Eph. i. 3—6.

67. Did Christ lay down his life to procure this benefit? **Ans.** Yes; Gal. i. 4; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19; John xvii.

68. Is this work either commenced, or carried on, without union to Christ? **Ans.** No; John xv. 4, 5.

69. Why is union to Christ necessary to our sanctification? **Ans.** (1.) It is not in our own power. (2.) We have no right to the benefit, unless in union to Christ in his righteousness. (3.) We cannot exercise any grace but by communion with him.

70. In what are we united to Christ, in order to communion and sanctification? **Ans.** (1.) In his incarnation. (2.) In his death, or righteousness. (3.) In his resurrection. (4.) In his Spirit.

71. How does communion with Christ in his incarnation promote our sanctification? **Ans.** (1.) Our nature was set apart, or sanctified, in the person of Christ. (2.) As we have, by union to Adam, borne the image of the earthly man, so, by union to Christ, we bear the image of the heavenly one, 1 Cor. xv. 48, 49. (3.) Christ actually communicates, by his Spirit, a holy nature to us, in the image of himself.

72. How does communion with Christ in his death promote our sanctification? **Ans.** Because, by his death, he procured our freedom from the curse, and, consequently, from spiritual death. Thus our depravity was crucified with Christ, that the body of sin might be destroyed, Rom. vi. 4, 5.

73. How does our communion with Christ in his resurrection secure our sanctification? Ans. (1.) His resurrection was virtually our resurrection to a life of holiness, Rom. vi. 4; just as Adam's fall was our fall into sin. (2.) As Christ rose from the dead, so he actually communicates spiritual life to us by his Spirit, so that we are quickened together with him, Eph. ii. 5; and thus, even while in this world, we are said to sit in heavenly places with him, Eph. ii. 5, 6.

74. How have we communion with Christ in his Spirit, for our sanctification? Ans. He communicates to us, by his Spirit, all those qualifications or graces fitting us for holy life; such as—giving us an inclination to love and obey his law; giving a persuasion of our peace with God, of our strength in him, &c.

§ VIII.—75. What means does the Holy Spirit use in our sanctification? Ans. Means both outward and inward.

76. What are the outward means? Ans. God's word, ordinances, and providences, Rom. v. 1—5; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Tit. ii. 11, 12.

77. Have these any power to sanctify us of themselves? Ans. No; they have no physical influence—no appointed influence, by which the benefit would necessarily attend the outward means—no efficient influence; only moral.

78. But is their moral influence sufficient? Ans. No; 1 Cor. iii. 7.

79. How do they prove effectual? Ans. By the Spirit and faith, Tit. iii. 5.

80. What is the inward means? Ans. Faith.

81. How does faith prove a means of sanctification? Ans. (1.) Appropriating Christ to ourselves, we receive, of his fulness, the grace we need. (2.) Faith is directed and excited to act, by the Spirit, in the use of means.

§ IX.—82. As sanctification is progressive, is it not unequal in its degrees, in different persons? Ans. Yes; there is the babe in Christ, and the strong man, Heb. v. 13, 14.

§ X.—83. How is it proved that sanctification is always imperfect in this life, since God loves holiness, and hates sin, and could make his people perfect if he pleased? Ans. (1.) From the fact that no man keeps the law perfectly, 1 Kings viii. 46; Prov. xx. 8. (2.) That sanctifying grace is only begun here, 1 Cor. xiii. 9, 10. (3.) Saints are to acknowledge remaining corruption, Gal. v. 17. (4.) We must always pray against sin, Matt. vi. 12, 13; and contend against it. (5.) We ought to study progress; implying imperfection, 1 Cor. ix. 24. (6.) From the special confession of Paul, Rom. vii.

§ XI.—84. But it is objected that Paul must be speaking of himself as unregenerate, or when he was unregenerated, in that seventh chapter to the Romans; as he says that he was carnal, sold under sin; that he did evil and not good; and that no good thing dwelt in him, &c.? Ans. (1.) In verses 5—13, Paul described his unregenerated state; but from the 14th he speaks in the present tense. (2.) He speaks of his *inward man*, verses 22, 23, and the law of

his *mind*, as gracious, which a natural man has not. (3.) He shows a contest between sin and grace, which necessarily implies regeneration, and is not in the natural man. (4.) His expressions condemning himself, evidently mean his depravity which remains.

§ XII.—85. Obj. (1.) Some Scriptures, as Matt. v. 48, command perfection; and we are taught to pray for it? Ans. It is a perfection of parts—an aim at perfection, or desire for it.

86. Obj. (2.) The Scriptures represent some as perfect? Ans. These passages signify perfection of parts, as is in the believer, or refer to future glory, as Eph. v. 27; or mean an advanced belief, as Phil. iii. 15.

87. Obj. (3.) The examples of Noah, Job, Asa, &c.? Ans. These are spoken of as advanced in holiness, comparatively holy; but absolute holiness is evidently not intended, when the sins of all of them are recorded.

88. Obj. (4.) No one can attain salvation without perfect holiness? Ans. True, but this is made perfect in death, Heb. xii. 23; 1 John iii. 2.

§ XIII.—89. Can we give fully the reasons why God is pleased to have the believer imperfect while in this world? Ans. No; God may have designs in this which he has never revealed; and the depth of his wisdom and counsels we cannot comprehend.

§ XIV.—90. When God bestows the inward grace of sanctification, what are its effects? Ans. Holiness of heart and life.

91. In what does this holiness of heart and life consist? Ans. In an aversion to all sin, and relish for good.

92. Is this aversion and relish habitual, or only occasional acts? Ans. It is habitual.

93. Is it considered as an ornament of the Christian? Ans. Yes; Ps. xlv. 14.

94. On what accounts should we set a high value on holiness? Ans. Not as a merit before God; but, (1.) Its divine excellence—being the beauty of the Lord. (2.) Its necessity in order to duty and happiness. (3.) Its utility even for this life, 1 Tim. iv. 8.

§ XV.—95. Does holiness consist only in the exercises of the mind, or does it lead out to good works? Ans. It leads to good works; otherwise it would be an inactive principle.

96. What are we to understand by good works, as the fruits of sanctification? Ans. (1.) Not merely civil and relative duties—as justice, humanity, alms, &c. (2.) Nor works which, in some respects only, are good, which may be found in unbelievers and heathens, as justice, truth, &c., without grace. (3.) Nor yet are they works perfect in degree; none such are performed by men in this world. But (4.) They are spiritual, on right principles, and acceptable to God.

§ XVI.—97. As good works are actions, what is included in this term? Ans. Thoughts and words, as well as outward deeds, Phil. iv. 8.

98. Is there any difference between the good actions of gracious

and of natural men, when the outward acts are the same? Ans. Yes.

99. Do the Scriptures acknowledge those deeds of the natural man which are good in themselves, as gracious deeds? Ans. No; Rom. viii. 7; John xv. 5.

100. But the good works of the heathen and unregenerate are commended, as Rom. ii. 14, 15; Luke vi. 32, 33? Ans. These actions are acknowledged to be good in the matter of them, but not good works, acceptable to God in the spirit of them.

§ XVII.—101. Can an unregenerate man perform a good action acceptably to God, in which the person and the action are accepted? Ans. No; He may perform an action, the matter of which is agreeable to God's will, and so far it is good; but, on account of certain defects, neither the person nor the action is accepted of God.

102. What then is necessary to a good act, as acceptable to God? Ans. (1.) The matter of it must agree with God's law. (2.) The spirit in which it is done must be right with God. (3.) Therefore the person must be a new creature.

103. Can it be good, or acceptable to God, if any one of these ingredients be wanting in the act? Ans. No; because, (1.) God requires the act to be what he has commanded; and, (2.) That the heart be right with him in doing it.

104. What then is the rule by which the action must be performed, in its matter and spirit? Ans. God's word or law.

105. Does not God reveal his will, in some measure, by the light of nature? Ans. Yes; Rom. ii. 14, 15.

106. Is the action a good and gracious action, if performed only in obedience to nature's light? Ans. No; the matter (*secundum quid*) may be good, but the whole action not. We must perform it in faith in Christ, in order to be good; and this is obtained only by God's written word.

107. As a good action, in the work of sanctification, requires a right spirit and principle, what is necessary to this? Ans. (1.) That the efficient cause be the grace of the Spirit; Gal. v. 22. (2.) That the instrumental cause be faith; Gal. v. 6, 1 Tim. i. 5, Heb. xi. 6. (3.) That we have a right end in view.

108. What ends should we have in view? Ans. (1.) As subordinate ends—our own good, temporal and eternal, 1 Tim. iv. 8, Phil. ii. 12; and the good of others, Matt. v. 16, Rom. xv. 2. (2.) As the ultimate and supreme end, the glory of God, 1 Cor. x. 31.

109. Why is all this essential to a good action? Ans. Because not only does God, by authority and wisdom, prescribe what is to be done, but he also prescribes the exercise of the heart in which the action should be done; and all this is necessary to constitute an action of an intelligent being.

110. Wherein is faith necessary to our good works? Ans. (1.) We must believe the action to be commanded of God. (2.) We must believe our own inability to do it aright ourselves. (3.) We must believe in our justification, and the acceptance of our persons

and services in Christ. (4.) We must believe in Christ for supply of grace and strength for the duty.

111. Can we perform gracious or holy actions, without faith in our justification, and in the grace of God to accept us, and supply us? Ans. No; Rom. viii. 1—6, Heb. ix. 14; because, otherwise, our service is mercenary, a bondage, reluctant, and in our own strength.

§ XVIII.—112. Since none of the believer's works are perfect, how can they be called *good*? Ans. There is a real goodness in them, by the grace of the Spirit, (1.) In as far as the matter is good. (2.) There is a goodness of motive, end, and design. (3.) A goodness in the principle of them, as proceeding from faith, love, and a spirit of obedience.

113. But how are they acceptable with a God of infinite holiness? Ans. (1.) They are not acceptable as a ground of justification; this requires absolute perfection. But, (2.) The good that is in them is acceptable as God's own work. (3.) The action is accepted through Christ, 1 Pet. ii. 5, as an act; his atonement taking away the sin of the action; his obedience satisfying the demands of the law for perfection; and so, through his intercession, the action is accepted as a service to God—an act of obedience and worship.

114. Is there any merit whatever in good works of believers? Ans. No; not even merit of congruity, or paction; as they are the fruits of justification, and of grace.

115. How then are rewards, spoken of in Scripture, as Matt. v. 12, to be understood? Ans. (1.) They are rewards of grace, to encourage. (2.) These works will be to the honour of those who perform them, as more advanced in faith and sanctification.

116. Are not works of supererogation, to be applied for the benefit of others, abhorrent to a gracious heart, and most manifestly unscriptural? Ans. Yes.

117. Do the Scriptures warrant the idea that extraordinary attainments in religion, by activity in duty, and great instrumentality in the conversion of others, *merit* crowns of glory in heaven? Ans. No; there is no merit in such cases; although those may be distinguished by greater degrees of glory in heaven, who were instrumental in turning many to righteousness, Dan. xii. 2. God may honour such in heaven, without acknowledging that they deserve it;—"What hast thou that thou hast not received?"

§ XIX.—118. Are not the doctrine of free justification through Christ, and our consequent denial of any merit in good works, reproached as a denial of the necessity of good works? Ans. Yes.

119. Do we not maintain the necessity of good works, although not necessary as grounds of our justification or attainment of heaven? Ans. Yes.

120. On what accounts do we hold them necessary? Ans. (1.) They are necessary by divine command. (2.) From the nature of faith, and other graces of the Spirit in believers, actually leading to good works. (3.) From that communion with God which be-

lievers enjoy, which must lead to good works. (4.) From the relation of good works to heavenly happiness. They are the necessary fruits of that grace by which we are prepared for heavenly enjoyment. (5.) They are necessary in order to glorify God, and evidence our grace, and as means of exercising the grace in the heart.

121. Have they not egregiously erred, who have represented good works as injurious to our salvation? Ans. Yes.

122. Do they not err, who find fault with the sound practical piety of the comparatively ignorant, because they have not enlarged views of truth and duty? Ans. Yes.

123. Is it right to say that holiness and good works are necessary as means of salvation? Ans. The expression may be understood in a sound sense, but it is exceptionable; as the grace of God is the only efficient means, and faith the only instrumental means of salvation. Sanctification is itself a gift of salvation, on attaining to which, we are redeemed, 1 Cor. i. 30, 1 Thess. iv. 3; and a preparation, by grace, for the final enjoyment of salvation; and, therefore, is not a means, meritorious, causal, efficient, or instrumental.

§ XX.—124. Though sanctification is essentially necessary to all, in order to the enjoyment of heaven, are good works necessary in every case? Ans. No; not in infants, nor in persons converted so late in life that they have no opportunity to perform them.

§ XXI.—125. What is the end or design of sanctification? Ans. (1.) The ultimate and supreme end is the glory of God. (2.) Our own salvation and happiness.

126. When is sanctification perfected? Ans. At death, 1 John iii. 2.

127. How is it perfected? Ans. By Almighty power.

~~§~~ *A brief statement of the difference between justification and sanctification.*—They differ, (1.) In their nature; the one is a change of state; the other a change of heart. (2.) In their cause; the cause of the one is Christ's righteousness; of the other, grace implanted. (3.) In their properties; the one is an act; the other a work; the one is equal and perfect; the other is not. (4.) In their order; the one is first; the other follows. (5.) Justification is not discernible of itself, but by sanctification. (6.) Justification removes the guilt; sanctification, the pollution of sin. (7.) Justification delivers from the law; sanctification conforms to it. (8.) Justification gives peace with God; sanctification conforms to him. (9.) Justification belongs to Christ's Priestly office; sanctification especially to the Kingly. (10.) Justification procures sanctification.

PART V.

CHAPTER XXVI.—OF PRAYER.

LECTURE I.—DEFINITION, OBJECT, RULE, PARTS, KINDS, AND SUBJECTS,
OF PRAYER.

§ II., IV.—Quest. 1. What is the direct meaning of prayer?
Ans. Petition.

2. Does it include the idea of commanding, or demanding?
Ans. No; humility, sense of unworthiness, and expectation of a free gift, are its necessary accompaniments.

3. Are not the various names of prayer, given in Scripture, instructive respecting its general character and nature? Ans. Yes; *δεησις*, (*deesis*,) *sense of need*; *προσευχη*, (*proseuche*,) *desires*; *εντευξις*, (*enteuxis*,) *intercession, or entreaty*; *ευχαριστια*, (*eucharistia*,) *thanksgiving*.

§ III.—4. Who is the object of address in prayer? Ans. God, and God only.

5. Why is prayer to be addressed to God alone? Ans. (1.) He commands it; Psa. i. 15; Matt. iv. 10. (2.) Prayer is worship, which is due to God alone. (3.) Prayer is an acknowledgment of all perfection and authority, which belong to God alone. (4.) God alone is worthy of our trust and confidence. (5.) God has made us promises as the foundation of prayer, and makes us welcome.

6. Would it not be giving more honour to God to acknowledge our unworthiness of coming to himself, and to address some intermediate being? Ans. No; (1.) Because no intermediate being has power or authority to answer our prayers. (2.) God is most honoured by acknowledging his condescension in hearing us, and by confidence in him. (3.) It would dishonour God to suppose that any intermediate being was worthy to be the object of prayer, that he was nearer to an equality with God, or more gracious and condescending.

7. When we employ Christ as Intercessor, do we employ an intermediate being? Ans. No; because he is God himself.

8. Do we employ Christ as Intercessor, under the idea that he is more loving or condescending than the Father? Ans. No; but as the Mediator, who, as God, is worthy to appear in the presence of God for us, and who, as our Righteousness, is the ground of our acceptance.

9. Though we may not employ creatures as direct objects of address in prayer, instead of God, yet might we not employ them as intercessors with God, or with Christ? Ans. No; because (1.) None are worthy. (2.) There is no need of any such. (3.) None

are appointed of God. (4.) It would be idolatry; exercising faith in them, ascribing more kindness to them than to Christ.

10. In employing Christ as Intercessor, do we, nevertheless, come to God himself in prayer? Ans. Yes; we come to God in Christ's name, for his sake, through his merits.

11. Should our prayers be to the Three-one God in unity? Ans. Yes.

12. May we address any one of the Divine persons in prayer? Ans. Yes; if we do it with a right understanding—as the Three-one God in that person; so Stephen, Acts vii. 59; so Paul, 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

13. Which person is it most proper to address? Ans. The Father.

14. Why? Ans. (1.) Because of the Scripture rule—the Lord's prayer. (2.) It is he that makes the promises, which are the foundation of faith. (3.) We come to the Father, through the Son, by the Holy Spirit.

15. Can we pray aright without a rule to direct? Ans. No; without a rule, we could not know the object of address, what to pray for, our warrant, the way, or the manner.

16. Are our necessities a rule? Ans. Not properly. Without the word, we know not our necessities, nor the supply provided.

17. Ought we to know the authority which we have for the way, the matter, and the manner of prayer? Ans. Yes.

§ II.—18. What are the parts usually included in prayer? Ans. Petition, confession and thanksgiving.

19. Why are these included in prayer? Ans. (1.) Examples show that they are included in the same address; as Solomon, at the dedication of the temple, 1 Kings viii. 23, &c.; Neh. ix. (2.) Because we cannot pray aright without a spirit of confession and of thanksgiving.

20. Should not adoration and self-dedication be included in prayer? Ans. Yes; so examples show, and so prayer implies.

§ VII.—21. How many kinds of prayer are there? Ans. Principally three;—ejaculatory, secret and social.

22. What is ejaculatory prayer? Ans. It is rather thoughts directed to God.

23. Have we any example of this in Scripture? Ans. Yes; Neh. ii. 4.

24. Do the nature and warrants of prayer justify this kind of prayer? Ans. Yes; thoughts may as well be directed to God as words. The desires of the heart are prayers.

25. In what cases may this kind of prayer be used? Ans. In any case where there is not time or opportunity for formal prayer; as in company, in business, in meditation, and on any emergency.

26. Is it a useful kind of prayer? Ans. Yes; it is apt to be most sincere, most earnest, most confident; it cultivates spiritual mindedness; it attends to what may be forgotten or overlooked in formal prayer; and it is most remarkably successful.

27. What is secret prayer? Ans. Prayer to God in our retirement.

28. Ought we, in secret prayer, to be entirely alone, from even our most intimate friends? Ans. Yes.

29. Why so? Ans. Because we have petitions, confessions, thanksgivings which concern ourselves only. We may have petitions respecting ourselves or others, which none but God hears.

30. Have we express warrant for secret prayer? Ans. Matt. vi. 6.

31. What does our Lord mean by the direction, "Enter thy closet, and shut thy door," &c.? Ans. (1.) Be entirely alone. (2.) Be so secured against intrusion, as not to be disturbed of it.

32. Is it then right to engage in secret prayer in the same manner with others, if any more retired place can be had? Ans. No.

33. What is social prayer? Ans. A number uniting in prayer, one leading in the exercise.

34. How should those be exercised who join with the leader in social prayer? Ans. They should join in the petitions, directed up by the leader, in thoughts, desires, &c., directed to God; in separate petitions:—"Our Father, who art in heaven," &c.

35. In social prayer, do we pray for ourselves exclusively? Ans. No; but for ourselves and one another.

36. Since we all engage in social prayer, in the same manner for ourselves and for one another, what is necessary to a right performance of this duty? Ans. (1.) Besides the necessity of a leader who is capable, we should be of one sentiment. (2.) We should have mutual love.

37. May we then be as particular, and include all the things in social, as in secret prayer? Ans. No; but only such things as we can all join in, and all understand.

38. Since unity of sentiment is necessary to social prayer, is it proper to employ every, or any professor of religion, indiscriminately, to lead in our devotional exercises? Ans. No.

39. But may it not be proper to admit to our social prayers even the most erroneous, the most wicked, and even our enemies who hate us? Ans. Yes.

40. How may social prayer be divided? Ans. Into private and public.

41. What is the distinction between them? Ans. (1.) Private prayer is by a few; public by many. (2.) Public prayer is performed under a universal invitation, and indiscriminate privilege of attendance; private prayer is restricted to a family, or to those who agree to assemble for the purpose, or who are specially invited. (3.) In public social prayer, the exercise is conducted by persons set apart to the work, qualified and proved; 1 Chron. xxiii. 13; Num. vi. 23—26.

42. Is not public prayer an important means of instruction, and of promoting religion? Ans. Yes.

43. Is it not necessary, then, that the leaders in public prayer be qualified, and that they be tried, and set apart by the church-courts? Ans. Yes.

44. Is it not proper, then, that those who lead in social prayer

and especially in public, should study and prepare to lead to edification? Ans. Yes.

45. What study and preparation are proper for this exercise? Ans. Not forms of prayer; but (1.) We should study what to ask and confess, and for what to give thanks. (2.) We should arrange matters of prayer in some clear order. (3.) We should study with prayer, meditation, self-examination, and yet not confine ourselves to prepared thoughts or words.

§ III.—46. Can any pray aright but believers or regenerate? Ans. No.

47. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Acceptable prayer is in faith; Heb. xi. 6. (2.) Acceptable prayer is by the help of the Holy Spirit dwelling in us; Rom. viii. 26. (3.) It includes gracious affections and desires. (4.) The prayer of the wicked is abomination; Prov. xxviii. 9.

48. Yet is it not the duty of all men to pray? Ans. Yes.

49. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) It is a natural-moral duty; Acts xvii. 27. (2.) Neglect of this duty is sin; Psa. x. 4. (3.) God requires it; Acts viii. 22—the case of Simon, the sorcerer. (4.) The Lord's prayer applies even to the wicked.

50. But how is it the duty of the wicked to pray, when his prayer is an abomination? Ans. (1.) His sin cannot excuse the neglect. (2.) It is not his duty to pray in unbelief, or regarding iniquity in his heart, but to return to God in faith and repentance, with prayer.

LECTURE II.—MATTER, MANNER, WARRANT, AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF PRAYER.

§ V.—51. Is there any limitation as to the matter of prayer? Ans. Yes.

52. What is the comprehensive rule as to the matter of our prayers, or how may we know for what to pray? Ans. The promises must be our guide. These warrant prayer.

53. May we, then, pray for what is not promised? Ans. No.

54. Why not? Ans. All is promised that we need. We have no claim to anything from God but by promise; and we have no other way of knowing his will.

55. May we, then, pray for the dead? Ans. No.

56. Why not? Ans. Because we have no promise for them. As redeemed, they have no need; as damned, they have no hope.

57. May we pray for those who have sinned the unpardonable sin? Ans. No; 1 John v. 16; there is no promise for them.

58. Should we pray for all other classes of men? Ans. Yes; 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.

59. When we pray for our enemies, or for the enemies of God, does it imply a prayer for their success in their sinful schemes or desires? Ans. No; but for their reformation and salvation, and for their success in lawful desires.

60. If our prayers for their salvation be not granted, are our prayers then not acceptable? Ans. No; if our object and our mo-

tives be according to God's will, our prayers are acceptable; *Psa. xxxv. 13.*

61. May we, in prayer for ourselves or others, ask anything contrary to the doctrines of the gospel? *Ans. No; this is asking what is not promised.*

62. May we, then, pray for the salvation of the heathen, or any others, without the means of grace? *Ans. No; because this is not promised. It is contrary to gospel doctrine; Prov. xxix. 18.*

63. In praying for ourselves or others, may we pray for all promised spiritual blessings? *Ans. Yes.*

64. In praying for these spiritual blessings, should we pray for them absolutely or conditionally? *Ans. Absolutely.*

65. Why ask absolutely? *Ans. Because they are promised unconditionally. To ask such blessings conditionally, is to doubt or deny the promise.*

66. But while we are not sure that we are of the elect, to be actually made partakers of these blessings, why not ask conditionally? *Ans. Because God warrants and requires our assured faith.*

67. But may we ask spiritual blessings for others absolutely? *Ans. No; because, although God warrants our assurance of faith for ourselves, he does not warrant it for others. The ground of assured faith is given to each one for himself.*

68. Will our prayers be acceptable, if made for even promised blessings, if the blessings be asked for purposes different from God's revealed plan of grace; or if asked to be given on principles, or in a manner or way, different from God's revealed will? *Ans. No; this would not be according to the promise; James iv. 3.*

69. Are there not some spiritual blessings that we may ask absolutely to be given at the time of asking? *Ans. Yes; such as faith, the new heart, &c.*

70. Are all spiritual blessings to be asked absolutely, to be given at the time of asking? *Ans. No; such as measures of grace, light, &c.*

71. Yet is it sinful or unacceptable to express our desires in prayer that these be given immediately? *Ans. No; if asked with submission to divine wisdom and sovereignty, as to the time and measure; Luke xviii. 1, &c.*

72. In praying for others, are we ever to pray for any punishment to them? *Ans. No; unless so far as God may, in his wisdom and holiness, see it necessary for his glory, and their good; but never as merely a punishment to them; Luke ix. 55.*

73. May we pray to be kept perfectly free from sin? *Ans. No; this is not promised.*

74. But may we not pray to be kept absolutely from the dominion of sin? *Ans. Yes; Psa. xix. 13; Rom. vi. 14.*

75. May we pray to be kept from particular actual sins? *Ans. Yes.*

76. Should we pray for temporal benefits for ourselves and others? *Ans. Yes.*

77. In what manner should we pray for these? *Ans. Condi-*

tionally; as far as for God's glory, and the good of ourselves or others.

78. May our prayers for temporal benefits be acceptable, although the petition be not granted? Ans. Yes; 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9.

79. How can it be acceptable, if not granted? Ans. If the object desired be lawful, and be asked with right motives, and in a right spirit, it is acceptable.

80. Is it any valid objection to the duty and privilege of praying for temporal benefits, that we are warned, (Matt. vi. 25, 31,) not to be solicitous about them; that God has promised, (Matt. vi. 33,) to add them to us; or that we are forbidden, (John vi. 27,) to labour for them? Ans. No; (1.) Because it is only an unbelieving and an undue care and attention to them that is forbidden. (2.) Because care and diligence for these things are enjoined. (3.) Because we ought to be thankful for temporal favours, and, therefore, ought to desire them. (4.) That which we should desire of God, and for which we should depend on him, we ought to ask.

81. Obj. We can acquire these things by our own endeavours, and therefore ought not to ask them? Ans. (1.) It is not true. (2.) We ought to pray for strength, for the use of it, and for the blessing.

§ VI.—82. Should prayer always be with understanding? Ans. Yes; otherwise it cannot be in faith; 1 Cor. xiv. 15. We should know our wants, the provision made, and the warrants given.

83. Will prayer be acceptable, if not sincere and earnest? Ans. No; as God requires us to worship him in spirit and in truth.

84. Is perseverance requisite in prayer? Ans. Yes; Luke xviii. 1, &c.

85. What do we mean by perseverance in prayer? Ans. Not to give up our hope or application as long as hope is warranted—continued supplication, although the answer is delayed; Matt. xv. 22, &c.

86. Is it necessary that we pray with reverence and submission? Ans. Yes; the character of God requires this.

87. Can we pray aright without a spirit of contrition and repentance? Ans. No; for, otherwise, we regard iniquity in our heart; Psa. lxvi. 18.

88. Can prayer be acceptable or successful without faith? Ans. No; Heb. xi. 6, James i. 6, 7.

89. How is faith to be exercised in prayer? Ans. It includes a faith's persuasion of the whole word of God; but particularly it is, (1.) An appropriation of the promise, or of the thing promised. (2.) Faith in the love, grace, and faithfulness of God, as the hearer of prayer. (3.) Appropriating faith in Christ, as the way of obtaining our petitions. (4.) A faith's trust that we shall receive; Mark xi. 24.

90. But on what ground can we come with confidence in prayer? Ans. On the ground of the promise in Christ.

91. May we, then, come to God in prayer, merely because he is gracious, without employing Christ as our way? Ans. No; we must come in his name; not in our own; John xvi. 23.

92. What is it to pray in the name of Christ? Ans. To ask blessings for his sake alone.

93. What is necessary to our asking in Christ's name? Ans. (1.) A sense of our unworthiness. (2.) Desire of an interest in Christ, and to receive all our mercies on account of his merits and intercession. (3.) Willingness to renounce all other grounds of hope. (4.) Believing our right and welcome to obtain all on his account. (5.) Trusting or believing that we shall so obtain.

94. Can we of ourselves pray aright? Ans. No; Rom. viii. 26.

95. What help may we expect from the Holy Spirit? Ans. (1.) Knowledge, Rom. viii. 26. (2.) The bestowment and strengthening of graces, Rom. viii. 26, Gal. iv. 6. (3.) His indwelling, and guiding our faith, desires, and views; John xiv. 16, 17, Gal. iv. 6.

96. Wherein does the intercession of the Spirit differ from the intercession of Christ? Ans. The intercession of Christ is without us; that of the Spirit is within us; Christ intercedes for us; the Spirit intercedes indeed for us, by prompting our thoughts and desires; as it were, making us his instruments, Gal. iv. 6.

97. Would we have any right to pray, without a warrant from God to do so? Ans. No.

98. What is our warrant? Ans. In general, the word; particularly, (1.) The promise of blessings to be asked. (2.) The command to pray; Matt. vii. 7. (3.) His promise of a gracious hearing; John xvi. 23, 24. (4.) Approved examples. (5.) The neglect is reprov'd; Psa. cx. 4, Jer. x. 25. (6.) The provisions made for our successful prayers; as Christ the Intercessor, the Spirit to help us, and a throne of grace erected and made in heaven; Psa. lxxv. 2, Heb. iv. 16.

99. Is anything more than the promise and command to all, necessary in order to warrant an appropriating personal application with confidence, in prayer? Ans. No; that promise and command are entirely sufficient warrant to every one. No personal qualification is necessary.

§ VII.—X.—100. Are the mere circumstances of *gesture, words, place, and time*, essential to prayer? Ans. No; although, in all these, there is an importance, under certain occurrences.

101. What rule should be observed in reference to gestures? Ans. (1.) Whatever gesture best manifests reverence and earnestness, in the circumstances in which we are. (2.) Whatever gesture is best calculated to promote these affections.

102. What is the most Scriptural gesture in public prayer? Ans. Standing.

103. Should we not count it sinful and injurious to depart from this rule, except in cases of necessity and mercy? Ans. Yes; because this tends to beget irreverence, and because, with our habits and manners, we are accustomed to stand, as a mark of reverence.

§ VIII.—104. Although we may pray in secret without using words, yet should we not generally use them in formal secret prayer? Ans. Yes; as expression by words is calculated to engage the attention, to keep the mind from wandering, and to affect the heart.

105. As words are necessary in social prayer, what rules should

be followed in the use of them? Ans. (1.) That they be plain, simple, and easily understood. (2.) That they be dignified and sober, without laboured elegance, which is unbecoming the exercise. (3.) That the words be as few as will clearly express the ideas—not “much speaking.” (4.) That they be uttered with such vehemence and loudness as is necessary to easy hearing.

106. Are we to consider that long prayers, and repetitions in prayer, are absolutely condemned in Matt. vi. 7, xxiii. 14? Ans. No; only when long for a show, or as if meritorious, and repetitions through vanity, affected eloquence, or carelessness; but not if they arise from much matter or fervency; so there is much repetition in Psalms xlii., lxxx., cxxxvi., &c.

§ IX.—107. Is there any place now, as formerly, more holy than another, as a place for prayer? Ans. No; John iv. 21.

108. Why was one place of prayer more holy than another, of old, when it is not so now? Ans. Because of the emblems of the divine presence in the temple, and the various types of heavenly things.

109. But is not the public assembly of the church more holy than private places? Ans. Not as to place; but more solemn, by divine appointment, and the number meeting in public ordinances of divine appointment.

§ X.—110. Are we not authorized to pray as often, and at such times, as circumstances allow and require? Ans. Yes.

111. But are there not times in which we are required to attend to secret and family prayers? Ans. Yes; as evening and morning.

112. What proof is there that these times should be observed? Ans. Psa. xcii. 2, and the morning and evening sacrifices.

113. If Providence should render it difficult or impracticable, at any time, to attend to these duties at those hours, would it not be our duty to take other hours? Ans. Yes.

114. What are we to understand by “praying always,” or “without ceasing?” Ans. (1.) Praying with perseverance. (2.) Duly and daily. (3.) Neglecting no proper opportunity. (4.) Being always in such an exercise of faith as to be ready for prayer on suitable occasions.

115. Are not the Papist’s “canonical hours” superstitious and unwarranted? Ans. Yes; no such thing is required in Scripture. They say that all who have entered holy orders are bound to employ seven hours in the day in devotional exercises.

§ VIII.—116. Should forms of public or social prayer be used? Ans. No.

117. Why not? Ans. (1.) There is no prescription of them. (2.) There is no example of them in Scripture. (3.) It tends to formality, indolence, and irreligion. (4.) The praying in the Spirit, (Jude 20,) and the Spirit’s helping our infirmities in prayer, imply that no forms are used. (5.) The design of prayer, which is to express present wants and desires, proves that forms are improper.

118. But may not forms be used by children, &c.? Ans. Yes;

with warning and instruction, in due time, to use prayers of their own inditing.

LECTURE III.—NECESSITY AND UTILITY OF PRAYER—THE LORD'S PRAYER.

§ I.—119. What is the need of prayer; or, wherein is it necessary? Ans. (1.) From our necessity, and dependence on God. (2.) God has appointed prayer as a means of obtaining blessings. (3.) There is no salvation without it.

120. What is the utility of prayer? Ans (1.) It is a means of daily communion with God, for our benefit. (2.) It promotes faith and spiritual mindedness. (3.) It affects our minds, and leads us to more knowledge of our wants, and of the provisions of grace. (4.) It is an effectual means of obtaining all spiritual blessings.

121. Will believing prayers for promised blessings ever be disappointed? Ans. No; Isa. xlix. 23; John xvi. 23.

122. But of what use is prayer, since God knows our wants? Ans. (1.) God has appointed it as a means of obtaining blessings. (2.) It is a means of cultivating communion with God. We should use prayer, and seek and receive blessings, as intelligent beings. (3.) It is a means of exercising desires, sense of wants, and sense of our dependence on God.

123. But how can prayer be a means of actually obtaining blessings, when God is unchangeable in his will, and decrees? Ans. (1.) God has appointed prayer as a means of obtaining them. (2.) It is therefore, an instrument, as any other means to their appropriate ends. God has decreed all things. (3.) It is as influential as an application to our neighbour; because we can obtain nothing of our neighbour, but as God moves his heart, and that according to his decree. (4.) Prayer to God is even more certainly influential; because God may not move that neighbour's heart, but he will not fail in fulfilling his promises to those who apply in faith.

§ XI.—*Of the Lord's Prayer.*—124. For what purpose did our Lord give us that form commonly called "The Lord's Prayer"—as a form to be used as such, or a directory? Ans. As a directory;—"After this manner, therefore, pray ye."

125. Is it in Scripture called "the Lord's prayer?" Ans. No; we call it so because he is the immediate author of it.

126. Is there any more reverence due to it than to other recorded prayers in Scripture? Ans. No; they are all indited by the Spirit.

127. What is its peculiarity? Ans. It gives the best order of prayer, and is a most comprehensive epitome of prayer.

128. Does it add any matter not contained in prayers recorded in the Old Testament? Ans. No.

§ XII.—129. How is the Lord's prayer divided? Ans. The preface, six petitions, and the conclusion.

130. Does this prayer contain both supplication and deprecation? Ans. Yes.

131. How many petitions are supplicatory? Ans. The first four; the last two are deprecatory.

132. What order is observed in reference to spiritual and temporal blessings? Ans. The spiritual are placed first.

133. Should the conclusion be considered as part of the prayer? Ans. Yes.

134. What connexion has it with prayer? Ans. (1.) It gives glory to God. (2.) It declares the ground of our faith.

§§ XIII., XIV.—135. Who is the object directly addressed? Ans. The Father.

136. Does this address exclude the Son and Spirit? Ans. No; (1.) It is God in the person of the Father that we address. (2.) To address the Father in the name of the Son, and by the Spirit, makes all the persons equally the object of address and worship.

137. Is not God, as a Triune God, called *Father*? Ans. Yes; Isa. lxxxiii. 16; Heb. xii. 9.

138. But may not the first person of the Trinity be most directly understood here? Ans. Yes; although the Three-one God is understood or addressed thereby.

139. Why is our address in prayer made to God in the person of the Father? Ans. (1.) Because God, in that person, makes the promises to us in Christ. (2.) We approach him in the name of the Son, and by the Spirit, according as he reveals himself to us. (3.) Because the apostles distinguish the divine persons in this manner, in prayers, salutations, and doxologies; Rom. viii. 14, 15; 2 Cor. xiii. 14. (4.) So our Lord distinguishes them; Matt. vi. 4, &c., John xiv. 13—15, 16, xvi. 23. (5.) The title “Father,” teaches that we should exercise childlike love and confidence.

140. What are we taught by the word “*our*,” in this prayer? Ans. (1.) That it is our duty to engage in social prayer. (2.) That we should pray for one another. (3.) That we should cultivate brotherly love.

141. What are we taught by the ascription, “*in heaven?*” Ans. (1.) To promote reverence and humility. (2.) To promote faith in his perfections.

142. On what ground are we to call God, “*Father?*” Ans. Not on the ground of our performance of duty, but on the ground of his covenant promise in Christ.

143. In what respect is God called a Father to men? Ans. (1.) By creation; Mal. ii. 10. (2.) By external covenant relation, offering himself as our Father in Christ; 2 Cor. vi. 18. (3.) By actual adoption; Gal. iii. 26.

144. In which of these respects should we call God *Father*? Ans. In all; but especially as our Father by adoption and covenant relation.

§ XV. *The first petition.*—145. What are we to understand by the “*name*” of God here? Ans. God himself, with all his perfections; so, Acts xix. 17, “The name of the Lord Jesus was magnified;” that is himself; 2 Thess. i. 12, compared with John xiii. 31, 32.

146. What is meant by the prayer that God's name may be "hallowed," or sanctified? Ans. (1.) That God would manifest his glory. (2.) That we may be enabled to glorify him. (3.) That others may be induced to glorify him.

147. Why do we pray for this, when we know that God will without fail, glorify himself? Ans. (1.) To express our pleasure in the thought, and desire for it. (2.) To desire that God, by his grace, would enable us and others to do it.

148. What is implied in this petition? Ans. (1.) Love to God. (2.) Sense of our inability and dependence. (3.) Faith that God's glory consists with our salvation, and that he will bestow his grace on us.

149. What are we taught by this being the *first* petition? Ans. (1.) That this is the most worthy object. (2.) That all our other petitions should be subordinate to this. (3.) That only in the fulfilment of this petition can we obtain blessings to ourselves.

§ XVI. *The Second Petition.*—150. What are we here to understand by God's "*kingdom*?" Ans. We may understand both God's essential kingdom, and Christ's Mediatorial kingdom.

151. What do we understand by the prayer that his kingdom may "come?" Ans. By *coming*, we may understand, (1.) His kingdom's extension over all. (2.) Its success. (3.) Its manifestation.

152. In what sense may we pray for the coming of God's essential kingdom? Ans. For the manifestation of his perfections and glory therein, and expressing our pleasure in the thoughts of his government over all things.

152½. In what sense may we pray for the coming of Christ's kingdom of grace? Ans. (1.) That the visible Church may be extended and purified. (2.) That knowledge and true religion may prevail. (3.) That we may experience more and more advances in grace. (4.) That this kingdom of grace may be consummated in glory.

153. What does this prayer imply? Ans. (1.) Love to Christ, and his salvation, and his cause in the world. (2.) Grief for the low state of religion. (3.) That we are not contented with the existence of religion in the world and in our souls, but desire its advancement in ourselves and others. (4.) A desire that all Christ's means of advancing godliness may prosper.

154. Is not this petition involved in the first? Ans. Yes; the fulfilment of this petition is the method of fulfilling the first. God's name is glorified by his coming kingdom.

§ XVII. *The Third Petition.*—155. What are we here to understand by the *will* of God? Ans. His will of purpose, and his will of command, or approving will.

156. In what sense do we ask the first—that his will of purpose be done? Ans. (1.) If afflictive, we submit and acquiesce. (2.) If prosperous and beatifying, we desire it.

157. What is implied in asking that God's will be done? Ans.

(1.) That he has a perfect right to accomplish his will. (2.) That his will is good. (3.) That his will should be his rule of action. (4.) The belief that his will consists with our happiness.

158. In what sense do we ask that God's approving or preceptive will may be done? Ans. (1.) We desire that it may be done by ourselves and others. (2.) That we and others may be persuaded and enabled to do it, Ps. cxliii. 10.

159. Where do we desire this will of God to be done? Ans. Both in heaven and on earth, but especially on earth, or by men in this world; as there is no failure of duty in heaven.

160. After what example do we desire it to be done? Ans. After the example of the inhabitants of heaven—angels and glorified saints.

161. Are we to expect or pray that God's will will be obeyed and known with the same perfection on earth as in heaven? Ans. No; but in a similar manner—with a likeness in sincerity, cheerfulness, universality, and constancy.

§ XVIII.—*The Fourth Petition.*—162. What is asked? Ans. Daily bread—temporal benefits. Bread is put for all temporal necessities.

163. Some suppose that it is spiritual bread that is here meant, as spiritual are more important than temporal things. How prove that temporal things are meant? Ans. (1.) Where spiritual things are to be understood by bread, there is something in the use of the expression that requires us to understand it in that sense; not so here. (2.) Temporal things are worthy matter of prayer, elsewhere expressed in Scripture. (3.) We need direction in praying respecting these things, and might expect something on this subject. (4.) In such a brief compend, we need not expect enlargement on any one point; and there are other petitions which refer to spiritual things.

164. What is meant by *daily* bread? Ans. (1.) That we daily need it. (2.) The word rather means, *substance—necessary—necessary* provision. (3.) Therefore that we should be contented with necessities, though we should get no more.

165. What is meant by "*this day?*" Ans. Daily exercise of faith and dependence, even though we have store; for God sustains that store, and renders us capable of enjoying it.

166. But may we not seek and endeavour after some store of temporal good things? Ans. Yes; Prov. xxvii. 23; if done with a right spirit and in a right manner—but we should still daily trust in God.

167. What is meant by "*giving?*" Ans. That all our temporal enjoyments are of God's gift, whatever means we use.

168. What is meant by giving to *us?* Ans. To ourselves and others; especially those of the household of faith.

169. Since temporal things are not purchased by Christ, how do we ask them for his sake? Ans. (1.) God can give us things for Christ's sake, the existence of which does not depend on his purchase,

as well as things which he purchased. (2.) We ask them to be given under a new right, that of God's Fatherly gift, since we lost our first right by the fall. (3.) We ask them to be given with a blessing.

LECTURE IV.—THE LORD'S PRAYER.—CONTINUED.

§ XIX.—*The Fifth Petition.*—170. What is meant by "*debts*?" Ans. Sins; Luke xi. 4, 14, 15.

171. Why are sins called *debts*? Ans. They are due to law and justice; and are illustrated as debts, Matt. xviii. 23.

172. What *forgiveness* is here asked—judicial, or Fatherly? Ans. Both are intended.

173. How shall the believer ask judicial forgiveness, since he is forgiven? Ans. (1.) He asks the continued forgiveness of sins, acknowledging his dependence on grace for it. (2.) He asks the manifestation of it. (3.) He asks Fatherly forgiveness, or removal of chastenings.

174. What kind of "*debtors*" are here meant? Ans. Not political; but those who have injured us—moral debtors.

175. What kind of forgiveness of our moral debtors is meant? Ans. Not, that in all cases, we avoid prosecution, Matt. xviii. 15; but that we do not cherish hatred or revenge.

176. How then understand the expression, "*As we forgive,*" &c.? Ans. (1.) Not as the rule or measure of God's forgiveness. (2.) Not as meritorious, or deserving of forgiveness from God; but, (3.) As in accordance with our asking forgiveness; asking in a right spirit. (4.) Acknowledging that although our forgiveness of others cannot merit pardon from God, yet non-forgiveness will justly prevent our forgiveness of God. (5.) An argument for forgiveness; because God has already bestowed his grace, in enabling us to forgive.

§ XX. *The Sixth Petition.*—177. What are we to understand by temptation? Ans. Temptation means trial.

178. What kinds of trial may the prayer refer to? Ans. To several; as, (1.) Trials by God's providential sending of afflictions, James i. 2. (2.) Trials by Satan. (3.) Trials by the various scenes of life, which, through our depravity, endanger us. (4.) Trials by the various snares and allurements of the men of the world.

179. How does the prayer apply to afflictions which God may send in his providence? Ans. A submissive prayer that God may be pleased to exempt us; or, if not, that he will support us, James i. 3.

180. How does the prayer apply to the various scenes of divine providence, in which we may be placed, and which, through our depravity, may ensnare us? Ans. That God would keep us from sin under them; in prosperity, adversity, human schemes, &c.

181. How does the prayer apply to the temptation by Satan, or wicked men? Ans. That God would restrain those temptations, or support and deliver us, if tempted; Rom. xvi. 20; 1 Cor. x. 13.

182. How understand the prayer that God would not lead us

into temptation? Ans. (1.) That he would not expose us to trials, or, (2.) If he expose us, that he will deliver us from compliance; 1 Cor. x. 13.

§ XXI. *The Conclusion.*—183. What is ascribed to God in this conclusion? Ans. Kingdom, power, and glory.

184. What kingdom is ascribed to God? Ans. The kingdoms of nature and of grace.

185. For what purpose are we to ascribe these to God? Ans. (1.) To praise and glorify him, acknowledging his power, glory, and government. (2.) To promote our confidence, by trusting in him who has the kingdom, power, and glory. (3.) As an argument with God to hear our prayers.

186. What is the force of the argument? Ans. (1.) That he is able to grant our petitions. (2.) That no other is able; all our hope is in him. (3.) That to grant our petitions will redound to his glory.

187. Why use arguments with God? Ans. (1.) To increase our own faith. (2.) As a means of obtaining our petitions; he allows these petitions as means.

188. What are we to understand by "*Amen*?" Ans. (1.) It signifies consent; Numb. v. 22; 1 Cor. xiv. 16. (2.) Desire; Deut. xxvii. 15, 16. (3.) Assurance of confidence; 2 Cor. i. 20; 1 John v. 14.

189. Does the order of this prayer require us always to follow the same order of matter? Ans. No; as we see by the prayers of the Apostles, &c.

190. But still is not the order instructive? Ans. Yes; pointing out the reverence with which we ought to pray, the obligation to seek the glory of God, the prosperity of his cause, and the accomplishment of his will, if we would expect any benefit to ourselves,—our temporal and spiritual wants daily needing supply,—and recognising the grounds of our confidence.

191. But why, then, in this order, are our temporal put before our spiritual wants? Ans. (1.) Perhaps to show that we are not absolutely bound to this order. (2.) That if the heart be right, the order of expression is less important. But (3.) By the word "*and*" the two following petitions are united with it, teaching us that, as we daily need the necessaries of life, so as constantly do we need spiritual blessings.

192. Is not prayer a good work? Ans. Yes.

LECTURE V.—FASTING, WATCHING, AND ALMS.

§ XXII.—193. Are there any other good works particularly connected with prayer? Ans. Yes; such as fasting and watching, which immediately respect ourselves; alms, which respect our neighbours, and these belonging to present time; and vows, which respect future duties.

§ XXIII.—194. Is fasting a divine ordinance? Ans. Yes; Lev. xvi. 29—31; Joel i. 14; ii. 15—17; Acts xiii. 2, 3; xiv. 23; Matt. ix. 15; and from the moral nature of it.

195. Did God ordain fasting as a stated ordinance? **Ans.** Not usually. He did ordain it to accompany the ordinance of typical atonement in the seventh month; Lev. xvi. 29—31; perhaps at the passover; Ex. xii. 8—15; but, otherwise, left to be observed as occasion required; Matt. ix. 15.

196. What are some of those occasions which call for it? **Ans.** (1.) A time of calamity; as Esther's fast, the Ninevites, Jonah, &c. (2.) On discovery of great sin of a person or people, as Haman, Nehemiah, &c. (3.) When about to seek the Lord in some special ordinance; as on the great day of atonement. (4.) When engaging in some special duty, or undertaking; as Acts xiii. 2, 3.

197. In what do the special duties of a fast consist? **Ans.** In internal and external service.

198. What internal exercise is included in a fast? **Ans.** (1.) Meditation and self-examination; Hag. i. 5. (2.) Deep humiliation before God; Joel ii. 12, 13. (3.) Free and full confession; Neh. ix. 3. (4.) Turning from sin to God; Joel ii. 12, 13. (5.) Covenanting, public or personal; believing, engaging, appropriating, dedicating.

§ XXIV.—199. What is the peculiar outward duty of a fast? **Ans.** Abstinence.

200. From what should we abstain in fasting? **Ans.** (1.) From food; Ezra x. 6. (2.) From other luxuries; as gay clothing, (indicated by wearing sackcloth,) and any worldly pleasures; Dan. x. 8.

201. Should the abstinence from food be absolute and entire? **Ans.** It should be as the circumstances of the person indicate; observing still the rule "God requireth mercy, not sacrifice." Therefore, (1.) If health permit, and the fast be short, and fasting do not impair activity, we should abstain; but not to the injury of health. But (2.) We should not make inconvenient sense of want, or discomfort, a warrant for using food.

202. Does our Lord's reproof of the Jews' evidences of fasting, Matt. vi. 16—18, require us to lay aside all evidence of it? **Ans.** No; only undue austerities and vain show.

203. Does Daniel's eating of bread, though not luxurious, warrant us to lay aside literal fasting altogether? **Ans.** No; his fast was long, and could not be sustained under total abstinence.

§ XXVII.—204. Is then a good internal spiritual exercise sufficient, as an observance of this ordinance, without the outward means? **Ans.** No; since both are required by God.

205. But may we not attend to the inward exercise of humiliation, without engaging in a literal fast? **Ans.** Yes; the inward exercise is not an ordinance of itself, but a moral duty, in which we may engage at any time, without outward means.

206. But may we engage in the outward exercise of fasting, as a religious exercise, without observing the inward exercise of a fast? **Ans.** No; Isa. i. 11—18, lviii. 5—7.

207. Is the outward exercise of fasting meritorious, or efficient in promoting repentance? **Ans.** No; we cannot merit, nor can we effect anything good, ourselves, or by outward means.

208. What then is the design of literal fasting? Ans. (1.) It is intended as an outward expression of our sense of sinfulness and unworthiness. (2.) As an expression of sorrow for sin. (3.) As a means of exciting to more fervency in our confession of sin, in our mourning, and in our turning to God. (4.) As a means of mortifying lust, by self-denial.

209. What is the obligation to use this outward means? Ans. (1.) The appointment of God—as a command, and as a means of obtaining his blessing. (2.) As an external expression of inward humiliation. (3.) As a means of promoting it.

210. Should a fast consist in a selection of food as allowable, and a rejection of other kinds as unlawful? Ans. No; except to select what is necessary, when we must use food, and to reject what is for mere luxury.

211. Is there any warrant, then, for the Popish selection of fish, and rejection of other flesh? Ans. No; God has made no distinction of meats under the New Testament; and fish may be prepared in a manner as exciting to lust as other flesh.

212. For what length of time should a fast be ordinarily kept? Ans. Usually one whole day; so the ordinary fasts recorded in Scripture; as that of the day of atonement.

213. Do not the records of the various lengths of time employed in fasts, warrant us to appoint them to continue according to circumstances? Ans. Yes; and, therefore, a part of a day may be employed, especially in private.

214. What was the Pythagorean and Montanist selection of food? Ans. The Pythagoreans taught to abstain from the flesh of such animals as were subjects of transmigration; the Montanists rejected wine, fruits, and juicy food, for a few weeks.

215. Might a day of humiliation be lawfully appointed and observed, without fasting? Ans. Yes; Ex. xii. 16; Lev. xxiii. 34—36. And this appears from the nature of the exercise.

216. Should a fast be kept with like religious care as the Sabbath? Ans. Yes; Lev. xvi. 29—31; xxiii. 32. It is called “a Sabbath.”

217. Since God has not appointed the time of a fast, but only the exercise, and pointed out the occasions for it, should we not account the appointed time as a vow, and a free-will offering? Ans. Yes.

218. Should we not, then, keep that time according to vow, as to the length of it, and the manner, so far as that manner is in accordance with God's word? Ans. Yes; Eccl. v. 4, 5.

§ XXV.—219. Who should appoint a fast? Ans. (1.) A secret fast is to be appointed by the person himself, Dan. x. (2.) A family fast, by the head of the family, 1 Cor. vii. 5; Zech. xii. 12—14. (3.) A public fast, by church officers; Joel ii. 15, Ezra viii. 21.

220. Who should lead in the exercise, when the fast is public? Ans. Those lawfully called to minister in holy things; Joel ii. 17, Neh. ix. 4.

221. Who should engage in it? Ans. All the members of the church, Joel ii. 16; Neh. ix. 1.

222. Does the lawful appointment of a public fast lay an obligation on all the members to fast? **Ans.** Yes; the duty of appointing a fast, and of calling all to fasting, necessarily implies this.

223. What would be the evil of denying this obligation, and allowing every man to refuse compliance, at his pleasure? **Ans.** (1.) It would render a call to public fasting unavailing. (2.) It would produce discord in the church. (3.) It would deny the divine authority to make such calls.

224. Though God has not appointed the time of a fast, yet is not the time which is lawfully appointed, required to be observed by divine authority? **Ans.** Yes; because appointed according to divine institution, as a fast obligatory on all those who are called to the exercise.

225. If the reasons of fasting which are proclaimed, be contrary to God's word, and no real cause of fasting, according to his word, are we bound to observe the fast for these reasons? **Ans.** No.

226. Does the possibility of such calls by Church officers invalidate the obligation to observe fasts when rightly called? **Ans.** No; no more than an erroneous Church calling to the observance of the sacrament of the Supper, invalidates the call of a sound Church.

§ XXVI.—227. Should the church appoint a stated time of fasting, monthly or annually? **Ans.** No; (1.) Because there is no authority for so doing. (2.) It would be inconsistent with the nature of a fast, unless some stated cause were known; as the appointment of the great day of atonement, Lev. xvi.

228. But may not the church appoint a fast annually, as they may annually see occasion? **Ans.** Yes.

229. What is the difference between this and a stated fast? **Ans.** (1.) The annual appointment on appropriate occasions, accords with the nature of the ordinance; but, (2.) A stated annual fast overlooks the design of the ordinance, and requires the observance, whether there be occasion or not. The first is an appointment on account of the occasion, as the ordinance requires; the latter appoint the observance without an occasion.

230. Are not the Popish stated fasts, then, as that of forty days before Easter (the Passover,) unauthorized? **Ans.** Yes.

231. Do the forty days' fasts of Moses and our Saviour warrant this? **Ans.** No; these were peculiar and miraculous.

232. Is the Church bound to observe a fast appointed by the civil magistrate? **Ans.** No; the appointment belongs to the officers of the Church. It is not the magistrate's office authoritatively to specify reasons of fasting. He might thereby condemn truth and duty, and encourage error or sin.

233. But if the magistrate, as a Christian, sees just occasion for fasting, can he do nothing to effect his desire? **Ans.** Yes; he may request the church to appoint a fast, and he may give his reasons for so doing.

234. But reforming kings of old appointed fasts, and why may not the magistrate do it now? Ans. The magistrate, under a Theocracy, might do so, as having some authority in the church committed to him as a type of Christ.

§ XXVIII.—*Of Watching.*—235. Is *watching* a distinct ordinance? Ans. No; because, (1.) There is no appointment of it as such. (2.) Our Lord's injunction to the disciples, Matt. xxvi. 38—40, 41, was only on account of the occasion, so far as keeping from sleep was concerned. (3.) The Psalmist's watching, or waking, Psa. cxix. 62, was only the occasional effect of spiritual watchfulness. (4.) The watching required in Scripture is a spiritual watchfulness, or attention to duty, secret, private, and public; guarding against sin and temptation; waiting to be ready for God's calls, to duty, to trials, and to death; Mark xiii. 35—37; 1 Thess. v. 6.

§ XXIX.—*Of Alms.*—236. What is the meaning of the word? Ans. Exercising *mercy*.

237. What is it called in the Old Testament? Ans. *Righteousness*; Psa. xxxvii. 21—25, cxii. 9.

238. In what sense is alms-giving an act of righteousness? Ans. God is the owner of all we have. He requires us to give to the poor. It is therefore due; and, by God's appointment, we owe this, out of his bounty to us.

239. Is almsgiving a spiritual exercise merely, or an outward act? Ans. It is an outward act, having relation to bodily wants.

§ XXX.—*The Principle of Giving.*—240. From what principle should our alms spring? Ans. From a principle of love; Heb. vi. 10; 1 John iii. 17.

241. Is almsgiving an act of religion? Ans. Yes; it should be from love and obedience to God.

242. Is it a commanded duty? Ans. Yes; Isa. lviii. 7; 1 Tim. vi. 18.

243. Does not nature also teach the duty? Ans. Yes.

244. Do the Scriptures join alms and prayers together? Ans. Yes; as Matt. vi. 4, 5; Acts x. 4; which shows that it is a religious duty. Nor will prayers be accepted, if we have not the disposition to almsgiving; 1 John iii. 17, 18.

245. On whom is the giving of alms incumbent? Ans. On all who have ability and opportunity.

§ XXXI.—*The Objects of Alms.*—246. Who are the proper objects of alms? Ans. The needy.

247. Are there any classes of the needy that have the preference? Ans. Yes; believers, Matt. xxv. 40; Gal. vi. 10; and relatives; 1 Tim. v. 8, 16.

248. Should not poor congregations be included in our alms? Ans. Yes.

249. Are ministers' salaries to be counted alms? Ans. No; they are dues; 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14.

§ XXXII.—*Rule of Giving.*—250. What is the rule of giving? Ans. Our ability, and the necessities of others; 2 Cor. viii. 11, 12.

251. Who is the judge of this? Ans. Ourselves.

252. Is not God, however, the ultimate judge in this matter? Ans. Yes; to him we must give account of our stewardship in this, but not to men; 2 Cor. ix. 6, 7.

253. How are we to judge, so as to be justified before God? Ans. Prayerfully comparing our means, necessities, and others' wants.

254. Should we give all we have? Ans. No.

255. Why? Since our Lord commands the young man to sell all and give to the poor? Ans. (1.) Our Lord's command, in that case, was singular, and for the purpose of the young man's conviction. But, (2.) To give all, would destroy distinction of property, which is recognised in Scripture, and our capability of further charities; Eph. iv. 28.

256. Should we give all for which we have no immediate use? Ans. No; because we should provide for our families; Prov. xix. 14; and there are other pious uses for which we should stand in readiness.

257. In what spirit should we give? Ans. Cheerfully, 2 Cor. ix. 7; in love, in the fear of God, in faith in him, and with gratitude.

§ XXXIII.—258. Is lending on usury a giving of alms? Ans. No; although it may favour the borrower, yet he pays for the favour.

259. If we lend without interest, is it alms? Ans. Yes; it is giving the interest, or what the use is worth.

§ XXXIV.—260. What is the end to be accomplished by alms? Ans. Help and comfort to the poor, and glory to God.

261. Can alms be any purgation of sin, or desert of reward? Ans. No.

262. How then understand Matt. xxv. 35—40; our Lord's description of the judgment? Ans. Their alms were evidences of faith, and acceptable deeds.

LECTURE VI.—OF VOWS.

§ XXXV.—263. What is the ordinary meaning of a vow? Ans. A solemn promise to God.

264. Has not the word in Latin and Greek, which we translate *vow*, been used in the sense of *wish*, *desire* and *prayer*? Ans. Yes; as *εὐχη*, (*euche*), and *votum*. But *נדָר*, (*nadar*), in Hebrew appears to have been used only in a promissory sense; as Gen. xxviii. 20; Ps. lxxvi. 12.

§ XXXVI.—265. Is a vow a religious exercise and an act of worship? Ans. Yes.

266. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the command of God to vow. (2.) From the origin of a vow in our hearts; as faith, desire, love to God, sense of obligation, reverence, &c. (3.) From its end and design; God's glory and our spiritual benefit. (4.) The form—being to God himself.

267. Is a religious vow of the nature of an oath? Ans. Yes; as it is made to God himself; Ps. cxix. 106.

268. May it be accompanied by a formal oath? Ans. Yes; 2 Chron. xv. 14; Neh. x. 29.

269. But is every promissory oath a vow? Ans. No; when it is not made to God, but to our neighbour.

270. Is not vowing the same as covenanting? Ans. Yes.

271. Is vowing, or covenanting a duty still under the New Testament? Ans. Yes.

272. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the command being applicable to all ages; Ps. lxxvi. 12. (2.) From prophecies of its occurrence in New Testament times; as Isa. xix. 18; Jer. l. 5. (3.) From the nature of the duty, as moral, and not typical or ceremonial. (4.) From its tendency to promote our faith and obedience.

§ XXXVII.—273. May a religious vow be made to any but to God? Ans. No.

274. Why? Ans. (1.) It is an act of worship; promising to God, trusting in him, and engaging to obey him. (2.) The command requires us to vow to God; Num. xxx. 2; Ps. lxxvi. 12. (3.) He alone is omniscient to know our hearts; and he alone is Lord to whom we should devote ourselves.

275. Are not the Popish vows to saints and angels idolatrous? Ans. Yes.

§ XXXVIII.—276. To what may we bind ourselves by vows? or what is the matter of a religious vow? Ans. Something which is our duty to God, according to his law, and nothing else.

277. Why should we be limited to what God commands? Ans. Because his law commands all our duty.

278. May we not vow something that is in itself indifferent? Ans. Yes; in itself indifferent, but not indifferent to us in our circumstances;—as fasting on certain days. The fast is an appointed duty; the day is not appointed of God. We may vow to devote a day to this exercise, or not, as circumstances require. And so of many other similar things.

279. But should such vows of things indifferent be perpetual? Ans. No.

280. Should a vow to a moral duty which God has appointed as always binding be perpetual? Ans. Yes.

281. Why this difference? Ans. (1.) What God commands as perpetual, is always moral—is always possible so far as it is commanded, and never will interfere with other duties. (2.) But what he has not commanded as perpetual, will sometimes not be possible, and will interfere with other duties. (3.) God's wisdom alone can determine what should be perpetual; and our making that perpetual which God has not made so, is not obedience, but will-worship.

282. In all vows of things not directly commanded, as the day of a fast, the frequency of our prayers, &c., should not the vow be conditional—*Deo volente*? Ans. Yes.

283. Is it necessary, in a lawful vow, that we know the thing to

be possible? Ans. Yes; in ordinary providence, and conditional in his providence.

284. Should not the thing vowed, though indifferent in itself, have a tendency according to God's appointment, to glorify him, and fit us for further duty? Ans. Yes; otherwise it is useless, and will-worship.

285. Is it our duty in vowing to promise absolute perfection in our obedience? Ans. No; because that perfection is not promised.

286. How then are we to vow with respect to the measure of our duty? Ans. As God has promised, and according to the means of grace bestowed, that by his grace, we shall not allow ourselves in sin, &c.

287. Should we vow to perform a thing unknown to us? Ans. No; we should vow in judgment; Jer. iv. 2.

§ XXXIX.—288. Do we sin if we vow anything evil or useless? Ans. Yes; as we then engage to God himself, as witness and Judge, that we will violate his law, and disobey him; or offer to him what is but will-worship,—in no-wise commanded.

289. If we discover that, by oversight, we had vowed something sinful, are we bound to keep that vow? Ans. No; we should confess our sin in vowing, and accordingly we should break that vow in obedience to God.

290. What evil is there in a rash vow, made in uncertainty what it may lead us to? Ans. (1.) It is trusting to our own wisdom. (2.) Offers to God what he has not commanded. (3.) It is great irreverence.

291. Are not all these evils, of sin, rashness, and will-worship, found in the Popish monastic vows? Ans. Yes; as the vows of perpetual virginity, voluntary poverty, blind obedience, &c.

292. Obj. Jephtha vowed rashly, and performed his vow? Ans. (1.) Though Jephtha is represented, in Heb. xi. 32, as a believer, the apostle does not justify all his conduct. This act was sinful. (2.) If he did fulfil his vow literally, he sinned. (3.) He should have broken it.

293. Is every one bound to vow to God the performance of moral duties? Ans. Yes; Psa. lxxvi. 12.

294. Obj. We are at liberty to vow or not, as we please; Eccles. v. 5? Ans. (1.) In reference to things in themselves indifferent, this is especially true; as of a day of fasting, the Nazarite's vow, &c. (2.) But in reference both to such cases, and to all commanded moral duties, Solomon does not say that we are innocent in the neglect of vowing, but more guilty if we neglect to pay our vows.

295. Obj. If moral commanded duties be the matter of our vows, the sin of him that vows is in consequence increased, if he break his vows? Ans. We admit that it is so; but the same thing is true of our profession of religion, communicating, prayer, enjoying any gospel privileges, and abusing them.

296. Obj. Nothing can add to the obligation of God's law and authority; therefore, such vows are of no utility, or the sin of vi-

olating them is no greater than the same sin without a vow? Ans. (1.) Vows are useful, or they would not be commanded. (2.) That violation of vows is a greater sin than the violation of the commandment without a vow, is unquestionably taught in Scripture. (3.) The violation of an oath is a greater sin than falsehood without an oath; and therefore the objection is false. (4.) Although it is true that nothing can add to the obligation of God's law, yet, by an oath or vow, we come under God's law in a new relation, and that law condemns our violation of it in both relations. The falsehood is condemned by the ninth command; and taking God's name in vain, by breach of vow, by the third command.

§ XL.—297. What is the object or design of vowing? Ans. God's glory and our good.

298. How does it procure these ends? Ans. (1.) It is an acknowledgment of God's authority, and of the obligation of his law. (2.) It promotes God's glory when it proves a means of promoting our godliness, or that of others, or of maintaining his cause. (3.) It tends to promote our faith and our obedience.

299. But in what spirit or manner should we vow? Ans. (1.) In love to God's law, and desire to obey it. (2.) In faith in him as our God and Father. (3.) In faith in Christ, for pardon and acceptance, and for grace and strength to perform.

300. What is implied in every vow to God? Ans. (1.) Acknowledgment of him as our Lord. (2.) Love to him and his law. (3.) Desire of his salvation. (4.) Desire to glorify him, have communion with him, and attain sanctification. (5.) Dedication of ourselves to him. (6.) Renunciation of other lords and other hopes.

301. Should all our vows be secret and personal? Ans. No; we ought to vow publicly and socially.

302. Should not public social vows be made on the same principles as secret and personal vows? Ans. Yes; they should be the same in their matter, and in the spirit in which they are made.

303. If the vows are public and social, what is necessary to such vows? Ans. (1.) That they be formal. (2.) Explicit.

304. Were there any reasons why such public social vows were lawful and dutiful in the church of Israel, and not in New Testament times? Ans. No.

305. Did God abolish the duty in New Testament times? Ans. No; he expressly commands it to all generations, Psa. lxxvi. 12; and expressly predicts it in the New Testament church, Isa. xix. 18; xlv. 23, 24; Jer. l. 5.

306. What are the proper seasons for this public social vowing? Ans. (1.) When the church is putting on a new organization; as at Sinai. (2.) When she engages in any special duty; 2 Cor. viii. (3.) In affliction and temptation; as Asa, 2 Chron. xv. 1—15; Neh. x. (4.) In times of apostasy, or danger of it; as Israel at Jordan, Nehemiah, &c.

307. What is the utility of public social covenanting? Ans. (1.) It promotes knowledge. (2.) Promotes self-examination. (3.) It tends to promote faith and evidence of grace. (4.) It tends to try

our sincerity in other duties and ordinances. (5.) It tends to dispose us to more faithfulness in witnessing for God. (6.) It tends to awaken and convince others, who are enemies to true religion. (7.) It tends to strengthen the weak in faith, and guard them against temptation.

308. Does this duty require more knowledge, faith, or assurance of the truth, than we ought to seek? Ans. No.

309. Does it require any other engagements to duty, any more sincerity, faith, love, or obedience, than baptism and the Lord's Supper? Ans. No.

310. Do the ordinances of baptism and the Supper render this duty useless? Ans. No.

311. Does it require an engagement to any more particular and full profession of faith than God's word and the sacraments do? Ans. No.

312. Does it require any more steadfastness in our profession and practice than the word and the sacraments do? Ans. No.

313. Does it require any more agreement in our profession and practice than the word and the sacraments do? Ans. No.

314. Should a fear of inability to fulfil our vows deter us from this ordinance? Ans. No.

315. How long does a covenant of duty to God bind us? Ans. During life, if the duty be of a perpetual nature.

316. How long will a church covenant bind to moral and perpetual duties? Ans. While that church exists.

317. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From Scripture texts; Josh. ix. 15, compared with 2 Sam. xxi. 1, 2; Jer. xi. 10; Deut. xxix. 14, 15, compared with 22—25. (2.) From God's plan of dealing with the church; continuing his promises and his law from generation to generation. (3.) From the nature of church covenanting; it is not as individuals only, but as the church.

318. Can ignorance, error, or irreligion release from obligation by a lawful covenant with God? Ans. No.

319. If church members had sufficient knowledge of the truth, love to it, and sense of its value, would there be any objections to covenanting? Ans. No.

320. If we had a higher sense of duty, and less conformity to the world, would there be so much objection to covenanting? Ans. No.

321. If the sacrament of the Supper were rightly observed, would there be such objections? Ans. No.

322. If secret covenanting were more intelligent, distinct, and sincere, would there be such objections to public social covenanting? Ans. No.

CHAPTER XXVII.

OF PERSEVERANCE.

LECTURE VII.—DEFINITION, AUTHOR, MEANS, SOURCE, AND SUBJECTS OF PERSEVERANCE.

§ I.—Q. 1. Is *Conservation*, or *Perseverance* in grace, a benefit of the new covenant? Ans. Yes; we count—Vocation, Justification, Sanctification, and Perseverance.

2. May conservation be considered as an adjunct of sanctification? Ans. Yes; because it is the continuance of sanctification, and promised with it; Jer. xxxii. 40.

3. But may it not with propriety be considered separately? Ans. Yes; because it applies to the whole state of grace, in justification, adoption, and union to Christ, as well as to sanctification.

4. Would our present state of grace be a valuable benefit without perseverance? Ans. No; it could afford the believer no confidence, no hope, and no safety.

§ II.—5. Is there any difference between conservation and perseverance? Ans. Yes; perseverance is our part, and the consequence of conservation on God's part.

6. Is not the believer's perseverance, then, as infallible as his conservation? Ans. Yes; because secured by it.

7. By what names is conservation called in Scripture? Ans. "Upholding," Psa. xxxvii. 24; "Keeping," 1 Pet. i. 5; "Confirming," 1 Cor. i. 8; "Sealing," Eph. iv. 30.

8. Does not perseverance sometimes mean our duty? Ans. Yes; as, "Keeping the faith," 2 Tim. iv. 7; "Keeping the unity of the faith," Eph. iv. 3; "Keeping purity," 1 Tim. v. 22. But here we speak of it as God's work, respecting our whole state of grace, enabling us to persevere.

9. Does not conservation sometimes mean God's common providence towards all his creatures? Ans. Yes; as Psa. xxxvi. 7.

10. Does it not sometimes mean God's preserving the elect from temporal evils and external calamities, as a new covenant blessing? Ans. Yes; as Psa. xxxiv. 20; xxxvii. 29; xci. 11.

11. How far does God engage to keep his people from these? Ans. As far as shall be for their good; and to keep them from the curse.

12. But in what sense do we speak of his preserving his people, on the question before us? Ans. His special providence keeping us in a state of grace.

13. What are the points included in the definition? Ans. (1.) It is a benefit of the covenant of grace. (2.) It is a work of God's grace. (3.) It is by inward and outward acts. (4.) By the instrumentality of means. (5.) The elect are the subjects. (6.) And the elect as called and justified, &c. (7.) From what they are preserved. (8.) The end—God's glory and their salvation.

§ III.—14. Whose work is our preservation in a state of grace? **Ans.** God's work; 1 Pet. i. 5.

15. Does this work belong to the three persons, according to the economy of redemption? **Ans.** Yes.

16. How, or in what respect, to the Father? **Ans.** As giving a seed to Christ, fulfilling the promises, and giving the Spirit; John xvii. 11; x. 29.

17. How to the Son? **Ans.** As the Administrator of the covenant; John x. 28; xiv. 16, 17.

18. How to the Holy Spirit? **Ans.** As the Applier of redemption; 1 John iii. 9.

19. Cannot the believer keep himself? **Ans.** No; Jer. x. 23. He can only use the means of his keeping.

20. But cannot those means which he uses be efficient for his preservation? **Ans.** Not of themselves; but God's power keeps, through these means; 1 Pet. i. 5.

21. But may not the grace bestowed on the believer, in regeneration and sanctification, keep him? **Ans.** No; that grace bestowed is God's means of keeping the believer; but it has not its origin and source of supply in the believer himself. If left of God, he would fall totally from grace. The source of supply of grace is in Christ; Col. ii. 9, 10. So long as that grace is exercised or exists in the believer, he perseveres; but God alone sustains it in him.

22. Does God use means of our perseverance, and of supplying us with grace? **Ans.** Yes.

23. What means does he use? **Ans.** (1.) Angels; Psa. xci. 11, Luke xxii. 43. (2.) Gospel ministers, Isa. xxx. 21, Heb. xiii. 17. (3.) Other believers, Jude 21–23, James v. 19, 20. (4.) The word, Psa. xvii. 4, John xvii. 17, Eph. vi. 17. (5.) The sacraments, Rom. vi. 4, 1 Cor. x. 16, 17, xi. 23–26. (6.) Providences, in mercies and judgments, Psa. cxix. 67, 71.

24. How are angels means of our perseverance? **Ans.** By suggestion, Acts x. 4, 5; by protecting us from enemies, and repelling evil spirits, Psa. xci. 11, Heb. i. 14.

25. How are gospel ministers and other believers means of it? **Ans.** By instruction, warning, &c.

26. How are the word and sacraments means? **Ans.** Besides the word instructing, warning, &c., both word and sacraments promote faith and other graces.

27. How are providences means? **Ans.** By awakening, leading to reflection and faith, to prayer and confession, &c.; Rom. v. 3–5.

28. Is our perseverance, then, a provision of the covenant of grace? **Ans.** Yes; God gave a seed to his Son, to be redeemed, not temporarily or partially, but effectually and eternally; John vi. 37, 2 Tim. ii. 19, Isa. liii. 10, 11. This benefit was secured in that covenant, by decree, by covenant promise to Christ, and by Christ's purchase.

29. Was this benefit secured in the covenant of works? **Ans.**

No; not in man's probationary state. It was secured in that covenant only after the condition would be fulfilled.

30. Is not our condition, under the covenant of grace, then, essentially different from that of Adam, under the covenant of works, and preferable to it? Ans. Yes.

31. Wherein is the believer's condition, under the covenant of grace, different from that of Adam in innocence, and preferable to it? Ans. (1.) Adam was in a state of probation, to perform a condition of life; but believers are not in a state of probation, having no condition to perform. (2.) Adam's eternal life was suspended on his perfect obedience, to be performed; the believer's is suspended on Christ's obedience, already performed. (3.) Adam's confirmation was suspended on his performance of the condition; believers' confirmation, sealing, &c., are now bestowed, through their union to Christ, and on account of his purchase. (4.) Therefore, Adam had no divine security that he would persevere in his probation; believers have security, through Christ, to be kept in a state of grace; 1 Pet. i. 5.

§ IV.—32. Who are the subjects of this preservation? Ans. The elect; John vi. 37, 2 Tim. ii. 19.

33. Are any others the subjects of it? Ans. No; not to eternal life, because not elected to it, nor purchased by Christ.

34. But is not preservation extended to all men, in some sense, according to 1 Tim. iv. 10? Ans. Yes; but, (1.) That preservation is not to eternal life, but to natural life, worldly comforts, worldly usefulness, and in their religious privileges and professions, as far as for his glory and the good of the church. (2.) That text may signify also that God offers himself as the Saviour of all.

35. Are all the elect, without exception, preserved in a state of grace? Ans. Yes; John vi. 37, 39, xvii. 12, Rom. viii. 30, 2 Tim. ii. 19, 1 Pet. i. 5.

36. Are believers who are weak in knowledge and in faith, preserved as certainly and effectually as the stronger? Ans. Yes; Psa. xxv. 9, 2 Cor. xii. 9.

§ V.—37. In what state or condition does the doctrine of divine preservation suppose the elect to be? Ans. (1.) As already in a state of grace—justified and regenerated. (2.) As exposed to enemies and in danger of falling, without divine keeping.

38. What are the enemies who would endanger their state of grace? Ans. (1.) The devil; Eph. vi. 11, 1 Pet. v. 8. (2.) The world; John xvi. 33, 1 John ii. 15, 16. (3.) The flesh; Rom. vii. 23.

39. How does Satan endanger the perseverance of the saints? Ans. (1.) By allurements and wiles; 2 Cor. ii. 11, Eph. vi. 11; deceiving by suggestions, and by making ordinary things temptations; Acts v. 3. (2.) By fiery darts; Eph. vi. 16.

40. How does the world endanger our perseverance? Ans. (1.) By the allurements of the things of the world; 1 John ii. 15, 16. (2.) By the allurements of evil examples, Ps. cvi. 35, 36. (3.)

By erroneous sentiments of the men of the world, 1 Cor. xv. 33.
 (4.) By the reproaches and persecutions of the men of the world, Matt. xxiv. 21, 22.

41. How does the flesh endanger our perseverance? **Ans.** Depravity tends to apostasy, Rom. vii. 23.

42. By what ways or acts does God preserve his people? **Ans.** By three ways; (1.) Sustaining their justification and relation to Christ, according to covenant. (2.) Strengthening and sustaining their graces, 1 Pet. v. 10; and subduing their sins, Mic. vii. 19. (3.) Subduing and repressing enemies, Ps. lxxvi. 10; Rom. xvi. 20.

43. What is included in that state of grace from which the elect are preserved from falling? **Ans.** Two things—justification and regeneration.

44. Are not both these things equally secured to the believer? **Ans.** Yes; he cannot fall from the one without falling from both.

45. If justification be secured, does it not secure the continuance of a regenerated state? **Ans.** Yes; they are, by the decree of God, the covenant of grace, the purchase of Christ, and by Gospel promise, inseparably connected together.

46. Why are they so inseparably united? **Ans.** (1.) God gave his Son to effect a complete redemption. (2.) Christ did not shed his blood in vain, to justify and not sanctify, or sanctify and not justify, or to lose his reward. (3.) None can attain heaven without both justification and sanctification.

47. Do the Scriptures speak of our preservation in a justified, as well as in a regenerate state? **Ans.** Yes; Rom. viii. 30, 33, 34. It is, therefore, improper to speak of perseverance as though it only had regard to our state of regeneration, as our author seems to do, and as is too generally done. And without including both, the Scripture proofs of our perseverance in grace cannot be fully exhibited.

48. Do the Scriptures teach that a professor of religion cannot fall from his attainments totally and finally? **Ans.** No; Heb. vi. 6; x. 38, 39; 1 John ii. 19.

49. Do they teach that the believer cannot decline from the exercise of grace, or fall into sin? **Ans.** No; we have instances of this in Scripture.

50. Against what kind of a fall do they teach that believers are secured? **Ans.** A total and final fall; Psa. xxxvii. 24; Heb. x. 39.

51. May the believer's fall be total for a time, though he be afterwards recovered? **Ans.** No; Rom. xi. 29, Psa. xxxvii. 24.

LECTURE VIII.—NATURE AND GROUNDS OF PERSEVERANCE, OBJECTIONS, &c.

§ VI.—52. Is the believer's perseverance absolutely sure? **Ans.** Yes; Rom. viii. 30—34.

53. Is his perseverance conditional? **Ans.** No; John x. 28, 29; 2 Tim. ii. 19; 1 Pet. i. 5.

54. How then understand the seemingly conditional expressions, Ezek. xviii.; Mark xvi. 16; Heb. x. 38? Ans. Faith and obedience are the means by which God keeps us, but not the conditions. God engages, in Christ, to maintain these graces as means of his infallibly keeping us; Jer. xxxii. 40; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 5.

55. Is this doctrine fully and plainly proved from Scripture? Ans. Yes.

56. What proof do the Scriptures give for it? Ans. (1.) Scripture doctrines directly, whether in plain language, or in figures; as, *plain*, Psa. xxxvii. 24; John x. 28, 29; Rom. viii. 29—39; 2 Tim. ii. 19; 1 Pet. i. 5;—*figurative*, Psa. cxxv. 1; Jer. xvii. 8; Matt. vii. 24, 25. (2.) Scripture promises; Psa. lxxxix. 33, 34; Isa. liv. 10; Jer. xxxii. 40, Hos. ii. 19, 20. (3.) The grounds on which the Scriptures found that perseverance.

57. What are those grounds? Ans. (1.) The origin of all our salvation—the unchangeable electing love of God; Jer. xxxi. 3; John iii. 16; Rom. viii. 29, 30. (2.) The purchase of Christ under the covenant of grace. (3.) The intercession of Christ; John xvii. 9—11; Heb. vii. 25. (4.) The believer's union to Christ. (5.) The indwelling of the Spirit; John xiv. 16; Eph. i. 13; iv. 30; 1 John ii. 27; iii. 9.

58. How does the purchase of Christ secure our perseverance? Ans. (1.) He paid a price infinitely valuable. (2.) The price, by covenant, was a full satisfaction to law and justice, in precept and penalty; Rom. x. 4, Gal. iv. 4, 5. (3.) By covenant, this price was paid, in the stead of the elect, as their redemption; Isa. liii. 10, 11; Gal. iii. 13. (4.) Divine truth engaged, on this ground, to give the elect to Christ, as redeemed by him to eternal life; John x. 28. (5.) Divine justice can demand no more. Nay, justice itself demands and secures that the elect shall be acquitted of all law-claims; that they shall be justified, and forever justified. (6.) On the ground of the purchase, God by covenant promised the sanctification of the elect; 1 Cor. i. 30; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19; and therefore both the justification of the elect, and their sanctification, were secured by covenant, on the ground of the purchase. (7.) On the ground of the covenant purchase, their regenerating grace cannot be taken from them, or withheld, because this would be a violation of justice. It cannot be taken away unless a law-charge could come against them, which justice forbids; Rom. viii. 1, 33. On the ground of the covenant purchase, they have a right to eternal glory; Rom. viii. 30, Tit. i. 2.

59. In what consists that union to Christ which is a ground of the believer's perseverance, or what does it include? Ans. (1.) Union in law; Rom. viii. 1; x. 4; and therefore Christ's righteousness is imputed to the believer, Psa. xxxii. 1, 2, compared with Rom. iv. 6—8; and he (the believer,) is therefore acquitted of all legal claims, and justified; and justice itself forbids his condemnation, or the withholding of any purchased blessing from him; as sanctification, perseverance, and glory. And, moreover, by that

union in law, the believer is a joint heir with Christ, to all purchased blessings; Rom. viii. 17. (2.) A real union; John xv. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 27; Col. i. 18. By which union Christ communicates grace infallibly to his people, for sanctification and perseverance.

60. Are not the assurance, the confidence, and the joy in Christ, which the Scriptures warrant and enjoin, evidences that the doctrine of infallible perseverance is true? Ans. Yes; there could be no ground for these, if the believer were liable to fall away from a state of grace.

61. Is not the assurance which God has given us that he will sustain the believer's faith, hope, and love, a proof that the doctrine of perseverance is true? Ans. Yes; as Rom. v. 1—5; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 5; 1 John v. 4.

§ VII.—62. Is not the doctrine of the infallible perseverance of the saints much opposed by professing Christians? Ans. Yes.

63. By whom, especially? Ans. By Socinians, Papists, Arminians, &c.

64. Why do they oppose it? Ans. (1.) Because of ignorance of the true plan of salvation. (2.) Because they draw their doctrine from nature's light, by the false guidance of their depraved reason and feelings, and not from the word and with prayer. (3.) Because of the ruling principle in man's conception—that man must furnish the ground of his acceptance with God. (4.) Because of pride of our own wisdom, strength, and goodness, and aversion to free and sovereign grace.

65. Is not the fallibility of the saints from the state of grace, the doctrine dictated by the heart of every one ignorant of the plan of salvation, and of the Bible doctrines of free grace, and the doctrines embraced by them? Ans. Yes.

66. Why is the perseverance of the saints denied especially by Socinians, Papists, and Arminians; or why do they agree in this? Ans. Because they agree in those principles which incline to, and maintain that doctrine of the saints falling away; as—that man must procure, in a measure at least, his own salvation; and that reason is our practical guide, instead of Scripture.

67. They object, however, from Scripture history, the falls of David, Solomon, Peter, &c.? Ans. We admit that these men fell into sin, and declined from the exercise of grace; but they did not fall totally or finally; they came to repentance, and thus furnished proof of the faithfulness and grace of God, and of the truth of our doctrine. Witness the confession and prayer of David, Psal. li.; the tears of Peter, Matt. xxvi. 75; and the Ecclesiastes of Solomon; as also the promise respecting him, 2 Sam. vii. 14, 15; and the testimony of Nehemiah, xiii. 26.

68. Obj. The fall of Adam, who, as God created him, was perfect in holiness, or without any sin? Ans. We reply as before; (1.) The covenant of works gave him no security; he was left to his own strength; while, (2.) The covenant of grace secures the believer, on the ground of Christ's finished salvation. (3.) Adam's strength was that of a holy human being; the believer's strength is that of God.

69. Obj. Conditional propositions of perseverance, used in Scripture, as Ezek. xviii. 26; Heb. vi. 4—6; x. 26—29, prove that believers may fall totally? Ans. These passages do not assert that believers may fall. They apply, (1.) To persons moral in their lives. (2.) To those under legal conviction, without grace. (3.) To those who have various religious attainments, but without grace. (4.) They are applied to convince men that by their sin they deserve wrath. And, (5.) To warn all to consider whether they have grace or not. Heb. x. 29, by "sanctification," means, (1.) A professor of religion is set apart, or ecclesiastically sanctified, by the blood of Christ, in which he professes to hope. Making this profession, he is set apart, or sanctified. (2.) That he professes to be really sanctified by it. (3.) That it is by the blood of Christ that a believer is sanctified, and this person is supposed to have this hope for himself.*

70. How explain 2 Pet. ii. 20? Ans. It applies to reformation from gross sins, under gospel privileges.

71. Are exhortations to fear and watchfulness, evidences that believers may totally fall away? Ans. No; they are means to be used, which God will bless for keeping us.

72. Does David's prayer, Psa. li. 11, "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me," imply that believers may fall away? Ans. No; he prays for what he knows he will obtain; by the prayer, acknowledging what he deserves; he prays for such a measure of the Spirit's gifts as he needs, &c.

73. Is man's weakness and sinfulness any argument against perseverance? Ans. No; for Scripture does not place our safety in our own strength.

74. Obj. Our safety will encourage sin and neglect? Ans. (1.) Fear of judgment cannot produce true holiness. (2.) The new heart obeys on godly principles.

§ VIII.—75. What is the end or design of the divine plan of the perseverance of the saints? Ans. Our salvation and God's glory.

76. Does not this benefit secure the salvation of the elect? Ans. Yes.

77. Does it tend to produce diligence in the believer? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. xv. 58.

78. Does it not actually secure his holiness by divine grace? Ans. Yes; Eph. i. 3—5.

79. How is God glorified by it? Ans. (1.) It ascribes all our salvation to God and to his grace. (2.) It renders God's plan of grace effectual, and proves his wisdom. (3.) It exhibits infinite riches of grace and condescension.

80. What would be the consequences of denying the perseverance of believers? Ans. (1.) It would deny comfort to believers. (2.) It would destroy all grounds of faith in salvation. (3.) It

* Another explanation of this passage is that which makes the pronoun "*He*" refer to *Christ*—"the blood of the covenant, wherewith *Christ* was sanctified," or set apart.—Ed.

would deny the covenant of grace, and the riches and freeness of salvation. (4.) It would deny God to be the sole author of salvation. (5.) It would deny God's eternal decree, and its immutability. (6.) It would deny the proper purchase of Christ. (7.) It would either drive man to despair, or lead him to seek salvation by his own works.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

OF REGENERATION, ADOPTION, RECONCILIATION, AND REDEMPTION.

LECTURE IX.—REGENERATION.

§ I. Quest. 1. May not regeneration, adoption, reconciliation, and redemption, be considered as other names for effectual calling, justification, sanctification, and conservation? Ans. Yes; in a great measure so, but expressing different shades of meaning, and enlarging our knowledge on these subjects.

§ II.—2. What is the difference between regeneration and effectual calling? Ans. (1.) Regeneration properly signifies God's act in the moment of our saving change; while effectual calling signifies or includes the whole operation of God in the work of producing that change, in reference to both what we are called from, and what we are called to. (2.) Regeneration is therefore included in effectual calling, as a part of the work. (3.) Regeneration conveys the idea of our relation to God as his children, which effectual calling does not directly do. (4.) Regeneration conveys the idea of the new nature which we obtain in effectual calling; the latter does not do so directly.

3. Does not the word *regeneration* by a figure, mean a second generation? Ans. Yes; John iii. 3; Tit. iii. 5.

4. To what does it refer as the first generation? Ans. To natural birth; John i. 13; iii. 6.

5. Is not this act of God called simply *generation* or *begetting*? Ans. Yes; Jam. i. 18.

6. How may we understand this as meaning the same thing as regeneration? Ans. The same thing is set forth by the different expressions; the one stating simply the benefit conferred, our saving change; the other expressing it with allusion to our natural birth.

7. Is not the same benefit called by the phrase "born of God" and "born of the Spirit?" Ans. Yes; as John i. 13; 1 John iii. 9; John iii. 5, 6.

8. In opposition to what are we said to be born of God, or of the Spirit? Ans. In opposition to all natural or merely moral causes or influences; John i. 13.

9. What is meant by "blood," the "will of the flesh," and "the

will of man," to which the new birth from God is opposed? Ans. (1.) To be born of *blood* signifies natural birth, or extraction. (2.) Of the *will of the flesh*, signifies our natural disposition, or affections. (3.) Of the *will of man*, signifies natural or moral efforts of ourselves or others.

10. Is not the same idea as regeneration expressed by "quickening?" Ans. Yes; Eph. ii. 5.

11. Is regeneration of which we treat, the same as that mentioned in Matt. xix. 28? Ans. No; we speak of a saving work, on each elect soul, while Matt. xix. 28, either means that radical change made in the gospel dispensation by Christ's first advent, or the renovation of the world at the resurrection, or his second advent.

§ VI.—12. What is done in regeneration? Ans. A new spiritual being called "the new man," and a new spiritual nature and life, are given to the soul naturally destitute of these things; 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. ii. 10.

13. Does regeneration confer any new natural powers? Ans. No; the things conferred are wholly spiritual. If new natural powers were conferred, man would not be the same natural being.

14. Does it directly improve the natural powers in natural things? Ans. No; some improvement may be an indirect effect of regeneration, by restoring a man from his moral debasement. Thus civilization, learning, &c., advance in Christian nations.

15. How much of man undergoes the spiritual change in regeneration? Ans. The whole man; 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. iv. 24.

16. Are the understanding, will, and affections renewed? Ans. Yes; Col. iii. 10; Eph. iv. 24.

17. Is regeneration anything more than the conferring higher degrees of good moral dispositions, of which we were naturally possessed? Ans. Yes; as it is a new creation, all things made new, making the sinner a new man.

18. How can a man remain the same accountable being, when he is made a new creature; and such a radical and entire change produced? Ans. His accountability depends on his being a moral and intelligent being, which he is naturally, though fallen, and not on his spiritual and holy nature.

19. How can the understanding be renewed, without a change of his natural powers and natural being? Ans. The renovation of the understanding is the communication of the spiritual power or capability of discerning spiritual things; 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15; of understanding them, and perceiving their excellence, and their application.

20. Does even the body come under the influence of regenerating grace? Ans. Yes; 1 Thess. v. 23.

21. In what respects? Ans. The animal feelings are sanctified, subdued and restrained.

22. Does the new life obtained in regeneration manifest itself by vital operations? Ans. Yes; as Gal. v. 22.

23. Are these operations, strictly speaking, regeneration itself, or only its effects? Ans. Only its effects.

24. Is not regeneration an act of God, communicating spiritual life, and effecting the saving change? **Ans. Yes.**

25. In this act are we active or passive? **Ans. Passive, as in creation.**

26. What then is the difference between regeneration and conversion? **Ans. In regeneration, we are passive, in conversion active. In regeneration, God gives life, in conversion we exercise it.**

27. How do the Scriptures set forth the evidences of regeneration? **Ans. By describing its manifestations—or the exercises of the regenerate.**

28. How are these represented or described? **Ans. (1.) By the figure of vegetative life, and action, as 1 Pet. ii. 2; 2 Pet. iii. 18. (2.) By the figure of sensitive life; as of seeing, hearing, tasting, &c., Eph. i. 18; Rev. ii. 7; Ps. xxxiv. 8. (3.) By the figure of rational life, as 1 Cor. ii. 12, 15; 1 Pet. i. 8.**

29. Is faith or regeneration first in order? **Ans. Regeneration; because faith is the exercise of a principle of spiritual life.**

30. Are we actually justified before regeneration? **Ans. No; not till we believe. We are regenerated or made alive; in consequence, we believe; and in answer to faith, we are actually justified.**

31. On what account are we then regenerated, or how are we regenerated on account of Christ's righteousness, while we are not believers, and are not justified? **Ans. By covenant, God grants regeneration on account of Christ's atonement.**

LECTURE X.—REGENERATION.—CONTINUED.

§ III.—32. Whose work is regeneration? **Ans. The work of God alone.**

33. How prove that it is wholly of God? **Ans. (1.) It is expressly ascribed to him in Scripture, John iii. 5; 1 John iii. 9; 2 Cor. v. 18; Eph. ii. 10. (2.) Other causes or authors are expressly excluded from the work, John i. 13; Eph. ii. 8, 9. (3.) As God is necessarily the fountain of all life, he must be so of this. (4.) As regeneration is a new creation, so it must be of God, 2 Cor. iv. 6; Eph. ii. 10; Gal. i. 15, 16. (5.) Man's impotence, so fully set forth in Scripture, shows that it must be of God, John xv. 5; Rom. viii. 7; 1 Cor. ii. 14.**

33½. Are other causes expressly excluded? **Ans. Yes; John i. 13.**

34. But it is objected, that the command to us to make for ourselves a new heart, implies that we are able to do it, Ezek. xviii. 31? **Ans. (1.) The command indeed shows that it is our duty, but does not imply the power in a fallen creature. (2.) The command is given us under the gospel, to show us our duty, to convince of sin, and to show us our need of saving grace. (3.) God promises the new heart, Ezek. xxxvi. 26; and thus proves our inability, and shows that the command was intended for instruction and conviction.**

35. But it is objected that man's accountability implies that he is able? Ans. Accountability depends on our moral and intellectual powers, which we have by nature, and not in spiritual powers, which we have lost by sin.

36. The doctrine of our inability to convert ourselves, discourages endeavours in duty and reform? Ans. (1.) It does discourage endeavours in duty, in our own strength, and hope of success by it; that is, it discourages vain hope, and unbelieving endeavours. But, (2.) It tends to promote humility, desire, faith and hope in Christ.

37. What is the true reason why men hold the doctrine of our ability to convert ourselves? Ans. (1.) Ignorance of our natural state, and of the nature of regeneration. (2.) Ignorance of gospel provisions. (3.) Pride of our ability. (4.) Unbelief, and unwillingness to trust on free grace for this gift.

38. Is regeneration the work of the Three-one-God? Ans. Yes; as of the Father, Ps. cx. 3; Isa. viii. 18; of the Son, 1 Cor. xv. 45; of the Holy Spirit, John iii. 5, 6; Tit. iii. 5.

39. To which of the persons is it most immediately ascribed? Ans. To the Spirit, Tit. iii. 5; because he is the applier of redemption.

40. How then is Christ called the "quickening spirit," 1 Cor. xv. 45? Ans. In opposition to Adam, who, although created an intelligent and holy being, yet had no power to give life, natural or spiritual. But Christ represented the elect, who were dead in trespasses and sins, was adapted to their necessity, and is able to give life. He is the quickening spirit, as he is God, as well as man; and as it is his office, as Mediator, to give life to his people. And he does this by his merits, and by his Spirit.

41. In what sense are we said to be "born of water," John iii. 5? Ans. (1.) Some suppose it means the righteousness of Christ, as necessary, as well as the Spirit's power. But Christ's righteousness does not appear to be signified by this figure. (2.) Some suppose it means our natural birth, as the figure is used in Isai. xlvi. 1; and in this sense it would mean, that a natural birth is necessary in order to be a subject of the new birth. (3.) Some suppose it means the water of baptism. But, though baptism is our duty, yet it is not essential to our regeneration, or salvation; as our Lord intimates that water is, in this text. (4.) We prefer the idea that "water" and "spirit" are the same thing, as in Matt. iii. 11; but presenting a variety of operations; as cleansing, giving life, &c.

42. Is regeneration a creating act of God? Ans. Yes; 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. ii. 10.

43. As, then, man is passive in this act, does he remain wholly passive after it? Ans. No; the new life given in regeneration, acts in faith and other graces.

44. But though the sinner is wholly passive, in the act of regeneration, has he not a natural capacity for it, different from beasts and blocks? Ans. Yes; he is a fit subject to be wrought upon;

possessed of intellectual and moral powers; though not capable of operating himself.

45. Does that natural capacity for the regenerating act of God imply any power, natural or moral, to effect regeneration ourselves? Ans. No; we are spiritually dead, Eph. ii. 1.

46. Though regeneration be a creating act of God, yet does he not use means in effecting it? Ans. Yes; 1 Pet. i. 23; James i. 18; Prov. xxix. 18.

47. Can the word and ordinances effect this change of themselves? Ans. No; 1 Cor. iii. 6; and observation teaches the same thing.

48. How is the word, when blessed of God, a useful means to adults? Ans. Enlightening, convincing, and persuading them.

49. As the word cannot answer these purposes to infants, is it nevertheless necessary to their regeneration? Ans. Yes; Acts ii. 38, 39.

50. How is it necessary, or useful to the regeneration of infants? Ans. (1.) God has appointed that the promise must come where the blessing of salvation is to be bestowed. (2.) His promise is to parents and their seed; Acts ii. 38, 39. (3.) By this means he brings children, with their parents, into his covenant. (4.) He will fulfil his promise where he gives it, but where the promise is not given, he will not bestow the gift.

51. Is the gospel ministry instrumental in regeneration? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. iv. 15, Gal. iv. 19. It is an appointed means of applying or using the word.

52. Though the work be of God, and of his sovereign grace, yet is it not in his visible church that he ordinarily effects it? Ans. Yes; Ps. lxxxvii. 4-6, Gal. iv. 26, 27.

53. Though man cannot regenerate himself, yet should he not use the appointed means of grace, in order to it? Ans. Yes; Prov. viii. 34.

54. Can he prepare himself, by these means, for regeneration? Ans. No; although he may, by these means, be convinced and enlightened, yet he is not thereby disposed to newness of life, nor in any measure renewed, till God new create the soul.

55. Is reformation of opinions and sentiments, and of life, no preparation for regeneration? Ans. No; for, so long as these are directed by unholy principles, they are no preparation; and if they spring from gracious principles, they are the effects of regeneration.

56. Is the word of God, strictly speaking, an instrument in God's hand in regeneration? Ans. So far as regeneration is a creating act of God, we cannot see how it is an instrument; but, so far as God, by that act, opens the eyes, and changes the affections and will, it appears that the word is the means. And it appears that the Scriptures speak of regeneration in this complex sense; as Eph. ii. 10, "created to good works;" 2 Cor. v. 17, "all things becoming new;" 1 Pet. i. 23, "born of the word;" James i. 19, "begotten by the word of truth." It is safest to use the Scripture ex-

pressions, or the identical ideas conveyed by them, and avoid philosophical discussions of the subject. There are other ways of disproving the efficiency of moral means, in effecting regeneration, than by denying the instrumentality of the word.

57. Can sanctification progress by any other way than that by which regeneration is effected; that is, other than by the immediate power of God? Ans. No; grace in us cannot act under the influence of means, but by the power and grace of God.

58. Can even the believer obtain a saving discovery, or exert a godly affection, under the influence of the word, without the supernatural work of the Spirit? Ans. No; of ourselves we can do nothing; John xv. 5; 2 Cor. iii. 5.

59. Yet is not the word the means of these gracious exercises? Ans. Yes; 2 Thess. ii. 13.

60. Is regeneration a benefit of the covenant of grace? Ans. Yes; (1.) God decreed to bestow regeneration in Christ; Eph. i. 4, Rom. viii. 29. (2.) He promised this to Christ; Isa. liii. 10. 11.

61. Have we then this benefit through the purchase of Christ? Ans. Yes; Tit. ii. 14, 1 Cor. i. 30.

62. Did the Holy Spirit engage, in that covenant, to regenerate those redeemed by Christ? Ans. Yes; Eph. i. 4, Tit. iii. 5.

63. Could such a benefit be granted without a covenant and purchase? Ans. No; justice, holiness, and truth forbid it.

§ IV.—64. Who are regenerated? Ans. The elect; 2 Thess. ii. 13, 1 Pet. i. 3, 4.

65. Why are they all regenerated? Ans. The covenant of grace secured it; the faithfulness of God; his decree, or unchangeable purpose; and the purchase of Christ; John vi. 37, 2 Tim. ii. 19.

66. Why are not others regenerated? Ans. Because not chosen of God, nor given to Christ by covenant, nor purchased.

67. Are even elect infants, dying in infancy, regenerated? Ans. Yes; "of such is the kingdom of heaven;" Matt. xix. 14.

68. In what state are the elect before regeneration? Ans. "Dead in sins," Eph. ii. 1, 2.

69. Does this death in sins include guilt and condemnation? Ans. Yes; Eph. ii. 3.

70. Have they before regeneration any power or disposition to exercise grace? Ans. No.

71. Why are they utterly destitute of all gracious dispositions? Ans. The curse of the law lies on them, which is death.

72. Is there any medium state between a state of depravity and regeneration? Ans. No; there can be no medium between death and life.

§ V.—73. What is the impulsive cause of our regeneration? Ans. The grace of God alone; James i. 18; Eph. ii. 8.

74. What is the ground on which the grace of God regenerates and sanctifies? Ans. The righteousness of Christ rendered under a covenant engagement.

75. Is grace, then, entirely free and sovereign in regeneration,

when it is granted only on Christ's account? **Ans. Yes; because justice must be satisfied; Christ, who is God, gave the satisfaction, and God in sovereign grace, proposed it.**

76. Is the grace of God in regeneration so free that all our merits or recommending qualifications are excluded? **Ans. Yes; Eph. ii. 8, 9.**

77. But, though a man cannot regenerate himself, may he not, by a moral life, and use of the means of grace, recommend himself to God beyond others, and so procure regenerating grace? **Ans. No; because (1.) Man is dead in trespasses and sins. (2.) He can therefore do nothing spiritually good, before regeneration, or perform the acts of the living. (3.) Regeneration is ascribed wholly to grace, and to the will of God.**

78. Does not regeneration by grace effect the salvation of the soul, and promote the glory of God? **Ans. Yes.**

LECTURE XI.—ADOPTION.

§ VII.—79. What is the general meaning of the word *adoption*? **Ans. Taking a stranger for a son, and admitting him to family privileges.**

80. Is not sonship with God often spoken of in Scripture, and in various senses? **Ans. Yes.**

81. Is it ever used in reference to all mankind? **Ans. Yes; Mal. ii. 10.**

82. In what sense are they called the children of God? **Ans. By creation, so Adam, Luke iii. 38.**

83. In what sense is it used of magistrates, as Psa. lxxxii. 6? **Ans. As having honour and power under God.**

84. In what sense is it used of angels, Job. xxxviii. 7? **Ans. They have power and a special image of God.**

85. Is it ever used in reference to the visible church? **Ans. Yes; Ex. iv. 22; Isa. i. 2.**

86. In what sense is it used respecting the visible church? **Ans. As having the visible privileges of children, and a peculiar care of God.**

87. Of whom is it used in a special and peculiar sense? **Ans. Of believers; Gal. iii. 26; Rom. viii. 14.**

88. Are there not several senses in which it is used of believers? **Ans. Yes; as in Rom. viii. 23, it is used in reference to the believers' resurrection, and eternal glory; signifying a more glorious manifestation of their sonship. But it is used more generally of believers in the present life, as expressive of their peculiar relation to God through Christ. In which sense we treat of it here.**

89. Is not adoption necessarily connected with justification? **Ans. Yes; When God justifies us, he gives us heirship to himself, as his children; Rom. viii. 17; he unites us to Christ, which makes us sons of God.**

90. Is it not included in effectual calling also? **Ans. Yes; we are thus called to be children. It is a privilege of effectual calling.**

91. Is adoption an act or a work? **Ans. An act.**

§ VIII.—92. Whose act is it? Ans. God's act; necessarily so, as he alone has authority to dispose of his inheritance, and to adopt strangers into his family.

93. To which of the persons of the Godhead is this act especially ascribed? Ans. To the Father; Eph. i. 5; 1 John iii. 1.

94. Why especially to the Father? Ans. Because in the economy of redemption, he sustains the rights of the Godhead, and because it is in the Son, and with the operation of the Holy Spirit that he adopts.

95. Is it not also ascribed to the Son? Ans. Yes; John i. 12.

96. How is it ascribed to the Son? or what part does he act in it, according to the economy of redemption? Ans. He gives them the right, power, or privilege of sonship, by his purchase and intercession.

97. What part does the Holy Spirit act in adoption? Ans. He takes possession of the elect, fits them for the privilege, by regeneration, and dwells in them as the Spirit of adoption, witnessing their adoption, and communicating the graces of that relation; Rom. viii. 15, 16; Gal. iv. &c.

98. Is adoption an act of pure grace? Ans. Yes; 1 John iii.

1. It is wholly of God's sovereign and gracious will. Man cannot deserve it.

99. Is it a blessing of the covenant of grace? Ans. Yes; God made provision for it in that covenant; it is the fruit of Christ's purchase, and of the Father's promise in that covenant; Eph. i. 5.

100. What is the difference between Adam's sonship in innocence, and that of the believer in Christ? Ans. (1.) Adam was a son of God by creation, and possession of the image of God. But believers are sons by union to Christ, the Son of God. (2.) Adam had not a right to the inheritance till his part in the covenant was fulfilled. Believers have a right through Christ's fulfilment of the covenant.

§ IX.—101. Who are adopted by God? Ans. The elect—they only, and all of them.

102. Why are the elect all adopted, and they only? Ans. (1.) Because of the decree and covenant giving them to Christ; Eph. i. 5. (2.) Because of Christ's purchase of those given to him; John i. 12; Gal. iii. 26.

103. Did the Old Testament saints enjoy adoption as well as believers now? Ans. Yes.

104. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From direct texts, Deut. xiv. 1; Isa. lxiii. 16. (2.) From their interest in the heavenly inheritance; Psa. lxxiii. 23, 24. (3.) From their privileges with God as children, in their life in the world; Psa. lxiii.; ciii. 13; cxliii. 10. (4.) From the fact that the plan of salvation has, in all dispensations, been the same—justification on the same ground, sanctification by the same Spirit of Christ, reconciliation to the same God, and all effected by the same grace and love.

105. Did not Old Testament saints enjoy substantially the same privileges, as children of God, as believers do now? Ans. Yes; as their spiritual comforts, assurance, and faith clearly manifest.

106. Yet was the manifestation of adoption ordinarily as clear to them as to believers now? Ans. No; their external evidence of the privilege was not then so fully revealed as now, and their internal experience was not generally so clear, as the influence of the Spirit were not then so fully granted.

107. But it is objected that several passages intimate that adoption belongs to New Testament times, in opposition to the old dispensation; as 2 Cor. vi. 18; Gal. iv. 5; 1 John iii. 2? Ans. (1.) The text, 2 Cor. vi. 18, was a promise even to Old Testament saints; Jer. iii. 19; xxxi. 9; and so far as it refers to New Testament times, it only signifies greater enlargement of privileges. (2.) Gal. iv. 5, does not speak of the Jewish law, but of the law as a covenant, from which Christ redeemed all his people, of the former and the present dispensations. (3.) 1 John iii. 2, only signifies that every one, when united to Christ, is then a son of God.

108. Do Rom. viii. 15, 16, and Gal. iii. 26, intimate a denial of the privilege of adoption to Old Testament saints? Ans. No; the opposition there stated is between the present privileges of the believer and his state of nature. And the latter text is designed to state the way by which we enjoy sonship—that is, by faith; and the context is designed to show that the way of the Old Testament saints was the same.

109. Obj. The old dispensation kept the people too much under a spirit of bondage, to consist with sonship? Ans. (1.) There was indeed more of a spirit of bondage under that dispensation than now, and less light, objective and subjective; but not so much as to be inconsistent with the privilege of adoption, as we have seen, by their prayers, thanksgivings, and professions. (2.) The bondage of the old dispensation is misrepresented by many, and held as greater, and of a different character than it really was; and the liberty of the new dispensation is, for a similar reason, perverted.

110. How understand Gal. iv. 1, 2, 3? Ans. (1.) This passage acknowledges the old dispensation to be darker, more burdensome, and favoured with less liberty than the new. But (2.) It was not such darkness or bondage as was inconsistent with adoption, no more than the infancy of an heir by birth denies its sonship; and so that passage teaches.

§ X.—111. In what state does adoption suppose the elect to be? Ans. Strangers to God, banished from him, and having no right of heirship; Eph. ii. 12, 13.

112. Of whose family had they been? Ans. Of the family of Satan; John viii. 44.

113. Had they, then, any good thing to recommend them to God, or anything of the spirit of children? Ans. No; Eph. ii. 1—3.

114. Are not regeneration, faith, justification, and adoption, at the same time? Ans. Yes.

115. But which is first in the order of nature? Ans. The order of nature is—regeneration—faith—justification—adoption. Because there is no adoption without justification; no justification without faith; and no faith without regeneration.

§ XI.—116. What is done in adoption? Ans. The elect are taken into God's family, in the relation of children, Eph. ii. 13; Hos. i. 10.

117. Who are the members of God's family? Ans. Holy angels, saints on earth and in heaven, Eph. iii. 15.

118. Is adoption a judicial or a Fatherly act? Ans. Judicial; so in its nature granted on judicial grounds.

119. On what grounds is adoption granted? Ans. The righteousness of Christ, and through his intercession, Eph. ii. 13.

120. Are not the privileges of adoption remarkable proofs of the love of God in Christ to sinners? Ans. Yes; both in its reality and greatness, 1 John iii. 1.

121. How does adoption prove the love of God to sinners? Ans. (1.) The greatness and reality of his love in giving his Son to redeem. (2.) In not only redeeming them from wrath, but to favour, and the fruits of divine favour—the privileges of adoption.

122. Does God always grant the Spirit of adoption, as well as adoption itself? Ans. Yes; Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 14, 15.

122½. But does not the Spirit of adoption in believers differ in measure and degree? Ans. Yes; so much so, that a believer, for a time, may not be able to perceive that he has the Spirit of adoption.

123. What are the privileges of adoption? Ans. They are many. In general, they are all that they need as the children of God. As (1.) They obtain a holy familiarity with God as their Father, and boldness at a throne of grace, Eph. iii. 12; Heb. iv. 16. (2.) They have free access to God, and success, John xvi. 23. (3.) Freedom from servile fear, Rom. viii. 15, through faith in Christ. (4.) Freedom from servile obedience, Rom. vii. 6; Heb. ix. 13, 14. (5.) They have a new name, 1 John iii. 1, as *children*, and Psa. xlv. 9, *spouse*. (6.) They are heirs of God, of grace and glory; and this heirship is sure—a joint heirship with Christ, Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iv. 7. (7.) They are under God's Fatherly care, making all things work for good to them, Rom. viii. 28; 1 Pet. v. 7. (8.) They have the Spirit of adoption, for comfort, instruction, strengthening, &c.

124. Do not these privileges lay us under high obligations to serve God, and to seek the blessings provided? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. vi. 20.

LECTURE XII.—RECONCILIATION.

§ XII.—125. Is not the idea of reconciliation included in justification? Ans. Yes.

126. Is the idea of reconciliation, as used in Scripture, included in effectual calling? Ans. No; except as effectual calling signifies a call from a state of guilt to a state of peace and pardon.

Our author defines reconciliation to be the bringing of the elect from a state of enmity to God, to a comfortable peace and friendship with him. We admit that when this happy reconciliation takes place, the elect, who were enemies, become friends, but affirm that

this is not directly the meaning of the word *reconciliation* in Scripture. We first inquire what reconciliation in the Scripture use of the word means.

127. Though in our ordinary use of the word, *reconciliation* means a change of mind, has it this meaning in Scripture? **Ans. No.**

128. Is God said in Scripture, to be reconciled? **Ans. No;** Scripture represents God as *reconciling*, and man as *reconciled*, 2 Cor. v. 18—20; Eph. ii. 14, 16; Col. i. 19—22.

129. And do these Scripture texts, speaking of God reconciling man, signify that he is thereby changing man's mind, renewing man's will and affections? **Ans. No.**

130. In these passages how is the reconciliation said to be effected? **Ans.** In 2 Cor. v. 18—20, we learn that it is by *not imputing trespasses*, or *pardonning sin*. In Eph. ii. 14, 16, and Col. i. 19—22, that it is by the *blood of the cross*, or the *atonement*.

131. Although every one who is interested in the atonement of Christ, and pardoned, is also, by the Spirit, renewed and sanctified, yet does the atonement or pardon directly change the heart? **Ans. No.**

132. As, then, the word *reconcile*, in Scripture, does not mean a change of man's heart, does it ever mean a change in God? **Ans. No;** there is no change in God, in his will or love.

133. Would not the doctrine of a change in God, occurring in man's salvation, misrepresent God himself, and the plan of redemption? **Ans. Yes.**

134. How would it misrepresent both God and the plan of redemption? **Ans.** (1.) It would represent God as changeable. (2.) It would maintain the idea, either that man's redemption did not originate with God, or that he adopted a plan to change his own mind, instead of a plan to change the sinner's state.

135. What then does the word *reconcile* mean, in the Scripture use of it? **Ans.** (1.) It means to take away the cause of displeasure. (2.) To change man's state from condemnation to justification and peace.

136. How does this appear? **Ans.** (1.) From Matt. v. 23, 24. In this text, not the person offended, but the person supposed to have given the offence, is directed,—not to reconcile the one offended, by a change of his mind,—but *to be reconciled*—the person not offended, but offending, to be reconciled—that is, not to change his own mind, but to take away the cause of offence. Now, between God and man, it is man's part, who has offended God, to take away the cause of the offence by an atonement. But, as he cannot do this, God takes it away by his Son. Therefore, instead of man atoning for himself, and thus being reconciled, God makes the atonement, and thus reconciles man. Therefore, (2.) This appears manifestly the meaning of the word in 2 Cor. v. &c.; Eph. ii., &c.; and in Col. i., &c.; where God is said to reconcile us to himself, by Christ, not imputing our trespasses; and Christ is said to reconcile us to God by the cross—and by the *blood of the cross*, and *through death*;

which therefore signifies the atonement taking away the cause of the offence. (3.) When reconciliation is always ascribed to the cross, it must mean taking away the cause of displeasure.

137. Between God and man, how is the reconciliation effected, or the cause of displeasure taken away? Ans. By the atonement.

138. Does not reconciliation sometimes, in Scripture, mean the atonement itself, and sometimes its application in justification? Ans. Yes; The first is meant, Eph. ii. 16, and Col. i. 22. The second is meant, 2 Cor. v. 19. The one is the ground—the other the application.

139. Though Christ by his death fully laid the ground of our reconciliation, yet is the sinner really reconciled till the atonement is applied and he justified? Ans. No.

140. What are we to understand by the exhortation in 2 Cor. v. 20, "Be ye reconciled to God?" Ans. It means, accept the atonement, and enjoy peace with God; because the apostle is proposing the atonement, and therefore is inviting the sinner to accept.

141. Does not this entreaty or exhortation imply a change of the sinner's heart? Ans. Yes; his compliance is a change; but the thing offered, and to be accepted, is a change of state—justification.

142. Though there is no change in God, but a change is necessary, both in the sinner's state and heart, yet is not God, in some sense, at enmity with the sinner, which in justification, is removed? Ans. Yes.

143. But is it a legal enmity or a real affection? Ans. It is legal; such as a judge may have towards a culprit whom he loves.

144. If then God lays aside the legal enmity towards the sinner, is it any change in God, or any proper reconciliation of God? Ans. No; it is a change in the sinner's state, and relation to God. It is his reconciliation.

145. But when God lays aside his legal enmity to the sinner, does he not then change his conduct to him, and love him? Ans. Yes; he changes his conduct towards him, but does not change himself. He loved him from eternity whom he now justifies, and he loves him still.

146. But does he not now love him with a love of complacency, whom before he loved only with a love of benevolence? Ans. God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son. This may be considered a complacency in the person of the elect, but not in his character. Now, being justified, the elect sinner is also regenerated, and he loves him with a love of complacency, as possessing his image; as lovely and justified in Christ. Thus the change is wholly in the sinner, and not in God.

147. Whether is man's enmity to God legal or real? Ans. It is real.

148. Is not an atonement the only method of removing legal enmity? Ans. Yes.

149. But will an atonement for man itself remove his real enmity? **Ans.** No; it never does till the Holy Spirit changes the heart by his power and grace.

150. But does not the atonement open the way for this? **Ans.** Yes.

151. And will not this effect always follow the making of the atonement, in the case of the elect? **Ans.** Yes.

152. And does not this removal of the real enmity in the heart of the elect always accompany his actual justification? **Ans.** Yes; and thus the elect sinner is always reconciled in heart to God, when he is reconciled in state.

§ XIII.—153. Is this work wholly of God? **Ans.** Yes; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; and elsewhere.

154. Would it not then be improper to say that God is reconciled, when the work is wholly of him? **Ans.** Yes; and so the Scriptures always ascribe the work to God, and constantly represent man as the subject of it.

155. Does this work belong to all the three persons, according to the economy of redemption? **Ans.** Yes.

156. How is it ascribed to the Father? **Ans.** As giving his Son, as imparting his righteousness to us, as justifying us; 2 Cor. v. 18; 1 John iv. 10.

157. How ascribed to the Son? **Ans.** As making the atonement, and interceding; Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 20.

158. How ascribed to the Holy Spirit? **Ans.** As concurring in the whole work, and as leading us to faith in Christ.

159. Could this work be effected by any other than God? **Ans.** No; because (1.) None had a right but God to propose a reconciliation. (2.) No method but one of his own choice could be acceptable. (3.) None was able to effect it but God.

160. Is it then wholly of grace? **Ans.** Yes; Col. i. 19, 20; Eph. ii. 8.

161. Though it be of grace, is it not also in accordance with justice? **Ans.** Yes; Rom. iii. 26; justice is satisfied by the legal and perfect removal of the cause of displeasure.

162. Though our actual reconciliation is of God, is not the word a means? **Ans.** Yes; as it instructs us, and persuades us to take an interest in the reconciliation by Christ.

163. Could there be any reconciliation but by a covenant of grace? **Ans.** No.

164. Why was there no reconciliation provided in the covenant of works? **Ans.** (1.) Because, while man stood there was no occasion for it, and, (2.) Because it would require another and different covenant, from that of works, to provide and procure a reconciliation for the breach of it.

§ XIV.—165. Who are the subjects of reconciliation? **Ans.** The elect; they all, and they only.

166. Why are all the elect, and none but they, reconciled? **Ans.** (1.) Because of the covenant giving them to Christ. (2.) Because

of Christ's purchase. (3.) Because of the faithfulness and immutability of God.

167. Were Old Testament saints reconciled, as well as those of the New Testament? Ans. Yes; as they had peace and friendship with God.

168. On what ground were they reconciled? Ans. On the ground of Christ's atonement; Rom. iii. 25; Heb. ix. 15.

§ XV.—169. In what condition does reconciliation suppose the elect to have been? Ans. In enmity; Rom. v. 10.

170. Was that enmity existing both on their part, and on God's? Ans. Yes; on their part, by a real enmity; and on God's part, by a legal enmity; which was perfectly consistent with eternal love, and a gracious intention to reconcile them.

171. Were the elect, then, at the same time under God's legal enmity and his love of benevolence in Christ? Ans. Yes; Eph. ii. 3; John iii. 16.

172. Is not the reconciliation of the elect, then, wholly of grace? Ans. Yes.

§ XVI.—173. Is peace with God an effect or result of this reconciliation? Ans. Yes; Rom. v. 1, 2.

174. Is this real peace changeable? Ans. No; Isa. liv. 10.

175. What is the reason of its stability? Ans. The purchase of Christ, and God's immutability of purpose, of justice, and of love.

176. Is peace of conscience an effect of reconciliation? Ans. Yes; Phil. iv. 7; Heb. ix. 14.

177. May this peace of conscience ever be interrupted? Ans. Yes; as instances show; as Heman, Psa. lxxxviii.; Asaph, Psa. lxxiii.; 1 John iii. 20, 21.

178. Is our love to God an effect of it? Ans. Yes; Psa. xviii. 2; Luke vii. 47; 1 John iv. 19.

179. In what sense may God's love to the elect be said to be an effect or result of their actual reconciliation? Ans. Not as a love of benevolence or good will to their persons, nor a love of beneficence, which was eternal in Christ, but a love of complacency in their persons and characters, as justified and regenerated. God's love can be exercised in some acts of beneficence towards his elect, as reconciled, which justice could not allow while they were not actually reconciled.

180. Why is the believer's peace of mind sometimes shaken, when his actual state of peace cannot be broken? Ans. (1.) He cannot always perceive his state of justification and peace. (2.) Indwelling sin, prevailing for a time, obscures his evidences of grace. (3.) God hides his countenance, because of the believer's sin, or for trial.

181. What are some of the ends which God would effect by leaving the believer to lose his peace of mind? Ans. (1.) To correct his faults, and lead to repentance. (2.) To lead him to more diligence in faith and prayer, Song iii. 1, &c. (3.) To lead him to set a value on his grace, Psa. xxx. (4.) To lead him to desire heaven, Psa. lxxiii. 22. (5.) To lead to a sense of dependence on divine grace, and a sense of divine sovereignty.

LECTURE XIII.—LIBERATION, OR REDEMPTION.

§ XVII.—182. Do the Scriptures speak of liberation or redemption as belonging to salvation by Christ? Ans. Yes; John viii. 36; 1 Cor. i. 30; Gal. v. 1.

183. Does not this itself include a whole salvation? Ans. Yes; it includes effectual calling, justification, sanctification, perseverance, and eternal glory.

Having, under these several heads, elsewhere discussed redemption, we shall not now discuss it under any of these particulars, but only under the idea of *liberation*, or deliverance from bondage or slavery. And we inquire, first, what it is? It is expressed by various words in Scripture; as, in Hebrew, לָקַח, *Goël*, and פָּדָה, *Phadah*, meaning *redeem, buy back by price, or deliver by power*; and, in Greek, ἀπολυτρωσις, *apolutrosis*, and εξαγορασμος, *exagorasmos*, signifying *redeeming by price*, and ελευθερωσις, *eleutherosis*, *set at liberty*.

184. Does not *redemption*, in Scripture, therefore, mean a deliverance from bondage, whether by price or by power? Ans. Yes.

§ § XXI., XXII.—185. Is there any kind of moral or spiritual bondage, to which man is by nature subject, to which this redemption does not apply? Ans. No; it gives a liberty from all moral bondage, whether that bondage was to justice or to power.

186. In what does this liberty or redemption chiefly consist? Ans. In redemption from the law as a covenant, Gal. iv. 4, 5.

187. From what claims of that law is the believer delivered? Ans. From all its claims; from its penalty and its commands.

188. But did not divine justice itself make these claims on us? Ans. Yes.

189. How then are we redeemed from them? Ans. By Christ's satisfying justice and law.

190. Was redemption from these absolutely necessary to our happiness? Ans. Yes; as fallen, we must perish under the penalty, if not redeemed; and be condemned before God, if under the precept of the law as a covenant.

191. What is included in the curse of the law, from which Christ redeemed us? Ans. Its whole sentence, under the name of *death*: as, (1.) Guilt and wrath, by sin. (2.) Condemnation before God to wrath and misery, John iii. 18, 36. (3.) A guilty conscience, Heb. ix. 14. (4.) Banishment from God's favour and gracious presence, Gen. iii. 24. (5.) Depravity and the dominion of sin, Rom. vi. 14; vii. 5; viii. 7. (6.) Impotence to all good, Jer. xiii. 23; John vi. 44; 1 Cor. ii. 14. (7.) The power of Satan, Acts xxvi. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 26.

192. Is redemption by Christ a deliverance from all these? Ans. Yes; Gal. iii. 13.

193. Does deliverance from the curse of the law bring with it deliverance from the commands of the law as a covenant? Ans. Yes; Rom. x. 4; Gal. iv. 4, 5.

194. What was the necessity for this? Ans. (1.) The necessity,

in law and justice, that the commands be perfectly obeyed, as the condition of life. (2.) The necessity, in justice, that man be condemned if he break them. (3.) The absolute inability of man to keep them, Rom. viii. 3. (4.) The impossibility of peace of conscience, and a spirit of obedience, if under the law as a covenant, Rom. vi. 14; vii. 5; Gal. iv. 4, 5.

195. What positive enjoyment is granted in this redemption from the law by Christ? Ans. (1.) Peace with God, in pardon and justification, and security against condemnation, Rom. v. 1; viii. 1. (2.) The liberty of access to God, and communion with him, Eph. ii. 18; iii. 12. (3.) A liberty in our obedience, Psa. cxix. 32, 45. (4.) A liberty from the slavish fear of death, and the sting of it, 1 Cor. xv. 55—57; Heb. ii. 14, 15.

196. In what consists our liberty of access to God and communion with him? Ans. (1.) In welcome to God as our Father, and persuasion of it. (2.) Persuasion of his love. (3.) Persuasion of our being accepted and heard. (4.) Peace of conscience in our services, through Christ.

197. In what consists our liberty in obedience? Ans. (1.) Obedience in freedom from a guilty conscience, Heb. ix. 14. (2.) Obedience in persuasion of our acceptance in Christ, Eph. i. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 5. (3.) Obedience in freedom from a servile spirit—from obeying as the condition of life, Rom. vii. 5. (4.) Obedience in love to the law, and delight in God's service, Rom. vii. 12, 22.

198. Is there not, then, both a liberty in state, and a liberty in spirit, procured by Christ? Ans. Yes.

199. Is this liberty of spirit perfect in this life? Ans. No; it is imperfect, through indwelling sin and unbelief.

200. Is the liberty with which Christ has made us free, a holy liberty? Ans. Yes; it must be so, as procured by Christ.

201. Is it, then, a liberty to hold such opinions of divine things as we please—act as our inclinations lead us—and obey God's law, or not, as suits our taste? Ans. No; this is not the liberty with which Christ has made us free. It is our bondage to sin.

202. Or is it a liberty of conscience from the control of man, as to our judgment? Ans. No; this is a natural liberty, granted by God as our Creator.

203. Is it a liberty of our persons from slavery; or a liberty of conducting our temporal affairs as we see fit, consistently with justice, rectitude, and the rights of others? Ans. No; this is a natural liberty, granted by God as the God of providence.

204. Is it not a liberty purchased by Christ, and secured in the covenant of grace? Ans. Yes.

205. Does not this liberty include a change of heart, and a capability of willing and doing what is good and acceptable to God? Ans. Yes; Phil. ii. 12, 13.

§ XVIII.—206. Who is the author of this liberty? Ans. God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

207. Has any creature wisdom or power to effect it, to acquire it themselves, or impart it to others? Ans. No.

208. How is it of God the Father? **Ans.** As giving his Son to purchase it, and the Holy Spirit to apply; Col. i. 12, 13.

209. How of the Son? **Ans.** He purchased it, and gives the Spirit to apply; John viii. 36; Gal. v. 1.

210. How of the Spirit? **Ans.** He applies the redemption and bestows the spirit of liberty.

211. To whom did Christ pay the price of redemption? **Ans.** To God; Rev. v. 9.

212. Did he pay a price to Satan? **Ans.** No; He delivered from Satan by power; Col. ii. 15.

213. Is it a blessing of the covenant of grace? **Ans.** Yes; it was promised in the covenant of grace, was accordingly purchased by Christ, is applied by the Spirit, and belongs to the promises; Luke i. 71, 72.

214. What is the utility of it? **Ans.** (1.) It is for our comfort. (2.) It fits us for duty. (3.) Fits us for happiness.

§ XIX.—215. Who partake of this liberty? **Ans.** The elect.

216. Was the purchase of redemption or liberty any more extensive than the application? **Ans.** No; Rom. viii. 29, 30.

217. Why are the purchase and application of equal extent? **Ans.** (1.) Because the purchase was made by covenant, for the actual redemption of the persons given to Christ. Therefore, (2.) God's faithfulness, justice, purchase, covenant, and promise, secure the application to all for whom it was purchased.

218. Would a purchase more extensive than the application, have been a real redemption, or of any use? **Ans.** No.

219. Has any one the possession of this liberty, unless the redemption be applied? **Ans.** No.

220. Is it a purchased redemption at all, if it do not secure the application? **Ans.** No; it is no redemption if not applied.

221. Did Old Testament saints partake of this liberty? **Ans.** Yes; as their conduct, their joy, and thanksgiving prove; Psa. ciii. 9—14; cxix. 32, 45; Isa. lxiii. 16.

222. Is there not, however, more of the spirit of liberty under the new dispensation? **Ans.** Yes; Gal. iv. 1—7.

223. Obj. The Old Testament saints were under bondage by the dispensation under which they were; Gal. iv. 1—3? **Ans.** It was a comparative bondage—less liberty than now.

§ XX.—224. In what state are mankind before their actual liberty by Christ? **Ans.** In bondage, under guilt, condemnation, and the power of sin and of Satan.

225. Does not redemption by Christ imply that we were utterly unable to redeem ourselves? **Ans.** Yes.

226. Could we enjoy this liberty without the power and operation of the Spirit applying redemption? **Ans.** No.

227. Could we have enjoyed this work of the Holy Spirit, if Christ had not purchased our liberty? **Ans.** No; justice demanded a price, in order to our liberation.

228. Are we bound, in duty to God, to seek the liberty that Christ has purchased for us? **Ans.** Yes; his authority binds us

to accept; his gracious provision lays us under obligation to embrace it; and if we do not, we cannot serve him; Rom. vii. 5.

229. As the liberty with which Christ makes us free, includes a liberty from the law as a covenant, does it give us liberty to neglect the law as a rule of life? Ans. No; such liberty is a bondage to sin, and not Christian liberty.

230. Does not Christian liberty dispose us to obedience? Ans. Yes; to obedience in the spirit of children.

~~No~~ This subject may cast light on the question of *the liberty of the will*.

231. Did Christ purchase the natural liberty of the will? Ans. No; we have this by creation.

232. Are the supernatural influences of the Spirit necessary to it? Ans. No.

233. What is the natural liberty of the will; or, in what does it consist? Ans. In having the power or privilege of choosing, without restraint from another, and according to our nature.

234. Has not man, then, in his state of nature, the perfect natural liberty of a creature? Ans. Yes.

235. Does it, then, follow that he has power to choose spiritual good? Ans. No.

236. Does his inability to choose spiritual good, diminish either his natural liberty, or his accountability? Ans. No.

237. But did not Christ purchase, and does not the Holy Spirit effect, a spiritual, gracious liberty, in the will of the elect? Ans. Yes; Gal. v. 1.

238. In what does this spiritual liberty consist? Ans. (1.) In freedom from inclination to sin, and from its governing power. (2.) In a gracious disposition, and ability to choose what is spiritually good.

239. What is necessary to such liberty? Ans. (1.) Freedom from a guilty conscience; Heb. ix. 14. (2.) Freedom from obligation by the law as a covenant, both in penalty and precept; Rom. vi. 14; Gal. iv. 4—6. (3.) Faith in this freedom; Heb. xi. 6. (4.) The renovation of the heart by the Holy Spirit; Rom. viii. 14, 15, 2 Cor. v. 17.

240. Can man, then, naturally have this liberty, since the fall? Ans. No.

241. Can he effect it in himself? Ans. No; Jer. xiii. 23, Rom. viii. 7.

242. Is he able to perform any duty acceptably without it? Ans. No; Rom. vii. 5; viii. 8.

CHAPTER XXIX.

OF THE SACRAMENTS.

LECTURE XIV.—THEIR GENERAL NATURE.

§ I.—Quest. 1. Is the word *sacrament* found in Holy Scripture? Ans. No.

2. What ordinances of the Old and New Testaments are usually called by this name? Ans. Circumcision, the Passover, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper.

3. When did these ordinances come to be called *sacraments*? Ans. In an early age of the Christian church.

4. Why did they call them *sacraments*? Ans. (1.) From the peculiar solemnity of these ordinances. (2.) From the mystery in them. (3.) From the engagements which they require or imply.

5. From what did the name originate? Ans. It is of Latin origin, and appears to have been adopted from various uses of the word among the Romans. As, (1.) It was used for a sum of money deposited in a civil court, in a law-suit, to be received back, if the suit were gained, and, if the suit were lost, to be forfeited to the public treasury, for sacred uses. (2.) It was used for a military oath to be faithful to the commander. (3.) As expressive of a sacred mystery. So they translated, for example, 1 Tim. iii. 16, "Great is the *sacrament* (*μυστηριον*, *mysterion*) of godliness;" so Eph. i. 9.

6. As this name is not found in Scripture, is it right to retain it? Ans. Yes; we may give suitable names, if we rightly apprehend the thing.

7. What do the Holy Scriptures call these ordinances? Ans. *signs* or *seals*; Gen. xvii. 11; Rom. iv. 11.

8. Are they, by metonymy, called *covenants*? Ans. Yes; Gen. xvii. 10; Acts vii. 8.

9. Of what are they signs and seals? Ans. Of the covenant of grace, and of its blessings.

10. Are they seals of the covenant as made with Christ in eternity, or of the covenant promise as made to us? Ans. Of the latter; Gen. xvii. 10, 11.

11. What is the peculiar characteristic of a sacrament, by which it is distinguished from other divine ordinances? Ans. It must have an external sign, signifying a spiritual thing.

§ III.—12. Is it essential to a sacrament that it be appointed of God? Ans. Yes.

13. Why is it essential? Ans. Without this, (1.) It would not be a duty. (2.) It would not be acceptable; Matt. xv. 9. (3.) It would not be profitable to us; Matt. xv. 9. (4.) It would not be an act of worship. (5.) It would not be a seal of God's promise.

14. Are sacraments moral duties, independent of divine appointment? Ans. No; they are so only by divine appointment.

15. In what respects are sacraments sacred, and different from profane or civil rites and ceremonies? Ans. In respect to their author, matter, and end.

16. What is the matter held forth in sacraments, rendering them sacred? Ans. The blessings of the covenant of grace.

17. What is their end or design? Ans. (1.) Special—for communion with God, increase of faith, and practical godliness. (2.) A secondary design is to distinguish Christ's people from the world; 1 Cor. x. 16, 17—21.

18. As a sacrament is intended to be a seal of the promise, is it intended to confirm the promise, or our faith? Ans. Our faith.

19. What things, under the appointment of God, are necessary to constitute a sacrament, and distinguish it from other divine ordinances? Ans. (1.) An external, visible substance, as a sign. (2.) That man, by appointment, actually partake of it. (3.) That there be a thing signified by that sign, for man's participation. (4.) And that there be a certain union between the sign and the thing signified.

20. Is it necessary that the sign in a sacrament be external and sensible, or perceived by the senses? Ans. Yes; so circumcision, the Paschal Lamb, water, bread, and wine.

21. Is it necessary that it be a substance? Ans. Yes; not a mere quality, as colour and form.

22. Is it necessary that it be visible? Ans. Yes; as bread, wine, &c.; not as the Sabbath—a day—though called a sign; as Ezek. xx. 12.

23. Is a sacramental sign a miraculous substance? Ans. No; it is a common matter, or act, according to the laws of nature.

24. May the same kind of a thing which is used as a sign in a sacrament, be used also for other purposes? Ans. Yes; God chose things of ordinary use, to be signs in his ordinances, and to be sacred only in that use.

25. If an external, visible, and substantial sign belong to a divine ordinance, does such a sign constitute that ordinance a sacrament, if, by appointment, man is not to have a visible and sensible participation of it? Ans. No; because man would, by such a sign, have no sign or seal of his participation of the blessing signified.

26. Would it be a sacrament or seal, if man were only allowed to contemplate the sign for his instruction? Ans. No; as the rain-bow.

27. In a true sacrament, is it not necessary, then, that participation in the external sign be an appointed sign of participation in the thing signified? Ans. Yes.

28. Does participation in a sacrament imply that the person is already a partaker of the blessing signified; or only that he is to be a partaker? Ans. That he is already a partaker, and will enjoy further participation; Rom. iv. 11.

29. Why so? Ans. Because he takes a seal of the blessing promised, and not merely the seal of the promise.
30. Does the sign in a sacrament signify the blessing contained in a new covenant promise? Ans. Yes.
31. What does the sign signify respecting the promise? Ans. Both the gift on God's part, and the reception on ours; 1 Cor. xi. 24.
32. Would not a sacrament be unmeaning and useless, without a promise? Ans. Yes; it could signify and seal nothing.
33. Does not a divinely appointed sign of a promise become a seal of it? Ans. Yes; it is appointed for this purpose; Rom. iv. 11.
34. What are we to understand by a sacramental sign's signifying spiritual, new-covenant blessings; or, how does it signify them? Ans. (1.) It represents them to us, for instruction, and as an offer. (2.) It warrants faith in the gift of God. (3.) It actually conveys the blessing signified to the believer; and, (4.) It seals it.
35. How does it appear that the sign warrants faith in the gift of God? Ans. Because it accompanies the promise as a seal of it to us; Rom. iv. 11.
36. How does it appear that the blessing promised is actually conveyed to the believer, by the sign? Ans. From 1 Cor. x. 16, 17; xi. 24. These and such texts show that the sign was instituted as a means of actual conveyance—assuring us, by the sign, that God gives the thing signified.
37. Can the outward act of participation of the sign make us partakers of the thing signified? Ans. No; 2 Cor. iii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 13.
38. Has the ordinance itself any power to communicate the blessing? Ans. No; Matt. iii. 11.
39. Can the intention of the minister make us partakers of the blessing signified, or hinder our participation of it? Ans. No; 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7.
40. If it depended on the minister's intentions, could we at all partake in faith? Ans. No.
41. By whom are these doctrines opposed? Ans. By Roman Catholics; who say that the outward act (*ex opere operato*), can convey the blessing, &c., &c.
42. How then is the spiritual blessing actually conveyed to the believer, by means of the sign? Ans. By the blessing of Christ, and the working of his Spirit; 1 Cor. 6, 7; xii. 13.
- 42½. Cannot Christ convey the blessing by the sign, as well as by the word? Ans. Yes.
43. Is this actual conveyance of the blessing signified by participation of the sign, in saving faith, acknowledged by all professors of religion? Ans. No; Socinians deny it; holding the signs to be mere instructive emblems, but inefficient, even by grace.
44. Will God assuredly give the blessing signified, to the believing receiver? Ans. Yes; Matt. xviii. 20; xxviii. 20; 1 Cor. x. 16, 17; xi. 24.

LECTURE XV.—GENERAL REMARKS,—CONTINUED.

45. Is there a union constituted between the sign and the thing signified? Ans. Yes.

46. What constitutes or establishes that union? Ans. The appointment of Christ.

47. Is this, in any respect, a natural union? Ans. No.

48. What would be the consequence, if it were a natural union? Ans. (1.) The participation of the sign would, without fail, give actual participation of the spiritual benefit. (2.) The sign would, itself, and independently of the blessing of Christ, and of faith on our part, give possession of the blessing.

49. Is the sign, then, though in itself a natural act or thing, a natural sign of the blessing? Ans. No; because, then, (1.) The one would be the cause, and the other the natural effect. (2.) The same effect would always follow from the same cause. (3.) It would follow by natural, and not by supernatural influences.

50. Is there not, however, a resemblance of some kind between the sign and the thing signified in a sacrament? Ans. Yes; it is so for instruction; but this resemblance establishes no natural union between them, as cause and effect.

51. Does, then, the relation or union between the sign and the thing signified, in a sacrament, depend wholly on divine appointment? Ans. Yes.

52. What kind of a union or relation, then, subsists between them, by divine appointment, since it is not a natural union? Ans. It is moral and supernatural; depending entirely on the blessing of Christ, for participation of the blessing, in partaking of the sign.

53. Does such a union actually exist, unless the ordinance be dispensed substantially according to divine appointment? Ans. No.

54. Is it reasonable to expect, when such a union exists between the sign and the thing signified, that the latter will be called by the name of the other? Ans. Yes; as in 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25. The bread is called Christ's body, &c. And this explains the language in the institution.

55. Does it consist with the nature and design of a sacrament to suppose that the sign is mysteriously transformed into the thing signified? Ans. No; this would destroy the sacramental union between them altogether. It would constitute a oneness, and not a relation, or moral union; the participation of the sign would be a literal participation of the thing signified; and the unbelieving partaker of the sign would be a partaker of the thing signified; and thus, would either perish in union to Christ, and interest in him, or be saved while unbelieving and unregenerate.

56. Seeing all divinely appointed sacraments possess a uniformity of character, must not the sign in all of them be transformed into the thing signified, if it be in one of them? Ans. Yes; as

the water in baptism into the blood of Christ, and the Paschal Lamb into Christ himself.

57. If a sign of a spiritual new covenant blessing accompany any divine institution, may it not, in a lax sense, be called a sacrament? Ans. Yes; but not strictly, or in a strict sense.

58. Were there not many sacraments, in this lax sense, in the old dispensation? Ans. Yes.

59. What were some of them? Ans. (1.) The ark, in the flood. (2.) The rainbow. (3.) The passage of the Red Sea. (4.) The cloud in the wilderness. (5.) The manna. (6.) The water from the rock. (7.) The brazen serpent. (8.) All the sacrifices. And, (9.) Under the covenant of works, the tree of life.

60. Why were they not strictly sacraments? Ans. (1.) The rainbow and the cloud were not matters of participation, but of contemplation. (2.) Sacrifices were types; sacraments are not types, in their sacramental character. In sacraments, God gives to man, and man participates; in sacrifices man gives or offers to God. (3.) All the others were extraordinary, and for a particular occasion; but sacraments are ordinary ordinances, continued in the church. (4.) They were designed to confirm some particular promise, or for a particular occasion; while sacraments are intended to confirm all the promises of the gospel. (5.) The tree of life was a sacrament of the covenant of works.

61. Is it not the design of a sacrament to represent, by a sign, and to seal and apply, the promised blessing to believing receivers? Ans. Yes.

62. Does it represent the promised blessing to believers as theirs by divine gift, and offer it to them? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. xi. 24.

63. What class of persons ought to partake of the sacraments, according to divine institution? Ans. Visible church members, or professed believers.

64. Who are acceptable receivers in God's sight? Ans. True believers.

65. Who have a right before men, to partake? Ans. Visible church members, in good standing; 1 Cor. xi. 28, 2 Thess. iii. 14.

66. Why could none but true believers be benefited by participating, or be acceptable? Ans. (1.) Because no others have any benefits to be sealed. Ans. (2.) Because others, by unbelief, reject the thing signified.

67. Wherein would it be unreasonable that non-professors of religion, or openly irreligious characters should partake of the sacrament? Ans. (1.) In partaking, they take a seal of what they do not profess to receive or possess. (2.) They would, by the participation, be engaging to do what, by irreligion, they refuse to do—to believe in Christ, and yield themselves his servants.

68. Is the ordinance of a sacrament intended to make men believers by participation? Ans. No; but to confirm the faith, and increase the piety of those who are already believers.

69. How, then, are infants proper recipients of a sacrament?

Ans. As church members by birth, under God's promise; as objects of the promise, and capable of the blessing; as God thereby gives them the seal of his promise, and the seal of the blessing, if then regenerated, or seals the blessing when received.

70. Should not applicants for admission to sacraments, be of suitable age for an intelligent participation? Ans. Yes.

71. Is the outward participation of the sacraments necessary to salvation? Ans. No; so the thief on the cross; so Mark xvi. 16.

§ IV.—72. Were there sacraments under the old dispensation, as well as under the new? Ans. Yes.

73. Is there any difference between them and ours? Ans. Yes.

74. Were the differences essential, or only accidental? Ans. Only accidental.

75. In what did they differ? Ans. (1.) The external signs were different. (2.) In their ease or convenience of application. (3.) In their duration. (4.) In their administration, or the persons administering. (5.) In the clearness of the thing signified. (6.) In their connexion with typical deliverances; as the Passover. (7.) In their reference; of old, to Christ as to come, and now, to Christ as come.

76. As the sacraments of the Old and New Testaments do not differ essentially, wherein do they agree? Ans. (1.) God is the author of both. (2.) The signs are equally external and visible. (3.) The signs in both are to be partaken of, not contemplated only. (4.) The sign and external participation in both were equally inefficient to confer the blessing. (5.) The efficacy to believers was the same; Rom. iv. 11; 1 Cor. x. 16. (6.) The thing signified is the same—new covenant blessings. (7.) The union between the sign and the thing signified is the same—appointed and supernatural. (8.) The relation of the receivers to God is the same—a saving covenant relation to him. (9.) The end is the same—for confirming faith, and promoting godliness.

77. What errors do Papists and Lutherans hold on this point? Ans. (1.) The Papists especially hold that there is a greater efficacy in the New Testament sacraments—that participating externally makes us partakers of grace—that the blessing signified is in the New Testament sacraments themselves. (2.) The Lutherans also hold that the thing signified is, in some sense, in the signs; and that the Old Testament sacraments were types of ours.

78. But it is argued that Col. ii. 17, speaking of Old Testament ordinances as shadows of things to come, warrants the idea that their sacraments were types of ours? Ans. They were types indeed, of Christ, and spiritual blessings, but not types of ordinances.

79. What would be the error of holding them types of our sacraments? Ans. (1.) All types were emblems and promises of saving blessings, and therefore not emblems or promises of mere ordinances, which are no blessings in themselves. (2.) The supposition that they were types of ours, assumes that our sacraments are saving blessings of themselves—that the thing signified is in them—and

that external participation of the ordinance is a participation of the spiritual blessing itself.

80. Obj. 1 Pet. iii. 21, declares that baptism is an antitype of the ark in the flood? Ans. (1.) The Greek term *antitype*, does not here mean the thing signified by the type, but a type or emblem answering or agreeing to another type or emblem. (2.) The apostle, in that text, shows that the thing set forth by those emblems was the spiritual blessing; and that baptism, and the ark in the flood, were both emblems of it.

81. Obj. Gal. v. 2, and 1 Cor. vii. 19, declare circumcision to be useless or injurious; and therefore it was equal to, or of the same meaning or use as baptism? Ans. (1.) The apostle does not declare it useless, in its proper time—in the old dispensation—and in its proper use then. But, (2.) He means, Gal. v. 2, that to rest on circumcision, as saving in itself, or by the use of it to reject Christ, is ruinous. (3.) He means, by 1 Cor. vii. 19, that without faith in Christ, circumcision was always unprofitable, and that neither it nor any other ordinance was saving in itself.

82. Do not the benefits which Old Testament saints enjoyed by their sacraments, show that they were the same as ours? Ans. Yes; Rom. iv. 11, 1 Cor. x. 1—4.

§ V.—83. Had not those extraordinary sacraments, under the Old Testament, a reference to Christ, as instructive types? Ans. Yes; as the ark in the flood, 1 Pet. iii. 21; the brazen serpent, John iii. 14; the manna, John vi. 32, 33; the rock in the wilderness, &c., 1 Cor. x. 1—4.

LECTURE XVI.—THE OLD TESTAMENT SACRAMENTS.—CIRCUMCISION.

§ VI.—84. What were the proper sacraments of the Old Testament, which were of permanent obligation during that dispensation, and essentially the same as ours? Ans. Circumcision and the Passover.

85. What was the general intention of the first? Initiation, or ingrafting.

86. What was the general intention of the second? Ans. Spiritual nourishment in the church.

§ VII.—87. Does not *circumcision* sometimes, in Scripture, mean the persons circumcised, or the adherents to circumcision? Ans. Yes; Gal. ii. 8.

88. Does it not sometimes mean the spiritual blessing signified by the ordinance? Ans. Yes; as Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6; Rom. ii. 28, 29, Col. ii. 11.

89. Why is the word *circumcision* used for the thing signified? Ans. Because of the instituted moral union between the sign and the thing signified in the sacrament.

90. What is the meaning of the word *circumcise*? Ans. To cut round—so the Greek *περιτομή*, *peritome*.

91. Why is it called *κατατομή*, *katatome*, *concision*? Ans. To signify the outward ordinance abused; Phil. iii. 2.

92. Which of the Old Testament ordinances was a person to observe first? Ans. Circumcision; Exod. xii. 44.

93. Might a circumcised man partake of the passover, if his children were not circumcised? Ans. No; Exod. xii. 48.

94. Why should circumcision be observed before the Passover? Ans. Because it was the initiating ordinance; the person should first be an acknowledged member of the family before admission to family provisions.

95. But why should his children be circumcised before he himself partook of the Passover? Ans. A man who would partake of the Passover should be a believer, and should be living in faith and obedience.

§ VIII.—96. When was circumcision first instituted? Ans. In the time of Abraham; Gen. xvii. 11, 14.

97. Why is it said, John vii. 22, that Moses gave them circumcision? Ans. Because he imbodyed it in the law, Lev. xii. 3. Therefore it is said, "not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers."

98. Was the ordinance changed in any respect by Moses? Ans. No.

99. Have we not reason to believe that when circumcision was enjoined on Abraham, and on all his males, there were godly persons elsewhere who were not of his family? Ans. Yes; as Melchisedec, Abraham's relations in Mesopotamia, &c.

100. Was circumcision required of them? Ans. No; circumcision was not necessary to salvation; but it was given to the church, in Abraham's family, as an ordinance instructive, and a means of grace.

101. Was it not, both to Abraham, and by Moses, enjoined strictly on all the males of Abraham's seed? Ans. Yes; Gen. xvii. 14.

§ IX.—102. Did not God act as a sovereign in choosing this ceremony? Ans. Yes.

103. What appears to have been the design of choosing such a ceremony? Ans. (1.) To confound human wisdom by choosing what could not be understood but by revelation, and an understanding of our natural condition, and of the plan of divine grace. (2.) To try, and to exercise their obedience. (3.) To teach them that sin came by natural generation, and grace by regeneration. (4.) To show that we must be cut off from the covenant of works, (under which all are, by natural generation,) or perish. (5.) To teach humility on account of sin, as the ceremony was humbling before others. (6.) To teach us to crucify the flesh, though it be painful to do so. (7.) And that they might have in their bodies a continual remembrancer of these things.

104. What was the visible sign in this ordinance? Ans. Cutting off the foreskin.

§ X.—105. Was the prepuce to be entirely cut off, in circumcision? Ans. Yes.

106. Did the institution determine either what persons were to perform the ceremony, or by what instrument? Ans. No.

107. Is it not to be inferred that the operation was to be performed by such as could do it with skill? **Ans. Yes; Luke i. 59.**

108. And may we not infer that it was to be done by any suitable edged tool? **Ans. Yes; Josh. v. 2, 3; literally "edged swords."**

109. Does Zipporah's conduct in circumcising her son, (Ex. iv. 25, 26,) indicate either that a woman should operate, or what the instrument should be? **Ans. No.**

110. Might not the observance of the ordinance, in Zipporah's case, be acceptable, while the performance by a woman, and perhaps in a passion, was not approved? **Ans. Yes.**

§ XI.—111. Who were, by divine institution, to be the subjects of circumcision? **Ans. Males of Abraham's family.**

112. Who were included as males of Abraham's family? **Ans. (1.) His own sons, by whatever wife. (2.) Servants in his family, Gen. xvi. 12. (3.) In after generations, strangers who became proselytes.**

113. Though Ishmael and the sons of Keturah, and Esau were circumcised, yet was the ordinance of any use to them, after they had rejected the other privileges of the covenant? **Ans. No.**

114. Might not the extension of the privilege of circumcision to strangers in Israel, prefigure the calling of the Gentiles? **Ans. Yes; as the Gentiles were to be in fact united to the Jewish church.**

115. Though, by some means, the ceremony of circumcision was practised among the Egyptians and Ethiopians, was it of any use to them? **Ans. No; because, (1.) They did not understand it. (2.) They did not enjoy the word of God, and his other ordinances. (3.) They had no privileges of the covenant and its promises; Eph. ii. 12. It was to them an idle ceremony.**

116. Was this ordinance to be repeated on any individual? **Ans. No; (1.) From the circumstances of it, it could not be repeated. (2.) From the nature and design of the ordinance, as initiatory, it was unnecessary.**

117. Did Joshua repeat it (v. 2,) on persons before circumcised? **Ans. No; as appears from verses 4th—7th.**

118. As women were not subjects of the operation, were they excluded from the covenant and its privileges? **Ans. No; women were partakers of salvation of old, as well as the men; as Miriam, Hannah, Anna, &c.; so Luke xiii. 16; this woman was a daughter of Abraham; so Heb. xi. 11, 35; 1 Pet. iii. 5.**

119. Were the women included in the ordinance? **Ans. Yes; Gen. xvii. 7, xxxiv. 14; Judges xiv. 3.**

120. How could they be considered as included? **Ans. Circumcision was a sign of cutting off from the covenant of works, which relation is continued by natural generation; and women had the sign of this in the males.**

121. Might not Gal. iii. 28, signify that women's privileges are now enlarged, and that they had no interest in Christ, of old? **Ans. No; that passage may refer to baptism, as applied to women, but teaches that there is no difference of privilege, and therefore never was, but that the privilege is now plainer.**

122. Might not the limitation to males intimate the comparative darkness of the old dispensation? Ans. Yes.

§ XII.—123. Why was Christ circumcised? Ans. Not for all the reasons, nor for the chief reasons why his people were circumcised, (as a sign of release from the law as a covenant, through an atonement, or justification and regeneration,) but, (1.) That his relation to Abraham might be acknowledged. (2.) To signify his church-membership, and his union to the circumcised. (3.) To signify his subjection to the law of Moses, Col. ii. 11. (4.) To signify and seal the cleansing of his people, who are his body. (5.) To signify that circumcision should terminate in him.

§ XIII.—124. When were adults to be circumcised? Ans. On their acceptance of the promises, and entering into covenant with God; so Abraham, Gen. xvii. 23, 24; so Ex. xii. 48.

125. At what age were infants to be circumcised? Ans. On the eighth day.

126. Did not the circumcision of infants teach that they were interested in the covenant of which circumcision was a seal? Ans. Yes.

127. Did it intimate that they did not obtain this interest till the eighth day? Ans. No.

128. Why not? Ans. Because (1.) There is no reason assigned or conceivable why they should be interested in the covenant the eighth day, and not before. (2.) The promise was to the seed, and therefore in earliest infancy. (3.) Circumcision was a seal of the promise, and of interest in it, which seal might be given at any suitable time after the interest in it was possessed, though not before it.

129. Does not the delay till the eighth day teach that circumcision, though obligatory and important, was not essential to salvation? Ans. Yes; the want of it could not invalidate the promise.

130. Why was circumcision delayed till the eighth day? Ans. No doubt, (1.) Because of the seven days' legal uncleanness of the mother; Lev. xii. 2, 3. (2.) Because of the weakness of the child to bear the operation.

131. Did not the institution to circumcise on the eighth day teach that the seal should be applied as soon as circumstances would allow? Ans. Yes.

132. Did the institution teach that life and health should not be hazarded on account of the outward seal? Ans. Yes.

133. Might we not infer from the appointed delay, that if sickness of the child, or any serious inconvenience occurred at the eighth day, it should be deferred? Ans. Yes; as the Israelites in the wilderness were not circumcised.

134. Would it have been lawful to circumcise before the eighth day, if the child were in danger of death? Ans. No; because the appointment did not allow it, and the want would not have destroyed the child's interest in the promise.

135. Was it lawful to delay circumcision a day beyond the eighth, on account of the Sabbath? Ans. No; John vii. 22, 23.

136. If by any cause, lawful or unlawful, circumcision were delayed beyond the eighth day, was it a duty to perform it afterwards? Ans. Yes; Ex. iv. 25, 26.

§ XIV.—137. Was the neglect of this ordinance threatened with punishment? Ans. Yes.

138. What was the threatening? Ans. Cutting off from the people; Gen. xvii. 14.

139. What are we to understand by "cutting off from the people?" Ans. (1.) Excommunication from church membership; as Ex. xii. 19; Ezek. xiii. 9; John ix. 22. (2.) Cutting off by the civil magistrate, and, in some cases, death; as Lev. xx. 6, 27.

140. Was death by the magistrate to be executed for neglect of circumcision? Ans. No; the civil punishment was only to be inflicted for certain crimes.

141. Is not this sentence of cutting off ascribed to God himself? Ans. Yes; Lev. xvii. 10; xx. 3, 6.

142. In what sense is it to be understood, when ascribed to God? Ans. (1.) That they are excommunicated by his authority, and his providence. (2.) That he will execute temporal judgments. (3.) That he will exclude them from his covenant mercies, in time and eternity, if impenitent.

143. How is this punishment, of cutting off, to be understood in application to neglect of circumcision? Ans. (1.) Of excommunication from church privileges; and, (2.) From covenant mercies, in time and eternity, if impenitent.

144. Was this threatened against the child, or the parents? Ans. Not the child, but the parents.

145. Why not against the child, but the parents? Ans. (1.) Because the threatening is to those who have understanding. (2.) It is against the guilty, but the child is not guilty in this case. (3.) The threatening is against the neglect of the ordinance, rather than against the want of it.

146. But how, then, understand Gen. xvii. 14, that the uncircumcised child shall be cut off? Ans. (1.) The original should be translated actively—"Who shall not circumcise"—and "such a one has broken the covenant." (2.) If the uncircumcised child shall still neglect it himself, then, but not till then, he shall be cut off.

147. Why, may we judge, was such threatening appropriated to this neglect? Ans. (1.) Because of the authority of God in the ordinance. (2.) Because of the importance of the ordinance. (3.) Because of the danger of neglecting it on account of its reproach among the heathen; and, (4.) Because what is unmeaning and of little account, in the eyes of the world, is of great importance to the church, and in God's account.

§ XV.—148. What did this ordinance signify in general? Ans. The grace promised in the covenant; Gen. xvii. 11.

149. What particular blessings of the covenant did it most prominently signify? Ans. Justification and sanctification.

150. How does it appear that it signified justification? Ans.

From Rom. iv. 11, "a seal of the righteousness of faith;" and because, as it was to be a token of the covenant, (Gen. xvii. 11.) this was eminently included.

151. How was circumcision adapted to signify justification? or, how did the sign point this out? Ans. (1.) By the covenant of works, Adam's sin is transmitted by ordinary generation; circumcision being performed on the organ of generation, signified the cutting off from the covenant, and consequently from its curse. (2.) We are delivered from the covenant of works, and its curse, only by justification in Christ; and, therefore, it signified justification.

152. Did it not, therefore, signify union to Christ? Ans. Yes.

153. Did it not signify deliverance by Christ from all the claims of the law? Ans. Yes.

154. How does it appear that circumcision signified sanctification? Ans. From Deut. xxx. 6, Rom. ii. 28, 29, Col. ii. 11.

155. How did the sign of circumcision point out, or signify sanctification? Ans. (1.) As it signified cutting off from the law as a covenant, through union to Christ, so it signified deliverance from the curse of the law in our spiritual death; and so the gospel teaches; Rom. vi. 14. (2.) The foreskin cut off signified our depravity inherited from Adam. (3.) It signified that we should mortify our members—our depraved affections; Lev. xxvi. 41, Col. iii. 5.

156. Had circumcision any reference to Christ? Ans. Yes; it represented our release from the law as a covenant, our justification and sanctification, as effected by him, according to the covenant of which it was a seal—"I will be thy God," &c.; which was promised only in Christ.

§ XVI.—157. Was it one design of circumcision to make a visible distinction from the Gentiles? Ans. Yes.

158. What was the necessity of this distinction? Ans. (1.) To remind them of the condition of the world, and of all men by nature, as guilty and depraved. (2.) To remind them of their special privileges by grace. (3.) To remind them of their obligation to God. (4.) To guard them against conformity to the world, to which they would naturally incline, and that they should keep themselves distinct from the Gentiles.

159. Wherein were they to keep themselves distinct from the world? Ans. (1.) As believing in the doctrine of human depravity and guilt. (2.) As believing in a Saviour, and in redemption by him, from the whole curse of the law. (3.) As engaged to seek salvation through the Saviour. (4.) As engaged to the practice of holiness in the prescribed service of God.

160. Was circumcision, moreover, an assurance and seal of the promise of the covenant to them, and a seal of their engagement to duty? Ans. Yes; Deut. x. 16, Rom. iv. 11.

§ XVII.—161. How long was this ordinance to continue in use? Ans. Till New Testament times—till the coming of Christ.

162. How does it appear that it was then to be abolished?

Ans. (1.) From texts; as, Acts xv. 10, Gal. v. 2-6. (2.) From the predicted change of external dispensation; Jer. xxxi. 31, 32, compared with Heb. viii. 7, 8, 13. (3.) From its being a burdensome ceremony, Acts xv. 10; from which Christ sets the church free in New Testament times; Gal. v. 1, 2.

163. (1.) It is objected, that circumcision should not be abolished, as it was not introduced by Moses, but by Abraham? Ans. Moses did not introduce the whole of the typical ceremony, but he embodied this and other typical ceremonies into his code.

164. (2.) Obj. Circumcision is prescribed, as an everlasting covenant, as well as the blessings of which it is a sign? Ans. (1.) Though the covenant promise was absolutely eternal, the outward sign might not be so. (2.) The eternity of types is spoken of in a restricted sense. Eternity often means in Scripture, the whole of a certain period; as 2 Sam. vii. 13. Thus the throne of David, &c., was forever—as long as that dispensation lasted. (3.) Though circumcision was not eternal, as an outward observance, its spiritual meaning and application should be so, as of other types said to be eternal; as David's throne, 2 Sam. vii. 12, 13, compared with Luke i. 32, 33, Acts x. 30. (4.) If even circumcision were obligatory to the end of time, this would not be absolute eternity, as the covenant promise; so that all must admit a limitation here. (5.) Baptism, signifying the same thing as circumcision, is the continuance of the ordinance in its substance.

165. Obj. (3.) It was predicted that in New Testament times, circumcision should continue, because the uncircumcised should not come into the church or the land of Israel; Isa. lii. 1; Ezek. xlv. 9? Ans. These texts speak, under the figure of uncircumcision, either of enemies of the church, or of unsanctified members, that they shall not oppress or defile the church. Thus uncircumcision is put for impurity, rebellion, &c.; Ex. vi. 12, 30; Jer. vi. 10.

166. Obj. (4.) Circumcision was observed by Christian Jews; Acts xv. 5; xxi. 21, and even by Paul and Timothy; Acts xvi. 3? Ans. Circumcision being an ordinance of God, was left off by degrees, as the people obtained more light. On the death of Christ, its obligation ceased, but its use was permitted. On greater light arising on the church, none could adhere to it but in rejection of Christ, and in making it a saving and justifying observance, and then the apostles absolutely prohibited it; Gal. ii. 3, 5, and v. 2, 3.

167. It is the opinion of some that when the Jews shall be converted they will continue the use of circumcision. How disprove this? Ans. (1.) It would be contrary to faith in free justification by Christ; Gal. v. 2, 3. (2.) It would be but the keeping up of their present prejudices, and these prejudices no doubt suggest this notion. (3.) They would not then be free from that yoke on the fathers which they were not able to bear.

168. The Ethiopians use circumcision as a political sign of nobility, on the pretended descent of their royal family from Solomon by the Queen of Sheba. Is not this an utter perversion of the or-

dinance? Ans. Yes; it is using the seal of the promise without having the promise itself, and for a civil and political, instead of a religious purpose.

169. Did circumcision represent a different way of salvation from that of the gospel, or was it the law of another God, from the Christian's God, as the Manicheans suppose? Ans. No; Rom. iv. 11; Col. ii. 11; Heb. vi. 12.

170. Is not circumcision, though abolished as an observance, still instructive to us? Ans. Yes. It represents our natural condition, and salvation by Christ.

LECTURE XVII.—OF THE PASSOVER.

§ XVIII.—171. What was the other sacrament of the Old Testament? Ans. The Passover.

172. From what did it obtain its name? Ans. From the angel's passing over Israel, &c., Ex. xii. 12, 13, 27.

173. Whether did it signify the angel's passing through Egypt for destruction,—or passing over Israel? Ans. Passing over Israel—so the word פסח *Phasah*, signifies *passing or leaping over*. But the word used for passing over or through Egypt is אבר *Abar*. Ex. xii. 12, 13.

174. In what different senses is the word used in Scripture? Ans. (1.) For the angel's passing over Israel, Ex. xii. 12, 13. (2.) For the lamb itself which was eaten in the ordinance, Luke xxii. 7, Mark xiv. 12. (3.) For the feast or ordinance, Numb. ix. 2, John vi. 4. In this sense we now speak of it. *Definition*. By eating, was commemorated the twofold benefit, of the angel's passing over, and of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage—and a seal to believers of delivery by Christ.

§ XIX.—175. When was this ordinance instituted? Ans. At Israel's going from Egypt.

176. Was it afterwards changed in its nature or any of its essentials? Ans. No; although changed afterwards in some circumstances.

177. When was it first observed? Ans. On the night of Israel's departure from Egypt—on the fourteenth day of the first month, of the sacred year.

178. What difference was there in the design and meaning of its first and subsequent observance? Ans. Its first observance was the divinely appointed occasion of Israel's deliverance from the destroying angel, and from Egyptian bondage—and afterwards, it was a memorial of these things.

§ XX.—179. What was the visible sign in this sacrament? Ans. A lamb of the sheep or goats; Ex. xii. 5.

180. What was the description of the lamb? Ans. A male—a yearling—without blemish.

181. Why a male? Ans. As the best, Mal. i. 14; a type of Christ.

182. Why a yearling? Ans. That it might be indeed a lamb.

183. Why without blemish? Ans. (1.) To signify Christ's holiness, of which it was a type, 1 Cor. v. 7. (2.) To signify the sound-

ness of our spiritual offerings, their being agreeable to the command, and with sincerity, Mal. i. 14.

184. Was not the lamb chosen as an appropriate emblem of Christ? Ans. Yes; so John i. 29, Isa. liii. 7.

185. Were oxen used instead of the lamb, or besides it, as the Passover sacrifice? Ans. No.

186. But how understand Deut. xvi. 2, 2 Chron. xxxv. 7—9, in which oxen are included? Ans. They held a feast with the passover, and oxen were added, as part of the feast, but not as part of the sacrament. In 2 Chron. xxxv. 7, they are distinguished.

§ § XXI., XXVI.—187. What was the thing signified by this sacrament? Ans. The signification was two-fold. (1.) The Israelites' deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and from the destroying angel. (2.) Salvation by Christ.

188. How does it appear that it signified Israel's deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and from the destroying angel? Ans. (1.) From express Scripture; Ex. xii. 27. Because God "passed over," &c., Ex. xiii. 8. (2.) From the time and the occasion of the institution,—the night of their departure, and instituted on occasion of the judgment on Egypt which should set them free, and instituted as the appointed means of their escape from that judgment.

189. How does it appear that the passover signified salvation by Christ? Ans. (1.) From texts, 1 Cor. v. 7; John i. 29, 36. (2.) From the sacrifice of the lamb, and all sacrifices were types of Christ. (3.) From several ceremonies belonging to the ordinance.

190. What rites or ceremonies belonged to this ordinance? Ans. (1.) Keeping the lamb separate four days, Ex. xii. 3—6. (2.) Killing the lamb without breaking a bone of it, Ex. xii. 46. (3.) The sprinkling of the blood, Ex. xii. 7. (4.) Roasting the lamb, Ex. xii. 8. (5.) Eating the lamb, Ex. xii. 8. (6.) The manner of eating it—as the whole lamb, with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, with staves, shoes on, girded, &c.

191. Have we not reason to believe that some of these rites were temporary, and adapted only to the first occasion? Ans. Yes; as (1.) The lamb does not appear to have been afterwards kept up four days, Matt. xxvi. 17. (2.) Nor were they in Canaan to eat it in their houses, Deut. xvi. 2, 5, 6, 7. (3.) Nor does it appear that they were afterwards to confine themselves to their houses for the night, Matt. xxvi. 30. (4.) The sprinkling of the blood on the door-posts, which was temporary and gave way for sprinkling the altar, 2 Chron. xxx. 16; xxxv. 11. (5.) The preparation for a journey, loins girded, staves, and shoes.

192. What appears to have been signified by these rites? as (1.) The lamb kept four days? Ans. No doubt to be in readiness. Ascertaining it to be sound; solemnly set apart to a sacred use; and perhaps to remind them of preparation for the solemnity; and Christ's ministry lasting about four years; and his going up to Jerusalem some days before the passover.

193. What was signified by confining themselves to their houses, Ex. xii. 22? Ans. To be within the protection of the blood on the

door-posts, while the destroyer was gone forth; so to teach their safety from divine wrath through the blood of Christ.

194. What was signified by sprinkling the blood on the upper lintel and door-posts? Ans. As a protection from the destroyer, and to prefigure protection by the blood of Christ.

195. What was signified by girding, staves and shoes? Ans. As ready to depart; to teach them to be ready through faith in Christ, for duties, trials, and death; and to leave their spiritual bondage.

196. What was signified by the lamb itself? Ans. Christ; John i. 29; 1 Cor. v. 7.

197. What was signified by killing the lamb without breaking a bone? Ans. The death of Christ, John xix. 36.

198. What did the roasting signify? Ans. The death of Christ under divine wrath, and in opposition to eating the sacrifice raw, or even boiled with water; Ex. xii. 9.

199. What was signified by eating the lamb? Ans. Participation of Christ by faith, John vi.

200. What was signified by eating the whole lamb—not carrying it from house to house, Ex. xii. 10, 46? Ans. Our taking a whole Christ.

201. In case the family could not eat the whole lamb, what was to be done with the remainder? Ans. It was to be burnt the same night; Ex. xii. 10.

202. What was signified by this ceremony of burning the remainder? Ans. (1.) As the appointed method of disposing of the whole lamb. (2.) To intimate that it was all a thank-offering to the Lord, as other thank-offerings were to be treated in the same manner; Lev. vii. 15; xxii. 30. (3.) That though they could not literally eat the whole lamb, they took a whole Saviour by faith, and neither overlooked nor rejected any character or office of Christ, nor turned it to a profane or common use.

203. What was signified by unleavened bread? Ans. Sincerity, not indulging sin, the new heart; 1 Cor. v. 7, 8.

204. What was signified by the bitter herbs? Ans. Perhaps the bitter bondage in which they had been; perhaps, repentance; or perhaps, the bitterness of the cross of Christ, to be expected in his service.

205. What was signified by the time of day and year of killing the Passover? Ans. Christ died about the same hour, and at the same time of the year.

LECTURE XVIII.—THE PASSOVER,—CONTINUED.

§ XXII.—206. Who were employed in the preparation or administration of this ordinance? Ans. Different persons; as (1.) The heads of families separated the lamb, killed it, and sprinkled the blood on the door-posts, Ex. xii. 3, 6, 21, 22; compared with 2 Chron. xxx. 17. Heads of families, no doubt, took charge of the house, that it should be free from leaven. (2.) Afterwards the priests sprinkled the blood on the altar, and killed the passover; 2 Chron.

xxx. 16; Ezra vi. 20. (3.) The roasting might be done by the domestics. (4.) All the people prepared were to eat the passover.

207. Did the women eat of the passover? Ans. Yes.

208. How does this appear, since the injunction to appear before the Lord, annually, in this feast, and in two others, was laid expressly on the males; Deut. xvi. 16; Ex. xxiii. 17? Ans. (1.) In the express exclusion of certain characters from this ordinance, women were not excluded, but only the uncircumcised and unclean. (2.) Women were considered as circumcised in the males. (3.) Households were to eat the passover, Ex. xii. 3, 4; but women were part of the households. (4.) Women were a part of the congregation of Israel, but the whole congregation were to eat the passover; Ex. xii. 47. (5.) Moreover, though the males were enjoined to appear at three certain feasts, yearly, Ex. xxiii. 17; Deut. xvi. 16, of which the Feast of the Passover was one, (the feast of *harvest* and the feast of *ingathering* were the others,) (or the feast of *unleavened bread*,—of weeks,—and of tabernacles; Deut. xvi. 1, 10, 13; Ex. xxiii. 14—17; Deut. xvi. 16, were the three,) yet we know that the women did attend at these feasts, and did partake, as Numb. xviii. 10, 11, 19. Daughters were included, though in verse 10, males are named; 1 Sam. i. 1—7; ii. 19; Luke ii. 41.

209. Were not children of suitable age bound to eat the passover? Ans. Yes; as they belonged to the household, and to the congregation.

210. Were the women then, as well as the males, bound to eat the passover? Ans. Yes; because the unclean and uncircumcised were excluded, and not women—and those not excluded, on these grounds, were bound under a penalty to observe the ordinance; Numb. ix. 13.

§ XXIII.—211. Though the passover was, at first, to be kept in their houses, where was it required to be observed afterwards? Ans. In the public assembly, and in that particular place which God would choose; Deut. xvi. 5, 6.

212. May not its second observance, in the wilderness, have been held in the public assembly at the tabernacle? Ans. Yes; as the tabernacle was reared on the first day of the first month; Ex. xl. 17; and the passover was observed on the fourteenth day of the same month, and both in the second year.

213. Is it clear that it was utterly unlawful to keep the passover in private houses after the public celebration of it was established? Ans. Perhaps not—arguments for it, are such as these: (1.) All could not go to the temple; as, old men, women, children—and yet were required to keep the passover. (2.) The meeting together in one place was not enjoined under a penalty, as the use of the passover was. (3.) There would not have been room for all the people at the temple. (4.) The work of slaying all at the same public place, could not have been done in the short space allotted for it. (5.) That the Paschal lambs used at the time, in the private houses, were consecrated to God by the rites of the feast held at the

temple; and that a less solemn celebration in private was necessary. The arguments, in opposition to these, are such as these—(1.) The prohibition of slaying the passover at home is express; Deut. xvi. 5, 6. (2.) The impracticability of going to the public place of the passover would excuse from the penalty. (3.) If the people were allowed to keep it in private, many would avail themselves of the allowance, through sloth and worldly-mindedness. (4.) The passover being a sacrifice, was properly a temple service, and should not be observed but at the one altar at Jerusalem; Lev. xvii. 8, 9, Deut. xii. 13, 14. We incline to believe that the private celebration of the passover was not admissible.

§ XXIV.—214. At what time of the year was the passover kept? Ans. The first month of the second year.

215. Was not the second month allowed? Ans. Yes.

216. Why? Ans. To give opportunity to those unclean, or absent on the first month, to observe the ordinance; Numb. ix. 10, 11.

217. On what day of the month? Ans. The fourteenth—from the new moon.

218. At what time of day? Ans. At the going down of the sun; Deut. xvi. 6, or at evening, (original—*between the two evenings*, perhaps from two to five; Ex. xii. 6; Numb. ix. 3,) rather, at sunset, at which time the day began and ended—the closing and beginning evening.

219. In what month of the civil year? Ans. The seventh; which year began in autumn,—the month Tisri.

220. Did the Jews change the day on account of the Sabbath? Ans. No; though our author thinks they did, in the time of our Lord, translate it to another day, and that our Lord ate it before the Jews—as he argues thus—our Lord ate the passover, John xiii. —that night he was betrayed,—the next day the Jews would avoid defilement, that they might eat the passover, John xviii. 28,—and that day was the preparation of the passover, John xix. 14. Yet, on the contrary, we observe (1.) No accusation is brought against our Lord, by the Jews, for changing the day, nor by him against the Jews. (2.) John xviii. 28 means, that the Jews continued the feast of the passover during the seven days of unleavened bread, and would avoid defilement during that time, though they had eaten the passover on the preceding day, and other sacrifices were eaten during those days, which they reckoned as belonging to the feast of the passover; Deut. xvi. 2, 3; 2 Chron. xxxv. 8, 9. (3.) John xix. 14, by “preparation of the passover” means, the preparation of the Sabbath, as John xix. 31, that is the preparation of the Sabbath in the feast of the passover; which rendered that Sabbath a peculiarly solemn day, occurring in the feast of the Passover. But the question is not very important; but we incline to think that our Lord and the Jews ate the passover on the same day.

§ XXV.—221. Was the washing of feet performed by our Saviour at his last passover, John xiii. 4, any part of the ordinance of the passover? Ans. No; it was extraordinary, and an instructive emblem.

222. Was the passover a sacrifice, as well as a sacrament? Ans. Yes; (1.) it is called a sacrifice, Ex. xii. 27, and an oblation, Numb. ix. 7, 13. (2.) The blood of the Paschal lamb was offered to God; 2 Chron. xxx. 16; xxxv. 11. (3.) It was a type of Christ, as our atonement; 1 Cor. v. 7; John i. 29.

223. Obj. (1.) There is a formal difference between a sacrifice and a sacrament, and it was merely a commemorative ordinance? Ans. Some acts in this ordinance proved it to be a sacrifice; as killing, roasting, sprinkling the blood; and some proved it a sacrament; as eating, in commemoration of redemption.

224. Obj. (2.) Sacrifices were restricted to the priests, and to the temple; but this ordinance was administered by others than the priests, and in private houses? Ans. Generally this was the case with the Passover; and, at first especially, exceptions were made on account of the peculiarity of the ordinance.

225. Obj. (3.) Sacrifices were unlawful in Egypt, where the Passover was first observed; Exod. viii. 26? Ans. They were not prohibited by God, but by Egyptian prejudices. To this Moses referred.

§ XXVII.—226. What was the end and design of this sacrament? Ans. To promote faith and gratitude towards God in Christ, as their Deliverer, and faith in the blood of Christ.

227. How long was this ordinance to continue in the church? Ans. Till Christ's coming—till the end of that dispensation.

228. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Christ's coming as the Antitype, 1 Cor. v. 7, necessarily abrogated this ordinance. (2.) As none should partake of this ordinance but those circumcised, it must terminate with circumcision. (3.) This ordinance, being a bloody sacrifice, must terminate as all other bloody typical sacrifices did.

229. In what sense, then, understand Ex. xii. 14, and other similar passages, enjoining it to be observed forever? Ans. That it was periodical, during that dispensation.

§ XXVIII.—*Sacraments of the New Testament.*—230. What are the sacraments of the New Testament? Ans. Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

231. Is it not important that we ascertain what are the divinely appointed sacraments—neither to add, nor reject any? Ans. Yes.

232. Do the Scriptures expressly give the number of them? Ans. No.

233. How shall we determine that there are two, and only two? Ans. (1.) Because the requisites of a sacrament belong to those, and those only;—as, outward signs, spiritual things signified, appointed to be partaken of; and they seal and convey the thing signified, 1 Cor. x. 16, 1 Pet. iii. 21. (2.) Because all the Old Testament sacraments, ordinary and extraordinary, are compared to these two in Scripture; 1 Cor. x. 2—4, Col. ii. 12. (3.) Because these two only are proposed to us as the external bonds of our communion with God, and with one another; 1 Cor. x. 16, 17, xii. 13. (4.) Because these two do fully signify and seal our ingrafting into the

church, 1 Cor. xii. 13; our regeneration and sanctification, Rom. vi. 3, 4; and our justification, Mark i. 4; 1 Cor. x. 16; and no others are represented as doing so.

234. May we understand 1 John v. 6, 8, as referring directly to these two sacraments, by speaking of "the water and the blood?"
 Ans. No; not directly; but, no doubt, as the witnesses agreeing are earthly, (1.) The *Spirit* means the *word*, or the Spirit speaking in the word. (2.) The *water* signifies regeneration, as represented by the water from Christ's side. (3.) The *blood* signifies justification by the blood of Christ, represented in the same manner. Thus the water and the blood signifying regeneration and justification, the sacraments signify these things. Therefore, 1 John v. 8, does not directly mean the sacraments, but the things signified by them; and therefore the sacraments indirectly.

§ XXIX.—235. Should we consider that Christ's washing the feet of the disciples was the institution of a sacrament? Ans. No.

236. Why not; when Christ directed that they should do to one another as he had done to them; John xiii. 15? Ans. (1.) Because the disciples should do it as an act of brotherly love and humility, and not as a sign of a new covenant blessing. (2.) Christ, in giving this instructive emblem, did it as an emblem of his work of salvation, and his condescension. But while we should imitate his humility, we cannot imitate his work. (3.) Our participation of true sacraments signifies our participation of the blessings of the new covenant; but if this were a sacrament, it would absurdly signify our doing Christ's work. (4.) While Christ, by himself, or his apostles, expressly enjoins the observance of the sacraments, he nowhere enjoins the observance of this as an ordinance of worship, but as an act of humble condescension to one another.

237. Was this form of showing humility, and condescension to one another's comfort, enjoined as uniform in all ages? Ans. No; in that age and country the practice was commanded, and used as a sign of hospitality; Gen. xviii. 4, 1 Sam. xxv. 41, Luke vii. 44, 1 Tim. v. 10. But when this custom might be laid aside, any other, answering the same purpose, should be substituted for it; as entertaining friends and strangers, cheerfully serving the necessities of those to whom we have access, &c.

238. But did not our Lord intimate to Peter (John xiii. 8.) that this worship was a sign of interest in him? Ans. (1.) He intimated indeed that unless he condescended to minister to our spiritual wants, we could not be saved; and that he was about to wash their feet as a sign of this his work. But, (2.) He did not intimate that our doing it would be a sign of the same thing, but only of the humility which he exemplified.

239. Would it not be unreasonable to make every outward thing, by which our Lord illustrated a spiritual benefit, a sacramental observance? Ans. Yes.

§ XXX.—240. How many sacraments do the Papists add to the two? Ans. Five.

241. What are they? Ans. Confirmation, penance, extreme unction, ordination, and marriage. Like our author, we do not count their arguments worthy of review; but we may mention them, although he does not, except in general. In general, they argue the propriety of seven sacraments from their congruity with certain necessities, vices, and virtues, and from the use of the number *seven* in Scripture; as,

1. Congruity with seven necessities; as, (1.) Natural generation, to which baptism accords. (2.) Growth—confirmation. (3.) Nourishment—the Lord's supper. (4.) Remedy against diseases—penance. (5.) Remedy against the remainder of disease—extreme unction. (6.) Propagation by parents—marriage. (7.) Government—ordination.

2. Congruity with seven vices, or with deliverance from them; as, (1.) Original sin—baptism. (2.) Infirmity—confirmation. (3.) Malice—the Lord's supper. (4.) Actual mortal sins—penance. (5.) Venial and remaining sins—extreme unction. (6.) Lust—marriage. (7.) Ignorance—ordination.

3. Congruity with seven virtues; as, (1.) Faith—baptism. (2.) Hope—confirmation. (3.) Charity—the Lord's supper. (4.) Righteousness—penance. (5.) Fortitude—extreme unction. (6.) Temperance—marriage. (7.) Prudence—ordination.

242. But are not some of these divine institutions? and have not some of them visible signs? Ans. Yes.

§ XXXI.—243. What do they mean by confirmation? Ans. That grace is conferred, the person strengthened against Satan and sin, and an indelible impression of Christianity is made.

244. In what order do they place this sacrament? Ans. After Baptism, and before the Supper.

245. What are their ceremonies in the ordinance? Ans. (1.) They anoint the forehead in the form of a cross. (2.) The Bishop strikes on the cheek. (3.) He uses a form of words, of anointing and confirming in the name of the Trinity.

246. Is there any institution of such an ordinance in Scripture? Ans. No.

247. Obj. Paul (2 Cor. i. 21,) speaks of confirming? Ans. This is a spiritual grace, not an outward ordinance.

§ XXXII.—248. What do they mean by the sacrament of penance? Ans.. Absolution by a priest, after auricular confession, and doing penance.

249. Is there any institution of an ordinance of this nature? Ans. No.

250. Obj. (1.) The Scriptures give the keys to church officers, (Matt. xvi. 19; John xx. 23,) for remitting of sins? Ans. This refers to the exercise of discipline; but no visible signs are appointed.

251. Obj. (2.) The Scriptures require confession, and works meet for repentance; Matt. iii. 6, 8; James v. 16? Ans. It is confession to God, and before the offended person, or the church, not to the priest; and works becoming repentance; that is, holy reformation.

§ XXXIII.—252. When do they perform extreme unction?
 Ans. Near death.

253. Is there any divine institution of this as an ordinance?
 Ans. No.

254. What are we to understand by the apostles' anointing the sick; Mark vi. 13? Ans. A means of miraculous healing, not of preparation for death.

255. What is meant by the injunction, James v. 14, 15? Ans. (1.) The actual anointing was in order to a miraculous cure. (2.) As applicable to after ages, it is the spiritual anointing, of speaking the word, and the effect is the reviving of the heart, in faith and communion with God.

256. Obj. We might justly expect that God would provide some special privilege for the dying? Ans. He has done so in his promise, but not by a special ordinance.

§ XXXIV.—257. Although ordination be an instituted ordinance, and, although it has the sign of imposition of hands, yet is it a sacrament? Ans. No.

258. Why not a sacrament? Ans. It is not applicable to all believers; and, as it is office that is conferred, so it is not grace applicable to all believers that is signified.

259. Should we consider the imposition of hands as an essential in this ordinance? Ans. No; it is a signifying sign, but is rather a sign of praying and appointment, than of communication.

§ XXXV.—260. Is not marriage an institution of God? Ans. Yes.

261. But is the outward form instituted? Ans. No. .

262. Has it any sign? Ans. No.

263. Is there any grace signified? Ans. No.

§ XXXVI.—264. Do not the Papists add sacramental signs to this sacrament? Ans. Yes.

265. What are they? Ans. The sign of the cross, holy water, candles in the church, blessed wax, the wafer, &c.

CHAPTER XXX.

OF BAPTISM.

LECTURE XIX.—NAME—JOHN'S BAPTISM, &c.

§ I.—Q. 1. In what order does baptism stand among the sacraments of the New Testament? Ans. It is the first.

2. Wherein is it the first? or why first? Ans. It is first in institution, first in administration, first in the things signified; that is, ingrafting into Christ, and acknowledging of the person as a church member.

3. To which sacrament of the Old Testament does it correspond?
 Ans. Circumcision.

4. How does it correspond to circumcision? Ans. (1.) As circumcision was first in institution, so was baptism under the New Testament. (2.) As circumcision was first administered, (before the passover,) so is baptism before the Supper. (3.) It means the same thing as circumcision—union to Christ, justification, and regeneration. (4.) It is to be administered to similar subjects, all who are in the church, by birth or profession.

5. What is the general meaning of the word *baptism*? Ans. Washing; Mark vii. 3, 4; Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5.

6. From what is the original word *baptize* derived? Ans. From βαπτω.

7. Is not the word βαπτίζω diminutive of βαπτω? Ans. Yes; βαπτω, *I dip*. βαπτίζω, *I dip lightly, sprinkle, or wash*; as in the case of a table; Mark vii. 4.

§ II.—8. In what senses is the word used in Scripture? Ans. (1.) By metonymy for the doctrine of baptism; Acts xviii. 25; xix. 3; Heb. vi. 7. In this sense the Fathers called it the baptism of *light*. (2.) Metaphorically, for afflictions; as Matt. xx. 22, 23; Luke xii. 5; 1 Cor. xv. 29; especially for martyrdom for Christ's cause, called *baptism of blood*. (3.) Metaphorically for the effusion of the Spirit, copious and miraculous, as on the day of Pentecost; Acts i. 5; or common to all God's people, as Matt. iii. 11. This was called by the Fathers the baptism of *flaminis*—*flamen*, a blast or breath, or as some, *flamen*, a fire. (4.) In a proper sense, for washing with water.

9. What kind of washings have been called *baptism* in Scripture? Ans. Several; as, (1.) Common washing for cleanliness; as Mark vii. 4. (2.) Superstitious, as among the Pharisees, Heathens, Mohammedans, &c. (3.) Ceremonial, as in the law of Moses; as Heb. ix. 10. It is said to have been in use among the Jews, in admitting proselytes, and arose from various ceremonial washings, and analogous to what was done by Jacob, Gen. xxxv. 2, and directed by Moses, Ex. xix. 10. (4.) Christian baptism, which is the subject for consideration.

§ III.—10. Was the ordinance of baptism predicted or typified in the Old Testament? Ans. No; such passages as Ezek. xvi. 9; xxxvi. 25, did not predict baptism; but the thing signified by it. The types of the Red Sea, the laver, and various sprinklings, were not types of the ordinance, but of the things signified by this ordinance; as Joel iii. 18, Zech. xiii. 1.

11. Yet is it of divine institution? Ans. Yes.

§ § IV.—VI.—12. When was baptism, as a divine ordinance, instituted? Ans. In the ministry of John the Baptist.

13. What evidence have we that John baptized by divine institution? Ans. (1.) Direct texts; as John i. 33; Matt. xxi. 25. (2.) John's character as the harbinger of Christ; Matt. iii. 11, xi. 10. (3.) Christ's baptism by John; Matt. iii. 12—16. (4.) It was continued and recognised by Christ and his apostles.

14. Have we any express institution of the ordinance by any

express command given to John? Ans. No; his mission to baptize was sufficient.

15. How refute the Socinian notion that Christ's command, *Matt. xxviii. 19*, meant, not baptism, but preaching? Ans. (1.) In that command, both preaching and baptism are required. (2.) Such a figure is never employed—to put baptism for preaching. (3.) The apostles, in obedience to that command, did both baptize and preach.

16. Did our Lord, either by employing his disciples in baptizing during his ministry, *John iii. 22, 26*, and *iv. 1, 2*, or in his last command to them to baptize, *Matt. xxviii. 19*, reinstitute the ordinance of baptism? Ans. No; in these cases he only recognised the ordinance, and gave charge for its perpetual observance.

17. Was John's baptism the same as ours, or Christian baptism? Ans. Yes; it differed in some circumstances, but was substantially the same.

18. But Papists and Socinians hold that there is an essential difference between the baptism of John and Christian baptism; and object, (1.) That the baptism of John was not instituted by Christ? Ans. (1.) We deny their position; God did institute it; *John i. 33*. Christ implies this, *Matt. xxi. 25*. Therefore, (2.) It was instituted by Christ's will. (3.) He proved his institution of it by his own baptism, and by employing his disciples, *John iv. 1, 2*, and by giving his command to the apostles to continue it, *Matt. xxviii. 19*.

19. Obj. (2.) John's baptism belonged to the old dispensation? Ans. We deny the position. John's baptism was instituted to introduce the new, and properly belonged to it. Thus it was the baptism of repentance, for turning the hearts of the fathers to the children; *Mal. iv. 6*, *Mark i. 2, 3*, *Luke xvi. 16*.

20. Obj. (3.) The Trinity was not named in John's baptism? Ans. (1.) This is not strictly true; for John spake of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, *John iii. 34, 35*. (2.) To baptize by naming the persons, is not essential to baptism. (3.) To teach the doctrine of the Trinity, and to require faith in the glorious persons of the Trinity, in baptism, is to baptize in the name of the Trinity; and John did this, although it is probable that the persons were not formally named.

21. Obj. (4.) John did not baptize in the name of Christ? Ans. It is not true. For to baptize in the name of Christ is to require faith in him; and John did so baptize; *John i. 26, 27, 31*; *Acts xix. 4*.

22. Obj. (5.) The efficacy of Christian baptism is denied to belong to John's baptism, *Matt. iii. 11*? Ans. We utterly deny the assertion. John acknowledged that more than water baptism was necessary, and this is as true of Christian baptism as of John's; *so 1 Pet. iii. 21*.

23. Obj. (6.) John's baptism was not Christian baptism, because those baptized by him were re-baptized by Paul. *Acts xix. 3, 5*? Ans. We deny the assertion of re-baptism. *Acts xix. 5*, does not assert that Paul baptized them, but that Paul said that those who

were baptized by John and heard his doctrine, were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, by John.

24. As John's baptism differed in some circumstances from ours, what were some of those circumstantial differences? Ans. (1.) It was confined to the Jews; and so that of the disciples in the time of our Lord, and till the time of the baptism of Cornelius, Matt. iii. 1—7; John iii. 22. It is now extended to all, Matt. xxviii. 19. (2.) John's baptism was introductory to the new dispensation, Matt. iii. 2. The apostles' baptism was under that dispensation established. (3.) John's baptism referred to the Saviour to come, and at hand; the apostles' baptism to the Saviour as come. (4.) John's baptism was therefore less clear, and perhaps less formal than the apostles' baptism.

25. Wherein were John's baptism and Christian baptism the same? Ans. In their substance—in all that is essential to baptism; as, (1.) In their authority—the Author or Institutor. (2.) In the external sign—water. (3.) In the thing signified.

26. Did John's baptism signify union to Christ, as Christian baptism does? Ans. Yes, Matt. iii. 11; Acts xix. 4, 5.

27. Did it signify participation of the benefits of the new covenant through Christ? Ans. Yes; Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 4, remission of sins—and that in believing in Christ, Acts xix. 4.

These baptisms were also the same in the relation of the sign to the thing signified. In both it is spiritual and supernatural, not natural; Matt. iii. 11; John i. 26, 33. They also agreed in the things to which baptism engages us.

28. To what did John's baptism engage the people, equally with Christian baptism? Ans. (1.) To faith in Christ, Acts xix. 4; so Christian baptism does, Mark xvi. 16. (2.) To repentance, Matt. iii. 2; so the Christian, Acts ii. 28. (3.) To holiness of life, Matt. iii. 8; so the Christian, Rom. vi. 3—6.

Again, John's baptism was in the name of Christ, Acts xix. 4, 5; and so the Christian, Acts viii. 16; Gal. iii. 27. Again, John's baptism was in the name of the Trinity, as well as the Christian. Because he taught this doctrine in connexion with his baptism. He required faith in it, in order to baptism; as he taught it for this purpose. And this was baptism in the name of the Three persons.

29. How does it appear that John taught the doctrine of the Trinity, in his baptism? Ans. From Matt. iii. 9, 11; and John i. 32, 33, 34. Here is the Father sending to baptize—the Son expressly named—the Spirit descending on him, and also bestowed by the Son; so John iii. 34, 35.

30. May we suppose that we have on record all that John said on these subjects? Ans. No; Luke iii. 18, tells us that he preached many other things to the people.

31. Is the form of the words (in the name of the Father, Son, &c.) essential to baptism? Ans. No; for, (1.) It would be vain, if the doctrine of the Trinity be denied. (2.) If the doctrine be taught, and faith in it required, in order to baptism, it is baptism

in the name of the Trinity. (3.) Our Lord does not say, (Matt. xxviii. 19,) "use this form of words;" but "baptize in the name," &c. (4.) After this command of our Lord, the apostles baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

32. Should we change the form? Ans. It might be improper, and there is no necessity for so doing.

33. But how could Christ be baptized in the name of the Trinity? Ans. (1.) Surely with as much propriety as to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, as John certainly did, Matt. iii. 11; Acts xix. 4, 5. (2.) Though his baptism did not mean all to him that it signifies to us, yet he was baptized in part for the same purpose, as Matt. iii. 15, to keep the commandments, and to give his assent to the truth of the gospel, and to intimate his participation in it, so far as it applied to himself.

34. How does it further appear that Paul did not re-baptize those disciples whom he found at Ephesus, (Acts xix. 5,) who had been baptized by John? Ans. (1.) It is Paul's declaration, Acts xix. 5, that those who had been baptized by John, and under his teachings, were by him baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. (2.) If, as some suppose, Paul re-baptized on that occasion, he did nothing more than he shows, verse 4th, &c., that John did—that is, baptize in the name of the Lord Jesus, and so his re-baptism would be useless. (3.) Paul did not re-baptize, because in 1 Cor. i. 14, 16, he denies that he baptized any but certain ones who were Corinthians; but those at Ephesus were Ephesians. (4.) If Paul re-baptized on the ground that John's baptism was not Christian, and was then invalid, then all must be re-baptized who had been baptized by John. If they all were not re-baptized, then John's baptism was held to be valid, and the objection falls. But all were not re-baptized; as Apollos, Acts xviii. 24—26, was not re-baptized, but only instructed.

35. But it is objected that many of the three thousand baptized at Pentecost must have been baptized by John? Ans. There is no evidence that this assumption is true. On the contrary, we may suppose that those baptized by John believed in Christ, Luke vii. 29; or if some of them did not, they might not be, and most probably were not among the converts at Pentecost. But many refused the baptism of John, Luke vii. 30; and such were the persecutors of the Lord Jesus; and such characters, it appears, had been the converts at Pentecost.

LECTURE XX.—MODE OF BAPTISM, &c.

§ § VII. XXX.—36. Is baptism intended to be an ordinance of perpetual observance to the end of the world? Ans. Yes.

37. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the commission of Christ to the apostles, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; where preaching, baptism, and his gracious presence are equally continuous. (2.) From the obligation, under which all are, to be baptized, Mark xvi. 16; Acts ii. 38. (3.) From the apostles' recognition of believers

as baptized, as well as having the thing signified, 1 Cor. xii. 13. (4.) From all those texts which show that the reception of baptism is the practice of all believers, Rom. vi. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 21.

38. But Socinians hold that baptism was but temporary, for the setting up of the new dispensation; and they object to its perpetual observance, (1.) That the worship of the new dispensation is spiritual? Ans. (1.) The ordinances which contain signs and figures are now few, and are eminent means of promoting spiritual worship. (2.) They are not types, but instructive emblems. (3.) Other outward ordinances are unquestionably perpetual; as prayer, praise, and preaching the word are yet necessary to promote spiritual worship.

39. Obj. (2.) We do not, in Scripture, read of those who were born of believers being baptized; the ordinance was only for those converted from Judaism and Gentilism? Ans. (1.) From the brevity of the history, we cannot expect that the baptism of those born and brought up in Christianity would be mentioned, especially as the history is limited to the generation of converts. (2.) As the baptism of infants is implied in the baptism of households, and is even enjoined, Acts ii. 38, 39, so there is the same reason for the baptism of infants now, as the baptism of the infants of converts. And, besides, all believers are represented as baptized, 1 Cor. xii. 13. (3.) The use of a thing publicly known is not likely to be noted in history.

40. Obj. (3.) Even the apostles, the seventy disciples, &c., are not recorded as baptized? Ans. (1.) In a brief history, such things are not likely to be particularly recorded. (2.) But as converts and penitents were baptized, so no doubt these were.

§ VIII.—41. What is the outward sensible sign in baptism? Ans. Water; so it is universally represented.

42. Should it not be pure water? Ans. Yes; nothing but water is represented in Scripture as being used.

43. Why was water, and simply water, appointed as the sign in this ordinance? Ans. (1.) Because it is adapted to cleansing from pollution, and thus represents the blood of Christ. (2.) It is easily procured, and is abundant and free.

§ IX.—44. What is the action in baptism, designated by a general name? Ans. Washing.

45. What is the chief question on this subject? Ans. Whether it is to be performed by dipping, or by sprinkling.

46. May baptism be lawfully administered either way? Ans. Yes.

47. Why may we judge that we are at liberty to choose either method? Ans. (1.) Because the original word is used in both significations. (2.) Because we have no Scripture indications on this point, but what are given incidentally; and, therefore, either mode may be adopted.

48. Do not Anabaptists deny that baptism by sprinkling is valid? Ans. Yes.

49. Should we, on proof that sprinkling is lawful and sufficient, deny that immersion is valid? Ans. No; it is valid, though not necessary. The question, then, is not whether immersion be a valid mode of baptism, but whether it is required in Scripture, so that no other mode is valid.

50. What are some proofs that sprinkling is the proper mode? Ans. (1.) Examples; as, (a.) The three thousand baptized at Pentecost. (b.) Paul's baptism by Ananias. (c.) The jailer's baptism, &c.; which could not well be by dipping. (2.) From the word *baptize*. (a.) It is used for washing, by sprinkling or pouring on; as Mark vii. 4, where *baptize* is the word used in the original; and none of these vessels are usually dipped in washing, and tables never; so Luke xi. 38, "did not *wash* before dinner"—that is, *the hands*. (b.) The word is diminutive of βαπτω. (3.) Sprinkling is countenanced by the modes of ceremonial washing among the Jews—"divers washings," Heb. ix. 10, which were, in many cases at least, done by sprinkling or pouring, referred to Ps. li. 7; Ezek. xxxvi. 25. John the Baptist's mode did not surprise them. (4.) Sprinkling is inferred from the doctrine of baptism. It signifies the application of the blood and Spirit of Christ to us; Mark i. 4; Matt. iii. 11. Now, in the promises of the application of the blood and Spirit of Christ, sprinkling or pouring is the figure generally used; so Psa. li. 7, Acts ii. 17, 18; but dipping or immersion, perhaps never. (5.) Particular references in the use of baptism in Scripture, sustain the same view; as Acts i. 5; where baptism with water and with the Spirit are compared; so Acts xxii. 16, compared with Mark i. 4.

51. But the Anabaptists oppose sprinkling as invalid, and insist on immersion as essential to a valid dispensation of baptism; and they rely, (1.) On those passages which represent John as baptizing *in* Jordan; Jesus going up *out* of the water; Philip and the Eunuch going down *into* the water, &c. How answer? Ans. (1.) The Greek prepositions, translated *into*, *in*, *out of*, will signify *to* or *from*, as John vi. 3, "*into* a mountain;" Matt. viii. 28, "*out of* the tombs"—i. e. from where the tombs were. (2.) "*In* Jordan," Matt. iii. 6,—"*from* the water," Matt. iii. 16,—"*out of* the water," Acts viii. 39, &c., signify that they went to the channel, and came out of it.

52. The Anabaptists rely on John iii. 23, ("John was baptizing in Enon—because there was much water there,") to prove immersion. How answer? Ans. (1.) "Much water," (original "*many waters*") may signify many springs or rivulets, to supply the multitude with drink. (2.) Whether it was a city, village, or section of country, is not certainly known; but its etymology would signify a *fountain*, or *fountains*, and perhaps the expression, "much water," is given as the reason of the name:

53. They rely on the word βαπτίζω. How answer? Ans. (1.) βαπτω generally means *to dip* or *immerse*; βαπτίζω is diminutive of βαπτω, and will signify *lightly dipping*, or washing by pouring or sprinkling. (2.) If immersion were enjoined as essential, we

would have expected the word βαπτω to be used; but it is never used for this ordinance. (3.) Πασχω, is always to *sprinkle*, but it is not used for this ordinance, though used for ceremonial sprinklings, emblematic of the blood of Christ; Heb. ix. 13, 19, 21. (4.) Even βαπτω is used, in the Septuagint, for the application of the dew to Nebuchadnezzar; Dan. iv. 33.

54. But they rely on Rom. vi. 4, to prove immersion, and our author admits that this text favours it. How answer? Ans. (1.) Here the apostle is teaching the spiritual meaning of baptism, and not its form. (2.) If we suppose the apostle means that baptism must resemble burial, so it must resemble Christ's death, the cross, &c. (3.) His meaning is this—baptism signifies union to Christ, in his death, in his burial, and in his resurrection.

§ X.—55. Is there anything in Scripture hinting that we should, in baptism, sprinkle three times, in reference to the three persons of the Trinity? Ans. No.

56. If the one action be in the name of one of the persons, is it not in the name of the others? Ans. Yes.

§ XI.—57. What is signified by baptizing in the name of the Father, Son, and Spirit? Ans. (1.) By the authority of the Three-one God. (2.) Devoted to him. (3.) Trusting in him. (4.) In obedience to him. (5.) In profession of him as ours. (6.) Receiving from God a ground of claim on God the Father, to be our Father; on God the Son, to be our Redeemer; and on God the Spirit, to be our Sanctifier, Guide, and Comforter.

58. Might not baptism be in the name of the Trinity, without naming any of the persons in the action? Ans. Yes.

59. In what form did the Apostles baptize? Ans. In the name of the Lord Jesus, Acts viii. 16.

60. Does this mean that they did not baptize in the name of the Trinity? Ans. No.

61. What is meant by baptism "in the name of the Lord Jesus?" Ans. (1.) Done by his authority. (2.) Acknowledging him as Lord and Saviour, and the way to God. (3.) Devoted to the Three-one God in him.

LECTURE XXI.—THE THING SIGNIFIED IN BAPTISM.

§ XXVII.—62. What does the water in baptism signify? Ans. The blood and Spirit of Christ.

63. How does it appear that the blood of Christ is signified? Ans. Baptism is the sign of remission of sin, Mark i. 4; Acts ii.

38. But it is only by the blood of Christ that sin is taken away meritoriously.

64. How does it appear that the water signifies also the Spirit of Christ? Ans. Because baptism signifies the answer of a good conscience towards God, 1 Pet. iii. 21. It signifies sanctification, Rom. vi. 3, 4; which is done only by the Holy Spirit; and Christ baptizes with the Holy Spirit, Matt. iii. 11.

65. What is signified by the application of water to the body, in baptism? Ans. The application of the blood of Christ to the soul,

and the actual gift of the Holy Spirit to the person—his indwelling, **and** his work.

66. Does baptism, then, signify the taking away of both guilt **and** defilement by sin? Ans. Yes; Mark i. 4; Eph. v. 26.

67. Does baptism signify union to Christ? Ans. Yes; as Rom. vi. 3, 4; and it is only in union to him that we can have pardon **and** sanctification, Gal. iii. 27.

68. Does baptism also signify ingrafting into the Church? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. xii. 13. It signifies interest in the same blessings with the church, and therefore membership.

69. Does baptism make a person even a visible church member? Ans. No; it only acknowledges him to be a church member, and gives the sign of it.

70. Since baptism signifies union to Christ, interest in his blood, **and** partaking of his Spirit, does it not signify participation in all the blessings of the new covenant? Ans. Yes.

71. Does the ordinance of baptism signify any engagement on God's part? Ans. Yes.

72. What engagement does he make to us? Ans. The whole promises of the gospel; so in circumcision, Gen. xvii. 7, 10; Acts ii. 38, 39.

73. What does baptism in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, signify, on God's part? Ans. That God engages to be ours, as Father, Son, and Spirit.

74. To what does the Father engage? Ans. To be our Father, to pardon and accept us, and to fulfil the promises.

75. To what does the Son engage? Ans. To be our Prophet, Priest, and King.

76. To what does the Holy Spirit engage? Ans. To apply redemption, to enlighten, sanctify, and comfort.

77. Is not all this engagement to us in Christ? Ans. Yes.

78. Is baptism a promise and offer of these things to us? Ans. Yes; because it accompanies the promises, as a warrant and assurance to our faith.

79. Wherein does it differ from the offer and promise in the word? Ans. It is a visible sign, and thus a seal.

80. Does then baptism warrant us to accept of Christ and rest on him as ours? Ans. Yes.

81. But does it warrant us to believe that we are already in Christ? Ans. No; except on believing. Baptism does not itself confer grace, nor unite us to Christ. It is only a sign, offer, and seal, and a seal of our interest in Christ on believing.

82. Is there in baptism an engagement to God on our part? Ans. Yes; Rom. vi. 3, 4; Gal. iii. 27.

83. How does it appear that baptism is an engagement to God on our part? Ans. Because God, in this ordinance, gives himself to us, and therefore we give ourselves to him. He lays an obligation—we accept.

84. To what does baptism engage us? Ans. To accept of Father,

Son, and Spirit, as our God; to embrace his promises in Christ, and to perform our duties.

§ XXVIII.—85. Is baptism a seal of this engagement to God, as well as of his promise to us? Ans. Yes; it is a sign and seal accepted, as well as given.

86. Does baptism lay an obligation on us to faith and obedience? Ans. Yes; Rom. vi. 3—6.

87. Is it not through Christ, or in his name, that we are thus engaged to God, and to our duty? Ans. Yes; Rom. vi. 3—6; Gal. iii. 27.

88. Is not, then, the end or design of baptism something more than a mere profession of Christianity? Ans. Yes; it is a sign and offer of grace, and a seal of it to the believer, and a sign and seal of his engagements.

§ XXIX.—89. But can water-baptism confer grace, or confirm the soul in grace? Ans. No; (1.) It is only the appointed sign, not itself the thing signified. (2.) Efficacy is denied to baptism itself, Matt. iii. 11. (3.) Water cannot wash away sin.

90. But if Christ had made salvation a universal concomitant of baptism, or united them inseparably together, would not baptism be a saving ordinance? Ans. Yes.

91. How does it appear that he has not so united baptism and salvation? Ans. (1.) There is no proof in Scripture that he has so united them. (2.) The distinction made between baptism, as the sign, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, as the thing signified, and dependent on Christ, shows it. (3.) Simon the sorcerer was baptized, and not regenerated. (4.) The inseparable union of baptism and salvation would absurdly put the power of conferring salvation into the hand of the administrator. (5.) The Holy Spirit would be compelled to regenerate whom we please, whom the most graceless administrator chooses to baptize. (6.) There would be no need of self-examination, but only to know that we are baptized.

92. Obj. (1.) Scripture texts ascribe regeneration, and washing from sins, to this sacrament; as Tit. iii. 5; Acts xxii. 16? Ans. (1.) Tit. iii. 5, indeed refers to baptism as a sign, but asserts regeneration to be by the Spirit. (2.) In Acts xxii. 16, Ananias refers to the blood of Christ, received by faith, as taking away sin; and to baptism, as the appointed sign of it, and a moral means, which God blesses, as he does the word, James i. 18, 21.

93. Obj. (2.) Scripture prophecies of baptism; as Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Zech. xiii. 1; as predicting regeneration by baptism? Ans. These passages do not predict baptism, but spiritual cleansing, under the figure of water; and baptism signifies the same thing.

94. Obj. (3.) The act of circumcision itself took away the foreskin, and therefore we may infer that baptism takes away sin? Ans. The objection is frivolous. Circumcision only took away the foreskin, not sin or depravity. Baptism may take away the filth of the body, but not guilt or depravity.

95. Obj. (4.) Baptism ought to be distinguished from the word,

as effecting something more than the word does? Ans: It is distinguished from the word, as a sensible sign, and a distinct means of applying salvation; but not as having power to communicate the blessing, which necessarily belongs to the living God.

96. Is the blessing limited to the moment of baptism, so that baptism is null, if the blessing be not then given or possessed? Ans. No; as circumcision, it is still a sign of the blessing; an offer of it, so long as the person has the gospel offer; and when he afterwards embraces Christ, it is the seal of the promise to him. Besides, baptism, like circumcision, is not to be repeated to the baptized person, on conversion.

97. Does baptism suppose a person, before he receives it, to be in his state of nature, or in union to Christ? Ans. In union to Christ. It is not a converting, but a sealing ordinance.

LECTURE XXII.—SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

§ XVI.—98. Should any inanimate thing (as bells, by the Papists) be baptized? Ans. No.

99. Why not? Ans. (1.) There is no command. (2.) No example. (3.) They cannot be subjects of the blessings signified. (4.) It is a profanation of the ordinance, and founded on an error respecting the doctrine of baptism, supposing it capable of conferring a blessing.

100. Should the dead be baptized? Ans. No; for the same reasons.

101. Should the living be baptized as substitutes for the dead? Ans. No; for the same reasons.

102. But might not 1 Cor. xv. 29, "Baptized for the dead," be understood as referring to this practice, and approving of it? Ans. No.

103. Why not? Ans. Because, (1.) The apostle is there stating an approved practice; but this practice was not commanded, and so was not approved. It is contrary to the nature of the ordinance, which signifies the application of salvation to the same person to whom the sign is applied. (2.) The apostle intends an argument for the resurrection; but this would be no argument. It would be basing an argument on a mistaken notion and practice. If it might be an *argumentum ad hominem* to those of that belief, (as Mark, our author, thinks,) it could be none to others; but the apostle intends it as an argument drawn from the Scriptural belief of true Christians. (3.) In his argument, he supposes that, by baptism for the dead, the person risks all his earthly possessions, hopes, and life itself; but this baptism, as a substitute for others, risks nothing. That passage, no doubt, means, either metaphorically, by baptism, martyrdom for the hope of salvation through Christ, or a profession of religion, made in baptism, which exposed the person baptized, to martyrdom.

104. Are mankind alone the subjects of baptism? Ans. Yes; as is evident from the doctrine of baptism, the examples of baptism, and the commands to baptize.

105. But should all men be baptized, in whatever state we find them? Ans. No; not such as the deranged, those who are asleep, the unwilling, the grossly ignorant, heretics, the openly irreligious, &c.

106. Why should none of these be baptized? Ans. Because faith, repentance, a profession of Christ's name, according to his truth, and obedience, are required in order to baptism; Matt. iii. 6, 8, 11; Acts viii. 12, 37.

107. Can any but a true believer be acceptable to God, in receiving this ordinance? Ans. No; because he should have the thing signified, and faith, repentance, and obedience.

108. Should we refuse to baptize, unless we know that the applicant is a believer? Ans. No; because we cannot know the heart; the apostles did not wait to examine into this; and Philip baptized Simon the sorcerer, who was not a believer.

109. As we cannot judge the heart, what is the rule of admission to baptism? or, who should be baptized? Ans. Visible church-members; that is, those who appear to be believers.

110. What is necessary in order to visible church-membership? or, what evidence of this should be required? Ans. Knowledge, sound sentiments, credible profession of faith, and a consistent practice, and godly conduct.

111. How does it appear that all this ought to be required? Ans. (1.) Because such requisitions were made by John the Baptist, the apostles, and our Lord. John taught in order to baptism. Philip demanded profession of faith, in the case of the Eunuch, Acts viii. 37; which faith and profession required knowledge. And John the Baptist required repentance, and works worthy of repentance, Matt. iii. 8; and our Lord required discipline and baptism, Matt. xxviii. 19. (2.) Because all these will accompany a saving interest in Christ, in ordinary cases. (3.) Because the church should, in dispensing baptism, be a faithful witness for Christ, and a faithful instructor and reprovor.

112. Are these evidences of right to baptism sufficient to justify the church in administering it? Ans. Yes; these embrace all the requisitions made by John the Baptist and the apostles, either by example or doctrine.

113. If the church baptizes on these evidences, and the person prove to be a hypocrite, is the church guilty? Ans. No; Philip did so, Acts viii. 13. No doubt Judas was baptized. The church cannot judge the heart, and God does not require of her an impossibility.

114. Should all who, in the judgment of charity, are believers, be baptized, though living in some known sin, or openly holding some error against the church's profession? Ans. No.

115. Why not? Ans. (1.) Because this is forbidden in Scripture; 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15. (2.) Because the church should faithfully warn such a person of such sin or error. (3.) Because she should be a faithful witness for Christ, his truth and law. (4.) She should keep herself from participation in the sin of others; 2

John 10, 11. (5.) The communion of the church is not appointed for the sole purpose of distinguishing between Christians and the world; but for instructing the ignorant, correcting the erring, edifying the members, and maintaining Christ's cause, for his glory, and the continued enlargement and purity of the church.

116. May we not infer from 1 Pet. iii. 21, that such requisitions as knowledge, faith, sound sentiments and profession, and godly practice, were required in order to baptism? Ans. Yes; the "answer of a good conscience towards God," descriptive of the grace signified in baptism, implies that knowledge, faith, &c., are required in order to baptism, and that we should possess these things in reality, as the answer of the conscience towards God, corresponding to the demands externally made.

117. Should women be baptized? Ans. Yes; Acts viii. 12; xvi. 14, 15.

118. Why should women be baptized, if baptism be come in the room of circumcision? Ans. (1.) Because, in circumcision, women were included in the males—not so in baptism. (2.) Baptism is as applicable to females as to males—not so with circumcision. (3.) Their privileges are continued, but more clear.

§ XVII.—119. Should infants be baptized? Ans. Yes.

120. Whose infants? Ans. Those of believers, or professing parents.

121. Why not baptize the infants of non-professing parents? Ans. (1.) Because such were not circumcised of old. (2.) Because they have not the promise, and are not in covenant with God, 1 Cor. vii. 14. (3.) Therefore they have nothing to seal.

122. What should be required in parents presenting children for baptism? Ans. The same as in applicants for themselves.

123. Why should such requisitions be made of them? Ans. (1.) Because this was required of proselytes for circumcision; of themselves and their children. (2.) Because the children have right to baptism as church-members, through their parents' church-membership. Therefore these evidences should be required of them. (3.) Because we should have promises that the children shall be educated as church-members.

124. Is this an important question—respecting the right of infants to baptism? Ans. Yes; because, if infants have a right to baptism, the withholding of it is a sin. If they have not a right, their baptism is sin, and a profanation of the ordinance.

125. Did God grant the privileges of the covenant of grace to infants of believing parents, under the old dispensation? Ans. Yes; as Gen. xvii. 7—a promise comprehensive of all gospel privileges; as God's love and favour—their forgiveness—the Spirit, and all grace.

126. Was this a promise in Christ, and a gospel promise? Ans. Yes; (1.) It was gospel, Gal. iii. 8. (2.) It was in Christ, Col. iii. 16. (3.) It was confirmed in Christ, Gal. iii. 17.

127. Did God claim infant children as his? Ans. Yes; as ap-

pears, (1.) By his promises to them, Gen. xvii. 7. (2.) By giving the seal of it, Gen. xvii. 10. (3.) By his requiring them to be instructed in his law, Deut. vi. 7. (4.) By charging Israel, in their idolatry, with taking his children, and offering them to idols, Ezek. xvi. 20, 23, 37.

128. Was this grant of covenant privileges to infants ever repealed? Ans. No.

129. Is it not recognised in the New Testament? Ans. Yes; (1.) In Matt. xix. 13—15, and Luke xviii. 15, 16, little children—infants—are said to belong to the kingdom of God. (2.) In 1 Cor. vii. 14, children of believing parents are called “holy;” that is, in covenant with God, or under his covenant promise. (3.) In Acts ii. 38, 39, it is expressly said, “the promise is to you, and to your children,”—evidently referring to the Abrahamic promise.

130. Does not the unity of the Old and New Testament church require the continuance of this covenant promise to children. Ans. Yes; as Rom. xi. 17.

131. Was not circumcision administered to infants on this ground of covenant privilege? Ans. Yes; Gen. xvii. 7—12. And therefore baptism should be administered to infants on the same ground.

132. How prove that baptism should be administered to infants now on the same ground? Ans. (1.) Analogy pleads strongly for it, since the covenant privilege are continued to infants. Baptism signifies the same thing as circumcision. There is no other ordinance of divine appointment for devoting infants to God; and the privileges of the church are not diminished under the new dispensation. (2.) The apostle, in Acts ii. 38, 39, expressly places baptism on the same ground—the promise, and declares that the promise is to the children of as many as the Lord shall call.

133. Did not God lay an obligation on parents of old, to dedicate their children to him in circumcision? Ans. Yes; Gen. xvii. 7—14.

134. Does not this obligation still lie on us? Ans. Yes; because, (1.) If the ceremony or outward mode be repealed, the thing itself is not. (2.) The duty of dedicating children to God is still recognised, Luke xviii. 15.

135. Has Christ appointed any other ordinance of dedicating children to God, than baptism? Ans. No; and therefore we conclude that children should be baptized.

136. Does baptism ratify God's covenant, and our dedication to him, as circumcision did? Ans. Yes; it signifies the same thing on God's part,—sealing his promise; and the same thing on ours—receiving, and engaging to God, Deut. x. 16, compared with Col. ii. 11—13.

137. If, then, children should not be baptized, should there not have been an express prohibition of their baptism? Ans. Yes; as it would be reasonable to apply the New Testament ordinance to them, which signifies the same as circumcision.

138. Do not both Old and New Testaments show, by circum-

cision and baptism, that visible church-membership should have the seal of the covenant? Ans. Yes; both circumcision and baptism seal visible church-membership to those to whom they are applied. And therefore, as infants of believing parents, under both the old and the new dispensation, are church-members, they should have the seal of baptism, as they had the seal of circumcision.

139. Do the examples of baptizing households, as those of Cornelius, the jailer, Lydia, Stephanas, &c., prove that infants of believing parents should be baptized? Ans. Yes.

140. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Infants are component parts of households. (2.) Households were required to be circumcised, of old, as all included in the same covenant and promise, Gen. xvii. 12, 13, 27; Ex. xii. 48. (3.) Therefore households, under the New Testament, must be taken in the same sense.

141. Does Christ's command, Matt. xxviii. 19, warrant infant baptism? Ans. Yes.

142. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Infants were included in "nations." (2.) Christ required the apostles to teach (*disciple*) and baptize. (3.) Infants were brought under discipleship, or teaching, when their parents were; for when parents from the Gentiles were brought under instruction and discipleship, their children were circumcised; Ex. xii. 48. (4.) The disciples should understand Christ's words as the Jews were accustomed to understand such expressions; and they acted accordingly, in baptizing whole households, when the adults were become disciples.

§ XVIII.—143. Who especially oppose infant baptism? Ans. It was first opposed by some who denied original sin, and held that the baptism of infants was unnecessary; but, latterly, by Anabaptists, who acknowledge original sin.

144. Obj. (1.) There is no command to baptize infants; and therefore they should not be baptized? Ans. (1.) Though there is no explicit command to baptize infants, there is an implicit command in the long established privileges of infants—of church-membership and circumcision; in their continued privilege of the promise; and in the foundation of the right to baptism on the privilege of the promise; Acts ii. 38, 39; and in the command to baptize nations: (2.) Since infants had a right to the seal of the promise in circumcision, and this right is not denied in the New Testament, it is therefore continued. (3.) The want of an express command to baptize infants strongly implies their right continued, showing that a command was unnecessary for so plain a privilege, so plainly continued.

145. Obj. (2.) No examples of infant baptism are recorded in Scripture? Ans. (1.) The examples of baptizing households imply the baptism of infants. (2.) It was not necessary to have examples of infant baptism on record, in order to establish their right, because of the evidences of their right on other grounds, because of the brevity of the history, because the children's right to the seal of

the covenant was then unquestioned, and because the divine history gives account of converts to Christianity, and their baptism.

146. Obj. (3.) It is a perversion of the ordinance to apply the sign where there is no understanding of what is done? Ans. (1.) The baptism of infants is not to be compared to the baptism of inanimate things, which have not, and will not have, either understanding of the ordinance, or interest in it. (2.) Infants may live to understand the ordinance afterwards, and to profit by it. (3.) As they are interested in the covenant promise, the blessing may be bestowed even in infancy, and so, by baptism, sealed to them. (4.) As the objection bears as directly and strongly against infant circumcision, it is utterly groundless, and founded on a mistake.

147. Obj. (4.) Faith and confession of sins are, in Scripture, required in order to baptism; which infants have not? Ans. (1.) These are required of adults, in order to ascertain their church-membership; but we ascertain the membership of infants by their parents; Acts ii. 38, 39, 1 Cor. vii. 14. (2.) The argument would bear as strongly against infant circumcision; and therefore it is groundless. (3.) Faith and confession were required of adults, in order to their circumcision, yet their infants were circumcised.

148. Obj. (5.) Infants, in baptism, receive a seal, while they have not the benefit sealed? Ans. (1.) The objection is not true in every case. (2.) The same objection would bear as strongly against infant circumcision.

149. Obj. (6.) In all the instances of baptism recorded, it was administered on application for baptism, and on profession of faith? Ans. (1.) Infant baptism is granted on application of parents, and on their profession of faith, as circumcision was. (2.) We should not deny the right of infants to baptism because a profession of faith is required of adults, any more than we would deny the right of infants of old to circumcision because such a profession was required of their parents. (3.) In Matt. xix. 13, 14, and Luke xviii. 15, 16, Christ acknowledges the little children as coming to him, when brought by others. It is their way of coming.

150. Obj. (7.) Christ was not baptized till about thirty years of age? Ans. The ordinance of baptism was not instituted till about that time.

151. Obj. (8.) Infants may be baptized, and afterwards prove graceless? An. So also may a person baptized on his own profession, and so also might an Israelite circumcised in infancy.

152. Obj. (9.) The baptism of infants can do them no good, when they do not know what is done? Ans. (1.) This objection is groundless, as it would bear as strongly against circumcision. (2.) But baptism of infants is useful, and may be useful to infants in many ways; as, (a.) God can give the thing signified at the time. (b.) He may do it afterwards. (c.) He may provide for their instruction. (d.) He may take care of them as his covenant people. (e.) It may excite parents to their duty, and that duty may be a blessing to the child.

§ XIX.—153. But many questions may arise as to what infants have a right to baptism. Therefore we inquire—if the child was born while the parent was an unbeliever, may it, on his reformation and admission, be baptized? Ans. Yes; because, (1.) Gentiles converted to Judaism, were not only privileged, but bound to have their children circumcised. (2.) The child's condition, with respect to God's covenant, follows the condition of the parent with respect to church membership.

154. Why does the outward church privilege of the child follow the external church state of the parent? Ans. (1.) Because God is pleased to place children under his promises through the parents, Gen. xvii. 7, 10, Acts ii. 38, 39; and, therefore, if the parents be not externally in covenant with God, the children are not; if they are, the children are in external covenant with God. (2.) It appears that this privilege is granted to the child through its relation to the parent, and because of the parent's possession and use of the word and ordinances for the child's education; Gen. xviii. 19.

155. What is requisite that children may have a right to baptism? Ans. That they be visible church members: as such, they should have the seal.

156. How do they obtain church-membership? Ans. By having the promise; Acts ii. 38, 39.

157. How do they obtain interest in the promise, or external covenant, since they are unable to embrace it? Ans. Through their parents, or guardians, to whose house or household they belong; Acts ii. 38, 39.

158. On what then is the child's church-membership, or interest in the promise, or right to baptism, founded?—is it on their natural relationship to their parents, or on their civil and domestic relationship, as members of the household? Ans. We believe on both.

159. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) The promise is to the seed of the believer; Gen. xvii. 7; and the child of a believing parent is holy; that is, the child is included in God's eternal covenant with the parent, 1 Cor. vii. 14. This proves the right by natural relationship. (2.) Abraham's servants were included in the covenant as members of his household, Gen. xvii. 12, 13, 23, 27; for they were to be circumcised. This proves the right by domestic or civil relationship. (3.) As we justly argue, from the baptism of households, (as of Lydia, Acts xvi. 15; of the jailer, Acts xvi. 33; of Stephanus, 1 Cor. i. 16,) that infants were baptized; so, from the same data, we argue for the baptism of infants belonging to the household, though not related by birth to the head of the family. (4.) A Christian family is a component part of the church; it is a church itself, 1 Cor. xvi. 19; and a divine institution for the education of members of the church catholic. (5.) Natural relationship itself to believing parents, will not entitle a child to baptism, if the child, on their death, become a member of an ungodly house.

160. Is it necessary to a child's right to baptism that both its parents be church members? Ans. No; it has the right, if but one of them be a church member; 1 Cor. vii. 14.

161. Why should the child have a right to baptism by one parent, when it is as nearly related to the other, who is an unbeliever? Ans. (1.) God has been pleased to grant this privilege to a believing parent; 1 Cor. vii. 14. (2.) God has ordained that the believing parent has the conjugal relation sanctified to him or her, though the other parent be an unbeliever; and therefore the sanctification of their offspring, 1 Cor. vii. 14. Though, in such a case, the infant is the child of an unbeliever, it is nevertheless a child of a believer; and thus it has the promise. (4.) Through that believing parent it has the opportunity of a religious education.

162. May, then, a child, though of unbelieving parents, if adopted or taken into a religious family for education, be baptized? Ans. Yes; for reasons given, Q. 159. And besides, (1.) Gospel privileges are not abridged under the new dispensation. (2.) Christ requires teaching, or discipline, to precede baptism, Matt. xxviii. 19; and the baptizing of households, (see examples of apostles, Acts xvi. 15, 33,) to accompany discipleship; and consequently to baptize those children who are members of godly families.

163. Should we not then consider the children in a godly family, as under discipline as disciples, and therefore under the promise, and entitled to baptism? Ans. Yes.

164. But it is objected, that 1 Cor. vii. 14, ascribes the child's church-membership (or holiness,) to its natural relation to the believing parent; and therefore its right to baptism is founded on this fact alone? Ans. (1.) The apostle does plead for the child's holiness on this ground, but does not deny that it might have this character also on another ground—its membership in a godly family. (2.) The apostle says, "else were your children unclean." By this he means, if both the parents were unbelievers, or if the one believing parent had not the conjugal relation sanctified, the child would be no church-member through them; yet he does not deny that it would become a church-member, if adopted into a godly family.

165. What is the reason that a child has no right to baptism, if the parents and guardians are unbelievers, and non-professors of religion? Ans. (1.) Because the child has no right to baptism but through the promise. (2.) If the parent and guardian reject the promise, the child has it not, nor is it under tuition for discipleship. (3.) Because there is no example of the admission of irreligious and non-professing parents to baptism. (4.) Such admission would be preposterous, giving a seal of the promise to an open rejecter of it, or taking his promise to fulfil engagements which he openly and practically refuses.

166. Is not a child deprived of a great privilege, if deprived of baptism? Ans. Yes; and of a still greater privilege, if deprived of the promise, and of a religious education.

167. Who is guilty of depriving them of all these, when baptism is refused on account of the parents' irreligion? Ans. The parents alone.

168. Would baptism be of any benefit to the child, if granted to it without the covenant promise, and contrary to God's institution? Ans. No.

169. Does the child's right to baptism, even before God, depend on the secret faith, or real godliness of the parent? Ans. No.

170. Why not? Ans. (1.) Because God's external covenant with the church, and with parents, is the ground of this privilege, and not his covenant savingly embraced; Acts ii. 38, 39. (2.) All parents in the church of Israel, of good outward profession and conduct, had their infants circumcised.

171. May not the exclusion of infants from baptism on account of the irreligion of their parents, be profitable to both parent and child? Ans. Yes.

172. How so? Ans. (1.) Because discipline is appointed for the good of those to whom it is applied. (2.) If baptism were granted to those who should be excluded, it would involve them in sin, as well as the church, and leave them without reproof, and tend to harden them. (3.) To refuse it on the ground of irreligion, may convince and reform.

173. But it is objected that all infants of the people of Israel were circumcised of old; and therefore the children of all who apply should be baptized? Ans. (1.) The premise is not true; for the children of those who were cut off from church privileges, were cut off with them; Gen. xvii. 14. Though the guilt is charged on him that neglects the ordinance, the child is cut off from privileges with him; and so for other crimes requiring excommunication. (2.) No doubt circumcision was administered to children of ungodly parents; but their ungodliness was not so manifest as to cause their excommunication; so we baptize. (3.) Circumcision of the children of the excommunicated is virtually denied by John the Baptist, Matt. iii. 7, 8, requiring in order to baptism, fruits evidential of repentance; and so Peter demanded repentance, Acts ii. 38; and at all events he expressly required this in order to baptism.

174. May the children of believers, however defective or deformed, be baptized? Ans. Yes; no exception of such is made in Scripture; and no analogy would forbid their baptism.

175. If an idiot child should come to maturity before the parents' conversion, should it be then baptized? Ans. Yes; because it is still in a state of infancy, as to its mind, and is as much interested in the promise as other infants of believers.

176. May those born of those who are excommunicated, or of schismatics, or born of fornication, be baptized, if the parents be received again on confession? Ans. Yes.

177. But should such children be baptized, while the parents are still under censure, and impenitent, on the ground that the parents may still be judged believers? Ans. No; because (1.) Though the parents may still be judged believers, though fallen, they are not in communion with the church; and (2.) As of old the child was cut off from the privileges of the church, with the parents, so now they are cut off with them.

178. Should not infants be considered as standing or falling, before the church, with their parents? Ans. Yes; because their privileges come through the parents' privileges and standing.

179. Is the child's right to baptism derived from its immediate or its remote parents? Ans. From its immediate parents.

180. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Before the church, the children stand or fall with their immediate parents. (2.) The Jewish infants were cut off with their excommunicated parents; Gen. xvii. 14; although the root was holy; Rom. xi. 16, 17. (3.) Peter requires faith of the immediate parents, in order to the privileges of their children in the promise, Acts ii. 38, 39. (4.) At least one of the immediate parents must be a believer, else the children are unclean, 1 Cor. vii. 14; and this is as true if the grandparents of the children were believers and professors. (5.) Because iniquity is visited from parent to child; of immediate parents, and not of the remote, if godly parents intervene; and mercy is shown to thousands continuing godly. (6.) Because the immediate parent being an unbeliever, does not engage to bring up the child for God, as required by both circumcision and baptism; Deut. vi. 7, Gen. xviii. 19, Matt. iii. 8, compared with Eph. vi. 4.

181. On what ground, then, may a Christian procure baptism for an adopted child, whose parents were unbelievers? Ans. On the ground of education, and as one of a household under the promise, and under discipline.

182. Has not the child the covenant promise, through the covenant promise to the parent, and that promise embraced? Ans. Yes; Gen. xvii. 7, Ex. xx. 6.

183. Is this denied, by granting baptism to adopted children? Ans. No; Gen. xvii. 13 extends the covenant promise and privileges to the whole household, which were granted to Abraham's children through him. It appears that the promise of the covenant extends through the head of the family, to not only his natural relatives or children, but to his household; and that the want of federal holiness, or church membership, in the children of parents who are both unbelievers, is not so much because of the parentage of the children, as of their want of Christian education. For, if they were Christian parents, they would bring the children under Christian discipline; and if unbelieving parents, they will have no church in their house.

LECTURE XXIII.—BAPTISM OF CHRIST.—BAPTISM NOT ESSENTIAL.—
GENERAL MODE OF ADMINISTERING, ETC.

§ XX.—184. Why was Christ baptized, who needed no salvation, remission or regeneration? Ans. (1.) He was baptized as an act of obedience—to fulfil all righteousness. (2.) To set us an example of obedience. (3.) To signify that he was really man. (4.) To signify his union with the church. It was not necessary that his baptism should signify all that our baptism signifies; but it was necessary for the purposes above stated.

§ XXI.—185. Is baptism limited to any particular place? **Ans. No;** except that it be ordinarily administered in the public assembly of the church.

186. Why should it be in the public assembly? **Ans.** (1.) It should be accompanied with the preaching of the word; so the examples usually prove; and Christ's commission joins baptism with preaching; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. (2.) The church should be present to receive a member, and be witnesses, and to engage in public prayer for the baptized. (3.) That the church may be edified by its administration. (4.) Because private baptism tends to promote a low estimate of the ordinance, or fosters the idea that baptism is necessary to salvation, and favours a perversion of the ordinance in granting it to the unworthy.

§ XXII.—187. Has Christ appointed any set time for the baptism of either infants or adults? **Ans. No;** but it should be as soon as practicable.

188. Did not the church, in the early ages, generally baptize at the feasts of the Passover and Pentecost? **Ans. Yes;** but as these feasts were of human ordination, (?) so was the observance of baptism at these times; and of course, baptism was often sinfully delayed.

189. Constantine and others postponed baptism till near death. What error was in this? **Ans.** (1.) They, by this delay, neglected the duty of early devotion to God in his appointed ordinance. (2.) They did so under the erroneous notion that baptism washed away sin, and washed away only past, and not future sins.

§ XXIII.—190. Is baptism necessary to salvation? **Ans. No;** because, (1.) The covenant promise is extended to all the children of believers. (2.) Circumcision was neglected in the wilderness. (3.) The delay of circumcision till the eighth day, proves the same thing. (4.) The same thing appears from Mark xvi. 16. Faith alone is represented as essentially necessary. (5.) Our Lord has not suspended the salvation of believers' children on accidents, or on the inadvertency of parents. (6.) It appears also from the nature of baptism, which does not convey grace of itself, being only an appointed sign.

191. Obj. (1.) To prove the necessity of baptism, they quote John iii. 5, "Born of water and the Spirit;" alleging that the water means baptism? **Ans.** (1.) If *water* there does mean baptism, it is only parallel with Mark xvi. 16. (2.) But it no doubt means cleansing by the Spirit—two names for the same thing; as Matt. iii. 11.

192. Obj. (2.) Baptism is prescribed to believers; Mark xvi. 16, Eph. v. 26, Tit. iii. 5; and is therefore necessary? **Ans.** (1.) It is admitted that baptism is prescribed as a duty, and as a privilege, but not as essential to salvation. (2.) Though Eph. v. 26, and Tit. iii. 5, refer to baptism as a sign, yet those passages speak of regeneration and sanctification as essentially necessary, using language to express them which is used to express baptism.

193. Obj. (3.) There is no salvation out of the church; and therefore baptism is necessary? Ans. (1.) It is not true that there is no salvation out of the visible church. A person may be saved, as a believer, who, after believing, had no opportunity to become a visible church-member. (2.) The objection assumes what is not true—that baptism makes a person a visible church-member. A person must be a visible church-member in order to baptism.

194. Obj. (4.) Infants are under the guilt of original sin, and baptism is necessary to take it away? Ans. True, they are naturally under the guilt of original sin; but it is the blood of Christ, not baptism, that takes this away.

195. Obj. (5.) The children of believers and of unbelievers are in the same state before baptism? Ans. It is false. The children of believers are under the covenant promise before baptism; the children of unbelievers are not.

196. What, then, is the necessity of baptism, or the obligation to baptize? Ans. (1.) The obligation of the divine appointment. (2.) It is a means of grace. (3.) It is useful for confirming faith.

197. May not the contempt of baptism be damning? Ans. Yes; it proves unbelief.

§ XXIV.—198. Should baptism be repeated on the same person? Ans. No.

199. Why not? Ans. (1.) The institution of baptism does not require it, as that of the Supper does. (2.) We have no examples of it by the apostles, and they speak of baptism without reference to repetitions. (3.) Circumcision was not repeated. (4.) The thing signified is needed but once—as regeneration—interest in the blood of Christ—ingrafting into the church.

200. But if the person fall away after baptism, should it not be repeated on his reformation and reception into the church again? Ans. No; because, (1.) There is no command for this. (2.) There is no example of it. (3.) Though baptism may be abused, it is not thereby invalidated, but it binds the apostate under guilt, and seals salvation to the true penitent.

201. But if the baptism of any person be uncertain, might he not be baptized again, though really baptized before? Ans. Yes; because then it is not done as a repetition, nor on the principle that a former baptism became invalid, but for assurance of the fact.

202. Should baptism be repeated, if the former baptism was really invalid? Ans. Yes.

203. On what accounts might a former baptism be counted justly invalid? Ans. If done by a person who had no authority to baptize, or in a society which was not a church of Christ.

204. Why should these circumstances render baptism invalid? Ans. (1.) One unauthorized by Christ cannot perform a valid act for him. (2.) An office bearer in a society which is not the church of Christ, cannot receive a member into the true church. (3.) Baptism cannot be a valid sign of spiritual grace, unless administered by Christ's authority.

205. Would every error which might be found, even in the profession of a church, invalidate their baptism? Ans. No; only such as would prove them to be no church of Christ.

206. Does Socinian or Arian doctrine invalidate baptism? Ans. Yes; because the person is not baptized in the name of the Trinity, nor, in reality, in the name of Christ.

207. Is Popish baptism invalid? Ans. This is questioned; as they hold the doctrines of the Trinity, and of Christ's mediatorial person. But though they do, their idolatry and many errors justify us in denying them to be the true church of Christ. Therefore they cannot ingraft the baptized into the true church, which is required, 1 Cor. xii. 13. Further, they require belief in the Virgin's and in saints' intercession, in Papal pardons, and in grounds of justification other than Christ's righteousness; and they baptize according to their doctrines.

208. Obj. (1).—In favour of repetition—The apostle speaks of *baptisms*—in the plural; Heb. vi. 2? Ans. (1.) *Baptisms* there may mean the baptisms of many persons. (2.) It may mean the many ceremonial washings. Or, (3.) It may mean the ordinances of baptism, baptism by afflictions, and baptism of the Holy Spirit.

209. Obj. (2.) By Anabaptists.—When baptized in infancy, we cannot know the fact of our baptism, but by faith in human testimony? Ans. (1.) When baptized in adult age, we have but human evidence. It is in no case a matter of divine testimony, or of a divine faith in the fact. (2.) The testimony of the church is sufficient, as to the fact of our baptism. (3.) As actual baptism is not necessary to our salvation, so a deception by others would be neither our sin nor our loss. (4.) Human evidence of this fact is consistent with divine faith in our privileges and obligation by word and baptism.

§ XXV.—210. Is there any indelible mark or character made by baptism, as the Papists say, and which they advance as the great reason why baptism should not be repeated? Ans. No; (1.) The Scripture says nothing of such a mark. (2.) They cannot themselves point it out, or describe it, so as to test it. (3.) The supposition is inconsistent with the nature of a sacrament, which operates spiritually, not physically, as a seal for confirming our faith. (4.) The impiety of many who are baptized, proves the vanity of such a supposition.

211. Does Eph. i. 13, 14, and other places, speaking of "the earnest of the Spirit," or Ezek. ix. 4, speaking of the mark set on the forehead of the righteous, among the wicked, refer to such a thing? Ans. No; the earnest of the Spirit is his indwelling and spiritual operations in the hearts of believers; and the passage in Ezekiel is figurative; referring to God's omniscience, and his care, in guiding his ministers of vengeance, not to injure those whom he will protect.

§ XXVI.—212. Should any ceremonies be used in baptism but the application of water in the name of the Trinity? Ans. No;

because there is no other ceremony appointed; and if any other is used, it is unwarranted, and is not only useless, but an abuse of the ordinance.

213. Was exorcism used by the apostles in their time? **Ans. Yes.**

214. Can it be used without a miraculous power? **Ans. No;** Acts xix. 12—15.

215. On what occasions was it used? **Ans.** When Satan actually possessed the bodies of men.

216. Was it ever used for the mere purpose of taking away the spiritual power of Satan over the soul? **Ans. No;** and it is a presumptuous and useless attempt, where there is neither power nor occasion to use it.

216½. Is the name of the person necessary in baptism? **Ans. No.**

§ XII.—217. Who should administer baptism? **Ans.** Gospel ministers, and they only.

218. How does this appear? **Ans.** (1.) The command to teach, discipline, and baptize, is given to the same persons; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. (2.) The general dispensation of divine mysteries, given to gospel ministers, proves this; 1 Cor. iv. 1. (3.) The examples of administration of baptism, being by gospel ministers alone, prove the same thing. (4.) No other than gospel ministers being authorized by Christ to baptize, no other can validly apply the seal in his name. (5.) No other than church officers can validly introduce a member into the church; and if the liberty were given to all, it would soon prove a perversion of the ordinance, and fill the church with unworthy members.

219. But it is objected, (1.) That some who were not gospel ministers, did baptize; as Philip, Ananias, &c.? **Ans.** Philip was an evangelist, a preacher of the gospel, Acts viii. 5. Ananias might have been a gospel minister, and at all events was specially called of Christ to baptize Paul.

220. Obj. (2.) Zipporah and others, not in office, circumcised? **Ans.** The administration of circumcision, it appears, was not limited to church officers, but this is no reason why, under a change of dispensation, baptism should not be so limited. Besides, circumcision was limited to the Jews, and a few proselytes whom church officers admitted; but baptism is extended to persons of all nations who may be converted by the preaching of the gospel; there is, therefore, more reason that it should be committed exclusively to gospel ministers, with their helps in government.

221. Obj. (3.) All difference of persons is taken away under the gospel? **Ans.** All difference with respect to gospel privileges is indeed taken away, Gal. iii. 28; but all difference of office, or authority, is not, 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12, Rom. x. 15.

222. Does Paul mean, by denying that Christ sent him to baptize, 1 Cor. i. 17, that the administration of this ordinance was left to unauthorized men? **Ans. No;** but that this was not his chief work.

§ XIII.—223. Why may a man not baptize himself in ordinary cases? **Ans.** (1.) It is improper that an unbaptized person should

baptize. (2.) It is improper that a man not recognised as a member of the church, should authoritatively introduce a member. (3.) **Christ** himself was baptized of John. (4.) A distinction was always made between the persons baptizing, and the persons baptized. (5.) From man's passiveness in regeneration, which is signified in this ordinance.

224. Does defect of bodily parts disqualify for baptizing, if the person be able to do all that is required in dispensing the ordinance? **Ans. No.**

225. May more than one join in the administration of this ordinance? **Ans. Yes.** In exercises connected with it, they certainly may, but in the administration itself it would be useless and frivolous.

§ XIV.—226. Can the secret heresy of a minister invalidate baptism administered by him? **Ans. No.**

227. Can a minister's secret impiety render his baptism null? **Ans. No.**

228. Why cannot either the secret heresy or the impiety of the minister invalidate his administration of baptism? **Ans. (1.)** These are personal wants which affect himself, but not his administrations. (2.) If the ordinance administered be Christ's ordinance,—if administered according to his appointment, and by one regularly authorized according to the rules which Christ has given to the church, the dispensation is valid, and the faith of the receiver is not dependent on secret things which belong to God, but on things revealed and open. (3.) Gospel ministers are not physical or moral causes of grace or salvation, but only appointed and moral means.

229. May a minister's open or professed heresy, or even manifest impiety, invalidate his administration of baptism? **Ans. No;** so long as he is retained in office, in an orthodox church, Phil. i. 17, 18. But after he is, for these causes, deposed, his baptizing would be invalid, not only as a heretic, or impious, but because he has no authority.

230. But may not the open heresy of a church render baptism by one of its ministers invalid? **Ans. Yes;** when those things essential to baptism are denied by them, or when they hold errors that justify us in denying them to be a church of Christ.

231. If a man has obtained the office of the ministry in a manner outwardly regular, can his want of the secret call of God render his baptism invalid? **Ans. No;** because he is only a moral instrument; 1 Cor. iii. 5, 7. He is the instrument of the church, and through the church, an instrument of Christ.

§ XV.—232. Does the benefit of baptism depend on the minister's intention? **Ans. No.**

233. Why not? **Ans. (1.)** The ordinance is Christ's, and he alone or his blessing renders it profitable. (2.) If the benefit depended on the minister's intention, the receiver could never receive the ordinance in faith. (3.) If the benefit depended on the minis-

ter's intention, the grace of God would depend on the grace or will of a man, which is absurd and impious.

234. Obj. (1.) The words of institution are not only theoretic, but practical, and operative of grace? Ans. They are no more practical than the word preached, and work no grace of themselves, but only by the blessing of Christ.

235. Obj. (2.) The words of institution are ambiguous, may be differently applied, and need the intention of the minister to determine their application? Ans. The minister's intention cannot make them more definite.

236. Obj. (3.) The intention of the minister is necessary to the validity and efficacy of baptism, because, otherwise, it might be administered in sport, or for amusement, and yet be a valid baptism? Ans. It is necessary that the ordinance be used according to the appointment of Christ, and be solemnly dispensed in his name, and with professed seriousness,—administration in a joke would not be so.

CHAPTER XXXI.

OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

LECTURE XXIV.—NAME—TIME OF INSTITUTION—SACRAMENTAL ELEMENTS AND ACTIONS—WHO MAY ADMINISTER.

§ I.—Quest. 1. Is this sacrament expressly called *the Lord's Supper* in Scripture? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. xi. 20.

2. Why is it called "the *Supper*?" Ans. (1.) From the hour of its institution—evening. (2.) Because the supper, in Palestine, was the principal meal, and therefore it signified a *feast*. (3.) And as the supper was a principal, social meal, it signified the communion of believers.

3. Why is it called "the *Lord's Supper*?" Ans. (1.) He instituted it. (2.) He furnishes it as a feast. (3.) He furnishes the matter, invites the guests, and is present as the Master.

4. Why do we call it a *sacred* ordinance? Ans. Because of the institution of it by our Lord, because of its symbols and signification, because of the guests—believers, because of their exercises in observing it, and because of its end and design.

§ II.—5. Is it ever called "the *Lord's Table*?" Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. x. 21.

6. May we, with propriety, call it, (as the ancient fathers did) a sacrament of oblation or offering? Ans. No; it is not so called in Scripture. It is not its prominent meaning. The fathers called it so, on account of an offering of bread and wine, out of which the sacrament was dispensed, and the remainder distributed to the poor, or for common use; but this was no part of the institution. And the Papists called it an oblation, as if a sacrificial offering to God.

It is indeed an offering of thanks, as a celebration of Christ's oblation; but the name may encourage error, and perversion of the ordinance.

7. In what sense do the Papists call it an oblation? Ans. They offer it as a true sacrifice, for the remission of sins.

8. What did the Popish term *Mass* originally signify? Ans. It was from *missio*—Italian, *missa*. It signified that public exercise of worship with which they dismissed the catechumens—next, the public exercise of worship dismissing the assembly of believers—and lastly, it was used for the Supper.

9. Is not the term *Supper* used for the participation of salvation, here and hereafter? Ans. Yes; Luke xiv. 24.

10. Is communion with Christ expressed by the figure of a supper? Ans. Yes; Rev. iii. 20.

§ IV.—11. How many, and what evangelists record this institution? Ans. Three—Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

12. Is it not particularly recognised and recorded by Paul? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. xi. 23, &c.

13. When was it instituted? Ans. At the close of the Passover, and on the night of Christ's betrayal.

14. Might not its institution at the close of the Passover intimate that it superseded that ordinance? Ans. Yes; Luke xxii. 16.

15. Was not the time chosen for its institution calculated to make this impression? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. xi. 23.

16. What were the actions of Christ in the institution? Ans. (1.) Taking the symbols. (2.) Blessing them. (3.) Breaking the bread. (4.) Distributing both bread and wine.

17. Did Christ himself partake? Ans. It is probable that he did; (1.) From his partaking of the other sacraments. (2.) To show his communion with his people. (3.) From his saying, "I will not henceforth drink," &c.; Matt. xxvi. 29.

18. Is it probable that Judas partook with Christ and his disciples, in this ordinance? Ans. No; because, (1.) On receiving the sop, at the Passover table, (John xiii. 30,) he went out. (2.) Christ had now, at the Passover table, declared the character of Judas; and it is not probable that he then allowed him to partake of this ordinance.

19. How then understand Luke xxii. 19—22;—After an account of the institution of the Supper, Christ says, "The hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table?" Ans. Luke may not be giving the order of events; and, according to John xiii. 26—30, it was the passover-table at which the sop was given.

20. What were the sayings of Christ in the institution of the Supper? Ans. (1.) He enjoined several things; as *to take, to eat, to drink, and to do this in remembrance of him*. (2.) He promises some things.

21. What is meant by "Do this?" Is it to offer this as a sacrifice, as Papists suppose? Ans. No; Paul explains it, 1 Cor. xi. 26.

22. What does he promise? Ans. (1.) His body broken for

them. (2.) His blood shed for the remission of sins; among which is his virtual promise of his coming, and of his drinking, with his people, the new wine in the kingdom of his Father; that is, holding communion with them in grace here, and glory hereafter.

23. In calling the bread *his body*, and the cup *his blood*, does he not, by metonymy, give the name of the thing signified to the sign? Ans. Yes.

§ V.—24. In this ordinance are there not both sacramental elements and sacramental actions? Ans. Yes.

25. What are the substantial signs or elements in this ordinance? Ans. Bread and wine.

26. What kind of bread should be used? Ans. Whatever is common for nourishment.

27. Why so? Ans. (1.) Because although unleavened bread was no doubt used at the first institution, as Christ used the same bread, no doubt, which was prepared for the Passover, yet he does not limit us by specifying the kind. (2.) By using the bread at hand, without specifying the kind, he virtually said, take the bread which is in common use.

§ VI.—28. Did our Lord give any directions whether the wine should be pure, or mixed with water, or for any specific kind of wine? Ans. No; he took what was at hand; indicating that we should take such as is convenient, and such as is in common use.

29. If the literal fruit of the vine could not be obtained, might drink prepared from other fruits be used? Ans. Yes; even any drink that was ordinary for nourishment.

30. But would it be lawful to take water instead of wine, on account of the intoxicating power of the latter? Ans. No; such a step is contrary to Christ's authority—an assumption of wisdom superior to that of Christ; and it is pride and will-worship.

§ VII.—31. Should all the communicants partake in both kinds? Ans. Yes.

32. Why so? Ans. (1.) It was so instituted. (2.) Our Lord expressly commands, "Drink ye all of it," Matt. xxvi. 27. (3.) They did all drink, Matt. xiv. 23. (4.) The apostle expressly teaches that both elements are to be used by all the communicants, 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26; and refers to it, 1 Cor. x. 15, 16, 21. (5.) Also because the sign should be suitable to natural nourishment.

§ VIII.—33. Is it any justification of the Papists' withholding the cup from the people, that, in the Passover, no wine was mentioned in the institution? Ans. No; the passover was not a type of the Supper, but of Christ; and wine was used in that ordinance.

34. But is not the Supper called by the name of "breaking bread;" Acts ii. 42? Ans. Yes; but it is a synecdoche; which is very common, and cannot invalidate or darken the clear evidence for communion in both elements.

35. Obj. The blood of Christ is, by concomitance, contained in the symbol of the bread? Ans. (1.) The Supper was not instituted under this view, but both body and blood are distinctly represented. (2.) If the objection were valid, the priests should not use the cup.

36. Obj. When our Lord said, "Drink ye all of it," he addressed the apostles, who were church officers? Ans. (1.) They represented the whole church; otherwise, the people are not warranted to partake of the Supper at all. (2.) But the apostle applies this ordinance to all believers; as 1 Cor. x. 15, 16, xi. 23—28.

§ IX.—37. What are the rites or actions to be observed in this ordinance? Ans. (1.) Blessing the elements. (2.) Breaking the bread. (3.) Distribution. (4.) Receiving them. (5.) Eating and drinking.

38. Are not these significant sacramental actions and signs, as well as the elements themselves? Ans. Yes.

39. Is it a sacramental action, that the minister take the elements into his hands before consecration? Ans. No; although some do it.

40. But did not our Lord do this? Ans. Yes; Matt. xxvi. 26.

41. What did this mean in his case? Ans. By this action, he indicated that he authoritatively fixed on these elements to be the signs in this ordinance.

42. Was not this act then peculiar to himself? Ans. Yes.

43. Is there any sacramental significance in it intimated in Scripture? Ans. No; it merely signified Christ's authority. In this we cannot imitate him.

44. As the consecration, then, is the first sacramental action, how is this done? Ans. By prayer, and an accompanying declaration of the institution, which may be done by reading the divine authority for it.

45. Is this blessing, or consecration, any thing different from asking a blessing on an ordinary meal? Ans. No other difference than that we pray for a blessing on each, (that is the ordinary meal or the elements,) according to their respective uses.

46. Do not the prayer and declaration of Christ's institution, set apart the elements to a holy use? Ans. Yes.

47. Is there any holiness conferred on the elements by such prayer, or consecration, except setting them apart to a holy use? Ans. No; and if any of the elements remain unused, there is no holiness in them.

48. Should not all the congregation join in the consecrating prayer, as on other occasions? Ans. Yes.

49. Should the bread and wine be blessed separately? Ans. No; Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, compared with 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25. What in Matthew seems a separate blessing, is by the apostle referred to as one.

50. Is the naming the words of institution any part of the consecration, as the Papists suppose? Ans. No; for, (1.) Our Lord spoke these words after the blessing. (2.) We cannot, without profanity, use them in the first person, as he did.

51. As to the second sacramental action—"Breaking the bread"—what does it signify? Ans. The death of Christ, or breaking of his body for us; and our communion with one another; 1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 24.

52. As to the third sacramental action—"Distribution"—should the elements be distributed to any but those present? **Ans.** No; we have no example in Scripture of sending them to those absent; and such participation would not be proper communion.

53. Though the minister alone should dispense the elements, yet may not other church officers assist in the distribution? **Ans.** Yes.

54. What is signified by the action of distribution? **Ans.** Christ's giving himself to the communicants, by his authorized ministers.

55. As to the fourth sacramental action—receiving the elements by the communicants—how is it done? **Ans.** By the hand, from the minister, and from one another; Luke xxii. 17, respecting the Pass-over cup.

56. What does this action signify? **Ans.** Receiving Christ by faith, and in communion with one another.

57. As to the fifth sacramental action—"eating and drinking—what does it signify?" **Ans.** Actually receiving Christ by faith, applying him to ourselves, and partaking of his salvation, and communion with him.

58. What is the proper posture in receiving? **Ans.** Although it is not expressly commanded, sitting is according to the Scripture example; it is becoming the names given to this ordinance; *a supper, a table, a feast*; and kneeling is generally used superstitiously.

§ X.—58. Is the breaking of the bread an important sacramental action, and necessary to be observed in the dispensation of this ordinance? **Ans.** Yes; because, (1.) It is expressly stated in the institution, Matt. xxvi. 26, and by all the three Evangelists, and recounted by Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 24, x. 16. (2.) A sacramental meaning is given to it; 1 Cor. xi. 24. (3.) The sacrament is denominated from it; 1 Cor. x. 16, Acts ii. 42.

59. Is not this sacramental action and significance, overlooked and neglected by the Popish invention of wafers? **Ans.** Yes.

60. They object that it is not necessary to observe every circumstance recorded in the institution? **Ans.** True, some actions belonged purely to the circumstances of the occasion; as the unleavened bread, which was the only bread at hand; and it first occurred at night, because it was instituted at the passover table. But there are actions which belong to the sacrament essentially, which must be observed.

61. How shall we distinguish between those things which are necessary, and those which are accidental? **Ans.** (1.) If any thing is expressly commanded, it is necessary. (2.) Whatever has a sacramental meaning given to it in Scripture, is necessary. (3.) By considering the unity of the sacrament, and its leading design, of giving and receiving; whatever has a natural and proper connexion with them, and tends to illustrate them, or carry them out, is necessary.

§ XI.—62. To whom does the administration of this sacrament properly belong? **Ans.** To gospel ministers; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, 1 Cor. iv. 1.

63. What part belongs to them? Ans. The doctrine, the blessing, and the giving.

64. Why does it belong only to them to dispense this sacrament? Ans. (1.) Because Christ committed it to those who preach the word; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. (2.) Because it is evidently among the mysteries of God, of which they are stewards, 1 Cor. iv. 1. (3.) Because the dispensation of it must be with the preaching of the word, and declaration of the institution. (4.) Because the dispensation of it must be attended with church government and discipline, which belong only to church officers. (5.) Those not commissioned by Christ have no authority. (6.) Because all abuses and corruptions would be introduced, if a promiscuous right of dispensation were given to all church members.

65. On what grounds do the Socinians and others allow the dispensation of this ordinance to church members promiscuously? Ans. On the denial of divine authority for the ministerial office.

LECTURE XXV.—MEANING OF THE SACRAMENT.

§ XVIII.—66. What do the bread and wine in this ordinance signify? Ans. The body and blood of Christ.

67. What are we to understand by the body and blood of Christ? Ans. (1.) Christ's literal body, broken for our sins, and his literal blood, shed for us. (2.) His person as Mediator—God and man. (3.) Himself as substituted for us under the law; for as thus substituted, his body was broken and blood shed. (4.) Himself in all his offices, as Prophet, Priest, and King, and Trustee of the covenant; and therefore, (5.) All the blessings of his purchase.

68. Does this sacrament only represent Christ as crucified for our contemplation and instruction? Ans. No; it also signifies his giving himself to us, and our privilege and duty of spiritual participation.

69. Does the giving of these elements by Christ's ministers, signify the same as his own giving did? Ans. Yes.

70. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) As he authorized and enjoined on them to do it, his grace and faithfulness are pledged thereby to give himself spiritually; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

71. What kind of giving is signified in this ordinance? Ans. It is a sacramental giving; which signifies, (1.) Confirming, by signs and seals, the gift declared in his word. (2.) Assuring us, and giving actual possession of himself, on our faith's receiving.

71½. Is it a giving of himself, in actual possession, to every communicant; or does the ordinance itself confer the blessing? Ans. No; for then it would cease to be a sacramental sign for confirming faith.

§ XIX.—72. How does this sacrament signify the giving and receiving of Christ in reality, and spiritually? Ans. Because Christ has appointed these outward signs to signify and seal the gift and participation of himself, and all his benef

73. Has Christ, then, constituted a union between the sign and the thing signified? **Ans.** Yes.

74. What kind of union did Christ constitute or appoint between the sign and the thing signified? **Ans.** A real, spiritual, and supernatural union.

75. Is it a natural, corporeal, or local union? **Ans.** No.

76. What would be the consequence, if it were a natural union? **Ans.** (1.) The thing signified would always accompany the sign. (2.) The sign would itself convey the thing signified. (3.) There would be no need of faith, or spiritual desire, in order to partake of Christ, and his salvation, but only an outward observance of this ordinance. (4.) There would be no need of self-examination, and no occasion for judgments on unworthy communicants.

77. What do we mean by a supernatural union? **Ans.** That the connexion between the sign and the thing signified depends on divine appointment and grace. The blessing is communicated by the Holy Spirit, according to divine arrangement.

78. What do we mean by a real union? **Ans.** That the blessing will be infallibly conveyed, according to appointment, to the believing receiver.

79. How does it appear that Christ has established such a union between the sign and the thing signified? **Ans.** (1.) From the meaning of the sign in other sacraments; Rom. iv. 11, Col. ii. 12. (2.) From Christ's assertion that it is his body and blood, and commanding to take, eat, and drink, implying an appointed spiritual participation. (3.) From the apostle's declaration, 1 Cor. x. 16, that these elements are the communion of the body and blood of Christ. (4.) From Christ's assuring us, John vi. 51—56, that those who eat his flesh and drink his blood, have an interest in his salvation. (5.) And by his declaration, John vi. 63, that "the flesh profiteth nothing," &c., a natural union is denied.

80. What is the effect of this spiritual union? **Ans.** (1.) The signs, in this ordinance, set forth to our understanding, the thing signified. (2.) They contain an offer of spiritual blessings, which accompanies the word. (3.) The sign becomes a means of conveyance of the blessing to the believing receiver; 1 Cor. x. 16. (4.) The sign thus becomes a seal of the promise to us, of our participation by faith, and of our possession on believing.

81. Do the words—"This is my body—this is my blood"—convey the idea that the elements are literally Christ's body and blood? **Ans.** No.

82. What doctrine do the Papists hold on this point? **Ans.** Transubstantiation.

83. What do they mean by this? **Ans.** That, by consecration, these elements, by a miraculous operation of God, are changed into the very body and blood of Christ.

84. What doctrine do the Lutherans hold on this point? **Ans.** Consubstantiation.

85. What do they mean by this? **Ans.** That, by consecration,

the body and blood of Christ are in, with, and under the bread and wine.

86. What would be the consequences of our participation of the elements in this ordinance, if either of these doctrines were true? **Ans.** (1.) Christ's body must be omnipresent, to be in many places at the same time—to be in heaven and on earth. (2.) We must literally eat Christ's body, and drink his blood. (3.) The elements are no more sacramental signs, but the very thing signified. (4.) Our eating and drinking would be absolutely useless; John vi. 33.

§ XX.—87. What evidence have we that no such change takes place in the elements in this ordinance? **Ans.** Besides the absurdities and errors mentioned, in which the doctrine is involved, observe, (1.) The analogy of this sacrament with all others. (2.) The institution itself. (3.) The analogy of faith. (4.) Christ's reproof of such carnal views, John vi. 63. (5.) The dictates of reason. (6.) And the ordinary use of the figure of Metonymy.

88. How does the analogy of all sacraments disprove the change of transubstantiation, and prove the doctrine of a spiritual union? **Ans.** In that the sign and the thing signified are distinct; as, (Ex. xii. 11, 12,) the Passover lamb was the Lord's passing over the houses of Israel; and, (Rom. iv. 11,) circumcision was a sign of the righteousness of faith.

89. How does the first celebration, or institution, prove a spiritual union? **Ans.** (1.) Christ, and the bread and wine, are at the table. (2.) He took the bread and wine, and gave them, &c., while his body was distinct from these—he still called them "bread" and "wine." (3.) He required the disciples to keep this in memory of him when absent. (4.) He had expressly forbidden the thought of literally eating his body and drinking his blood, John vi. 63, and accordingly this ordinance was instituted.

90. How does the analogy of faith prove the spiritual union in this sacrament? **Ans.** (1.) The Scripture teaches that Christ was but once incarnate, or born of a woman. (2.) That he suffered but once, and that only while on earth. (3.) That his body is in heaven, and to be there till the last day, Acts iii. 21. (4.) That he sits at the Father's right hand. (5.) That interest in his mediation, and spiritual communion with God, carried on by the Holy Spirit, in his supernatural influences, is the only participation of Christ enjoyed in this world, 2 Cor. v. 7.

91. How does right reason teach that it is a spiritual union, and not a carnal feeding on Christ? **Ans.** (1.) That the body, or matter, cannot be omnipresent, or present in more places than one at the same time. (2.) That it cannot occupy the same place with other matter, at the same time. (3.) That the human body is not invisible, as it would be, according to these doctrines which we oppose.

92. Do the Scripture declarations on this subject call for the rejection of the testimony of the senses? **Ans.** No.

93. How does the figure of Metonymy favour the doctrine of a

spiritual union between the sign and the thing signified in this ordinance? Ans. (1.) An appointed sign of conveyance is frequently called by the name of the thing signified; as a deed of land, &c. (2.) Such language is frequent in Scripture; as the passover, Ex. xii. 11, 12; circumcision, for the thing signified, Phil. iii. 3, Col. ii. 11; and our Lord's expressions, John vi. 35, 53, 63, &c.

94. Would the words of institution have conveyed the whole doctrine of this sacrament, had they been—This represents my body, &c.? Ans. No; these words would not have taught the spiritual union between the sign and the thing signified, nor the conveying or sealing signification, &c.

95. Is there any evidence, of any weight, for the doctrine of transubstantiation? Ans. No; it is a Popish imagination, forged by Antichrist, and held by no others.

96. Is there any weight in the consideration that Luther was an eminent reformer and servant of God, and was in favour of consubstantiation? Ans. No; he was imperfect, as others; and his mind was trammelled by the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, in which he had been educated. ~~See~~ Transubstantiation was first broached in the eighth century.

§ XXI.—97. Obj. (1.) If we deny transubstantiation, then the types of the Supper will be equal to it, and even superior? Ans. (1.) We deny that there were any types of this ordinance. (2.) The excellence of the Supper over Old Testament sacraments consists in the clearness of its symbols, and of the promises, and in its reference to a Saviour already come.

98. Obj. (2.) The corporeal presence of Christ is promised, John vi. 51? Ans. It is not his corporeal presence that is there meant, but his spiritual presence to our faith; so John vi. 63.

99. Obj. (3.) We are not at liberty to recede from the letter of the institution, saying, "This is my body," &c.? Ans. (1.) We are warranted here, and elsewhere, to take the words as a metonymy; as John vi. 63, and other passages prove. (2.) It is admitted that the *cup* is put for the *wine*. This is receding so far. The Papists recede, when they change the bread into the body of Christ; they alter the word "*is*" to "*changed into*."

100. Obj. (4.) The bread is said to be the communion of the body of Christ, 1 Cor. x. 16; and unworthy communicants are "guilty of the body and blood of Christ?" Ans. (1.) The bread is the symbolic and spiritual communion, or signifies communion with Christ crucified. (2.) Unworthy communicants are guilty of dishonouring Christ in the symbols of his body and blood. As these elements signify Christ and his benefits, so, by unbelief, a man dishonours that which they signify.

§ XXII. It is said that the Christian fathers said many things respecting the body and blood of Christ that favour Popish transubstantiation; and that it may be admitted that some of their expressions were too strong; but that they elsewhere explain themselves as meaning a spiritual participation of Christ? Ans. It may

be observed, (1.) That the fathers had not this question in agitation, and, therefore, were not so fully on their guard; and, (2.) That many of the fathers had crude ideas of some things, on which they held sentiments now universally rejected by Protestants; such as the excellence of literal virginity, &c.

§ XXIII.—101. Is there any weight in the argument that God is able to effect this change? Ans. No; because, (1.) The possibility of the thing is no proof of the fact of it. (2.) God's infinite power is no argument for the fact of a thing, unless there are other evidences for it, and we are otherwise bound to believe it.

102. Is there any kind of necessity to believe transubstantiation? Ans. No; no more than the Jews had to believe that they were called literally to eat Christ's flesh.

103. Did Christ, or his prophets, or apostles, ever call any man to believe a miracle, contrary to the testimony of his senses? Ans. No; but this is a call of the Papists to believe a miracle on no sufficient ground, and to believe it contrary to the testimony of the senses.

104. Do the Scriptures ever call us even to believe a doctrine contrary to our senses? Ans. No; they call us to believe doctrines on which our senses can give no testimony, but not contrary to our senses.

§ XXIV.—105. When transubstantiation is disproved, does it not follow that adoration of the consecrated elements is sinful? Ans. Yes.

106. Obj. (1.) Christ is present, under the appearance of bread and wine? Ans. (1.) The assertion is not true; he is not present under the appearance of these elements. But, (2.) He is really, but spiritually present, in his own ordinance; but yet the sign is not to be adored. He is really present in the preaching of the gospel, yet the ordinance is not to be adored, but he who is present in it.

107. Obj. (2.) But, on the supposition of Christ in the elements, or the literal presence of his body and blood, is it not lawful to adore him as thus supposed to be present? Ans. No; no more than the supposition that an idol is God, will justify us in worshipping the idol.

LECTURE XXVI.—WORTHY PARTAKERS—TIME AND PLACE—OBLIGATION—FREQUENCY—PURITY—AND DESIGN OF THIS ORDINANCE.

§ XII.—108. Who should be admitted to partake in this solemn ordinance? Ans. Those who make a credible profession of their faith.

109. Should infants, who are not capable of understanding this ordinance, be admitted? Ans. No; because it is an ordinance in which persons are voluntarily to devote themselves to God, and they must be capable of self-examination, and of intelligent discernment of the Lord's body.

110. Should any unbaptized adults be admitted? Ans. No; because baptism is instituted as initiating into the church, and none should be admitted who neglect previous duty.

111. Should the openly immoral be admitted? **Ans. No;** because it is a feast for Christ's friends, and for communion with him; while the openly immoral cannot enjoy that communion; nor should believers hold communion with them in this ordinance.

112. Should the openly erroneous partake? **Ans. No.**

113. Why not, if they otherwise give evidence of faith and piety? **Ans. (1.)** Because open ceremonial uncleanness of old debarred from the Passover. **(2.)** It is the church's duty to testify against such, for their correction. **(3.)** By the admission of such, the church is defiled, and becomes partaker in the sin; 1 John, 10, 11; 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15.

114. Should we make grace a term of communion? **Ans. No.**

115. Why not? **Ans. (1.)** We cannot judge the heart, and we may err either way. **(2.)** God has not given us such a rule. **(3.)** On such a rule, we might be compelled to admit many who are in open error.

116. May not even a believer be an unworthy communicant? **Ans. Yes.**

117. How so? **Ans.** By prevailing sin, for the time; not having grace in exercise; and hence the injunction to examine ourselves each time we partake.

118. Can any one partake acceptably who is not a believer? **Ans. No.**

119. Why so? **Ans.** Because it is a believing remembrance of Christ that is required, and it is an ordinance of communion with Christ; 1 Cor. x. 16.

120. Can any one partake aright who has not grace in exercise at the time? **Ans. No;** for the same reasons.

121. What special preparation are we required to use? **Ans.** Self-examination.

122. Of what should we examine ourselves? **Ans.** Of our being in Christ; of our sins and wants; of our graces—as desires, knowledge, faith, repentance, love and obedience; and of our present exercise of these graces.

123. For what purpose should we make this examination? **Ans. (1.)** To know our state, our exercises, wants, &c. **(2.)** As a means of exciting grace, and of leading to faith, prayer, and covenanting with God.

124. If we find that we have interest in Christ, and grace in exercise, may we trust in these graces for acceptance and preparation? **Ans. No;** but in Christ to sustain us, and give more grace, and grant us acceptance in himself.

125. If, on examination, we doubt of our interest in Christ, or of real gracious preparation, should we abstain from communion? **Ans. No.**

126. If conscious of guilt and prevailing sin, may we abstain? **Ans. No.**

127. Would it be proper for such a person, although he would not engage in penance, as a Popish sacrament, to abstain, and betake himself to repentance, till another occasion? **Ans. No.**

128. Why not? Ans. (1.) If he has true repentance, he is prepared for this ordinance, and should obey Christ's dying command. (2.) It is a mistaken idea that he can attain repentance without faith in Christ, and in neglect of his duty. (3.) He should betake himself to Christ in faith, confess his sin, and seek more repentance in communion with Christ.

129. May a person be admitted who is under scandal, or has given offence to the church by sin, and has not confessed it, to the satisfaction of the church? Ans. No; because he is dishonouring Christ by impenitence, and cannot hold holy communion with his brethren.

130. Should a person partake who purposes to continue in sin? Ans. No; Ps. lxxvi. 18.

131. Should those be excluded who have been guilty of gross sins, if they show penitence, to the satisfaction of the church? Ans. No; Christ invites the chief of sinners, and enjoins his church to forgive on repentance.

132. As this is an eminent ordinance of church-communion, or communion of brethren, 1 Cor. x. 16, in what have they communion with one another? Ans. In communion with Christ, and therefore communion in worship, in profession, in faith, and in practice.

133. Does it involve the doctrines of their belief and profession? Ans. Yes; because they have communion with Christ, according to the doctrines of his word; they have communion in hope, according to these doctrines, and they have communion in profession and practice according to these doctrines.

134. Is it not incongruous and contradictory, to sit down at the same table, with discordant beliefs in matters of religious faith and practice? Ans. Yes; they profess to have communion with Christ on contrary principles, and engage to Christ to pursue different courses of worship or conduct, and to sustain different doctrines.

§ XIII.—135. Where should the Supper be administered? Ans. In the public assembly, 1 Cor. xi. 18, 20.

136. Is it any matter how small the assembly be, if necessity prevents it being larger? Ans. No; Christ and his eleven disciples observed it; and Christ allows it, Matt. xviii. 20.

137. Should the elements be carried to the sick or absent for their participation? Ans. No.

138. Why not? Ans. (1.) It is inconsistent with communion in the church. (2.) It is not properly showing forth Christ's death. (3.) It encourages the erroneous notions of the Papists, that this sacrament is necessary to salvation, and that it has a saving efficacy of itself.

§ XIV.—139. On which day of the week should the Supper be dispensed? Ans. The Sabbath is preferable, as the Lord's day, and because the apostles give us this example; Acts xx. 7.

140. But if circumstances should render it impracticable to observe it on the Sabbath, might it be lawfully dispensed on another day? Ans. Yes; Christ did not limit us to the Sabbath.

141. Or is the time of day determined? Ans. No.

142. Is it determined whether it should be administered to the people while fasting, or not? Ans. No; the disciples received it after supper.

§ XV.—143. What is the necessity or obligation to observe the Supper? Ans. (1.) The divine command. (2.) For keeping up the remembrance of Christ. (3.) For our benefit.

144. Is the observance necessary to salvation? Ans. No.

145. How then explain John vi. 53, "Except ye eat—ye have no life in you?" Ans. That text does not speak of this ordinance, but of faith's participation of Christ.

146. But though the observance of the Supper is not necessary to salvation, may not the neglect of it be damning? Ans. Yes; if neglected from contempt, or from a want of reconciliation to Christ.

147. Is it incumbent on all Christians to partake? Ans. Yes; all are bound to the duty, and to use it as a means of grace.

148. But is it not incumbent on all gospel hearers, though they be not Christians? Ans. Yes; not indeed to partake while unregenerate, but to believe, repent, and observe it.

§ XVI.—149. Should this ordinance be often repeated? Ans. Yes; the institution says, "As often as ye eat," &c.

150. What reason is there in the nature of this sacrament why it should be often observed? Ans. (1.) It is a commemorative ordinance, and therefore should be frequent. (2.) It is an ordinance for our spiritual nourishment and growth in grace.

151. Do the Scriptures point out how often it should be observed? Ans. No.

152. May we not infer from this that the frequency is left to Christian prudence, according to circumstances? Ans. Yes.

153. Do Scripture histories show that the apostolic church observed the ordinance every day, as Acts ii. 46? Ans. No; that text appears to speak of common meals.

154. Do the Scriptures show that the church then observed it every Sabbath, as Acts xx. 7? Ans. No; but that they observed it on that Sabbath. And 1 Cor. xi. 17, 20, does not mean that every time they came together, they observed the Supper.

155. As Christian prudence should direct in this matter, by what rules should we determine the frequency? Ans. (1.) That in determining, the judgment be spiritual, the heart desiring the ordinance; and not carnal, counting it a burden or a hindrance to worldly gratifications. (2.) That it be observed with preparation, and due means for it. (3.) That the observance do not prevent other duties. (4.) That we do not slight or undervalue other ordinances, in the want of it. (5.) That we do not idolize it, as though it had power of itself for quickening our graces.

156. Does the admitted frequency of the observance in apostolic times, warrant or require such frequency now? Ans. No.

157. Why not? Ans. (1.) The church then was in such a state that they were more abstracted from the world than people should ordinarily be; Acts ii. 46, iv. 32-37. (2.) Their accessions to the

church were numerous and daily; Acts ii. 47. (3.) The state of the question with the Jews, whether Jesus was the promised Messiah, was then exciting. (4.) There was then a call for peculiar devotedness to the cause of Christ. (5.) There was then a call for such an *excited* remembrance of Christ as the church could not continue in; and which, when the peculiar occasion of it would be removed, she should not maintain. Her devoted remembrance should be as sincere, but less agitating. (6.) There was then peculiar need of the enlivening and strengthening of their faith.

158. Is there any example of sacramental signs being used as frequently as other ordinances? Ans. No.

159. Are not visible signs intended to make vivid impressions? Ans. Yes.

160. Is a continued state of excited feeling necessary to godliness, or even favourable to it? Ans. No; it oppresses the system, injures the bodily powers, and tends to benumb the moral sensibilities.

161. Is there not danger that a too frequent use of the most enlivening ordinance would diminish the impression of the sensible signs which belong to it? Ans. Yes.

162. Should, then, any rules be laid down by the church, fixing the frequency of this ordinance? Ans. No; to do so would be contrary to the institution,—“as often as ye eat,” &c.—except general directions.

163. May we not safely say that the annual observance is more seldom than necessary, and than other duties require; and that weekly is more frequent than is consistent with other duties, in ordinary cases? Ans. Yes.

§ XVII.—164. Are not all additions to this ordinance, beyond what Christ gave, to be accounted corruptions of it? Ans. Yes.

165. But is it not lawful to adopt every thing which is necessary to the decent observance of the ordinance, while we do not add any thing to the ordinance itself? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. xiv. 40; such as cloth for the table, dishes, tokens, &c.

166. Have not Papists added many things, which they profess are necessary, which have greatly corrupted the ordinance? Ans. Yes; some of these we may state. (1.) Prerequisites—as priests' vestments, consecration of church and altar, candlesticks, burning wax, wafers, holy water, image of the cross, incense, &c. (2.) Concomitants—as bowing, kneeling, adoration of the elements, the priest striking his breast, washing his hands, vocal and instrumental music, using the sign of the cross, sprinkling holy water, &c. (3.) Consequents—as reserving of the consecrated host, carrying it about, adoring it, &c.

§ XXV.—167. Has not this ordinance a reference both to Christ, and to us, as to its objects? Ans. Yes.

168. What is its object or design with respect to Christ? Ans. Twofold; (1.) To keep him in our remembrance; 1 Cor. xi. 24. (2.) To keep up the knowledge of him in the world; 1 Cor. xi. 26.

169. What is its object with respect to us? **Ans.** It is for several purposes. As, principal—(1.) To increase our faith. (2.) Strengthen and enliven our graces, and excite to love and duty. (3.) To promote brotherly love. (4.) To unite believers in maintaining the cause of God; and (5.) Less principal; to distinguish believers from the world.

170. Is the Supper, then, a commemorative ordinance? **Ans.** Yes.

171. What do we commemorate? **Ans.** Christ's death, humiliation, and love, and his present life and office.

172. Is it a confessing ordinance? **Ans.** Yes.

173. What do we confess? **Ans.** Our unworthiness, guilt, and impotence; Christ's excellence, love, and salvation; and our love, gratitude, and hope.

174. Is it, therefore, a eucharistic ordinance? **Ans.** Yes.

175. Is it a testifying ordinance? **Ans.** Yes; Christ testifies to us, and we for him.

176. What does Christ testify to us? **Ans.** His love, grace, and salvation, and his readiness to hold communion with us.

177. What do we testify? **Ans.** His truth and its obligation, and our faith and hope.

178. Is it a communicating ordinance? **Ans.** Yes; Christ communicates to us and we to him.

179. What does Christ communicate to us? **Ans.** His Spirit, grace, and presence.

180. What do we communicate to him? **Ans.** Gratitude and love; we declare our case, and bring our maladies to him.

181. Is it an ordinance of communion one with another? **Ans.** Yes; giving and receiving the same things, and communing with the same Saviour.

182. Is it a covenanting ordinance? **Ans.** Yes; Christ proposes to us his covenant promise and his law, and we accept, dedicate, and engage.

§ XXVI.—183. What is the doctrine of the Socinians, as to the end or design of the Supper? **Ans.** That it is only a bare profession of the Christian faith; not a seal of the covenant promises.

184. Does not the apostle, (1 Cor. x. 16,) declare that it is "the communion of the body and blood of Christ?" **Ans.** Yes; we have spoken of this before.

185. What is the doctrine of the Papists on this point? **Ans.** That it is a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

186. Wherein is this erroneous? **Ans.** (1.) It is instituted as a commemoration of the only sacrifice—Christ's atonement. (2.) This error denies the perfection of Christ's sacrifice. (3.) It introduces shadows. (4.) There is no appointed victim, altar, or priest.

PART VI.

CHAPTER XXXII.

OF THE CHURCH.

LECTURE I.—DEFINITION AND NAME—CHURCH VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE, MILITANT AND TRIUMPHANT.

§ I.—Having treated of the covenant of grace, the Mediator of it, its benefits, and its seals, it is proper to treat of that body on which these benefits are conferred.

Q. 1. Is it not necessary that every individual take an interest, for himself, in the covenant of grace, and perform the duties which are connected with it? Ans. Yes.

2. But has not Christ required that those interested in the covenant should associate together, for the enjoyment of privileges, and the performance of duties? Ans. Yes.

§ II.—3. What is this association called? Ans. *The church*.

4. Does Christ take a special interest in this associated body, called *the church*? Ans. Yes; It is his body, Eph. i. 23; he is its Head, Eph. v. 23; he loves the church, Eph. v. 25; it is his special care, Matt. xvi. 18; Isa. xlix. 16.

5. Does the believer take an interest in this associated body? Ans. Yes; Psa. li. 18; cxxxvii. 5, 6.

6. Why does the believer take an interest in the church? Ans. (1.) Because his Redeemer loves her. (2.) Because her prosperity glorifies God. (3.) Because her prosperity is for the believer's benefit; Psa. cxxii. 8. (4.) Because her prosperity is for the benefit of the world; Matt. v. 13, 14.

7. Is the church of Christ an organized body, by his appointment? Ans. Yes; he has given her laws and officers.

8. Can the believer enjoy any privilege by a church capacity, which he cannot enjoy individually? Ans. Yes; as public ordinances, and the influence of religious society.

9. Are there any duties peculiar to the church as a society? Ans. Yes; all the public social duties of religion. Although the spirit and principle of all religious duties are the same in private as in public, yet there are many acts which belong to the collective body, which do not belong to the individual; as the dispensation and receiving of public ordinances, a united public profession of religion, admission of members to communion, and discipline and government.

10. Are not many errors held respecting the church, as well as respecting the covenant of grace? Ans. Yes.

11. Is the church the fountain of the knowledge of the covenant of grace, as the Papists hold? **Ans.** No; the word of God is the fountain of divine knowledge; although the church is the repository of these oracles; Rom. iii. 2.

12. Though the church is the repository of the divine oracles, is the authority of these oracles, in any respect, dependent on the authority of the church? **Ans.** No; their authority depends on God alone; and the church, as well as individuals, is subject to their authority.

13. What is the origin of our word *church*? **Ans.** Κυριακος, (*Kuriakos*), *the Lord's*; meaning *the house of the Lord*, as the church is called, Heb. iii. 6.

14. What Greek words are generally used to signify *the Church*? **Ans.** Εκκλησια, *ecclesia*, and συναγωγή, *synagogē*.

15. What do these words originally (or by etymology,) mean? **Ans.** *Calling out, and assembling together.*

16. What is signified by the word Εκκλησια, when used for the true church? **Ans.** Those called by the Lord, out of the world.

§ III.—17. Is the word Εκκλησια, used in the New Testament, for any assembly called together, even a political one? **Ans.** Yes; Acts xix. 32, 40.

18. Though we use the word *church* for the house or place of religious assembly, is it so used in Scripture? **Ans.** No.

19. How then understand 1 Cor. xi. 18, 22, "come together in the church," where *the church* is spoken of in opposition to their own houses; or 1 Cor. xiv. 28, 34, 35, "women speak in the church?" **Ans.** The assembly in which they are met.

20. What meanings are in Scripture, attached to the word *church*, in a religious sense? **Ans.** (1.) Assembly of worshippers; 1 Cor. xi. 18, 22; xiv. 28—35. (2.) The whole visible body of Christ, in general; 1 Tim. iii. 15. (3.) Portions of the general visible body; as the church in certain countries, or particular congregations; Acts xx. 28; Rev. ii. 1, &c.; 1 Pet. v. 13; 1 Cor. xi. 28. (4.) Office-bearers in the church, Matt. xviii. 17. (5.) The elect in Christ, Matt. xvi. 18; Eph. i. 22. (6.) Glorified saints, Heb. xii. 23; Rev. vii. 9.

21. How does it appear that, in Matt. xviii. 17, the church means the office-bearers? **Ans.** (1.) Because the direction is to lay the case before those whose duty it is to judge and decide the controversy. (2.) Because Christ has committed this work to office-bearers, and not to the whole body.

22. In what sense can office-bearers be called *the church*? **Ans.** As representatives of the church in matters of discipline and government—the whole governmental part of the church.

23. How is the church of Christ on earth usually divided? **Ans.** Into visible and invisible.

§ IV.—24. What is the invisible church? **Ans.** True believers, effectually called, and united savingly to Christ.

25. Is it not this class that is most directly intended by the name *church*, when it is called "his body," Eph. i. 23; of which

he is the Head, Eph. v. 23; for which he gave himself, and which he sanctified? Ans. Yes; Eph. v. 25, 27.

25½. What is the visible church? Ans. The visible or apparent body of believers on earth.

26. Why are they called the visible church? Ans. Because they appear to be believers; as they profess the name of Christ, and outwardly obey him.

26½. Which (the visible or invisible) is most properly called the church of Christ? Ans. The invisible; as the visible church is so called, as composed of those who are apparently believers.

27. Do we mean, by the invisible church, simply the elect, or the elect as actually called, and united to Christ? Ans. The elect as called, &c.

28. What is the extent of this church as to time? Ans. All believers who have been, are, or shall be, as one body united to Christ.

29. What is its extent as to the world? Ans. True believers in every part of the world.

30. Shall all this church be saved? Ans. Yes; because he gave himself for it, sanctifies, and keeps it.

31. As the Papists plead that a visible, external body, who profess the Christian faith, partake of the sacraments, and are subject to the order and government of the church, are truly the church spoken of in the Scriptures, how does it appear that the invisible church, or believers united to Christ, are especially and properly intended by the term *church* in Scripture? Ans. (1.) Because this is truly the church, for which Christ gave himself, which he sanctifies, keeps, and saves, and of which he is the Head, Husband, &c. (2.) Because the visible body of professors of religion are called *the church*, only because they are apparently believers, or in charity counted believers. (3.) From the meaning of the word *Ecclesia*, called out; as believers are effectually called out from the world, and professors are outwardly called out, as a means of effectual calling. (4.) Because there would have been no visible body as a church, if Christ had no true church as his body and members.

32. The Papists object, (1.) That the word *church* is always, in Scripture, put for a visible society; as 1 Cor. i. 2, iv. 17? Ans. It is true, the church on earth is a visible society, but it is not called the church only on account of its visibility, but on account of that real character which the visible body apparently possesses.

33. Obj. (2.) We are taught that there are, in the church, good and bad? Ans. It is the visible church, indeed, in which such characters are; but still that body would not be called the church of Christ, if he had not a church of believers, of which they appear to be members.

34. Obj. (3.) If the church properly were only true believers, then the church would be invisible even to pastors themselves; and the elect who are as yet unbelievers, would be members of the church? Ans. (1.) As true believers should have an outward, visible character, they can, as such, be known; and the knowledge of

their saving union to Christ is not necessary to the pastors of the church. (2.) Even the elect who are yet unbelievers, are not members of Christ's invisible church; they must be not only elect, but savingly called, in order to be members of the invisible church.

§ V.—35. What things necessarily enter into a definition of the true church of Christ? Ans. (1.) That there be members. (2.) That these members be of fallen men. (3.) That they be effectually called to communion with God, according to election. (4.) That they be united to Christ. (5.) That they be united to one another. (6.) That this union be by the Spirit, as the author, faith, as the means, and love, as the bond of union, Col. iii. 14. (7.) That they be heirs of glory.

§ VI.—36. Do holy angels belong to the church? Ans. No; as they are not fallen, or redeemed.

37. But are they not said to be one family with the redeemed, and united with the church, under Christ? Ans. Yes; Eph. iii. 15, Heb. xii. 22.

38. How are they of one family with the church, through Christ, and yet not of his church? Ans. As Christ, as Mediator, is the Head and Lord of holy angels, he, by redeeming man, has brought angels and men into one company, as his family, and to communion with one another.

39. Is Christ a member of the church? Ans. No; except as the Head of the church.

40. In the church, as the true body of Christ, is there any difference of nation, age, sex, condition, or dispensation? Ans. No; Gal. iii. 28.

41. Is the invisible church numerous? Ans. Yes; Matt. viii. 11, Heb. xii. 23, Rev. vii. 9.

42. Does it appear that their number is equal to that of the world? Ans. No; as they are called a "little flock," Luke xii. 32; so Matt. vii. 13, 14, xx. 16. Nor are they equal in number to the damned, or to those externally called.

§ VII.—43. By what is the invisible church distinguished from other societies, and even from the visible church, as such? Ans. (1.) By eternal election to salvation in Christ; John x. 16, Acts ix. 15. (2.) By effectual calling, 1 Cor. i. 9. (3.) By union with God, with Christ, and with one another, 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, 1 John i. 3. (4.) By heirship to eternal glory, Acts xiii. 48.

44. What are the properties of that union which the invisible church has with God, with Christ, and with one another? Ans. (1.) Most intimate. (2.) Mutual. (3.) Inseparable. (4.) Efficacious to produce oneness of spirit.

45. How does the intimacy of that union appear? Ans. It is represented by political unions; as that of husband and wife, &c.;—natural unions; as those of the head and members, the vine and branches;—and even by the union between the persons of the God-head, John xvii. 11, 22.

46. In what consists their union with one another? Ans. (1.) In

union of interest to Christ. (2.) Participation of his salvation. (3.) They are united in spirit, by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. (4.) They are united in faith, worship, and obedience.

47. How can this union be inseparable, when there is such diversity of opinion, and even of practice, among them? Ans. On account of their imperfection in this life, their union is not in all respects perfect; but whatever truth they hold, and whatever duty they all observe, they are united in these, though nominally separate. But they must be partakers of the same salvation, and of the same Spirit of Christ, and have the same faith, so far as to have interest in Christ, if they be true church-members.

48. How may the invisible church be divided? Ans. Into militant and triumphant.

49. What is the militant church? Ans. Christ's church on earth, whose interest and obligation it is to war against indwelling sin, against Satan and the spirit of the world, Eph. vi. 12.

50. What is the church triumphant? Ans. The church, or company of believers, in heaven; having obtained victory over all enemies, Rev. vii. 9.

51. Is there still a union between the church triumphant and the church militant? Ans. Yes; they are united in Christ, in his righteousness, and in the Spirit.

52. Is there any direct communication between them? Ans. No.

LECTURE II.—CHURCH VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE—MARKS OF A TRUE CHURCH.

§ VIII.—53. May not persons belong to the invisible church of Christ who are not in her visible and external communion? Ans. Yes; as believers not yet baptized, nor perhaps expressing their faith, or desire of membership; persons supposed to be too ignorant for admission; those unjustly excommunicated; or even some justly excommunicated; and schismatics.

54. Do not the invisible church and its members, however, ordinarily possess a visible character, as the church of Christ? Ans. Yes; they have a visible character, as members of Christ's church, but the reality of their relation to Christ is invisible to us.

55. But may not their evidences of saving union to Christ be visible to us? Ans. Yes; the evidences are visible, warranting a charitable judgment; but the real grace is still unseen.

56. As the visible church is the apparent body of Christ, are they, as such, associated together under any bonds or organization? Ans. Yes; Christ has given her an existence, (Psa. cxlvii. 2,) requiring the association of her members, Psa. cxxii. 4; and has given her laws, ordinances, and officers; verse 5th.

57. In what things does he require her to associate? Ans. (1.) In profession of his name; 1 Cor. i. 10. (2.) In practice of obedience to his laws, and observance of his ordinances; Phil. i. 27.

58. How far does the visible church extend, as to time? Ans. Through all ages; Psa. lxxxix. 36, Rom. xi. 17.

59. How far, as to people? Ans. To all nations; Psa. ii. 8.
60. What is the general characteristic of the visible church? Ans. That she profess the true religion, with a corresponding practice.
61. Do infants of church-members belong to the visible church? Ans. Yes; Acts ii. 39.
62. Does the visible church, as such, enjoy any peculiar benefits? Ans. Yes.
63. What benefits? Ans. (1.) They have the oracles of God—the means of grace; Rom. iii. 2. (2.) Communion with one another in ordinances; 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. (3.) They have God's covenant promise; Eph. ii. 12, Acts ii. 39. (4.) They have God's protecting, preserving care and government; Psa. lxxxix., Isa. iv. 5, 6. (5.) They have, in their body, true believers, the salt of the earth.
64. But may not unbelievers be found in the visible church? Ans. Yes; Matt. iii. 12, xiii. 24, &c., 47, &c.
65. And is the visible church, which is composed of believers and unbelievers, called, in Scripture, the church of Christ? Ans. Yes; Matt. xiii. 24, 47, 1 Tim. iii. 15, Rev. ii. 3.
66. May the visible church, as such, be called a holy society? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. vii. 14, 1 Pet. ii. 9.
67. Why called *holy*? Ans. (1.) Because believers are in it. (2.) Because under God's covenant promise. (3.) They have divine ordinances. (4.) Because visibly separated to God, from the world.
68. How is the visible church the church of Christ, when unbelievers are in it? Ans. (1.) Because his people are in it. (2.) They are organized according to his institution. (3.) They are collected and organized by his providence. (4.) They profess his name, and outwardly follow him. (5.) They meet for his worship and sustain his cause. (6.) He takes care of them as their Head and King, for the sake of his own people in it, and for the sake of his cause in their hands; Isa. iv. 5, 6; lxxv. 8.
69. Is it to the visible church that Christ has given the ministry, divine ordinances, and all the rules of worship, government and discipline? Ans. Yes; Rom. iii. 2; Psa. cxlvii. 19, 20; Eph. iv. 11, 12; 1 Cor. xii. 28.
70. Is it to the visible church that God has made all his promises, and to which he has promised continuance, and defence from the gates of hell? Ans. Yes; Matt. xvi. 18; Psa. lxxxix.
71. Is she not then, in this character, a most important society? Ans. Yes.
72. Is not the knowledge then, of her character and laws highly important? Ans. Yes.
73. Is it not with the church, in this character, that we have to do, in applying Christ's laws and ordinances? Ans. Yes; we cannot apply them to believers, as such; not being able to know them; but to them, as well as hypocrites, as members of a visible society.
74. May not a church so far apostatize as to be a synagogue of Satan, and no longer a true church of Christ? Ans. Yes.

76. Can we expect that, in ordinary cases, believing true church members will be found in such a society? Ans. No.

77. May not a church be a *true*, though not a *pure* church? Ans. Yes.

78. What is the distinction between these two terms, as applied to the church? Ans. (1.) A pure church is always a true church; but a true church is not always a pure one. (2.) A true church is really a church of Jesus Christ, though she may have some impurities of profession or practice, which, nevertheless, do not destroy her character altogether, as a church of Christ. (3.) A pure church is one that has no error or defects, especially in her public profession and public practice.

79. Can we expect an entirely pure church on earth? Ans. No.

80. Since then a church, in some respects impure, may be a true church, is her purity or impurity an unimportant matter? Ans. No.

81. Why is it important? Ans. (1.) While Christ acknowledges Ephesus, Pergamos, and others, (Rev. ii. iii.,) to be true churches, he severely reproves and threatens them for their impurity. (2.) Impurity is disobedience, and offensive to Christ. (3.) It diminishes the church's influence in promoting piety and reformation. (4.) It provokes Christ to withdraw. (5.) It ensnares church members. (6.) It endangers the church, and the cause of God.

82. Since the visible church is an institution of Christ, and should appear to be his true church, his body purchased and effectually called by him, should she not have some characteristics by which she may be known and distinguished from a false church? Ans. Yes.

83. In laying down these marks, is it not necessary to lay down such as are peculiar to the true church, and always belong to her? Ans. Yes.

84. Should not these marks always be more manifest and known than the church herself is, whose character we try? Ans. Yes.

85. But in tracing the marks of a true church, must we not expect that these will be found in different degrees, in true churches? Ans. Yes; on account of imperfections belonging to all.

86. What is the utility of laying down, or ascertaining these marks? Ans. (1.) It promotes our separation from evil, and our closer adherence to that which is good. (2.) It will be a means of reformation in the church, and of promoting godliness. (3.) It will be a means of guarding us against snares, by the corrupt doctrines and examples found in churches.

87. What is the source from which our marks should be drawn? Ans. The word of God; and not the authority or example of men, or churches.

§ X.—88. What are the leading marks of a true church of Christ? Ans. Two—purity of doctrine, and holiness of life.

89. Can there be a true church of Christ without his true doctrine? Ans. No.

90. Why not? Ans. (1.) Christ builds his church on the rock of his truth, Matt. xvi. 18; on the foundation of apostles and pro-

phets, Eph. ii. 20. (2.) He is the Prophet and King of his church, and therefore we must receive his truth. (3.) Without saving faith, there is no union to Christ; and there is no saving faith without knowledge, and belief of his truth.

91. Is it a sufficient mark of a true church, that she holds some divine truth? Ans. No; she may do this, and be a synagogue of Satan.

92. What measure is essentially necessary to render this mark sufficient? Ans. There must be so much truth as is necessary to saving faith in Christ, and to lead to holiness of life.

93. Is not adherence to the truth, and a testimony against error, necessary to the validity of this mark of a true church? Ans. Yes; Rev. ii. 2, 13, 25.

94. Is it sufficient that the truth be preached occasionally, unless the church, as a body, maintain it? Ans. No.

95. Is the right administration of sacraments a necessary mark of a true church? Ans. Yes; as the sacraments are divine institutions, and means of communion with Christ, and of witnessing for him.

96. When are the sacraments rightly administered? Ans. (1.) When dispensed by one lawfully called to dispense the mysteries of God. (2.) When the sacraments are dispensed as Christ appointed them—in the elements appointed, and according to the doctrines of divine truth. (3.) When they are dispensed to suitable receivers.

97. Is not the Scriptural exercise of discipline, then, a necessary mark of the true church? Ans. Yes; Rev. ii. 2, &c.

98. Why is correct and faithful discipline a necessary mark? Ans. (1.) Because it is appointed and required by Christ, the Head, Matt. xxviii. 20. (2.) Because it is necessary to purity of doctrine, and to sanctity of life, in the church. (3.) It is necessary to the right dispensation of sealing ordinances, and to that testimony for Christ's truths and laws, which he requires of his church. (4.) It is necessary to her character as a witness.

99. Is it not a necessary mark, that the church have such a government as acknowledges Christ as the Head of the Church? Ans. Yes.

100. The Papists, wishing to use other marks, derived from their church, and to make it the ultimate test, object, (1.) That all churches ascribe these marks of purity of doctrine and life to themselves? Ans. It is admitted they do; but yet their pretensions must be tried by the word of God.

101. Obj. (2.) Schismatics may have these marks? Ans. (1.) What Rome calls *schismatics* may indeed have these, and be the true church. (2.) Those that are real schismatics, if they have these marks, are of the true church, though otherwise sinning.

102. Obj. (3.) These marks are less clear or less manifest than the church herself? Ans. This objection is based on the false hypothesis of the Popish church, that the authority of the church is to be the reason of our faith.

103. Obj. (4.) These marks are beyond the capacity of the com-

mon people to apprehend; and call them to exercise a judgment to which they have no right? Ans. (1.) They have a right to exercise their judgment, as accountable to God; and the word is addressed to them. (2.) They are capable of judging of these things, under the proper use of means of knowledge.

LECTURE III.—MARKS, CONTINUED.

§ XI.—104. May outward evidences of brotherly love be considered as a sufficient mark of the true church? Ans. No.

105. Why not? Ans. (1.) This is not peculiar to the true church; the worst heretics often excel in this. (2.) Outward evidences of love may be on carnal principles; as on agreement in a partisan measure; on agreement in carnal liberty; on agreement in opposing truth. (3.) Outward evidences of brotherly love may be manifest and strong for a time, and vanish, when the occasion passes away, while it has not truth and godliness for its basis.

106. Is not brotherly love one mark of the true church? Ans. Yes; John xiii. 35.

107. But since it is a mark of the true church, and yet may be found, in outward appearance, in a corrupt and apostatizing church, how shall we distinguish it as a true, or a false mark? Ans. (1.) Brotherly love, as a mark of the true church, must consist with love to Christ, the Head, which must show itself by obedience to his commands. (2.) True brotherly love must arise from the Spirit of Christ, sanctifying and guiding the members. Therefore, (3.) True brotherly love must be based on knowledge and love of Christ's truth, laws, and ordinances, on mutual evidences of the Spirit of Christ dwelling in the members, and on an engagement, by profession and practice, in maintaining the cause of Christ.

108. How explain John xiii. 35, where Christ, as some think, makes brotherly love the sole criterion of discipleship? Ans. (1.) Christ lays it down as one mark, indeed, but not the only one, of true discipleship. (2.) Christ did not, by this mark, intend to invalidate and reject other marks that he had pointed out; as faith, knowledge, love to himself and his law, and obedience to him. (3.) He did mean that they should exercise brotherly love, as his disciples, receiving his word, and obeying all his commands, John xiv. 15; Matt. xxviii. 20.

109. Is mere external holiness of life, whether practised by the members, or required by the church, a sufficient mark of the true church? Ans. No; because, (1.) The Pharisees attained great outward holiness, while they rejected Christ; and so do some Papists, Quakers, &c. (2.) False principles, rejecting Christ as righteousness, wisdom, and sanctification, may stimulate for a time, to outward holiness. (3.) True holiness must spring from evangelical principles, and therefore soundness in the faith must accompany outward holiness. (4.) Sound principles, and a sound profession are necessary to the character of the church, and to the office and ends for which Christ has organized her.

110. Is a sound profession, without outward holiness, a sufficient mark of the true church? Ans. No; Because holiness is essential to the character of the church, Heb. xii. 14. But it should be observed, (1.) That, though sound sentiments and unholiness of life are often found in individuals, they are seldom, if ever, found together in the church, as a collective body, because, with the increase of unholiness, the decrease of faith and sound profession usually keeps pace. And sound profession and pure preaching of the gospel will be blessed, in a church, for promoting holiness, at least in some of the members, and for effecting a reformation. But, (2.) The unholiness of a church, in her collective capacity, does not consist merely in the personal unholiness of her members, but in neglecting discipline, not requiring external holiness of the members, on pain of exclusion from communion, or membership. And, (3.) Therefore, if a church has a sound creed, but does not sustain it by discipline, it is not actually the creed of the church; it is not, in reality, her profession or testimony, because not sustained by that church. And therefore such a church cannot properly be said to have a sound profession, while she does not sustain it by discipline, and does not actually make it a term of communion. It is then the creed, or profession of the writers of it, but not of the church. The charge of unholiness does not lie against the church, merely because her members, personally, live in error or sin; but because she neglects discipline; as that is the church's indulgence of sin, Rev. ii. 2-6, 14, 15, 20; iii. 2-4.

111. Is perfection in profession and holiness necessary as a mark of the true church, as the Donatists hold? Ans. No.

112. Why not, since the law of God requires perfection? Ans. (1.) Perfection, in this life, is not attainable, and the mark would exclude all, and deny that Christ ever had a true church on earth. (2.) Perfection, though required by the law, is not required as necessary to the existence of a true church, any more than it is necessary to the existence of grace in the believer. (3.) Present perfection of the church is not the object of the gospel dispensation, nor of the institution of a church on earth; but rather that the visible church should contain true believers—be instrumental in convincing, converting, and edifying; and that she, as a visible society, may advance in knowledge and holiness.

113. Since no church is absolutely perfect, though a true church, and as a false church—a synagogue of Satan—may retain some Scripture truths, how shall we know what measure of truth and holiness is necessary to a true church, and what measure of error makes her a synagogue of Satan? Ans. If her profession or practice amount to a rejection of Christ, and of his free salvation, it is no church of Christ, Gal. v. 4. If her profession and practice do acknowledge and exhibit Christ and his salvation, in their Scriptural character, she may be a true church, though impure.

114. Whether is a church which is defective in her profession, on some points, having never made attainments, in her public ca-

capacity, on those points, or a church which has made those attainments, and has fallen from them, the worst? Ans. The latter; because apostate.

115. Are we in greater danger, and guilty of greater sin, in joining the latter, than the former? Ans. Yes; in the first we may effect reformation.

116. Is it sufficient to justify us in joining or adhering to a church, that she is a true church, though apostatizing? Ans. No.

117. Why not? Ans. (1.) Because we should hold fast attainments made, Phil. iii. 16. (2.) We should endeavour to advance in our attainments, but this cannot be done without holding fast what we have attained, Phil. iii. 15, 16. (3.) We should not partake in apostacy or encourage it. (4.) We should give a sound testimony for Christ. (5.) We should seek communion in the church on the very same principles on which we should seek communion with Christ personally. (6.) By joining with an apostatizing church, we provoke judgments of blindness, hardness, and unfaithfulness.

118. What marks of a true church have the Papists laid down? Ans. Fifteen; viz., (1.) Catholic. (2.) Its antiquity. (3.) Uninterrupted succession of bishops from the apostles. (4.) Uninterrupted duration of the church. (5.) Extent, or amplitude. (6.) Agreement in doctrine with the ancient church. (7.) Union of the members and the temporal head. (8.) Holiness of the doctrine. (9.) Its efficacy. (10.) Holiness of the clergy. (11.) Miracles. (12.) Prophecy. (13.) Confessions of adversaries in her favour. (14.) Miserable end of her enemies. (15.) Temporal prosperity.

119. Do these agree with the Scripture marks? Ans. (1.) Some of them, rightly explained, do; as 2, 6, 8, 9. (2.) Some of them may agree with a false church; as 4, 5, 7, 15. (3.) Some of them do not agree with the true church at all times; as 1, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. (4.) Some of them are neither manifest nor true; as the 3d. (5.) Some of them are made for the Roman Catholic church, and yet do not apply; as 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.

§ XII.—120. Is the church of Rome now a true church? Ans. No.

121. On what accounts do we deny it to be a true church? Ans. (1.) Its errors; especially denying justification and sanctification by Christ alone, their doctrine of the sacraments, of intercessors, &c. (2.) Their idolatry—of the mass, of mediators, images, &c. (3.) Their impiety—of uncleanness of priests, of falsehood, covetousness, pride, presumption, &c.

122. Obj. (1.) They are called a Christian church? Ans. (1.) Because they profess to be Christians. (2.) Because of some Christian truth retained by them.

123. Obj. (2.) They believe the apostles' creed, the Lord's prayer, and the Decalogue, and therefore they are a true church? Ans. Though they adhere to them in the letter, they do not in their true sense.

124. Obj. (3.) Our fathers, we believe, were saved, in that church? Ans. (1.) That church had not then come to such a height of apostacy as now. (2.) They might have been in their external commu-

nion, and not in an inward and universal communion with them. (3.) We doubt not that a person who is a true believer may be in external communion with a society which is not a true church of Christ.

125. Do not the above Scriptural marks of a true church prove the Protestant church to be the true church of Christ? Ans. Yes; the true doctrines and sacraments, maintained by discipline and a government acknowledging Christ as Head of the church, are found in her, and not in the Popish church.

§ XIII.—126. The Papists, through prejudice, made personal objections to the reformers; as that their private lives were immoral, and the Protestant church was low in outward condition. If even their charges against the private life of the reformers were true, and the outward condition of the church were low, were these valid objections to the reformation? Ans. No; (1.) We do not admit their charges against the reformers generally. (2.) If some were immoral, this did not condemn their doctrine. (3.) And the apostolic church was low in outward condition.

127. They object, (1.) That the Protestant church had no antiquity—that it did not exist before Zuinglius and Luther? Ans. (1.) It did not, as a particular church, but it did, as one in doctrine, in spirit, and in all the essentials of the church, with that of the apostles. (2.) It even existed during the whole apostacy of the church of Rome, as the church in the wilderness, Rev. xii. 6; consisting of members even in the communion of the Popish church, but holding sound doctrines, and of small bodies, such as Waldenses, &c., who were witnesses under Papal persecutions.

128. Obj. (2.) The Protestant separation from the church of Rome was schismatical? Ans. (1.) It was visibly so; but, (2.) Such a schism is a duty, and was required of Christ's people, Rev. xviii. 4. (3.) It was not a schism in the sense which is condemned in the Scripture—a separation from the true church, for insufficient reasons. It was the true church separating from a synagogue of Satan. The Popish church were the schismatics; having, by apostacy, separated from the true church.

129. Obj. (3.) Our doctrines, (as of the decrees,) making God the author of sin, are blasphemous, and that of free justification through Christ is impious; indulging licentiousness? Ans. These charges are false, by a false inference from our doctrines.

130. Obj. (4.) The Protestant church is not the church of Christ, as it lacks unity, by divisions? Ans. (1.) Perfect unity is not to be expected generally in this world. (2.) Various Protestant divisions are united in their doctrines and practice, in general. (3.) Heretics, denying the truth of the gospel, are themselves schismatics, and do not make the Protestant church schismatics. They are not in reality the Protestant church. (4.) Though there are many controversies in the Popish church, yet even their apparent unity, effected by fear and civil power, and violence, and by denying the right of private judgment, is not a real unity, nor the unity which Christ requires in his church, 1 Cor. i. 10.

131. Obj. (5.) The Protestant ministers have not a legitimate call to the ministerial office? Ans. (1.) Some of the Reformers had the office in the Popish church, and carried it with them. (2.) Others had it by a call from the people, who seceded from Popery.

132. But if those reformers who had the ministerial office in the church of Rome, were by them deposed, how could they exercise their office as Protestants? Ans. (1.) No doubt their deposition by the Papists took away their right to minister in that church, as members of it, but it could not take away their right to minister to a Protestant people, calling them to exercise their office of ministering the truth to which they had been ordained. (2.) The call of the people conferred the office, when, by the peculiarities of their circumstances, they could not have Presbyterian ordination.

133. Obj. (6.) The Protestant church has encouraged and established independency, civil and ecclesiastical? Ans. (1.) It does declare independence of the civil and ecclesiastical tyranny of the church of Rome. But, (2.) It maintains the doctrine of civil subjection to all lawful civil commands of the magistrate, and of ecclesiastical subjection to the spiritual authority and order which Christ has appointed in his church.

133½. What is the original authority for the ministerial office? Ans. Christ's call.

134. By what means is that call indicated? Ans. By the Presbytery, and ultimately by the people.

LECTURE IV.—MARKS CONTINUED.—PERPETUITY, AND ENEMIES OF THE CHURCH.

§ XIV.—134½. Is it right to join in communion with heretics? Ans. No.

135. Why should we not? Ans. (1.) By communion, we partake in their sins, 2 John 10, 11; 1 Cor. x. 17—20. (2.) It is dangerous to our souls, perverting our faith, and provoking God to withdraw his Spirit and presence from us, 1 Cor. x. 21, 22. (3.) We encourage apostacy, and endanger the cause of God by such communion. (4.) We do not, in such case, give due testimony against error, and those who hold it.

136. Is it dangerous and sinful to live in communion with the Roman Catholic church, especially under the light of Protestantism? Ans. Yes.

137. But should we separate from the true church for every error found in her, or for every act of mal-administration, if she be not apostatizing, but reforming? Ans. No; Rev. ii., iii.

138. But should we not separate, even from a branch of the true church, if apostatizing, or perseveringly holding error, or indulging it? Ans. Yes.

139. Will it justify us in continuing in an apostatizing church, that she does not by her profession or discipline, bind us to profess error, or to commit sin? Ans. No.

140. Why not? Ans. Because we should not only be negatively

sound, in our testimony, maintaining no error, but we should maintain a positive profession of the truth. A church may be sinfully defective, that professes no error.

§ XV.—141. Should not union among the members be a characteristic of the church of Christ? Ans. Yes.

142. Why is this an important characteristic? Ans. Because, (1.) Christ requires it, 1 Cor. x. 17. (2.) It promotes grace and holiness. (3.) It is calculated to gain members from the world. (4.) Her testimony for Christ will be more influential. (5.) Her union is becoming the unity of her Head, of her faith, and of the Spirit who pervades her.

143. In what should her unity consist? Ans. (1.) In faith, 1 Cor. i. 10, Phil. i. 27. (2.) In profession, Rom. xv. 6. (3.) In action and effort, Phil. i. 27. (4.) In external communion, 1 Cor. x. 16, &c.

144. But will union in outward communion be justifiable where there is not unity in faith, profession and practice? Ans. No; it is hypocrisy, and is a sinful preference of outward communion to the cause of Christ and his truth, and a neglect of duty as witnesses for Christ.

145. Should not this union be cultivated in worshipping assemblies? Ans. Yes.

146. And should not our union in worshipping assemblies be a testimony to our unity of sentiment and practice? Ans. Yes.

147. What is the special time for these assemblies? Ans. The Sabbath.

148. Is it any matter where, so that it be convenient? Ans. No; one place is now no more holy than another.

149. What should be the exercise in these assemblies? Ans. All public ordinances of Christ's appointment; as the reading and preaching of the word, public prayer and praise, the sacraments, almsgiving and benediction.

150. Is the attendance on these public assemblies so necessary, that the want of them, on particular occasions, destroys the outward unity of the church? Ans. No; sometimes attendance is impossible; sometimes it would be improper, through infirmity, or in times of persecution; and sometimes it would be sinful, where we have no opportunity, except where the truth or ordinances are corrupted; Prov. xix. 27.

151. Is not the neglect sinful, when Providence gives us opportunity, agreeably to his institutions? Ans. Yes; Heb. x. 25.

§ XVI.—152. Though the church is, in this world, imperfect, and liable to err, yet is not her continued existence secured? Ans. Yes; Ps. lxxxix. 29, 36.

153. Is she secured from fatal errors? Ans. Yes; Matt. xvi. 18.

154. But do these promises secure the continuance and purity of any particular church? Ans. No; but a church somewhere in the world; Matt. iii. 9, 10.

155. Does not the church of Rome claim infallibility to itself? Ans. Yes; in doctrine, not in practice.

156. In whom do they hold that the infallibility resides? Ans. Some say, in the Pope; others, in a council; others, in the Pope and councils.

157. Obj. (1.) They plead, in favour of their infallibility, Matt. x. 19, 20; that the Holy Spirit would speak in or through his church? Ans. This was a promise especially to the apostles, and first teachers under the new dispensation, as a special security to them, in planting the church, and giving the canon of Scripture; and is not applicable to others, except as a general promise of assistance.

158. Obj. (2.) They plead John xvi. 13; that the Spirit will guide into all truth; and Matt. xxviii. 20? Ans. (1.) It was a promise to the apostles, as infallible teachers. (2.) It includes a promise of guidance to all believers, to the saving knowledge of divine truth; and so far in doctrinal knowledge as is necessary to their salvation; which promise to believers, as all such promises are, is only to be fulfilled consistently with their condition in this world; so Matt. xxviii. 20.

159. Obj. (3.) The credit and authority of the church is degraded by denying to her infallibility? Ans. (1.) Her character should not be sustained by falsehood. (2.) It is her glory to be humble, and to live by faith on such guidance as God has promised.

§ XVII.—160. Is it the lot of the church, in this world, to be tried with afflictions? Ans. Yes.

161. What would appear to be the design of these? Ans. To purge her, 1 Cor. xi. 19, 1 John ii. 19; to instruct her, Ps. cxix. 71; to make her more faithful and circumspect, more humble and watchful, and heaven more desirable.

162. Are there not many kinds of troubles to the church? Ans. Yes; as particular or universal—internal or external to the church—spiritual or temporal—sent of God immediately or mediately.

163. What are the chief of them? Ans. Schisms, heresies, and persecutions.

164. What is a schism? Ans. Either withdrawing from a church, and organizing a separate party, or stirring up strifes to make parties in her, 1 Cor. i. 10—12, iii. 3, 4.

165. What is heresy? Ans. Errors, denying or overturning the truth of Christ, 2 Pet. ii. 1; either perverting the truth, in the communion of the church, or making sects for the support of error, 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2, 1 Cor. xi. 19.

166. From what do these troubles, of schisms and heresies, arise? Ans. From the imperfection of the church and her members, from natural depravity, blindness, unbelief, and enmity to the truth and law of God.

167. Are persecutions among the trials of the church? Ans. Yes; as the church has sadly experienced, and as was foretold by our Lord and his apostles, John xv. 20, 21, xvi. 1, 2, 2 Tim. iii. 12.

168. With what kind of persecutions has the church been tried? Ans. With the tongue and the sword, reproaches, and outward opposition against the church's profession, and against her members.

169. From what do these troubles arise? Ans. From enmity to Christ, to his cause, and his people; John xv. 19—21.

§ XVIII.—170. Do not such calamities prove that the church has enemies? Ans. Yes.

171. Do these enemies of the church become her enemies because of her vices, faults, or unfaithfulness? Ans. No; God may suffer enemies to punish her, as a means, in his hand, of chastising her for her faults; but their enmity is because of her holiness, and conformity to Christ, John xv. 19.

172. Who is the chief enemy of the church? Ans. Satan, 1 Pet. v. 8.

173. Who are his chief subordinates? Ans. The men of the world, John xv. 18—21.

174. What means does Satan employ, as the church's enemy? Ans. Persecution of tongue and sword, Rev. ii. 10; xii. 10; open error, wiles and seductions, &c.

LECTURE V.—ANTICHRIST—THE MILLENIUM.

§ XIX.—175. Who has proved to be the special enemy of the church, under Satan? Ans. Antichrist.

176. What does *Antichrist* mean? Ans. One in opposition to Christ.

177. In what ways may Antichrist set himself in opposition to Christ? Ans. (1.) By open opposition. (2.) By presenting himself as a substitute for Christ. (3.) By presenting himself as one equal to Christ. So the word *anti* means.

178. Are not all enemies to the truth enemies to Christ, and Antichrists? Ans. Yes; 1 John ii. 18.

179. But do not the Scriptures predict one Antichrist, by way of eminence? Ans. Yes; 1 John ii. 18; iv. 3.

180. Are we warranted to apply this name, and the Scripture predictions of Antichrist, to the church of Rome? Ans. Yes; or more directly to the order of Popes, as the head of Antichrist.

181. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the fact that the Pope answers to the name Antichrist. He calls himself the vicar, or substitute of Christ—equal to Christ—the Lord God the Pope; and is an adversary of Christ. (2.) From Paul's description of him, 2 Thess. ii. 2—14. This description answers minutely to him, and to no other, in all its points. In verse 3d, he is revealed, or manifested as rising out of an apostacy, or decline in the church; verse 4th, "He exalteth himself above all that is called God,—sitteth in the temple, as God, &c.;" verse 7th, Pagan Rome "let," or hindered his manifestation for a time, but when taken away, Antichrist was to appear; verses 8th and 9th, "signs and lying wonders;" and verse 10th, "deceivableness of unrighteousness." (3.) From various descriptions in the Revelation; as Rev. xi. 7, his power, and his hatred of the witnesses, as a beast; as Pagan Rome had been described by Daniel; xiii. 11, he had horns like a lamb, and spake as a dragon; verse 12th, he exercises the power of the

first beast, Pagan Rome, and causes to worship the first beast; verse 14th, he uses false miracles; xvii. 1, 6, 7, 9, the whore sitting on many waters; drunk with the blood of the saints; the beast which carried her had seven heads and ten horns; sitting on seven mountains, &c.; xiii. 18, the number of his name.

§ XX.—182. How do the Papists evade the charge of being the special Antichrist, as above described? Ans. They apply these things to an individual man, of the tribe of Dan, who is to arise. Their application of texts in support of this is unworthy of notice.

183. Are Gog and Magog the Antichrist spoken of in Scripture? Ans. They are indeed Antichrist, but not that special Antichrist spoken of by Paul, as the Man of sin, 2 Thess. ii., and in the Revelation.

184. Who are meant by Gog and Magog? Ans. (1.) In Ezek. xxxviii.; xxxix., it means, primarily, enemies of the Jews, after their return from Babylon. (2.) These enemies as typical of Antichrist. (3.) In Revelation, it means apostates, after the Millenium, of the same spirit with Ezekiel's Gog and Magog, and to have a similar end.

§ XXI.—185. What is the effect of these various calamities on the church, with respect to her visibility? Ans. They often obscure her.

186. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From history; as at the time of the flood, of Abraham, of some of the kings of Judah. (2.) From predictions respecting the New Testament church; as Rev. xii. 6, 14, the woman fleeing into the wilderness. (3.) From the actual experience of the New Testament church.

187. As the Popish church was, for many centuries, outwardly flourishing, in numbers, wealth, power, &c., and the true church was in the wilderness, and obscure, they wish from this to draw inferences favourable to themselves; and they say, (1.) That there are many promises of perpetuity and of outward splendour, to the New Testament church? Ans. (1.) As to the perpetuity of the church, the promise is fulfilled, even when she is in obscurity. (2.) The promised splendour (as Isa. lx. 1, 2,) is only promised at certain times; as appears from history, and predictions of her obscurity at certain times.

188. Obj. (2.) The church's splendour is set forth by comparing her to a candlestick, a mountain, and a city on a hill? Ans. (1.) All these similitudes are consistent with degrees of obscurity; as the candlestick may be put under a bushel; a mountain or a city may be hidden for a time. But, (2.) These similitudes are rather intended to show what the church should be, than what she always is, to outward appearance.

189. Obj. (3.) An open and public profession of faith, and visible union to the true church, are necessary, and the want of these proves them not to be the true church? Ans. (1.) It is not true that no one can belong to the true church, without an open, public profession. (2.) There may be a profession of faith in a very obscure

church; as in Abraham's time, &c. (3.) There may be union with the true church, when the external union is with a very obscure church; as in the families of Noah, Abraham, &c.

§ XXII.—190. Will the church, however low, still exist in the world? Ans. Yes.

191. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) It is promised, *Psa. lxxii. 5, 17; lxxxix. 36, 37.* (2.) The power, wisdom, and faithfulness of Christ, secure it. (3.) From the continuance of Christ's present administration till the end of time, *1 Cor. xv. 25.*

192. The Socinians hold that the church may cease; and argue for this, (1.) That the church sometimes disappears? Ans. (1.) It has never entirely disappeared. (2.) Though at times the church was so low that the world did not observe her, she still existed in some quarter.

193. They argue (2.) That sometimes faith would be destroyed, or would not exist, *Luke xviii. 8;* and the pure worship of God would cease, and thus the church be extinct? Ans. These passages speak comparatively; intimating the fewness of the numbers of believers, and the preponderance of false worshippers; and the latter text rather supposes the existence of the church, by defining the characters who shall worship the beast.

194. They argue, from *Rom. xi. 20, 21,* and *Rev. ii. 5,* that particular churches are threatened with utter extinction? Ans. The removal of the church from one place and nation to another, is not its annihilation. Christ will preserve his church, but has not engaged to keep it in any one place.

§ XXIII.—195. Will not the church always emerge from calamities and obscurity, as well as the believer from declines? Ans. Yes.

196. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the past history of the church. (2.) From promises; as *Isa. lix. 20, Hos. i. 10, 11.* (3.) From the grace and faithfulness of God.

197. Are we warranted to expect a greater revival to come than has yet appeared? Ans. Yes.

198. What is that time usually called? Ans. The Millenium.

199. From what does this name originate? Ans. From *Rev. xx. 2-7.*

200. What may we expect of the Jews in that revival? Ans. Their general conversion to Christianity.

201. How does it appear that there will be a general conversion of the Jews? Ans. (1.) From many predictions, *Isa. xi. 12, Hos. i. 10, 11, 2 Cor. iii. 16, Rom. xi. 12, 26.* (2.) Their present state is incompatible with these promises, and therefore will be changed by their conversion. (3.) God's covenant with Abraham seems to demand this, *Rom. xi. 28, 29.* (4.) Their continued preservation as a distinct people intimates this.

202. Will this conversion include the ten tribes, as well as the Jews? Ans. Yes; *Isa. xi. 12, 13, Hos. i. 11.*

§ XXIV.—203. Do we know the time or manner of the Jews'

conversion? Ans. No; not precisely; but it will be about the commencement of the millenium; and will no doubt be a most manifest work, Rom. xi. 12, 15.

204. Are we to expect that, on their conversion, they will return to their own land? Ans. No.

205. Why not, since they expect it, and many promises seem to favour their expectation? Ans. (1.) Because the sceptre is finally taken away from Judah, and the continuance of David's reign is fulfilled in Christ's New Testament government, Luke i. 32, 33, Acts ii. 30. (2.) Because of prophecies of perpetual suppression as a distinct nation, Isa. xxiv. 20, xxv. 2, Ezek. xvi. 53, 55, Hos. i. 4, 6. (3.) Because, in New Testament times, and in the recalling of the Jews, the distinction of nations is taken away, Isa. xix. 19, 24, Mal. i. 11, Gal. iii. 28. (4.) Because the designs of giving the land of Canaan to Israel of old, no longer exist. These designs were, (a.) For a distinction between them and other nations; (b.) That they might observe the whole ceremonial law; (c.) That they might keep the judicial law, and a civil government, in order to enjoy their peculiar worship. (5.) Because all parts of the world are equally holy now; John iv. 21. (6.) Because all prophecies of their return to their own land, either signify their literal return from captivity in Babylon, or a spiritual return, expressed in Old Testament figures.

206. Obj. (1.) The land of Palestine was promised to Abraham for an everlasting inheritance; Gen. xvii. 8? Ans. (1.) That promise was fulfilled long ago. (2.) That eternity was a limited one; limited to the period of the old dispensation, as circumcision was; Gen. xvii. 13.

207. Obj. (2.) There are many prophecies that they shall return to their own land; as Lev. xxvi. 42, Deut. xxx. 3, 4, Jer. xxx. 3, 9, 18, Ezek. xx. 40, xxxvi. 10, 11, xxxvii. 12, 14, Zech. viii. 8? Ans. (1.) Some of these texts respect the restoration from the Babylonish captivity. (2.) Some of them respect a spiritual return; as they speak of David as their king, and as similar passages, respecting the priesthood and sacrifices, and new moons, must be explained of spiritual services; as Jer. xxxiii. 18, Isa. lvi. 21, 23.

208. Obj. (3.) Jerusalem shall be trodden under foot until the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled; Luke xxi. 24; intimating that then the Jews would return? Ans. (1.) This may mean the end of the world. But, (2.) If not, yet, on the conversion of all the Gentiles, with the Jews, Jerusalem would cease to be profaned.

§ XXV.—209. Should not the expected conversion of the Jews lead us to favour them? Ans. Yes.

210. Wherein? Ans. By giving them a peaceable life among us, using diligencē for their conversion, and removing impediments; such as civil oppressions, reproaches, immoralities, idolatries, &c.

LECTURE VI.—MILLENIUM CONTINUED—PERIODS OF THE CHURCH.

§ XXVI.—211. What other important events may we expect to accompany the general conversion of the Jews? Ans. (1.) The

general accession of the Gentiles to the church. (2.) The fall and final overthrow of Antichrist. (3.) The greater prosperity and happiness of the church.

212. How does it appear that the accession of the Gentiles will be general at that time? Ans. From Scripture prophecy; as Dan. ii. 35; Zech. xiv. 9. If Christ's name and government be one throughout all the world, the Gentiles will be embraced in the church; Rom. xi. 12, 15, 25, 26; the fulness of the Gentiles will be advancing till that period, verse 25th; but the Jews' recovery shall be "the riches of the Gentiles," verse 12th; "Life from the dead," verse 15th; a revival, even to the church, in practical godliness.

213. How does it appear that Popery shall then fall? Ans. (1.) From prophecy; 2 Thess. ii. 8; Rev. xvii. 16; xviii. 2. (2.) From the nature of the thing; such a prevalence of the Kingdom of Christ must be the overthrow of his enemies.

214. Does it not also follow that Mohammedanism must fall at the same time? Ans. Yes; and for similar reasons. It appears, moreover, that Rev. ix. 14, under the sixth trumpet, predicts the rise of Mohammed; and that Rev. xvi. 12, under the sixth vial, predicts the fall of that system.

215. Wherein may we expect the prosperity of the church to appear? Ans. In the greater outpouring of the Spirit; Joel ii. 28; Isa. xi. 2, showing itself, (1.) In effecting the general conversion of Jews and Gentiles. (2.) By the suppression of the enemies of truth and godliness, Isa. xi. 6—9. (3.) By the revival of decaying religion; Rom. xi. 15; Rev. xx. 4; and of a testimony for the truth; Rev. xi. 11. (4.) By a pure dispensation of word and ordinances; Isa. xi. 6—9. (5.) Great outward peace in the church and the world; Isa. xi. 6—9.

§ XXVII.—216. Are we warranted to expect a perfect purity, and perfect peace, in the church, in the Millenium? Ans. No; Isa. xi. 6—9; it is only comparative; and we are warned that there must be heresies and tribulation. And though, in that time, much wickedness will be suppressed and abated, yet sin will still be in the world; and there will be the wolf and the leopard; Isa. xi.

217. Can we know the precise time, or manner of introduction of the Millenium? Ans. No.

218. Will the end of the world take place in the Millenium? Ans. No; Rev. xx. 7—9; Matt. xxiv. 37—39; Luke xviii. 8.

§ XXVIII.—219. How long will the Millenium continue? 1000, or 365,000 years? Ans. Only 1000 years, literally.

220. Why not 360,000, or 365,000 years, since, in the Revelation, a day is generally put for a year? Ans. (1.) A year, meaning a measured time by the sun, is not used as symbolical language in Scripture. It is, in Rev. xx. 2, *ετη*, (*etē*) years, as a time measured by the sun. But, in Rev. ix. 15, where we have the word year as symbolical, it is not *ετη* (*etē*) but *ενιαυτον*, (*eniauton*) a revolution; so John xi. 49, 51; or anniversary, Gal. iv. 10. It

is this word, bearing this sense, that is the *year*, in symbolical language. (2.) A year was the largest period known as a measure of time, and was not used as symbolical language; but a *day* for a *year* was used in symbolical language; as in a map, inches, or eighths of an inch, for a mile—the less for the greater. (3.) In symbolical language, when the description of the period must be repeated, another form of expression is used; as Rev. xi. 2, 3, “forty-two months,” and “twelve hundred and sixty days,” are the same time; and again, Rev. xii. 6, 14, “twelve hundred and sixty days,” are the same as “a time, times, and a half a time,” instead of saying—a year, years, (meaning *two*,) and half a year,—1260 days; while, in common language, the same terms are repeated in each kind, for plainness. (4.) To take the 1000 years symbolically, makes the world to be yet but beginning; while the whole tenor of Scripture leads us to believe that we are in the latter ages. (5.) We believe the continuance of the world in such prosperity, would fill the earth with human beings, beyond the means of subsistence; and there would not be room for them.

221. Should we suppose that the Millenium will be precisely 1000 years? Ans. No; it is probably a definite time put for an indefinite; or to mark a great period of time; and probably nearly the length of time included in 1000 years.

222. Should we believe that there will, in the Millenium, be a literal resurrection of the martyrs, as some suppose, from Rev. xx. 4, 5? Ans. No.

223. Why not? Ans. (1.) It is inconsistent with the doctrine of the resurrection, which teaches that there will be a universal resurrection at the last day, and at the same time; as John vi. 39, 40, 44; 1 Thess. iv. 15—18; 1 Cor. xv. 50—52; and this latter text makes no exception, but of those alive. (2.) It is particularly stated that, at the last day, the martyrs will be raised; which is inconsistent with their resurrection 1000 years before; 1 Cor. xv. 28—32. (3.) After the Millenium, there will be a great apostacy, and these martyrs would be again exposed.

224. Should we believe that, in the Millenium, Christ will personally reign on earth? Ans. No; he will not be personally present.

225. Why not; since Rev. xx. 4, 6, seems to intimate this? Ans. (1.) Because the same passage, if it signify Christ's personal reign on earth, would also signify a resurrection of the martyrs at the beginning of the Millenium, which we have just disproved. (2.) Because it would be contrary to Christ's declarations, “My Kingdom is not of this world,” John xviii. 36; “It cometh not with observation,” Luke xvii. 20; and to the apostle's doctrine, 2 Cor. iv. 18; for then it would be “seen and temporal.” (3.) Because Christ will return to this world, in personal appearance, but once; Acts i. 11, iii. 21; Heb. ix. 28; and that at the last day. (4.) Because all error and sin will not be banished from the church in the Millenium, nor all wicked persons; Isa. xi. 6—9; nor all calamities,

John xvi. 33; which things would be inconsistent with Christ's personal reign on earth, in his glorified state. (5.) We are assured, in Scripture, that the present New Testament form of dispensation shall continue to the end of the world; which it would not do, if Christ should reign personally and visibly on the earth; Eph. i. 19—23; 1 Cor. xv. 24—28; Matt. xxviii. 20. And, accordingly it is called "the last time," in reference to the dispensation; 1 Cor. x. 11; 1 John ii. 18. (6.) Because the crown is to be given to believers at the last day, and not in the Millenium; 2 Thess. i. 6—10; 2 Tim. iv. 8; Mark x. 30. (7.) Because, as there must be a great apostacy after the Millenium, Christ must either witness that apostacy, in his personal reign, or return to heaven, and come a third time, of which the Scriptures give no hint. (8.) Because all the passages relied on, to prove the personal reign, should, consistently with the analogy of faith, and all symbolical language, be explained in a spiritual sense and application.

And, passing over all other texts quoted by Millenarians, to support their theory, such as Dan. ii. 44, vii. 13, 14; Acts i. 6, 7, iii. 19—21; which should all be explained spiritually, we shall notice the special one, on which they rely particularly;—Rev. xx. 2—6.

226. What are we to understand, (verse 4th) by *thrones*? Ans. The government of the church established—"They sat on them;" Psa. cxxii. 5.

227. What by "judgment given to them?" Ans. Either—led to exercise judicial judgment in church courts, or Christ's judgment in his providence, manifesting their character, and giving them their place to which he had appointed them, and from which the enemies of religion had driven them.

228. What by "the souls of them who were beheaded?" Ans. The martyrs; not in person, but in their successors; as John the Baptist was Elijah;—not individually or numerically the same, but in doctrine, in spirit, and in the same cause.

229. What by "living and reigning with Christ?" Ans. (1.) Their character was cleared and relieved from slanders formerly heaped on them. (2.) Others, of their sentiment and spirit, arose as their successors, to sustain the same cause, the cause of Christ; so John the Baptist was Elijah; and so the witnesses, Rev. xi. 11. (3.) They, by profession and practice, had overcome the opponents of the truth; and so they reigned, &c. (4.) "With Christ," means—in his cause, and with his gracious presence, promised, Matt. xxviii. 20; and, under his government, carrying on his work in the world.

230. What by "the first resurrection," verses 4, 6? Ans. (1.) Individual regeneration. This is a resurrection, Rom. vi. 4, 5; Col. ii. 12. (2.) The public revival of the church, by the conversion of Jews and Gentiles—*first*, as great above all other revivals; same texts.

231. What by "the rest of the dead lived not again," &c., verse 5th? Ans. (1.) Those dead in sin, and who had persecuted the

church. (2.) Having formerly had power and influence, they have no successors in the Millenium, who have political power and influence; but, after the Millenium, they attained it for a little season; that is, they were politically dead only during the Millenium.

§ XXIX.—232. Into how many periods may we divide the visible church? Ans. Into two; the typical and the plain, or the old and new dispensations.

233. Has not the church, on the whole, been on the advance, with regard to light and privilege? Ans. Yes.

§ XXX.—234. Should we hold that the seven epistles to the churches of Asia, or the seven seals, seven trumpets, and seven vials, intimate seven periods of the New Testament church? Ans. No; it is fancy. The epistles are intended to instruct the church in her duty in every age; and the seventh seal includes the seven trumpets, Rev. viii. 1, 2; and the seventh trumpet includes the seven vials, Rev. xi. 15, compared with xvi. 1, 17.

235. Are not blessings and curses, light and darkness, persecutions and victories, intermixed in those revelations, and in providence? Ans. Yes.

§ XXXI.—236. Though the whole book of the Revelation is called a *prophecy*, (chap. i. 3,) does this imply that every part is prophetic? Ans. No; because inspired teaching is called by the general name of prophecy; 2 Pet. i. 20, 21.

237. Is there any reason to believe that the names of the cities where the seven churches of Asia were, are mystical? Ans. No; no more than names of other places in Scripture generally. When a mystical meaning is intended, there is some intimation of it. Here there is none.

238. Is it any reason why we should count these epistles prophetic, that the name of Jezebel is mystically used? Ans. No; the name represents certain characters.

239. Is it any reason why we should account these epistles prophetic of certain periods, that the closing of them, as well as of the whole Revelation, is general? Ans. No; it is rather a proof that they are not prophetic of certain periods, but rather intended to apply to all periods.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

LECTURE VII.—CHRIST HAS GIVEN HIS CHURCH A GOVERNMENT. WHAT IS CHURCH GOVERNMENT?

We shall consider church government in the following order. (1.) Did Christ give a specific form of government to his church? (2.) What is church government, and what does it include? (3.) When did he give it, and who were the governors of old? (4.) Is the

New Testament church government modelled on the Old? (5.) The Scripture qualifications of church governors. (6.) What kind of government—monarchical, congregational, or presbyterial? (7.) What are its leading principles?

§ § I., II.—Q. 1. Did Christ give a form of government to the church? Ans. Yes.

2. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From the necessity of it. (2.) From history. (3.) From the doctrines respecting it in Scripture.

3. Why is government in the church necessary? Ans. (1.) Because of human depravity, error, and sin. (2.) In order to union in action:

4. Is it not necessary to every society of intelligent beings, to have a government? Ans. Yes; it is necessary to unity of action.

5. How does it appear from the history of the church, in Scripture, that Christ gave her a government? Ans. Because the Scripture history of the Old and New Testaments, clearly represents the church as under a government.

6. Do not the names of *pastors, bishops, rulers, elders, &c.*, necessarily imply a government in the church? Ans. Yes.

7. Does not the history of admissions to the church, exclusions, and censures, necessarily imply a church government? Ans. Yes.

8. Does not every Scripture rule of church government imply a government given to her? Ans. Yes.

9. Is the government of the church expressly said to be a gift of Christ? Ans. Yes; Acts xx. 28; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11.

10. Is the government of the church common to her and to civil society? Ans. No; it is peculiar to her—a peculiar kind of government.

11. Why is it peculiar? Ans. Because, (1.) She is a peculiar society. (2.) She has peculiar duties. (3.) Peculiar privileges. (4.) Peculiar laws. (5.) A peculiar relation to Christ, and the members have a peculiar relation one to another.

12. Is the kind of government which the church should have, an important matter? Ans. Yes.

13. Why so? Ans. To maintain her purity, peace, and unity, to avoid tyranny, and to enjoy the blessing.

14. Is it reasonable, then, to suppose that Christ would have his church to devise a form of government for herself, and that he would specify or ordain none? Ans. No.

15. Is it proper to call church officers *ecclesiastics* or *clergy*, by way of distinction from the people? Ans. No; not with the design for which the distinction was made—making them exclusively *clergy*, &c.

16. Why is it not proper? Ans. Because all God's people are *church-men*, or *ecclesiastics*; and they are God's *lot, inheritance*, and *portion*, as the word *clergy* means, Deut. xxxii. 9; 1 Pet. v. 3. Yet it may not be improper, if not applied to them as an invidious distinction, or to gratify pride, but as representatives of the church; so Matt. xviii. 17; Acts i. 17, 25.

17. What do we call that government which is peculiar to the church? Ans. Ecclesiastical, or church government.

18. Is it a government peculiar to her interests, her duties, and her relation to Christ? Ans. Yes.

19. What is the general character of church government, as Christ gave it? Is it ministerial or legislative? Ans. It is properly ministerial.

20. What do we understand by *ministerial*? Ans. Administering Christ's laws; not legislating.

21. Why should it be ministerial, and not legislative? Ans. Because Christ alone is her Head and Lawgiver; and her part in government is to administer these laws.

22. But may not church officers legislate in some things? Ans. Yes; so far as adopting laws or rules for regulating the external affairs of the church, and such as are necessary to her order, in conformity to the laws of Christ.

23. Is not her government, in these respects, political? Ans. Yes.

24. Does economical (family) government properly belong to the government of the church? Ans. No; family government is in it, not of it, or over it.

25. Might political and economical (family) government be substituted for ecclesiastical, and supersede it? Ans. No.

26. Why not? Ans. (1.) Political government is not of such a nature as to regulate the church's duty, or to guard her interests; and its officers are not qualified for the work. (2.) Economical government cannot reach the collective body, and could not effect unity.

§ XIX.—27. Is church government, as given by Christ, merely consultative and persuasive, or is it a power of efficient action and authority? Ans. It is authoritative and efficient.

28. Why not merely consultative and persuasive? Ans. (1.) It would then be no government at all. (2.) It would not consist with Scripture representations of the church's government.

29. How does it appear from Scripture, that Christ gave actual authority and power to church officers? Ans. (1.) Under the old dispensation, they could cut off a person from the church; could actually exclude the unclean, &c., Deut. xxiii. 2, 3; Ezek. xliv. 7—9. (2.) Under the new dispensation, they have similar power; as appears, (a.) From the unity of the Old and New Testament church, from the fact that there is no repeal of former powers and privileges, and the equal necessity of such a power in the new dispensation, as in the old, in order to the peace and purity of the church. (b.) From the nature and design of the ministry in the church, requiring this power, 2 Cor. x. 8; xiii. 10. (c.) The keys are given; a sign of power, Matt. xviii. 17, 18; xvi. 19. (d.) From the names given to ministers, and other church officers; as "overseers," "governments," &c.; implying efficient power, Acts xx. 28; 1 Cor. xii. 28. (e.) From prohibitions to admit to church membership,

commendations for excluding some, and reproofs for retaining the unworthy; all implying efficient power in the church officers, 2 Thess. iii. 14; Rev. ii. 2, 14, 15. (f.) From the obedience and subjection to church rulers, which is required, Heb. xiii. 17.

30. Do not Socinians, Latitudinarians, and Erastians, deny this power in the church? Ans. Yes.

31. On what grounds do Socinians and Latitudinarians deny it? Ans. They deny the office of the ministry, as called by Christ, and the institution of church government properly by him.

32. On what grounds do Erastians deny it? Ans. They claim all authority in the church, and over it, for the civil magistrate.

33. They object, (1.) That such power and authority is inconsistent with the prohibition of lordship over God's heritage, 1 Peter v. 3? Ans. That prohibition forbids tyranny; but the authority in the church, as appointed of Christ, is ministerial only.

34. Obj. (2.) This authority and efficient power are inconsistent with that humility and brotherly love which are required by Christ? Ans. Humility and brotherly love must not annihilate obligation to other duties. And such efficient power belongs to the civil magistrate, and yet is not inconsistent with brotherly love.

35. Obj. (3.) Such power and authority in the church are inconsistent with civil authority—erecting one government within another; which must limit and oppose it? Ans. Civil and ecclesiastical authority do not oppose or limit one another; not being of the same nature, or for the same ends.

§ XVII.—36. Does the power of church government extend to temporal, or worldly things? Ans. Not properly.

37. Does it not extend to that property which is voluntarily given to the church? Ans. Yes; as appears from the office of Deacons, Acts vi. 2, 3; and the admitted principle, that the higher office includes the inferior.

38. But do the political affairs of nations, the decision of lawsuits, or the direction of men's lawful ordinary business, belong to church government? Ans. No; John xviii. 36, Luke xii. 13, 14.

39. But if there be any thing immoral in the government of nations, in lawsuits, or in private business, does it not belong to the church to notice it? Ans. Yes; the morality of actions belongs to her jurisdiction, but not their mere civil or political character.

40. Has she authority, then, to annul or suspend civil laws, or decisions, that are sinful? Ans. No; she can only oppose them ecclesiastically, testify against them, and censure her members who are guilty of them, Matt. xx. 25, 26.

41. Has she any authority over men except as her members? Ans. No.

42. Are not church members bound to subjection to civil magistrates? Ans. Yes; Rom. xiii. 1; in all things properly civil, or political.

43. Obj. (1.) In Matt. xxviii. 18, Christ claims all power in heaven and in earth; and, therefore, his church has that power over

even civil magistrates? Ans. (1.) Christ claims that power as Lord of all, which his church cannot have. (2.) Christ does not, as Mediator, exercise civil government; although he is Lord over all civil governments, Luke xii. 13, 14, John xviii. 36, Eph. i. 22.

44. Obj. (2.) If the church has no civil power, she cannot defend herself? Ans. (1.) As a church, her object, her power, and her weapons, are spiritual; and for her proper objects she needs no defence but that which is spiritual. (2.) As to her civil rights, of pursuing her proper objects without civil hinderance, her members may look to the civil magistrate.

45. Obj. (3.) As the priests of old governed in temporal things, (as Jehoiada and Azariah,) church officers should do so now? Ans. (1.) Under the old dispensation, the civil government being a theocracy, the priests had to give judgment according to laws of God, which, at least in part, formed the civil code; but now, civil and ecclesiastical things are more separated. (2.) Some cases, as of Jehoiada, were extraordinary, and the steps they took in civil affairs were their duty as men, and not as priests. And Azariah's conduct was in fact ecclesiastical over Uzziah as a church-member. (3.) The civil government has authority over church members as men, and the church has authority over men, and even over civil officers, when they are church-members, only as church-members.

46. Obj. (4.) Peter exercised civil power over Ananias and Sapphira; Acts v.; and Paul over Elymas the sorcerer; Acts xiii. 11? Ans. These were acts of miraculous power, and could be no rule to the church.

LECTURE VIII.—WHAT IS CHURCH GOVERNMENT?

§ XVIII.—47. Has the church the power of dispensing with the Divine law, either for herself, or for any of her members? Ans. No; James iv. 12.

48. Has she the power of remitting sins, as committed against God? Ans. No; it is absurd.

49. What then is meant in Matt. xviii. 18, John xx. 23, by the right of remitting or retaining sins? Ans. (1.) Declaring remission, &c., according to the word, or the doctrines of pardon and condemnation. (2.) Exercising church censures, and absolution.

50. Have church officers authority to make laws to bind the conscience, as a rule of faith, or of religious worship? Ans. No; James iv. 12, Deut. iv. 2, Rev. xxii. 18, 19; although they may make laws respecting mere order, for conducting the affairs of the church according to the word; 1 Cor. xiv. 40. And they have authority judicially and ministerially to declare the laws of God, which are binding on the conscience, by divine authority; Acts xv. 6—29, 1 Cor. iv. 1.

51. Would not legislation in matters of faith and worship, be contrary to the liberty of believers? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. vii. 23.

52. Obj. (1.) The priests of old made laws to bind the conscience; Deut. xvii. 10, 12? Ans. This is a misrepresentation of

that passage; they only gave judgment according to the law; verse 12th.

53. Obj. (2.) The apostles legislated, and laid down laws of faith and practice; Matt. xvi. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 2; and therefore church courts should do so? Ans. So far as they gave rules of faith and practice, they did it as apostles for Christ, and as such they have no successors.

54. Obj. (3.) The command of obedience to those that rule in the church, (Heb. xiii. 17,) implies the power of making laws? Ans. Not so; only power of judging by the law.

§ XX.—*Power of Church Officers.*—55. How is the power of church government usually divided, or distinguished? Ans. It is threefold; (1.) *Dogmatic*; or power of doctrine. (2.) *Critical*; or power of jurisdiction, or discipline. (3.) *Diatactic*; or the power of forming rules for the better management of worship and government in the church.

56. Is not *doctrine* a mode of government? Ans. Yes.

57. Does not this power include the whole exercise of the ministry, in leading the public prayers, in public preaching, and in the dispensation of the sacraments? Ans. Yes; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, 1 Tim. iv. 13–16.

58. Have ministers a right to interpret the Scriptures, and authoritatively to declare their doctrines, and to apply them? Ans. Yes; Neh. viii. 8; Acts viii. 34, 35; Rom. xii. 6.

59. Does this authority, if perverted, bind the conscience to receive unsound doctrine? Ans. No; Jer. xxiii. 16, 21, 32; Rom. xii. 6.

60. Do the sound interpretations of Scripture, by the ministry, lay any obligation on the hearer? Ans. Yes; the ministry is an ordinance of God, for applying Scripture.

61. Have ministers authority to reprove error or sin, and that in a special application to persons? Ans. Yes; 1 Tim. v. 20; 2 Tim. iv. 2; Tit. i. 10–13.

62. Have church officers a right to defend and maintain the truth judicially, or by judicial decisions, stating the truth, and condemning error? Ans. Yes.

63. May this be done by church courts, or ministers, and other church officers, in a collective capacity? Ans. Yes.

64. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) The power of interpreting the Scripture, which each minister has, must be possessed by them collectively. (2.) What the ministers severally have a right to teach and enjoin, they have a right to teach and enjoin collectively. (3.) What they have a right to utter and enjoin verbally and individually, they have a right to utter and enjoin collectively in a permanent form. (4.) Without such collective statements of the truth, or judicial decisions, their individual teachings would lack that harmony and unity which is required; Rom. xv. 6; 1 Cor. i. 10; Phil. i. 27. (5.) The ministers collectively, or in court, are the pastors of the church; as appears from Rev. ii. 1–3; all the

seven epistles to the seven angels, or presbyteries; so Acts xx. 17—28. (6.) The Scriptures directly teach that church officers should maintain the truth judicially; as Matt. xviii. 18—20, showing that the judgment or decision is by a court; so the epistles to the seven churches, Rev. ii. iii.; so Scripture example; Deut. xvii. 9—13; Acts xv. 6—22.

65. Are such decisions obligatory on the people? Ans. Yes; so far as sound.

66. Is there any additional obligation by these decisions, beyond the authority of the truth in the Scriptures? Ans. Yes; although these decisions give no additional authority, they lay an additional obligation, by the same divine authority; because it is a divine ordinance, giving further light, and a testimony by the officers of the church.

67. Have church officers anything further to do with the truth, and with these judicial decisions, in the government of the church? Ans. Yes; they should exercise actual discipline, according to these decisions.

LECTURE IX.—CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

§ XXI.—68. Is the power of discipline a power of jurisdiction? Ans. Yes; of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

69. What things are included in this discipline, or ecclesiastical jurisdiction? Ans. Several things; as, formal charges of error or sin; authoritative citation of the guilty, or of witnesses; trial; authoritative sentence, and the execution of it.

70. How does it appear that the exercise of discipline in the church includes all these items of jurisdiction? Ans. Because if discipline is to be exercised efficiently, there must be the power of citation, trial, giving sentence, and executing it; otherwise, the whole power is null.

71. Is this power to be exercised by a church officer individually, or by a court of church officers, collectively? Ans. Not, in ordinary cases, by an individual, but by a court.

72. Why by a court, and not by an individual? Ans. (1.) Because such power was not, in ordinary cases, given to an individual, under the old dispensation, but to a court—the Sanhedrim; Num. xi. 16, &c.; Deut. xvii. 9—12. (2.) Because Christ makes it a principle of the government which he has appointed, that there be a plurality; Matt. xviii. 17—20; and so, Acts xx. 28, all the elders were to take heed to all the flock, &c.

73. How does it appear that Christ has given to his church courts such an authoritative power of discipline? Ans. (1.) From this efficient power being actually given and exercised under the old dispensation; Deut. xvii. 8—12; Ezra x. 8. (2.) From the power expressly given by our Lord, Matt. xviii. 17, 18; John xx. 23, of binding and loosing, retaining and remitting sins, and of holding a former church member, now obstinate, as a heathen man and a publican. (3.) From the injunction to “Keep no company

with an offender," 2 Thess. iii. 14; not to receive such a one, 2 John 10; to reject a heretic, Tit. iii. 10; to deliver such a one to Satan, 1 Cor. v. 5—7; and that the church put him away, 1 Cor. v. 13. (4.) From approved examples of exercising such authority, Rev. ii. 2, 3; and reproofs for neglecting it, Rev. ii. 14, 15, 20. (5.) From the necessity of such power, in order to give any validity or utility to church government at all, in order to the preservation and purity of the church, to prevent just reproach, and for the good of offenders, to bring them to repentance.

74. Could church officers exclude the most unworthy, without authoritative discipline, both judicial and executive? Ans. No.

75. Have they a right to inflict civil punishments in church discipline? Ans. No; their "weapons are not carnal."

76. What are the censures competent to the church court, in the exercise of discipline? Ans. Judicial admonitions and warning, 2 Thess. iii. 15; Tit. iii. 10; rebuke, 1 Tim. v. 20; excommunication, 2 Thess. iii. 14.

77. How many kinds of excommunication do the Scriptures warrant? Ans. Two; the less and the greater.

78. What is the lesser excommunication? Ans. Suspension from sealing ordinances, while the person is still a member of the church; 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15.

79. What is the greater excommunication? Ans. Casting wholly out of the church, and wholly dissolving his relation to it as a member; Matt. xviii. 17; 1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Tim. i. 20.

80. For what causes, or on what grounds, should this sentence be passed? Ans. Generally, for gross sins, and impenitence in them; but even for lesser crimes, if persisted in with impenitence, and after a due use of means for repentance; Matt. xviii. 15—17.

81. Does this sentence determine the person's state before God? Ans. No; only his relation to the church.

82. Does any sentence, whatever, of retaining or remitting sins, by the church, determine the person's state before God? Ans. No; it determines only his guilt or acquittal before the church.

83. Was the higher excommunication, expressed by delivering over the person to Satan, (1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Tim. i. 20,) an act peculiar to apostolic power? Ans. No; it is competent to ordinary church courts; as appears from Matt. xviii. 17; and even from 1 Cor. v. 4—7, where the apostle blames the church for not doing it, and expressly requires them to put away from them that wicked person, verse 13th; and in 2 Cor. ii. 6, it is called "a punishment inflicted of many."

84. Did any miraculous operation attend the act, as done by the apostles? Ans. No; delivering him to Satan, was only declaring him no more a member of the church, but visibly a member of Satan's kingdom.

85. What is "the destruction of the flesh," spoken of in this act? Ans. It is the mortification of sin, which is often called *the flesh*; that is, the act is for the sinner's good, and as a means of repentance and salvation.

86. Should this sentence be passed, as some think, only when the sin is so aggravated as to leave no ground of charitable hope for the person's state of grace? Ans. No; the apostle had hope of the person whom he excommunicated. And, besides, the principle assumed in the question places discipline on a false ground—the person's secret state before God, whereas all church discipline refers to outward character and conduct, and to outward relation to the visible church. And, moreover, the principle is hazardous, and to act on it is a presuming assumption of God's prerogative of judging the state, and pronouncing on it with authority.

87. Do not Erastians and Latitudinarians oppose the doctrine and practice of authoritative church discipline? Ans. Yes.

88. On what ground do the Erastians deny it? Ans. (1.) That punishment belongs only to the civil magistrate. (2.) That the church's power is only consultative and persuasive, and that all authoritative censures belong to the civil magistrate.

89. But is church discipline a proper punishment? Ans. No; it is not vindictive, but for correction, and for the good of the individual, and of the church.

90. Could the magistrate exercise church discipline, without exercising the keys of church government, and assuming the ministerial office in the church? Ans. No.

91. Latitudinarians oppose authoritative discipline in the church, and allow only the discipline of moral influence. They object (1.) That Christ did not cast out Judas? Ans. Our Lord would not, in his personal ministry, dissolve a man's relation to the visible church, on his own knowledge of the heart, but on external manifestations, setting his church an example; Matt. xiii. 29.

92. Obj. (2.) Church discipline is forbidden by the parable of the tares; Matt. xiii. 29, 30? Ans. That parable only forbids our judging the heart, and granting or refusing church membership on that ground; or sifting out hypocrites who make a credible profession.

§ XXII.—93. Who are the subjects of ecclesiastical discipline? Ans. Men, as individuals, and as members of the church.

94. Should the church exercise discipline, or inflict censures on the dead, as the Papists do? Ans. No.

95. Why not? Ans. Because the end or design is to benefit offenders; 1 Cor. v. 5; 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15.

96. Has the church authority to exercise discipline on the men of the world, who are not church members? Ans. No; 1 Cor. v. 12, 13.

97. Has the church authority to exercise discipline on baptized persons, though they be not in full communion? Ans. Yes; they are "within;" 1 Cor. v. 12.

98. On what ground should discipline be exercised against any individual? Ans. On the ground of error or sin; Matt. xviii. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 14; 1 Tim. i. 19, 20; Rev. ii. 14.

99. May censure be inflicted on an individual, on suspicion, with-

out trial and proof? Ans. No; Deut. xiii. 14, xvii. 4; Matt. xviii. 16; Tit. iii. 10.

100. Should discipline be exercised, then, on collective bodies of men, or societies? Ans. No; because all Scripture examples are of individuals; and the charge should be special, and proved on the individual.

101. But may not the church declare societies, or bodies of men, out of her communion? Ans. Yes; but, to reject any individual applying for communion, a charge must be made and proved against him individually.

102. As, then, censure should be inflicted only on a specific charge and proof, is not the church bound to observe all those rules of trial which are necessary in order to ascertain the truth of the charge, and to attain justice? Ans. Yes.

103. Are not censures of different degrees? Ans. Yes.

104. How may we judge of the proper degree of censure in any particular case? Ans. It should be suited to the offence, and the disposition manifested by the offender.

105. But may not the highest censure be inflicted for a crime which is less aggravated in itself, if it be persisted in, to the wounding of the church, proving the person's impenitence? Ans. Yes; Matt. xviii. 14—18.

106. Does not only the persisting in an offence, but the repetition of it, deserve higher censure? Ans. Yes; Tit. iii. 10.

107. Should not all discipline be exercised with as much tenderness as the case will admit? Ans. Yes.

108. Should church censures include the infliction of civil penalties, or affect the offender's property, worldly business, or worldly relations? Ans. No; the end and the means are spiritual.

109. Should any censure affect our civil association with offenders? Ans. No; 1 Cor. v. 9—11; although it ought, in some cases, to affect our particular sociability with them; 1 Cor. v. 9—11; 2 John 10.

110. Does any church censure cut off the offender from teaching ordinances? Ans. No; all are welcome to these; teaching ordinances are not defiled or vitiated by their attendance.

111. Does any church censure affect, or change, or determine the offender's state before God? Ans. No; but merely his relation to the visible church.

112. Has censure or discipline any other design besides the offender's benefit? Ans. Yes.

113. What other designs? Ans. (1.) The good of others; Deut. xvii. 13; 1 Tim. v. 20. (2.) A testimony to Christ's truth and law; Ezek. xliv. 6—12; Gal. ii. 5. (3.) And, therefore, the glory of God; Isa. lii. 5; Mal. ii. 17.

114. Is the exercise of discipline, then, necessary in the church? Ans. Yes; it is necessary for peace, purity, edification, maintaining the truth, guarding members from sin and apostacy, for glorifying God, and escaping judgments.

115. What is the rule of discipline? Ans. The word of God is

the only rule, both as to the grounds of censure, and the censure to be imposed.

116. What is the process to be observed in private and personal offences? Ans. Private admonition, &c.; Matt. xviii. 15—17.

117. Might not this rule of process be useful in public offences? Ans. Yes.

118. If, in private offences, private dealing succeed in bringing the offender to repentance, should the offended party carry the matter any further? Ans. No; Matt. xviii. 15.

119. If private dealing bring the public offender to repentance, should the process stop there? Ans. No.

120. Why not? Ans. Because the satisfaction given should be as public as the offence.

121. Should public satisfaction be required for a private offence? Ans. No; unless the obstinacy of the offender make it public.

LECTURE X.—POWER OF ORDER.—AUTHORITY NOT FROM CIVIL MAGISTRATE.—INSTITUTION OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT.

§ XXIII.—*Of the power of Order.*—122. Has the church the power of making laws of this kind? Ans. Yes.

123. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) The Old Testament church did so, Neh. x. 32. (2.) Paul commanded it, 1 Cor. xi. 33, 34; xiv. 40; 1 Tim. iii. 15.

124. Does this power extend to instituted ordinances of worship, or rules of faith? Ans. No.

125. Would not such a power as this, in the church, interfere with Christ's Lordship, and with the people's conscience? Ans. Yes.

126. Must all these regulations, made by the church, agree with the word of God in their object, principles, and provisions? Ans. Yes.

127. What is the principle by which the church should be guided in making these laws? Ans. (1.) That they be necessary in order to the keeping of some divine command. (2.) That the command necessarily implies some such rule or order. (3.) That if several regulations be in our power, adapted to the keeping of the divine command, the church should choose the most convenient.

128. What regard is due to such regulations, when made by the church? Ans. We should make conscience to obey, because, (1.) They are agreeable to the word of God. (2.) Obedience is necessary in order to the peace, good order, and edification of the church. (3.) Reverence or respect is due to the power by which they are ordained, as an ordinance of God for that purpose, Matt. xviii. 17—20.

129. Would these rules be agreeable to the word of God, if they interfered with the just power of the civil magistrate? Ans. No.

130. Or should the church be deterred from making necessary rules, because of unlawful encroachments by the civil magistrate? Ans. No.

131. Should there not be great caution in forming these rules, and in their observance, and in enforcing them, lest they interfere with conscience? Ans. Yes.

132. But should the church be deterred from making and enforcing rules, necessary in order to the keeping of any divine command, because some consciences may take exceptions? Ans. No.

The *Ecclesiastical Canons*, often spoken of, are the ecclesiastical canons and decrees of Popes, first published, as a digest, in the latter part of the twelfth century, and afterwards enlarged from time to time. The professors of the *canon law* were called *canonists*. Their design was to laud the Pope and exalt his power.

§ XXIV.—133. Is the whole, or any part of the power of government, in the church, derived from the civil magistrate? Ans. No.

134. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) It is all derived from Christ; 2 Cor. v. 20; but civil magistracy is not of Christ, as Mediator. (2.) Christ conferred the power on church officers, and on them only; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. (3.) The qualifications of a civil magistrate do not qualify him for ecclesiastical government. (4.) He is chosen by people who are not church-members, and who cannot confer ecclesiastical power, Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18; John xx. 21—23. Christ specifies church officers; the magistrate is not named; the power cannot be equal in both. He gave all the keys to church officers. Church officers had power before a Christian magistrate existed. (5.) Christ does not allow the weapons, proper to a civil magistrate, to be employed in church affairs, 2 Cor. x. 4. (6.) As the civil magistrate has not this authority, he cannot convey it. (7.) It must often be exercised against the will of the magistrate, as Acts iv. 19; v. 29.

135. Is any part of the government of the church in the hand of the civil magistrate? Ans. No; the whole power to dispense the word, is committed to the pastors, or ministers, in the church; and the power of discipline, of judicially declaring the truths and laws of Christ, and of framing laws of order in the church, to ministers and others, to whom the power of ruling is committed.

§ IX.—136. Is there any express, or formal institution of church government, in the New Testament? Ans. No; only references to it, and examples of it; because it was formerly instituted.

137. Did Christ give a church government under the Old Testament dispensation? Ans. Yes.

138. Did the government of the church then contain all the powers, of the word, discipline, and order, as well as now? Ans. Yes.

139. Was the government of the church, under the old dispensation, wholly a temple government? Ans. No; there was a temple service, and a synagogue service, distinct from one another; and so the governments, in these two services, were distinct.

140. What was the subject or matter of the temple government? Ans. The succession of priests, the right performance of the common rites, the exclusion of the unclean from the holy things of the temple service, &c.

141. Was that government to continue in New Testament times? **Ans.** No; for that service was to be abolished.

142. Was the government connected with the synagogue service, a moral government? **Ans.** Yes; as appears from what they did in that government; as "cutting off," Deut. xvii. 8—13.

143. As that government was ecclesiastical and moral, was it continued under the New Testament dispensation, substantially? **Ans.** Yes.

144. Would references to ecclesiastical government, and incidental examples have been given, without any formal institution of it in the New Testament, if the same government, instituted in the Old, were not continued? **Ans.** No.

145. What are some of those references to church government, and examples of it, in the New Testament, which prove its previous existence? **Ans.** Matt. xviii. 17; Acts xv.; 2 Thess. iii. 14; Rev. ii. 2; xiv. 20.

146. Is not the continuation of the former institution of church government the reason that there is no formal institution of it in the New Testament? **Ans.** Yes.

147. Who held the government of the church, under the Old Testament? **Ans.** Prophets; as extraordinary teachers, ordinary teaching priests, Levites, and scribes, Hos. iv. 6; Ezra vii. 6, 10; Mal. ii. 7; and the Sanhedrim, Num. xi. 16, 17.

148. Was there but one Sanhedrim, under the Old Testament; or were there two? **Ans.** It appears that there were either two Sanhedrims—one civil, and the other ecclesiastical—or the same Sanhedrim for both purposes, with different presidents, or moderators, Deut. xvii.; 2 Chron. xix. 8—11. That there were two Sanhedrims—one civil, and the other ecclesiastical—is probable, from Ex. xviii. 13—26, where one Sanhedrim was appointed for civil purposes; and Num. xi. 16, 17, where another was appointed for ecclesiastical causes; and Jer. xxvi. 8—11, where we have two opposing councils; the ecclesiastical, to put Jeremiah to death, and the civil, to save his life; and John xviii. 31; having lost the civil government, they could not, as an ecclesiastical Sanhedrim, put any one to death.

149. As the civil government of the Jews was a Theocracy, was this ecclesiastical Sanhedrim a mixture of civil and ecclesiastical authority? **Ans.** No; not properly. But, (1.) As the civil government was a Theocracy, the civil magistrate could require the holding of the ecclesiastical courts; 2 Chron. xix. 8—11; but he could take no part in their deliberations or decisions; Deut. xvii. 8—12. (2.) And, as, under that Theocracy, many offences were punishable with civil penalties, the ecclesiastical Sanhedrim had power to judge of these matters, but not to execute the civil penalties; Jer. xxvi. 8—11, John xviii. 31. (3.) And we may infer that, while the execution of the civil penalty was left with the magistrate, or the civil Sanhedrim, the civil Sanhedrim, or magistrate could not interfere with the ecclesiastical Sanhedrim, in executing the spiritual penalty; John ix. 34.

150. Before the giving of the law by Moses, who exercised the government in the church? Ans. The Patriarchs; as Abraham, &c.

151. Were not some of these ecclesiastical governors, under the old dispensation, extraordinary and occasional? Ans. Yes; the prophets.

152. What part of the government of the church belonged to the prophets? Ans. The ministry of the word: although they might, as occasion required, exercise further power; as Samuel, Elisha, &c.

153. Did those prophets merely foretell future events? Ans. No; they also gave instructions in gospel truth and moral duty; as David, Solomon, Isaiah, &c.

154. How did they prove their commission? Ans. By miracles; and by delivering messages agreeably to the Scriptures, which they previously had.

155. Were a prophet's pretensions to be believed, if contrary to the written law? Ans. No; Deut. xiii. 1, &c.

156. Had the Jewish church an ordinary government, besides the prophets? Ans. Yes; as the ordinary teaching priests, Levites, and scribes, and the Sanhedrim; Ezek. viii. 1, Ezra x. 15, 16.

157. What was the Sanhedrim? Ans. Seventy elders; Num. xi. 16, 17.

158. Are we to suppose that there were no inferior courts? Ans. No; in Ezra x. 15, 16, it appears to be a smaller court; and so, in their several synagogues, we may infer an inferior court.

These views of Old Testament church government, sustain the doctrines, that Christ gave a government to the church; that the government was conducted by officers, and did not belong to the people; nor was it in the hand of one individual.

LECTURE XI. OFFICERS OF THE CHURCH, &c.

159. Is the New Testament Church government modelled on the Old? Ans. Yes.

160. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) There is no repeal of the former mode of church government; only the civil government, and that of the temple, are abolished. (2.) Our Lord assumes the continued existence of the former mode; Matt. xviii. 17. (3.) There is no special and formal institution of a form of church government, in the New Testament, but references to church government as given. (4.) The apostles practised church government, (Acts xv.) without representing it as a new thing. (5.) Directions are given, in the New Testament, to church officers, and to churches, which require substantially the same form of government as of old; as reproof, rebuking, trying, cutting off, feeding, &c.; Matt. xviii. 15—17; Acts xx. 28; Rev. ii., iii.

161. Wherein are the government of the old dispensation, and that of the new, alike? Ans. (1.) Both governed by a plurality. (2.) By officers equal in governing power. (3.) In the teachers in the church taking part in the government; Lev. x. 11; Ezek. xliv. 24; Heb. xiii. 7, 17. (4.) In laymen, or elders, being associated in government; Deut. xvii., priests and judges; Num. xi. 16, compared with 1 Tim. v. 17; Ezra x. 14, 15; Acts xv. 6.

§ X.—162. Were there both extraordinary and ordinary church officers in the New Testament church, at first, as in the Old? Ans. Yes.

163. Who were the extraordinary officers? Ans. Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists.

164. What does the title of *Apostle* mean? Ans. *One sent*;—an accredited ambassador. Thus even Christ is called an Apostle, (Heb. iii. 1,) on account of his mission. Persons sent on ordinary business, and not inspired, were so called; 2 Cor. viii. 23; Phil. ii. 25. Yet inspired apostles were so called, by way of eminence.

165. What was peculiar to the apostles, as teachers and governors in the church? Ans. (1.) An immediate call of Christ to the work. (2.) That they had seen Christ; Acts i. 21, 1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8. (3.) They were supernaturally inspired, to teach divine truth infallibly. (4.) They had the power of miracles, and of discerning spirits. (5.) They had power to give rules and regulations to the church.

166. Who were the prophets? Ans. Those endued with power to foretell future events, Acts. xxi. 10, 11; to explain and apply the Scriptures infallibly, Rom. xii. 6, 7. This name was no doubt also given to ordinary teachers; 1 Cor. xiv. 3. But ordinarily it signified inspired teachers.

167. Who were the evangelists? Ans. Those who attended the apostles, and assisted them; and some of them had supernatural power; Luke x. 1, 17; some of them wrote by inspiration; as Mark and Luke; some of them laboured only as assistants to the apostles, 2 Tim. iv. 5.

168. Had Apostles, Prophets, or Evangelists, any successors in their peculiar office? Ans. No; they were necessary in order to complete the canon of Scripture, to set up and organize the New Testament church. Then the work devolved on ordinary officers.

169. Did the ordinary officers exist at the same time with the extraordinary? Ans. Yes; as Acts xx. 17, 28—30, Rom. xii. 6—8.

§ XI.—170. What were the ordinary officers of the New Testament church? Ans. Pastors, elders and deacons.

171. Should we consider pastors and teachers as two distinct offices? Ans. No; in Eph. iv. 11, they are stated as two names for the same office; *τοὺς δὲ* not being repeated between them, as between those offices which are distinct.

172. Has this class of ordinary officers other names in Scripture? Ans. Yes; as “overseers,” “bishops,” “elders.”

173. Do these names designate distinct offices? Ans. No; they are all the same. But they are distinct names, to designate different parts, or different aspects of the same office. *Pastor*, refers to the care of a congregation, in teaching, admonishing, comforting, and ruling. *Teacher*, is in direct reference to delivering instruction. *Overseer* or *Bishop*, signifies watching over the people, to guard, guide, warn, provide ordinances, &c. They are called *elders*, as aged, or grave, sober, and fitted to rule.

174. How does it appear that the same office is designated by all these different names? Ans. (1.) In Acts xx. 17, 28, those who are called *elders*, in verse 17th, are called *overseers* or *bishops*, in verse 28th. And, in Tit. i. 5, he is called *elder*, who, in verse 7th, is called *overseer*, or *bishop*. (2.) Because the Scriptures do not ascribe some ministerial duties to one, and some distinct duties to another, but the same duties to each. (3.) It appears that there was an equality of power, authority and office, in all those to whom the office of teaching is ascribed; as Phil. i. 1, a plurality of bishops in the same church; so Acts xx. 28; and so our Lord requires equality in the teachers, or teaching elders, Matt. xx. 26, 27. (4.) In 1 Tim. iii. 1—7, the description of a bishop answers to the gospel minister, as the character and public office of teaching are given to him. (5.) Because the very highest office is called *elder*, 1 Pet. v. 1. (6.) The very same duties enjoined on the bishop, Acts xx. 28, are enjoined on the elders, 1 Pet. v. 1, 2.

175. Obj. (1.) To Timothy and Titus is attributed a power over elders? Ans. They were evangelists, and their office, in some things, extraordinary. 1 Tim. v. 1, implies no superiority of Timothy over the elder, but enjoins respect or reverence. Tit. i. 5, shows a peculiar work enjoined on Titus.

176. Was Timothy himself ordained by the Presbytery? Ans. Yes; 1 Tim. iv. 14.

177. Obj. (2.) In Rev. ii., iii., the angel is addressed in the singular, as having authority, where there were many elders, as at Ephesus, Rev. ii. 1, &c.? Ans. *Angel* is put collectively, for the Presbytery; as we have no account of one superior to the rest, and as Paul gave injunctions equally to all the elders of Ephesus, Acts xx. 28.

178. Obj. (3.) The high priest had authority over the other priests in the temple? Ans. The New Testament church government was not modelled on the temple government. That government was typical of Christ. The synagogue government was not typical.

179. Obj. (4.) Arius denied the distinction between bishops and presbyters? Ans. The heresy of Arius respecting the person of Christ, did not make him erroneous in every thing.

180. How or when was Episcopacy (making the bishop superior to the presbyter) introduced into the New Testament church? Ans. It was introduced by degrees, and some time after the apostles. It began by appointing permanent moderators, who, after some time, and especially after Constantine's favour to the church, began to claim precedence.

§ XII.—181. Were any rulers appointed by Christ, besides gospel ministers? Ans. Yes; elders.

182. Is not this name *elder* common to gospel ministers and to ruling elders? Ans. Yes; Acts xx. 27, 28, 1 Tim. v. 17, 1 Pet. v. 1.

183. What is the extent or object of their office? Ans. Ruling.

184. How does it appear that such an office is appointed as dis-

tinct from pastors or teaching elders? Ans. In 1 Tim. v. 17, the distinction is expressly made; so Rom. xii. 7, 8; 1 Cor. xii. 28.

185. Is their power, in their office, equal to that of the gospel minister, in the same office, of ruling? Ans. Yes; no distinction is made.

186. Is there any other order of officers in the church, by divine appointment? Ans. Yes; deacons; Acts vi. 2—4, 1 Tim. iii. 8—13.

187. What does the name *deacon* signify? Ans. *Minister*—a name for general service. Thus the apostles are called *deacons*, 1 Cor. iii. 5, “ministers,” or *deacons*; 2 Cor. iii. 5, 6, “able ministers,” or *deacons*. Christ himself is called a *deacon*, Rom. xv. 8, “minister (or *deacon*) of the circumcision.” And even women are so called, for their secular service of the church, Rom. xvi. 1.

188. Is not *deacon*, then, a general name for all church officers? Ans. Yes.

189. What is the proper business of the deacon? Ans. The care of the poor, and of the temporalities of the church; Acts vi. 2, 3, Rom. xii. 8, 1 Pet. iv. 11.

190. Would not the collection of salary properly belong to them? Ans. Yes; because, (1.) This belongs to the temporalities of the church. (2.) It is included in the serving of tables, Acts vi. 2. (3.) It was intended as a relief to those church officers who had a higher office in charge; Acts vi. 2—4.

191. Where trustees are considered necessary, ought not deacons to attend to this business? Ans. Yes; no doubt the annual election of trustees, without ordination, is a deviation from the Scripture pattern.

192. Have deacons, by office, authority to join in the government of the church, except in its temporalities? Ans. No; they are not appointed to this work. Yet, when present, they may be consulted; but they have no vote, in what properly belongs to the government of the church.

193. Is not their office included in the higher offices of elder and minister? Ans. Yes; elders and ministers sustain the office of deacon, in their official capacity; so Acts vi. 2—4. The apostles only laid this work over on distinct officers, for want of leisure, not from want of authority.

194. When deacons have to consult about their proper business, may not the church-session meet and transact the business with them? Ans. Yes; because it belongs to their office.

195. Is it essential to the organization of a congregation to have deacons? Ans. No; if the elders can attend to the business.

196. Are any other officers than ministers, elders, and deacons, recognised in Scripture, as of divine institution? Ans. No.

197. What grades of office do the Papists maintain? Ans. Many; as, (1.) Dignitaries; six in number;—bishops, metropolitans, archbishops, patriarchs, cardinals, and the Pope. (2.) Seven orders; the greater three—subdeacons, deacons, and priests, or presbyters; the lesser four—*ostiarii*, or door-keepers, *lectors*, or

readers, exorcists, and *accolyths*, followers or attendants, lighting the tapers, carrying the candlesticks, &c. All of which are of human institution, except bishops, presbyters, and deacons.

LECTURE XII.—QUALIFICATIONS OF CHURCH RULERS.

§ XIII.—198. Is a special call to an ecclesiastical office necessary to the lawful exercise of it? Ans. Yes.

199. How does it appear that a call of God is necessary? Ans. (1.) Because church officers are directly in his service. (2.) Because Christ is said to give them to his church, which implies his call; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11. (3.) Because of the important objects of their office; Eph. iv. 12, 13. (4.) The Scriptures require that there be a call of those who serve the church; Rom. x. 15; Heb. v. 4, 5. (5.) Those who run unsent are reproved; Jer. xxiii. 21, 31, 32. (6.) It appears from the very titles given to gospel ministers; as “ambassadors of Christ,” “stewards,” &c.

200. It is objected, (1.) Against the necessity of a call, that it is the duty of all persons, who are able, to instruct their brethren? Ans. It is true, they ought to do so by private means; but the public ministry is a distinct office.

201. Obj. (2.) That 1 Tim. iii. 1, shows that every one may commendably desire the office of the ministry? Ans. It is lawful to desire it, but it does not follow that we may exercise it without a call.

202. Obj. (3.) In the case of many gospel preachers, a call was dispensed with; as of those who fled from the persecution raised about Stephen, Acts viii. 4; the house of Stephanas, 1 Cor. xvi. 15; and the prophets, 1 Cor. xiv. 29, 30? Ans. There is no proof that these had not a call. In Acts viii. 5, Philip is named as one of those preachers who fled. The house of Stephanas may have served the saints in other ways than preaching.

§ XIV.—203. What kinds of calls has Christ, at various times, given to the ministry? Ans. Ordinary and extraordinary, mediate and immediate.

204. What is an extraordinary call? Ans. A call by special intimation, supernaturally given.

205. In what respects may the call be extraordinary? Ans. (1.) It may be a call to an extraordinary office; as Moses, the Prophets, Apostles, John the Baptist, &c. (2.) It may be to extraordinary teaching of doctrines or laws. (3.) It may be extraordinary in the manner of calling—supernaturally intimating to them, and they supernaturally and miraculously qualified.

206. Did not extraordinary gifts accompany extraordinary calls? Ans. Yes.

207. Are such calls to be expected now? Ans. No.

208. Why not? Ans. (1.) They were designed at first as introductory to an ordinary system. (2.) To give a ground of faith in what was new to the church. (3.) When the canon of Scripture is complete, there is no need of them; there is in Scripture a sufficient

instruction, and a sufficient foundation of faith. (4.) Extraordinary calls would be calculated to unsettle faith in the complete canon of Scripture.

209. What is meant by an immediate call? Ans. A call by God himself, without the instrumentality of man; as Moses, the prophets and apostles, &c.

210. What is meant by a mediate call? Ans. God's call by appointed means.

211. Were not some extraordinary calls, in some respects, mediate? Ans. Yes; as Timothy the evangelist, ordained by Paul, 2 Tim. i. 6, and by the Presbytery, 1 Tim. iv. 14; and Paul himself, Acts xiii. 2, 3.

§ XV.—212. What is an ordinary call? Ans. A call of God by instrumentalities and means, appointed of God for the ordinary and settled state of the church.

213. Is not an ordinary call always mediate? Ans. Yes.

214. Is not an ordinary call both internal and external? Ans. Yes.

215. What may we count an internal call? Ans. In general—preparation of heart; as, (1.) Saving grace. (2.) Saving knowledge; 1 Cor. ii. 12; 2 Cor. iii. 6. (3.) Experience of the truth; Matt. xiii. 52. (4.) Desire; 1 Tim. iii. 1.

216. What may we count an external call? Ans. (1.) Outward providences; as talents, learning, and removal of impediments. (2.) Good character; 1 Tim. iii. 1—7. (3.) Sound sentiments; Tit. i. 9. (4.) Admission by the Presbytery. (5.) The call of the people.

217. How can it be the call of Christ, when it is by ordinary means? Ans. If the ordinary means be of his appointment for this purpose, it is his call, as really as if it were immediate and extraordinary. Thus the ordinary priests in the temple were called of God, by ordinary means, according to his prescription; Heb. v. 4, 5.

218. By what particular means has a man the outward call of Christ to the ministry? Ans. Besides outward providences, furnishing him with qualifications, the call is made by the Presbytery, admitting, licensing, and ordaining him, and the people calling, or inviting.

219. With whom lies the power of calling a man to officiate in any particular congregation? Ans. With the people; Acts vi. 3, 5, xiv. 23.

220. Should this power be taken from the people, and assumed by the Presbytery? Ans. No; there is no Scriptural example of this; and it is right that the people should choose their own teachers and governors.

221. If a congregation be not making a call for a pastor, but are asking temporary supplies of ordinances, in whom lies the power of appointing their supplies? Ans. In the Presbytery.

222. How does this consist with the people's right to choose a pastor? Ans. The Presbytery, in such case, is their pastor; Acts xx. 28.

223. Should the power of choosing a pastor be, in any case, given to patrons? Ans. No.

224. Or may the power be given to the magistrate, however pious? Ans. No.

225. Why may it not be given to either patrons or magistrates? Ans. Because, (1.) The Scripture examples give it to the people. (2.) The people have naturally the right, and no other has that right over them. (3.) Patrons and magistrates are not always qualified to choose a pastor. (4.) The civil magistrate's office does not include the spiritual government of the people.

226. But, in Isa. xlix. 23, it is promised that "kings shall be nursing-fathers," &c. Does not this imply their power to supply the people with pastors? Ans. No; they may cherish the church otherwise than by supplanting the people, or robbing them of their rights.

227. Does the call of the people, however, give a minister the pastoral relation to them, without the intervention of the Presbytery? Ans. No; Acts vi. 5, 6, xiv. 23.

228. Does the "ordaining" of elders, spoken of in Acts xiv. 23, signify ordination to the office? Ans. No; *Χειροτονειν*, (*cheirotonein*), signifies to choose; so 2 Cor. viii. 19, "chosen to travel with us;" that is, the apostles held elections of the people, presided in them, and approved them.

229. Why is the intervention of the Presbytery necessary? Ans. Because, (1.) They are to take heed to the whole flock committed to them; Acts xx. 28. (2.) They should interfere to prevent improper elections and settlements, which may divide and distract congregations; and to see that the choice which the people make, promises to be for their edification.

230. Must the people's call of a pastor, then, come through the Presbytery? Ans. Yes; because, otherwise, the Presbytery could not watch over the whole flock. A private and final contract between a people and their pastor, would take the oversight of the congregation from the Presbytery.

LECTURE XIII.—SAME, CONTINUED—ORDINATION.

§ XVI.—231. May the people call a man to the office of the ministry among them, who has not been approved by the Presbytery? or, does this call invest him with the office? Ans. No; not in ordinary cases.

232. Why not? Ans. Because it is the part of the Presbytery to try, approve, and ordain. The people are not qualified for this part of church government, nor authorized to perform it, in ordinary cases. When necessity requires, it may be done; as in persecution, where there is no Presbytery to ordain. But, in ordinary cases, the people's call does not invest a man with office, while it is necessary to a minister's pastoral relation to them.

233. Through what instrumentality, then, does Christ invest a man with the ministerial office? Ans. Through the instrumentality of the Presbytery.

234. How does it appear that a man derives his ministerial office from Christ by means of the Presbytery, and not by the people? Ans. (1.) From the ordination of a man by the Presbytery; 1 Tim. iv. 14. (2.) From the Presbytery's duty of watching over the whole flock, and feeding them, Acts xx. 28; which implies the providing of pastors. (3.) From the obligation to prove and try the candidate, before investing him with the office, 1 Tim. iii. 10; to which work the Presbytery are competent, and the people are not. (4.) From the approved examples of Presbyteries trying and proving pretenders to the office of the ministry, Rev. ii. 2; and from their being condemned for neglecting this work. Rev. ii. 20.

235. What has a Presbytery to do, in order to invest a man with the ministerial office? Ans. (1.) Examine and try the candidate; 1 Tim. iii. 2—10. (2.) Admit him to the office, 1 Tim. iii. 10; v. 22. (3.) Ordain, or set him apart to the office, Acts vi. 6; xiii. 3; 1 Tim. iv. 14.

236. What is the necessity of trial and admission by Presbytery? Ans. (1.) That the candidate's qualifications and fitness for the office be tried. (2.) Because the people are not capable of conducting such a trial.

237. Would not a call to the ministry, of every one whom the people might choose, prove corrupting to the church? Ans. Yes.

238. By what rule is the Presbytery to make the trial? Ans. By the word.

239. What are the qualifications required in a candidate for the ministry? Ans. (1.) Good conduct, 1 Tim. iii. 2—4. (2.) Good character, verse 7th. (3.) Knowledge and experience suited to the office, verse 6th. (4.) Sound sentiments, verses 5th, 6th, 9th; Tit. i. 9. (5.) Gifts for teaching, verse 2d.

240. Do not the Papists require celibacy in their higher orders? Ans. Yes.

241. Is there any weight in their arguments for the celibacy of their clergy, drawn from the Scripture requisition of chastity of gospel ministers, and that they be not entangled with the affairs of this world? Ans. No; for, (1.) The married are as chaste as the unmarried. (2.) It is undue engagement in worldly things that is forbidden.

242. But they object, 1 Cor. vii. 1, 8; as forbidding marriage? Ans. (1.) It is equally a prohibition to all other Christians, as well as ministers. (2.) The apostle does not there absolutely forbid marriage; and, so far as he cautions against it, he did not give the caution because the unmarried state was more pure, but because more exempt from trouble, at that time.

243. Does the apostle, 1 Tim. iii. 2, forbid a second marriage in a minister? Ans. No; but bigamy, or polygamy.

244. What is signified by ordination? Ans. (1.) That the person ordained is judged, by the proper authorities, to be qualified for the office. (2.) That he consents to engage in the work of the office in a proper spirit. (3.) That he is solemnly set apart to the work, and solemnly charged to fulfil it, Numb. xxvii. 19.

245. What are the acts of ordination? *Ans.* After trial and admission, the person is solemnly set apart, by imposition of hands and prayer, Acts vi. 6; xiii. 3.

246. Was this ceremony of imposition of hands used in the old dispensation? *Ans.* Yes; Numb. viii. 10; xxvii. 18; in the cases of the Levites, and Joshua.

247. Was it used in ordination in the new dispensation? *Ans.* Yes; 1 Tim. iv. 14.

248. What is the meaning of the ceremony? *Ans.* (1.) Presenting and devoting to the Lord, Num. viii. 10; the people devoted the Levites to the Lord in their own stead, Num. viii. 16—18. (2.) It signifies the gift of the Holy Spirit, Deut. xxxiv. 9; Acts xviii. 17; xix. 6; the apostles laid on their hands and conferred the Spirit, Acts viii. 18; therefore it was a sign of conferring, and signified, (a.) The need of the Spirit. (b.) The privilege of having the Spirit.

249. Would it destroy the validity of ordination, if this ceremony were neglected? *Ans.* No; it is not essential.

250. But would it not be sinful to neglect it, when it can be done? *Ans.* Yes; because it is commanded by example, and to be recognised as divine.

251. If imposition of hands be not essential to ordination, what are its essentials? *Ans.* (1.) The sentence or decision to set apart to the work. (2.) Actually to set apart, by prayer, under a charge, expressed or implied, and accepted on the part of the person ordained.

252. Does ordination by imposition of hands and prayer, communicate anything to the person ordained? *Ans.* Yes; 1 Tim. iv. 14.

253. What does it communicate? *Ans.* Not knowledge, or talent, or the Spirit; but office, and authority to exercise it.

254. Why was Timothy ordained by Presbytery, (1 Tim. iv. 14.) when set apart by the apostle, 2 Tim. i. 6; and Paul, by the Presbytery at Antioch, (Acts xiii. 1—3,) when he had an immediate call by Christ, Gal. i. 12, ii. 6? *Ans.* Christ would honour his own ordinance, and show us that it should be observed.

255. If the church were brought to such a condition that there were none from whom ordination could be obtained, might a man, qualified for the work, and chosen by the people, exercise the ministry? *Ans.* Yes.

256. How does this appear? *Ans.* (1.) Christ has suffered his church to be brought to such a condition; as at the Reformation, and in the dark ages of Popery. (2.) Christ would not allow his church to be without a ministry and ordinances, under such circumstances. (3.) When the ordinary order cannot be observed, necessity must govern. (4.) The people's choice would be setting apart, or virtually ordaining.

257. Yet if, afterwards, such a minister could obtain regular ordination, should he not receive it? *Ans.* Yes; so Paul and Timothy.

258. Is a minister ordained to the office for the church at large, or only for a particular congregation? Ans. For the church at large; and therefore he is ordained to the ministerial office, wherever he may labour.

259. Were not ministers, under the name of elders, ordained to particular charges by the apostles, and evangelists; Acts xiv. 23, Tit. i. 5? Ans. No; those passages say nothing about the ordinance of ordination, but, in the one case, of the people's choice of pastors, under the superintendence of the apostles; and in the other, of Titus' placing them in congregations.

260. What is the difference between ordination and installation? Ans. (1.) Ordination is setting apart to the office; installation is setting the minister in a certain place, as his charge. (2.) Ordination is performed on the candidate's assent to demands respecting the office; installation, on his assent to the call, and to the duties of a particular charge.

261. Is it necessary that ordination be repeated, on a minister's change of location? Ans. No; because his ordination is to the office, which is not dependent on location.

262. Is it necessary that it be repeated after deposition and restoration? Ans. No; because, after restoration, his qualifications, his assent to the requirements of the work, and Presbytery's devoting him to it, are the same as before.

263. Would it, however, be sinful to repeat the ordination, on a change of location? Ans. No; unless such repetition be made in the way of declaring the former null.

264. Was not the imposition of hands used by the apostles at the ordination of elders and deacons? Ans. Yes; Acts vi. 6.

265. Is there any just reason why it should not be so used now? Ans. No; although, as the apostles used the imposition of hands, even on those who were baptized, as a means of communicating the Spirit, so they may have used it on many occasions, without giving an obligatory example to the church, to follow them in those particulars. We consider their example rather as a commendation of the practice, in setting a person apart to a sacred office, than as a positive requisition.

266. Does not the ordination of an elder, or deacon, refer especially to the exercise of their office in a particular congregation? Ans. Yes; because they are chosen for the congregation, and so ordained with a special respect to that congregation. Yet, in so far as they are members of a Presbytery, Synod, &c., their ordination is for the whole church.

267. Who has the right to ordain elders and deacons? Ans. Gospel ministers; as they have the authority to conduct the public prayers, and their office includes the lower.

268. Who has the right to ordain ministers? Ans. The ministry of the Presbytery; because they sustain the same office to which they ordain another; and they should lead in the public prayers. Thus the priests of old ordained Levites and priests, Num. viii. 11, and so the ministry in the new dispensation, ordained ministers, Acts xiii. 1—3.

269. Should the power of ordination be limited to a higher order in the church than the teaching elder? Ans. No; because the teaching elders collectively are competent to the work, 1 Tim. iv. 14; and because there is really no higher order since the apostles.

270. Is the choice or call of a minister, by the people, necessary to his installation? Ans. Yes; Acts vi. 2—6, xiv. 23.

271. Do the people's right to call, and the Presbytery's right to admit and ordain, and to install or reject, conflict with one another? Ans. No; but the one right is subject to the other. The people make choice in subjection to the Presbytery, as the judges of qualifications, and of proper order.

272. Is the Presbytery Christ's appointed mode of visibly trying, admitting, and ordaining? Ans. Yes; 1 Tim. iii. 10, iv. 14, Rev. ii. 1, 2, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20.

273. If, then, a church officer be admitted, ordained, and called, by Christ's appointed means, is not that a call from himself? Ans. Yes; Matt. xvi. 19, xviii. 18—20.

LECTURE XIV. THE FORM OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

§ III.—274. How many general kinds of church government are there supposed to be? Ans. Three—Monarchical, Presbyterian, and Congregational.

275. What is monarchical government? Ans. The whole, governed by one.

276. Is not the real government of the church, as in Christ's hand, monarchical? Ans. Yes.

277. But should the visible government, by men, be monarchical? Ans. No.

278. If Christ had appointed visible church government to be monarchical, and it were really conducted as purely ministerial, would it not have been entirely consistent with Christ's sole Lordship, as well as presbyterial, or republican would have been? Ans. Yes.

279. Should not the whole question, then, be—what form has Christ appointed? Ans. Yes.

280. Has not Christ absolutely forbidden a lordly government in his church? Ans. Yes; Matt. xx. 25, 26, 1 Pet. v. 3.

281. What are the characteristics of lordly government? Ans. It is self-willed and tyrannical; acting solely on the ground of power.

282. What are we taught about church government, in Matt. xx. 25, 26, and Luke xxii. 25, 26? Ans. (1.) Those passages forbid government by one person, as supreme. (2.) That Christ will not allow a lordly government in his church. (3.) That the government of one person, as supreme, would terminate in lordly tyrannical government. (4.) That an equality, as to power and authority, among those who govern, must be an essential feature of the government of his church. (5.) Therefore, that the government of his church must be by a plurality; so Matt. xviii. 18—20. (6.) That a lordly and monarchical government in

the church would be the fruit of pride, and not of a spirit of sincere and humble service in the church, as appears from the occasion of our Lord's remarks.

283. Would not a monarchical government in the church be impracticable, when the church should be enlarged through many nations? Ans. Yes; one man would be incompetent; the church would be injured, and her interests neglected

284. But the Papists object, in favour of monarchy, (1.) That it is the best form of civil government, and should be so in the church? Ans. (1.) This is at best mere opinion, and we hold it erroneous. (2.) If it were even the best form of civil government, it would not follow that it is best for the church, whose nature, objects, laws, and relation to Christ, are so different from civil kingdoms. (3.) Not our opinion, but the revealed will of Christ, is our rule.

285. Obj. (2.) The Old Testament church was subject to one high priest; intimating that the New Testament church should be so also? Ans. The assertion is not true. The high priest was chief in the temple government, about typical things, and was a type of Christ; Num. iii. 6—10, iv. 1—16; Zech. iii. 5—7. But the general government of the church of old, which was the model of the new, was under the ecclesiastical Sanhedrim, of which the high priest was a member; 2 Chron. xix. 8, 11.

286. Obj. (3.) Monarchy is necessary to unity in faith and practice? Ans. (1.) We see it is not; a republic may be as fully united as a monarchy. (2.) Christ, by his one rule of faith and practice, and by his Spirit, can preserve unity; and, without these, a monarchy cannot.

§ IV.—287. Is there anything in the Old or New Testament, that shows a visible monarchy in the church, by Christ's appointment? Ans. No; in the old dispensation, the ordinary government was by a plurality; and in the new, the synod at Jerusalem, (Acts xv.,) showed plurality and equality; and our Lord unequivocally forbids lordly dominion; Matt. xx. 25, 26; xxiii. 8, 10.

§ V.—288. As the Papists insist that Peter was appointed chief Pontiff under the new dispensation, is this sustained by Matt. xvi. 18, 19? Ans. No.

289. Why not? Ans. (1.) Because our Lord absolutely forbade any of his disciples to claim superiority, Matt. xx. 26, 27; and therefore Matt. xvi. 18, 19, must signify a different thing. (2.) Peter himself forbids it, 1 Pet. v. 3. (3.) The other apostles did not acknowledge him as having any superiority; Acts xv. 7—19; Gal. ii. 7—14. (4.) Christ did not appoint such a government under the old dispensation, and it is no more necessary or suitable under the new. The high priest, as a type of Christ, was over the temple worship, but not the head of church government.

290. How then understand Matt. xvi. 18, 19, where Christ commits the keys to Peter? Ans. (1.) As it cannot be allowed to give this passage a meaning contrary to other plain texts, as Matt. xx. 26, 27; 1 Cor. iii. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 6, so it must have a different

meaning. (2.) Christ, or the doctrine confessed, is the *rock*, and Peter obtained his surname on account of that confession. (3.) Christ did not say on *thee*, but “*on this rock*,” and *Petra*, not *Petros*. (4.) The keys are ministerial, not legislative. (5.) All the apostles had the keys equally, John xx. 23; Matt. xviii. 18; Matt. xvi. 19. (6.) Peter had the honour of being immediately addressed because he personally made the confession; but the commission of the keys was equally to the rest as to him.

291. Obj. (2.) In John xxi. 15—17, Christ confers on Peter the care of the church;—“*Feed my lambs?*” Ans. (1.) These verses contain a reproof to Peter for denying his Lord. (2.) In reference to that denial, Christ restores him to his office, or confirms it to him equally as to the rest.

292. Obj. (3.) The primacy was confirmed to Peter with many prerogatives, as signs of superiority; as the name *Peter*, walking on the water, generally first named among the apostles, &c.? Ans. (1.) James and John had also honourable names given them. (2.) Walking on the water, if it proved Peter’s faith, also proved his weakness. (3.) Any special notice of Peter arose from his being prompt and forward, but conveyed no prerogatives or authority.

LECTURE XIV.—FORM OF GOVERNMENT,—CONTINUED.

§ § VI. VII.—293. Do not the Papists claim that their chief Bishop, the Pope, is successor to Peter, as chief bishop and Pontiff? Ans. Yes; and this is still a more grievous error than to claim the primacy for Peter. And it was from the desire to sustain this claim that they ever did plead for Peter’s supremacy.

294. On what grounds do they plead the succession of the Popes to the primacy which they claim for Peter? Ans. (1.) That a succession is necessary. (2.) That Peter held the Primacy at Rome, and died there. (3.) That where he died must be the seat of the Primacy. (4.) That the Primacy of the Pope of Rome was acknowledged by councils, civil powers, and by particular churches, by appeals. (5.) And that the succession has continued unbroken.

295. Is it true that succession of bishops, with supreme power, was necessary? Ans. No; so far from it, that our Lord forbade any of his apostles, or others, to assume or exercise it in his church. It was necessary that there should be a succession of teachers, pastors, or elders, but not of apostles.

296. Have we reason to believe that Peter held the office of Bishop of Rome? Ans. No; for (1.) We have no information that he ever was at Rome. (2.) He was an apostle to the circumcision, or to the Jews, Gal. ii. 7, 8, and he accordingly exercised much of his ministry in Judea. (3.) His office, as an apostle, was not consistent with his being the bishop of any one place. Therefore, we know that he was not a bishop of Rome. (4.) Therefore he could never have a successor as a bishop of any particular charge.

297. Is it true that emperors, councils, and churches acknowledged the Pope of Rome as supreme, and the successor of Peter?

Ans. (1.) Some did, in later times, but they did not at first. (2.) For centuries, the bishop of Rome did not plead supremacy, or succession from Peter; and when he did claim it, it was resisted by emperors and churches.

298. Would not the apostacy of Rome have broken the succession, if it ever had existed? Ans. Yes.

299. But the Papists argue, that when Peter writes from Babylon, 1 Pet. v. 13, he means Rome? Ans. (1.) The apostle is not there using a figurative style, and had no occasion for it. (2.) The Papists must be hard driven for an argument, when they use this one. For to say that *Rome* is meant by *Babylon*, is to acknowledge herself the Antichrist, and therefore, she cannot be the successor of Peter.

301. Did Christ commit the ordinary government of the church to any individual? Ans. No; he made plurality a characteristic of church government.

302. How does it appear that Christ has made plurality a characteristic of church government? Ans. (1.) From the Old Testament church government, by a Sanhedrim. (2.) From Christ's express word, Matt. xviii. 17—20. (3.) From the example of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem, Acts xv. (4.) From Christ's prohibition of individual superiority, or claim of it, Matt. xx. 26. (5.) And because he did not institute any higher office in the church, for her ordinary government, than the teaching elders, and among these he required equality.

303. Under episcopal government must not the decision of important matters be often committed to the judgment and will of an individual? Ans. Yes.

304. Has this measure any authority in Scripture, in ordinary church government? Ans. No.

305. Does not this measure tend to tyranny? Ans. Yes.

306. And does it not raise an individual above his brethren in the ministry, cherish pride and ambition, and violate that equality which Christ requires? Ans. Yes.

307. From whom do church officers derive their lawful authority, according to Scripture? Ans. From Christ; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11, 12.

308. How from Christ in the present ordinary government? Ans. By his appointed means. This is his method of conveying authority.

309. What are Christ's appointed means of conveying authority in the church? Ans. Presbytery is the only means of his appointment.

310. How do Episcopal church officers obtain their authority? Ans. By the authority of a bishop.

311. What rules of Christ's house are violated by this mode of conveying official authority? Ans. (1.) The rule of governing by a plurality. (2.) And the rule of equality in teachers and governors in the church.

312. Does the possession of an office in the church give a man, in ordinary cases, authority to convey the same office? Ans. No; although, in ordinary cases, he that takes part in conveying an office should have that office himself, yet a council of such officers is necessary, in order to the conveyance of an office.

313. Has Christ promised his presence with a council of church officers, constituted in his name? Ans. Yes; Matt. xviii. 20.

314. Has he promised to confirm their deeds, done in his name? Ans. Yes; Matt. xviii. 18.

315. Has he promised either his presence with an individual, assuming to convey official authority in the church, or his confirmation of his deed? Ans. No; he has promised his presence with individuals in the discharge of their individual duties; as Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; but not in assuming to convey official authority.

316. Must we, then, deny that any who are episcopally ordained are the ministers of Christ? Ans. No; Christ may own a gospel minister, although some steps in his attaining that office may be unlawful. Yet the unlawful step is not the less sinful, nor the less dangerous to the church.

317. Does Episcopacy make the call of the people a prerequisite to a minister's service in a congregation? Ans. No; the Bishop assumes this authority.

318. Is not Episcopacy a monarchical government? Ans. Yes; and therefore it is not the government appointed by Christ.

319. If the magistrate assume to appoint bishops over any part of the church, or ministers over congregations, as is usually the case in episcopal churches, is it not the exercise of a monarchical government? Ans. Yes.

320. Has the magistrate either the authority or the qualifications, as a magistrate, for such an office? Ans. No.

321. Has he the promise of Christ's presence in the exercise of such an office? Ans. No; because he has not Christ's authority to do it.

§ VIII.—322. As the form of church government appointed by Christ, is not monarchical, we may inquire, on the other hand, is it properly Democratic? Ans. No; though this doctrine was held by the Menonites and Socinians, and in the present day, by Congregationalists, or Independents.

323. On what ground, or hypothesis, did the Menonites or Socinians plead for the Democratic form? Ans. They held that there is no call for any class of office bearers in the church, for the dispensation of word or sacraments, or for the exercise of government or discipline; and therefore that the government and discipline belong to the collective body of the people. Another class of Independents hold that there ought to be individuals set apart to the office of ministers, elders, &c., but that these office-bearers, have no more voice in government and discipline than any of the people.

324. What arguments are employed by the Independents of the present day, for the government in the hands of the people, and

not in church officers? Ans. (1.) That if the government were in the hand of a court of church officers, rules for their guidance would have been given by Christ; but he gave none. (2.) That though the church is to obey those that have the rule over them, yet it is the individual congregation that is required to obey their rulers, but not the whole church to obey the rulers of the whole. (3.) That when the apostles ordained elders, they commended them to the Lord, but not to a court; Acts xiv. 23.

325. Is it true that Christ has given no rules for the guidance of church courts? Ans. No; the whole law of Christ is their rule; 2 Chron. xix. 10, Deut. i. 16, 17.

326. Has he not moreover, given many special rules of procedure? Ans. Yes; as of witnesses, of sentence, and execution, &c.

327. Is not a church court warranted, by the divine law, to adopt such rules of order, in procedure, as are necessary in obeying a divine rule, though these rules of order may not be all specified in the Scriptures? Ans. Yes; whatever rule is necessary, in order to obey a divine rule, is substantially commanded.

328. If individual congregations (as is admitted,) are required to obey their immediate rulers, (as Heb. xiii. 7, 17,) does not this require the whole body, united as one church, though of different congregations, to obey their collective rulers? Ans. Yes; as appears from the Synod at Jerusalem, Acts xv.; Paul's injunctions to the elders of Ephesus, Acts xx. 28; and the epistles to the seven churches of Asia.

329. But it is alleged that the Scriptures give no warrant for different grades of church courts, and therefore there should be no collective government of all the parts of the church? Ans. (1.) Different grades are implied in the Old Testament government, of Synagogues, and the Sanhedrim; and Ex. xviii. 21, Deut. i. 15. (2.) The unity of the church requires the whole government of the church to be united. The unity of the church, in doctrine and worship, could not be maintained, without unity in government. (3.) Paul's charge, Acts xx. 28, bound all the elders to watch over *all* the flock; and the epistles to the seven churches of Asia require the same thing. (4.) Different grades of church courts are only the same government of the one body extended. (5.) If a session should govern a congregation, all the sessions together should govern all the congregations, which are one body.

330. Does the commending of church officers to the Lord, (as alleged,) contradict the idea of requiring their subjection to church courts? Ans. No; while commended to the Lord, they are required to submit to his laws, and the government which he has appointed, 1 Pet. v. 5.

331. Do not church officers themselves need to be under church government? Ans. Yes; they need it, and they, as well as others, are required to submit to it.

332. Besides the evidences arising out of the preceding considerations, what positive evidences have we, from Scripture, that the whole church should be under the government of church officers,

and not under a democratic, independent, government? *Ans.* (1.) Christ gave to the church, rulers and governors, 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11, 12; 1 Tim. v. 17; Heb. xiii. 7, 17; Rev. ii., iii. (2.) These officers, or governors, were plainly, as such, distinct from the people, and are charged with the duty. (3.) The Old Testament church government was in the hand of appointed officers, and not in the hands of the people, Deut. xvii. (4.) The Jewish church government was never abrogated; it was moral, and continued. (5.) Our Lord, Matt. xviii. 17, recognises the old government as still continued. As the Jewish church must necessarily have understood our Lord as meaning the church court, so we must understand him. (6.) We have the example of a church court in the Synod at Jerusalem, Acts xv. (7.) The epistles to the churches of Asia necessarily imply the government in the hand of church officers; being all addressed to the angel, &c. (8.) Paul's charge to the elders of Ephesus necessarily implies their duty of governing the church. (9.) Qualifications are prescribed for church rulers, which the body of the people do not possess, 2 Tim. iii. 1, &c.

333. But in reference to the Synod at Jerusalem, it is objected that a council of inspired men cannot be an example for us? *Ans.* (1.) They were not all inspired. It was apostles and elders. (2.) If it had not been intended as an example to us, they need not have met in council at all; as the inspiration of even one apostle was sufficient for an authoritative decision. (3.) The epistle, the result of that decision, was indeed inspired, but it was authoritative also on the whole church, as the deed of a court of Christ.

334. Is it from the people that church officers receive their authority, either to teach or rule? *Ans.* No; but from Christ.

335. Is it inconsistent with this to say that church officers have no right to rule a people, unless chosen by that people? *Ans.* No; even Christ's ministering servants have no right to rule any but those who voluntarily choose church membership.

LECTURE XV.—FORM OF GOVERNMENT.—CONTINUED.

§ I.—336. What are the grades of church officers, according to Presbyterian principles? *Ans.* Three: (1.) Bishops, or teaching elders. (2.) Ruling elders. (3.) Deacons.

337. What are the peculiar tenets of Presbyterianism? *Ans.* (1.) That Christ has appointed three grades of office—Bishop, Elder, and Deacon. (2.) That the members of each of these grades are equal among themselves. (3.) That each higher grade includes the power and office of the lower. (4.) That, as ministers of the word are equal in authority and power with one another, so ministers and ruling elders are equal in the office of ruling, or in jurisdiction. (5.) That, in ordinary cases, an act of jurisdiction should not be exercised by ministers alone; and in no case, by the exclusion of the ruling elder. (6.) That the whole church (of the same communion,) being one body, the whole body of church officers have the whole government. Yet the government may, nevertheless, be exercised

over a specified portion, by an appropriate portion of the church officers. (7.) That the decisions of church courts are authoritative.

338. How prove that there are three grades of church officers?

Ans. (1.) Teaching elders, and elders that merely rule, are distinguished, 1 Tim. v. 17. (2.) In Acts vi. 1—6, the order of deacons is explicitly pointed out. (3.) The synod of Jerusalem, Acts xv. 2, 6, consisted of apostles, and elders, and brethren; verse 23d. (4.) The Sanhedrim of old had teaching and ruling elders. (5.) 1 Cor. xii. 28, distinguishes teachers, and helps, and governments.

339. How prove that these grades are equal among themselves?

Ans. (1.) By the absolute prohibition of superiority of power or authority in the same class; Matt. xx. 25, 26. (2.) There is no Scripture hint to the contrary. (3.) The same duties are enjoined on all officers of the same grade.

340. How prove that the higher grade includes the lower? Ans.

(1.) In 1 Tim. v. 17, we are taught that those rule who labour in word and doctrine, as well as those who only rule. (2.) The apostles had the power to act as deacons, Acts vi. 2; but from necessity devolved the work on others.

341. How prove that in the business of judicial government, ministers and elders are equal in power and authority? Ans. (1.) There is no intimation in Scripture, that any grade has superiority in the department of judicial action. (2.) In describing the duties of governors, no distinction is made among the officers governing; Rom. xii. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 28; 1 Tim. iii.; Matt. xviii. 18—20.

342. How prove that ruling elders should not be excluded, and the whole authority assumed by the teaching elders? Ans. (1.) The ruling elders are given as "helps," and therefore should not be excluded; 1 Cor. xii. 28: they should be employed in their office. (2.) Because of the example of the Synod at Jerusalem; Acts xv. 2, vi. 23.

343. How prove that congregations should be governed by sessions? Ans. (1.) On the general principle that the church should be governed by officers, and the government be so distributed, as to afford convenience, and the faithful and prompt exercise of government. (2.) This accords with the distribution of governors of thousands, of hundreds, of fifties, and of tens; Ex. xviii. 21. Accordingly, (3.) Because judges, priests, &c., were distributed among the cities, in the gates, &c., Deut. xvi. 18; xvii. 8, 9. (4.) Because ministers, &c., are charged to feed the flock, which is among them; Acts xx. 28.

§ XXV.—344. How prove that the whole church (of the same communion,) should be under the government of the whole body of the office-bearers? Ans. (1.) By the consideration that the church is one body—the whole viewed as one congregation: otherwise, they would not be one, nor have the means of unity. (2.) By the consideration that although every located minister, with his session, has charge over his congregation, yet that minister and his session, and the flock under their immediate charge, are all under the care of

the whole body of church officers; Acts xx. 28; Rev. ii. 1, &c. (3.)
By the example of the synod at Jerusalem; Acts xv.

345. But on what principle are the smaller courts subordinate to the larger; as sessions to presbyteries—presbyteries to synods, &c.?
Ans. On the principle of the whole governing the several parts.

346. Is this subordination inconsistent with that equality in office-bearers which Christ requires? Ans. No; it is not a subordination of one officer to another, but of a part to the whole; of the lesser to the greater number; whilst the smaller is a part of the larger number.

347. Could the unity of the church be otherwise preserved or contentions settled? Ans. No.

348. Is this subordination any diminution of the church's liberty? Ans. No; no more than by a congregation's subjection to their session.

§ XXVI.—349. Who has the power of appointing, convoking, adjourning, or dismissing these courts? Ans. The power that has a right to govern the church, and that only. Not a single bishop, nor the magistrate.

350. Has any one a title by office to preside in these courts? Ans. No; except, in the session, the pastor, by superiority of office.

351. Who have a right to be members of these courts? Ans. All the office-bearers within their respective bounds.

352. But have all the elders a right to be actual members of the superior courts? Ans. As the elders are chosen by a congregation for its government, it seems reasonable that they should not all be actual members of a superior court, at the same time, but that each congregation be represented by one elder.

353. Should any pope, bishop, &c., have authority to invalidate a decision by withholding his approval? Ans. No; as this would be giving him unequal authority.

354. Has any member, of whatever standing, more right to vote, or any higher power of a vote, than another? Ans. No; this would be forbidden inequality.

355. Is any church court infallible in its decisions? Ans. No.

356. Why not? Ans. (1.) No such power is given to church courts. (2.) If infallible, then their decisions would be a ground of a divine faith; while the Scripture alone is such a ground.

357. Is the infallibility of church courts, necessary to the church's obedience, or to the obligation of their decisions? Ans. No; the church's obedience is not an implicit, blind obedience; and the ground of obedience, and obligation to it, is the accordance of the decisions with the Scriptures.

§ XXVII.—358. Does any man act the part of a gospel minister, or has he a right to take part in the government of the church, who personally neglects the work of the ministry, and devotes it on a curate or vicar? Ans. No; Acts xx. 28, requires him to attend faithfully to all the parts of his work.

359. Yet, if a gospel minister be without a pastoral charge, by

infirmity, age, or such employments in the church, and under her appointment and call, as deprive him of a pastoral charge, should he thereby lose his right in governing the church? Ans. No; as he sustains the office of a gospel minister, and his exemption from pastoral labour is not by his fault.

360. Are the people bound to respect and esteem church officers? Ans. Yes; for their work's sake; 1 Thess. v. 12, 13; 1 Tim. v. 17.

361. Are the people bound to obey them? Ans. Yes; Heb. xiii. 7, 17.

362. How far are they bound to obey? Ans. So far as it is obedience in the Lord.

363. Is temporal support to a gospel minister due from the people? Ans. Yes.

364. Why so? Ans. (1.) Because, in devoting himself to the ministry, he cannot otherwise provide for himself and family. (2.) He serves the people in spiritual things, and they ought to serve him in temporal things; 1 Cor. ix. 11. (3.) The Levites of old were so provided for. (4.) The New Testament Scriptures expressly provide for it; Matt. x. 10; Gal. vi. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 7—14.

365. Should a minister's salary be regarded as a charity? Ans. No; but as a just due; Matt. x. 10.

366. Obj. (1.) Paul did not claim salary, 1 Cor. ix. 12, 15; and therefore gospel ministers should not? Ans. (1.) Paul declined it in particular cases, only, on some special accounts. (2.) But he did not so deny himself in order to set forth an obligatory example to others, in ordinary cases. (3.) He acknowledges that he did receive stipends, 2 Cor. xi. 8, 9. (4.) Even when he declares that he did not take stipends from the Corinthians, (1 Cor. ix. 7—14,) he argues for the minister's right, and the people's obligation, both from the moral justice of it, (verses 7th and 11th,) and from the command and ordination of God; verses 8, 9, 10, 14.

367. Obj. (2.) Receiving salary is expressly forbidden; Mic. iii. 11; Matt. x. 8? Ans. (1.) That cannot be forbidden which is, as we have seen, commanded and ordained of God. (2.) The passages cited in the objection are misapplied. They forbid unjust gain, and exercising the ministry for the sake of gain.

368. Obj. (3.) In John x. 12, 13, hirelings are condemned; which implies condemnation of a salary? Ans. This text condemns, (1.) Those who serve in the ministry for the sake of gain. (2.) Those who are unfaithful in their work.

LECTURE XVI.—CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

§ XXVIII.—369. Is civil government necessary to human society? Ans. Yes.

370. What is its immediate end or design? Ans. The temporal welfare of society, in protecting man in life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness; Rom. xiii. 1—7.

371. Is not participation, active and passive, in civil government, common to Christians and unbelievers? Ans. Yes; they all need

the privileges and benefits of it, and have equal right to these benefits, and to take part in its management.

372. Is civil government distinct from ecclesiastical? Ans. Yes.

373. Wherein is it distinct? Ans. (1.) In its end—man's temporal welfare. (2.) In its subjects—all men, religious and irreligious. (3.) In the qualifications of its rulers. (4.) In its origin from God, as Creator and Preserver of men, as the God of nature and providence. (5.) In its mode of dispensation—including legislation. (6.) In the fact that Christianity, though desirable, is not essential to its existence, its usefulness, or its validity and lawfulness.

374. How can civil government be said to be of God, as Creator, and as the God of common providence, when Christ has all power committed to him, as Mediator? Ans. (1.) It is not a purchased benefit, being equally the privilege of all men, saints and sinners. (2.) Christ, as Mediator, did not institute civil government, but controls it, and overrules it, for his church's sake; Eph. i. 22. (3.) Civil government was and is given to heathen nations, who know nothing of Christ as Mediator. (4.) The immediate ends of civil government are not the ends of Christ's mediation.

375. What names have been given to civil governors in Scripture? Ans. Many; as kings, judges, lawgivers, rulers, gods, sons of God, ministers of God, &c.

376. Why are they called *gods*? Ans. Because they have authority, and represent God's majesty in governing men.

§ XXIX.—377. How many kinds or forms of civil government are there? Ans. Three.

378. What are they? Ans. Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy.

379. How are they distinguished or defined? Ans. (1.) Monarchy;—government by one man. (2.) Aristocracy;—government by a few nobles. (3.) Democracy;—government by the people.

380. May not all these be simple or mixed? Ans. Yes; either way.

381. What other distinctions may be made in these primary forms of government? Ans. (1.) The government may be hereditary and perpetual; which especially belongs to monarchy and aristocracy; or temporary, by rotation; which properly belongs to democracy. (2.) It may be absolute, or limited, which belongs especially to monarchy and aristocracy. (3.) It may be supreme or subordinate; that is, in a government, there may be a supreme power, and also a subordinate one.

382. Is any one of these forms so appointed of God that it, and no other, is valid? Ans. No.

383. As one form must be better than another, why is it that all or any of them may be lawful? Ans. God has appointed the ends of civil government; if these ends be maintained by any form, that form is lawful.

384. Is it lawful to change a form of government, by a regular

and peaceable process? Ans. Yes; because God has not limited us to any one form.

385. Is it lawful to change it forcibly, when it ceases to answer its end? Ans. Yes; because it has, in that case, forfeited all claim to support and existence.

386. But may we lightly or rashly attempt a radical change, or disturb the order of government, by violence? Ans. No; it is dangerous, and highly sinful; Rom. xiii. 2; Jude 8.

387. Why is it sinful? Ans. (1.) God has appointed it for good, and commanded obedience; Rom. xiii. 1—7; 1 Pet. ii. 13—17. (2.) It endangers the peace and safety of society, and involves us in the guilt of destruction of property, of murder, and of promoting all evil passions. (3.) It is doing all this through self-will.

388. But it is admitted that, in some cases, it is lawful to change a government, and resist existing powers, even forcibly. In what cases may we lawfully do so? Ans. In general, when that government ceases to answer its proper ends, for which God ordained it.

389. When may it be justly said to have ceased to answer its proper ends? Ans. (1.) When it ceases to maintain justice, to protect life, liberty, property, and lawful pursuit of happiness. (2.) When it becomes tyrannical and oppressive, and gives no ground to expect relief. (3.) When we cannot live under it without sin.

390. Would a judicious resistance, on such grounds, involve us in the guilt of resistance of God's ordinance, and of murder, destruction of property, &c? Ans. No; because, (1.) In the case supposed, the government had ceased to answer its appointed end—ceased to be God's ordinance, and forfeited his approbation. (2.) The bloodshed, &c., that may occur in such resistance, must be attributed to the government which renders the resistance necessary.

391. But does every degree of mal-administration warrant such resistance? Ans. No; otherwise resistance and revolution would be the ordinary course of things among men, as depraved; and no stability or order could be enjoyed.

392. Can the grounds which would justify forcible resistance be laid down, so as to mark definitely and particularly, how far we should submit, and when resist? Ans. No; general principles are all that can be safely stated, and cases must be left to the judgment of society, under the peculiar providence of God towards them.

393. But is it lawful to commence forcible resistance, without a fair prospect of success? Ans. No.

394. Why not? Ans. (1.) Because the end of obtaining justice and relief, is all that justifies resistance; and if there be no prospect of obtaining that end, Providence has then indicated endurance and not resistance. (2.) In such case, resistance would only increase the evils, and thereby involve those who resist in the sin of bloodshed.

§ XXX.—395. What is the immediate origin of civil government? Ans. Man; or the will, or choice of men; 1 Pet. ii. 13.

396. But is it not also of God? Ans. Yes; Rom. xiii. 1—7.

397. In what respect is it of man? Ans. As he is the instrument of its organization, or the actor in it.

398. Does this mean that man in organizing civil government, is under no obligation to acknowledge God or his law, in that organization? Ans. No; he is bound to acknowledge God and his law, and to conform to the divine will, in that organization, as far as it is revealed to him.

399. Why, then, is civil government said to be a creature of man, (1 Pet. ii. 13,) or to originate immediately in his will? Ans. (1.) As the immediate actor in forming and administering it. (2.) As man is the object of it, who is to be governed by it. (3.) As man's temporal benefit is the immediate end of it. (4.) As the particular form of the government, (monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy,) or the mode of it (pure or mixed, hereditary or elective,) is of man's choice; with all the particular modes of attaining the proper ends of government—by constitution, or legislation.

400. In what respects is it said to be of God? Ans. (1.) It is of God, or ordained of God, by his decree, purposing civil government. (2.) By his declared will—declaring it to the heathen, by the light of nature, and to Christians, both by the light of nature, and by special revelation. (3.) By his providence, bringing civil government into existence.

401. Are we, then, to understand that civil government is of God only by decree and permission, as sin is permitted and decreed? Ans. No; because we are required to support government, Rom. xiii. 6, 7; and to be subject, for conscience sake, verse 5th; and the magistrate is the minister of God to us for good, verse 4th.

402. Or is it of God merely by his overruling it for good, as chastisements, or physical evils are overruled? Ans. No; it is for good; and the magistrate is God's minister to us for good; Rom. xiii. 3, 4.

403. Are we, then, to understand that civil government is ordained of God, by his good will, as a good thing, and to subserve directly a good end? Ans. Yes; Prov. viii. 15, 16; Rom. xiii. 1—7.

404. Does this mean that God ordained all that belongs to any and every lawful civil government, and that he approves of it? Ans. No; he ordained and appointed, with his approving will, all that is good in them, in their organization, end, and means, but reprobates, and will punish all that is sinful in them.

405. Are we to hold, then, that every sin in a civil government, and every principle or measure adopted by it, antagonistical to its proper object or design, invalidates its authority? Ans. No; else no civil government in existence could be acknowledged as valid. The Roman government had many such evils in it, and yet was an ordinance of God; Rom. xiii. 1, &c.

406. May not a civil government be ordained of God, as to its existence and its end, and its authority be valid, on account of the good that is in it, (a preponderance of good,) while that government may adopt some things which he condemns? Ans. Yes; as appears in the Roman, Babylonian, and Persian governments.

407. Is it lawful for Christians to act as civil magistrates? Ans. Yes.

408. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Because magistracy is an ordinance of God. (2.) Because the ends of magistracy are important and lawful. (3.) Because such an important institution should not be left to the ungodly alone. (4.) From the examples of the godly of old; as Joseph, David, Daniel, &c. (5.) From prophecy that "kings should be nursing fathers," &c.; Isa. xlix. 23; Isa. lx. 10.

409. Is it lawful to obey a government in its lawful commands, although that government be sinful in many things? Ans. Yes; Rom. xiii.

410. Is it lawful to support a government which is in many things sinful? Ans. Yes; so Joseph in Egypt, Daniel in Babylon, and Rom. xiii.

411. Is it lawful to take part in administering a government which is, in some things, sinful? Ans. Yes; so Joseph, Daniel, the centurion, Acts x., and the deputy, in Cyprus, Acts xiii. 7. The publicans and soldiers under the Roman government, were not required by John to abandon their place; Luke iii. 12—14.

412. But is it lawful to execute a sinful law or decree? Ans. No.

413. How then are we justified in supporting by votes, taxes, or arms, a government which is, in some things, sinful, since we thus support them in executing a sinful law? Ans. (1.) We support a government, or a magistrate, for the good which they do. (2.) If, by means of that support, the magistrate executes a sinful law, he, not we, is accountable. (3.) If we refuse the support, the good end of that government would be frustrated, and greater evils would be the consequence. (4.) On this ground Joseph, Daniel, and others, acted; and on this ground Paul reasons, Rom. xiii. 3—6.

414. Should subjection and support, then, be yielded to magistrates, for conscience sake? Ans. Yes; Rom. xiii. 5.

415. Obj. (1.) To Christians taking part in civil government—our Lord refused to act as a magistrate, Luke xii. 14; and Matt. xx. 25, 26, he forbade the disciples to exercise dominion? Ans. (1.) Our Lord did not come as a civil magistrate. He had not that office under the civil government. (2.) While civil magistracy is lawful to Christians, it is not every one who has a right to exercise it, nor is it every man's duty to accept of the office, according to his circumstances in divine providence. (3.) Matt. xx. 26, only forbids ecclesiastical dominion.

416. Is the exercise of the magistracy inconsistent with Christian humility and charity? Ans. No.

§ XXXIII.—417. On what is founded the right to civil office, or civil power, in a magistrate? Ans. On the will of the people.

418. Does this contradict the doctrine that there is no power but of God, Rom. xiii. 1? Ans. No; God gives and confirms this power by means of the people's choice.

419. How does it appear that the right to civil power is founded

in the will or choice of the people? Ans. (1.) Except in extraordinary cases, as that of Moses, God has not directly designated the person who should rule. (2.) Reason says that, when God has not designated the person who should rule, the people, for whose good he is to rule, should choose him. (3.) Divine examples are given, for ordinary cases, of the people's right to choose; Num. xi. 16, compared with Deut. i. 13. And David, though anointed, by express direction, was chosen by the people; 2 Sam. v. 1—3; Deut. xvii. 14, 15.

LECTURE XVII.—CIVIL GOVERNMENT—CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

420. Is not magistracy just the people governing themselves, by an agent? Ans. Yes.

421. Has the magistrate any rightful or lawful power but what the people give him? Ans. No; because his office and power, under God, depend on the choice and gift of the people. He is only their creature, as a magistrate; 1 Pet. ii. 13; and their servant for government.

422. Can the people give him a power which they do not rightfully possess, as an organized body? Ans. No; they cannot give what they do not possess.

423. Or if the people give the magistrate a power which they cannot righteously claim, can he lawfully or righteously exercise it? Ans. No; because it is not his right by any valid gift.

424. Does not God give the people those rights which they have? Ans. Yes; "There is no power but of God."

425. How does God make known these rights to the people? Ans. By revelation; and that revelation both by nature's light and by Holy Scripture.

426. When the people give their just rights over to the civil magistrate, so far as they have a right to alienate them, is not that magistrate's power then from God himself? Ans. Yes; because the people's gift of power is God's method of conferring power on the magistrate.

427. But can the people rightfully alienate to the magistrate, or confer on him all the rights which they individually possess? Ans. No; there are individual rights which are inalienable. The individuals cannot alienate them to the collective or organized body; and the organized body can neither, as such, possess them, nor confer them.

428. What are those inalienable rights which we ought not to give up to society, nor to the magistrate? Ans. (1.) Our knowledge and thoughts we cannot alienate. (2.) Our right of private judgment, our rights of conscience, respecting our faith, and religious practice, our right of self-preservation, and right of provision.

429. Can society, then, take any of these from us *rightfully*, and confer them on the magistrate? Ans. No; it is robbery; and if any of them are wrested from us, it is our right to resume them when able.

430. Why is it our right to retain them, or resume them if wrested from us? Ans. Because God has given them to individuals, as their peculiar rights, and holds them accountable to himself, for their use of them.

431. What are the parts of the magistrate's office? Ans. Two; government and defence.

432. What is included in his power of governing? Ans. Three things; legislation, the judiciary, and the executive.

433. What is the peculiarity of each of these ingredients in the governing power? Ans. Legislation is making laws; judiciary, judging and applying the laws; executive, executing the laws.

434. Is it safe for the people that these powers be united in one person, or one body? Ans. No; it will favour tyranny.

435. Should not a civil government, then, have these powers divided between different persons or bodies, and as independent as possible of one another? Ans. Yes.

436. Should not the term *government*, or *magistrate*, be used in an abstract sense, for the power, however divided, and include all persons or bodies possessing it in a nation? Ans. Yes.

437. What should be the magistrate's rule, in legislation? Ans. The good of the people, as the object, and the law of God as the directory.

438. What law of God is he bound to follow? Ans. The best and fullest exhibition of it to which he has access.

439. Is the magistrate bound to act according to the law of God, in the judiciary and the executive, as well as in legislation? Ans. Yes.

440. Do not the conferring of offices, and the management of all the public affairs of a civil kind, belong to the governing power of the magistrate? Ans. Yes.

441. Is the law of God a higher law than that of any civil government? Ans. Yes.

442. How does this appear, since we are required to obey the civil magistrate? Ans. (1.) We are to obey the civil magistrate for the Lord's sake, 1 Pet. ii. 13; and therefore, so far as the civil command does not oblige us to disobey the Lord; so Daniel, chap. iii. 16—18; and Acts iv. 19. (2.) The very fact of appealing to the light and laws of nature, and to the natural rights of man, in making and defending, or opposing civil laws, proves even a consciousness that the law of God is of paramount authority. (3.) It is absurd to say that the creature can invalidate a law of the Creator.

443. But may not a law that is unjust, and therefore contrary to the law of God, bind us to obedience, when our obedience is not a violation of God's law? Ans. Yes; a law may be unjust and oppressive to us, but we ought to submit while it is a law, because our obedience, in that case, is suffering, not sinning.

444. Is it lawful for the Christian to appeal to the government and laws of his country, in law-suits? Ans. Yes; so Paul, Acts xxv. 10, 11.

445. Obj. Paul condemns such appeals, 1 Cor. vi. 1—7; and in Matt. v. 39, 40, our Lord condemns them? Ans. (1.) In the first passage, the apostle condemns law-suits especially between Christian brethren, and about lighter matters, and especially before their heathen enemies. (2.) In the other, our Lord forbids resentment and revenge, and requires submission to slight injuries, rather than go to law.

§ XXXIV.—446. What is included in the magistrate's power of defence? Ans. Punishment of criminals, and war.

447. How is punishment of criminals a defence of society? Ans. It is a defence of the orderly portion of society, and of the general interests of society; (1.) By reparation, in some cases. (2.) By restraining the vicious, and preventing injury.

448. How prove that the magistrate should punish criminals? Ans. (1.) By the laws of natural and moral justice, in making the punishment include a reparation of injuries, when this can be done, Ex. xxi. 26, 27, xxii. 1; and by using punishment to prevent crime, Ex. xxi. 23—25, Deut. xvii. 13. (2.) By the whole system of the judicial laws of the Jews, the greater part of which is founded on natural-moral justice, and none of it in contrariety to it. (3.) By New Testament Scriptures; as Rom. xiii. 1—7.

449. How determine the measure of punishment? Ans. (1.) By the consideration of the good of society. (2.) By the principles of equity; Ex. xxi. 23—25, and by Scripture directions.

450. Should capital punishment be inflicted for murder? Ans. Yes.

451. Why so? Ans. Because, (1.) It is expressly commanded; Gen. ix. 5, 6. (2.) The Scriptures require it, on principles of equity; Ex. xxi. 23—25. (3.) It should be done for the safety of society, by removing a murderer, and deterring others from the crime. (4.) For warning, to prevent crime; Deut. xvii. 12, 13. (5.) To free the nation from guilt; Num. xxxv. 33.

452. What guilt is taken away by capital punishment? Ans. National guilt.

453. Is this important to a nation, that the guilt of murder be taken away? Ans. Yes; otherwise, the nation must be punished for murder.

454. Obj. (1.) Capital punishment makes no reparation; and therefore should not be executed? Ans. Reparation is not the only end of punishment; there are other important ends; as safety of society, restraint of crime, and delivering the nation from guilt.

455. Obj. (2.) By capital punishment we take away what we cannot restore? Ans. When the Lord of all demands it, we have no reason to object. He has a right to take away what he gave, by whatever instrumentality he pleases.

456. Obj. (3.) Imprisonment, with other attending punishments, is better, as it will be more certainly executed, and thus strike a greater dread of punishment, and be more effectual as a restraint of crime, and give the murderer opportunity of repentance? Ans.

(1.) This is but a matter of opinion and theory—that punishment by imprisonment will be more effectual to restrain crime—and experience, we believe, proves it to be false. (2.) Punishment of murder by imprisonment, is not such a high testimony against the crime as capital punishment; it does not manifest the abhorrence of the crime in society that capital punishment does; and is calculated to diminish that abhorrence. (3.) On this, at least, doubtful question, divine authority decides, and in that decision is safety. (4.) God will bless his own laws, and appointed means for repentance, and without his blessing no means will lead to repentance. And experience proves that capital punishment is at least as instrumental in producing repentance, as imprisonment. But, (5.) Though repentance is an important end, it is not the only end of punishment, and it is God's prerogative to give opportunities for repentance or not, as he pleases; our part is obedience.

457. Obj. (4.) The commands of capital punishment all belong to the judicial law of the Jews, and are not obligatory on us? Ans. (1.) It is not true that all the commands of capital punishment belong to the judicial law of the Jews. The law declared to Noah, Gen. ix. 5, 6, though incorporated into the judicial law of the Jews, did not originate in it. (2.) Even a judicial law of the old dispensation is still obligatory on us, when it is moral in its nature, and founded on moral obligation, and permanent principles, and not on typical institutions. (3.) The law of capital punishment, Gen. ix. 5, 6, is expressly founded on permanent principles, and on a universal and permanent relation of man to God—the image of God in man. That image is equal in all ages. The reason of the law, therefore, is always the same, and consequently the law is always binding. (4.) This law of capital punishment, even as embodied in the judicial law of the Jews, was founded on moral grounds; as the guilt of innocent blood, Deut. xix. 13, is a moral and permanent ground; blood defiling the land, Num. xxxv. 31—33, is a moral ground; that is, the nation is guilty, if they do not punish it, and by capital punishment leave the guilt wholly on the head of the murderer. (5.) Capital punishment is recognised in the New Testament; Rom. xiii.

458. Obj. (5.) We are expressly forbidden to kill; Ex. xx. 13, Matt. v. 38, 39? Ans. (1.) One Scripture must not be so explained as to contradict the unequivocal sense of another. (2.) The prohibition of murder, or of unjust homicide, is no prohibition of its punishment by death, but indirectly a requisition of it.

459. Obj. (6.) The New Testament requires love to our neighbour, and capital punishment is inconsistent with it? Ans. (1.) The New Testament no more requires love to our neighbour, than the Old does. See the second table of the law explained, Matt. xxii. 39, 40. (2.) Love to our neighbour is perfectly consistent with lawful punishment, Lev. xix. 17; and the punishment of the murderer, for the good of society, is the most enlarged love of our neighbour.

460. Obj. (7.) Capital punishment is inconsistent with that for-

giveness which the gospel enjoins, after the example of God himself; Matt. vi. 14, 15? Ans. The objection is erroneous; because (1.) God required this forgiveness under the old dispensation, Ex. xxiii. 4, 5, Prov. xxv. 21; and he also required capital punishment. (2.) God's forgiveness is through the Mediator, and a perfect satisfaction. A judicial tribunal has no such satisfaction, and can take none. (3.) Private forgiveness and public justice are perfectly consistent.

LECTURE XVIII.—CIVIL GOVERNMENT, CONTINUED.—MAGISTRATES' POWER CIRCA SACRA.

461. Does war belong to the magistrate's power of defence? Ans. Yes.

462. How is war a defence? Ans. It is a defence from public aggressions on the lives, liberty, or property of society.

463. Is public war lawful? Ans. Yes.

464. Should the magistrate ever make aggressive war, properly so called? Ans. No; only defensive war.

465. Does this forbid him to declare or wage war on account of injustice and oppression perpetrated on his people by a foreign nation, and persevered in by them? Ans. No; that is defensive war.

466. Are not even defensive wars unlawful, if due means of obtaining redress, and adjusting differences, have not been first and unsuccessfully tried? Ans. Yes.

467. How prove that defensive war is lawful under the New Testament? Ans. (1.) Defensive wars were justified, and had the command of God, and his manifest countenance, under the old dispensation; as Abraham's war for Lot, Gen. xiv. 18—20; Gideon's war with Midian, Judges vi. 7; Jephthah's war with the Ammonites, Judges xi. (2.) These wars were on moral and permanent principles—self-defence, not invasion—and therefore justify all wars on the same principles, in every age. (3.) It is a dictate of common sense, and uncontradicted by Scripture, that self-defence is lawful and necessary, when life, liberty, &c., are at stake, and that it would be suicidal to suffer ourselves to be killed, when we can defend our lives by killing the murderous assailant. (4.) It is even lawful to kill in defence of property, when circumstances admit of no other defence; Ex. xxii. 2, 3. (5.) Nations stand in the same relation to one another as individuals in a state of nature, who have no social relations, no common government, and no public power, to which the defence may be committed, or deferred. (6.) To refuse lawful defence, would be to give up our lives, liberties, and all our worldly interests, to the most abandoned characters. (7.) Cornelius, the centurion, Acts x., is not reproved for his occupation as a soldier; nor the centurion in Capernaum, Matt. viii. 8, 10. (8.) When John the Baptist required repentance, and fruits worthy of repentance, and when expressly questioned on this point, Luke iii. 14, he allowed the soldiers to continue their occupation.

§ XXXI.—468. To what does the magistrate's power justly ex-

tend? Ans. (1.) To all persons in the community, without exception—to church members and officers, as well as others. (2.) To the body, but not the soul, in regard to its conscience, or secret exercises. (3.) To all civil things connected with all persons in the community. (4.) And to some ecclesiastical things in a certain sense.

469. What evidence have we, or how does it appear that the magistrate's power extends to church members, and even church officers? Ans. (1.) From the universal command of subjection, Rom. xiii. 1. (2.) From the example of Christ and the apostles; as our Lord's paying tribute money, Matt. xvii. 27; Christ's acknowledging Pilate's authority over him as man, John xix. 11; the apostle's acknowledging Cæsar's authority by an appeal, Acts xxv. 10. (3.) From the example of the priests, under the old dispensation, 1 Kings ii. 26, 27. Solomon expelled Abiathar for sedition. (4.) From the reasonableness of the thing; as, (a.) Their need of protection; for this, they owe allegiance and support to the civil government. (b.) It is unreasonable that they should be a burden on the community, and bear no equitable part of it. (c.) The unity and safety of the state or community require their subjection; otherwise they might be a party plotting its injury or overthrow, and society must be defended against their aggressions.

470. But might it not be proper that gospel ministers should, in ordinary cases, be exempt from some of the burdens of government, on account of their office and work? Ans. Yes; such as bearing arms, serving on juries, &c., which would interfere with their proper work.

470½. Does the authority of church officers in the church interfere with the unity of the republic? Ans. No; the governments are distinct.

471. Would it be just and equitable to grant to gospel ministers some exemption from taxes? Ans. Yes; unless their income will afford a tax, without drawing on the church for that tax. But if the salary be small, and be the minister's only resource, equity demands that it be exempted; because the tax comes off the church members, and is a tax on their religious privileges; while otherwise they pay as much tax for the support of government as their irreligious neighbours. Church members should pay tax according to their civil privileges, which they have in common with others.

472. Should church property be taxed? Ans. We think not, unless it be unnecessarily large, as it is employed for spiritual purposes, and not for temporal profit.

473. In what respect should the magistrate's power extend to church members and church officers? Ans. To them, simply as members of civil society,—as owing civil duties, and having civil rights.

474. Can the magistrate's power extend to the mind, judgment, or conscience, to control it? Ans. No.

475. Why not? Ans. (1.) Because it is beyond his power.

(2.) Because, though he may oppress the person, he can neither profit nor control the conscience or judgment. (3.) Because the magistrate's weapons, being civil penalties, are not adapted to the judgment or conscience. (4.) Because the rights of judgment and conscience are inalienable; and as the person may not give the control of them to another, so the magistrate cannot justly take it. (5.) Because the society collectively have no authority over the individual conscience, so they cannot give that authority to the magistrate. (6.) Because the subject has the same right to his conscience as the magistrate has to his.

476. But does not every lawful command of the magistrate, lay an obligation on the conscience of the subject to obey? Ans. Yes; Rom. xiii. 5, 1 Pet. ii. 13—15, Tit. iii. 1.

477. But, though a civil magistrate cannot rule the conscience, may he not restrain the profession or practice which the conscience of the subject dictates? Ans. (1.) If those dictates of conscience do not violate the rights of others, he may not; Acts iv. 19, 20; he has no authority to do it. (2.) If those dictates of conscience violate the rights of others, he may, and ought to restrain; that is, restrain, not as errors or sins, but as they become civil offences against society.

478. May the magistrate compel any, contrary to their conscience, to embrace a religious profession, or to a religious practice, which he thinks true and right, and useful to society? Ans. No; Dan. iii. 16—18. It is true, he should rule by the Scriptures. But it does not follow from this that he should compel to a sound profession; for, (1.) The magistrate has no authority to judge for the people. (2.) He is not qualified. (3.) His weapons are not appropriate. (4.) Such power would be perverted to error.

479. But might not the magistrate compel his subjects to take part in actual war, although their conscience utterly condemns war as unlawful? Ans. If the case were such that the existence, or safety of society is endangered without such compulsion, he may, as a civil magistrate, do so. But if he can defend the nation safely without the personal military service of such persons, it is better. And he may take their property proportionally, to carry on the war; as equity will justify this compulsion, and the forcible taking of property does not violate conscience.

§ XXXII.—480. Has the magistrate, as such, anything to do with ecclesiastical things? Ans. Yes.

481. How far does his power extend towards the church? Ans. To the persons, and to the collective body of the church, for their protection and defence in their natural and civil rights, and to restrain them from injuring the rights of others.

482. Do their privileges of making a profession of religion, and of worshipping God, and of performing all their duties according to their conscience, without molestation or hinderance, so far as these do not infringe on the rights of others, belong to their natural and civil rights? Ans. Yes; and in these things it is the magistrate's duty to protect them.

483. May the magistrate restrain vice, profaneness, blasphemy, and infidel publications? Ans. Yes.

484. Why so? Ans. (1.) Because the restraint of these is for the civil good of the community. (2.) Because no one can plead conscience for these things; and they do injury to society.

485. May the magistrate make enactments in favour of morality and religion, when these enactments neither violate any conscience, nor infringe on the civil rights of others? Ans. Yes; because these enactments are for the good of civil society; and because he ought to promote the glory of God, and the eternal interests of men, by such enactments as do not violate conscience.

486. And may not the magistrate forbid, and by the sword, prevent the execution of any church decrees which injure the civil rights of others, even though that church professes an obligation in conscience in making them? Ans. Yes; because whatever such a church may think, they cannot be allowed to injure others in their natural and civil rights.

487. But if a minister lose his salary by the discipline of his church, should the magistrate invalidate that discipline, as an infringement on natural and civil rights? Ans. No; because he accepted the call and the salary as subject to the discipline of the church; and, therefore, he has no right to the salary in such a case.

488. On the other hand, may the magistrate interfere with, or dictate the faith, profession, worship, discipline, or government of the church? Ans. No.

489. Why not? Ans. (1.) Because the people have no right to dictate to one another in these things, and, therefore, could not give this power to the magistrate. (2.) Because his civil qualifications do not qualify him for such dictation. (3.) Because Christ has imposed on every individual the obligation to believe, profess, worship, and obey, as he prescribes, and has committed the dispensation of his word and ordinances, and the exercise of discipline and government, to church officers, of whom he requires qualifications peculiar and different from those of the civil magistrate. (4.) Because Christ has promised his presence to church officers in these duties, but not to magistrates, in intruding into these things. (5.) Because the civil magistrate may not use civil penalties, in enforcing the principles and practice of religion; 2 Cor. x. 4; and he, as a magistrate, has no business with anything which he should not enforce with civil penalties, when a command is not sufficient.

490. Has the magistrate a right to interfere in any way with the peculiar business of church courts? Ans. No; because he would then be assuming the keys which do not belong to him. The people cannot give him this power. Christ has given the keys to church officers, who are chosen and appointed in a different manner than the civil magistrate, and possess other qualifications than those required in the civil magistrate.

491. But it is objected that the civil magistrate did interfere in

ecclesiastical matters, under the old dispensation? Ans. So far as they did interfere, it was either as prophets, as David, Solomon, &c., in which our magistrates cannot imitate them; or as executing the judicial law of the land, under a theocracy.

492. Obj. A Christian magistrate over a Christian nation, is bound to promote the glory of God, and the prosperity of religion, and the spiritual good of his subjects, according to the word of God, and therefore he ought to interfere in the matters of religion? Ans. The premises are granted; he is bound to these things; but this does not require or allow him to assume an office not conferred on him by God or man. But, so far as he can promote these ends, in the proper discharge of his office, he is bound to do it.

493. But, as the true faith, worship, discipline, and government, are for the civil good of the community, as well as for higher ends, might not the magistrate justly suppress every other? Ans. No; because this is a mode of doing good which does not belong to him; it belongs to the church to maintain the faith, worship, &c., taught in Scripture, by her appropriate spiritual weapons.

494. But, if the magistrate may not suppress a false religion, may he not support the *true*, by donations? Ans. No; not as a magistrate; that is, with the public funds; as this would be compelling the people to support, in many cases, a religion contrary to their conscience, and be abusing his trust with the public funds. It would be empowering the magistrate to judge for the people what religion they must maintain,—a power which does not belong to his office.

495. May he appoint to public trust and office those who favour the true religion, and refuse to appoint those of opposite sentiments? Ans. We think he may, if the people authorize him so to do; because, he is, in this, violating no conscience, and depriving no one of a right. No man has a proper right to office. But the magistrate should take care to do equal justice, even in this matter, and not violate the will of the people.

LECTURE XIX.—CIVIL GOVERNMENT CONTINUED,—MARRIAGE, ETC.

§ XXXV.—496. What should be the character of the magistracy or the magisterial government? Ans. Paternal and pastoral, Isa. xxii. 21, xlv. 28.

497. Why should it be so? Ans. (1.) Because his government is derived from the people, by their choice, and for their good. (2.) The good of the whole should be the object of the magistracy.

498. Is this inconsistent with the exercise of the sword? Ans. No; the sword is not properly for vengeance, but for the good of society.

499. What is due from the people? Ans. (1.) Honour to the magistrate; 1 Pet. ii. 17. (2.) Tribute; Rom. xiii. 6, 7. (3.) Obedience; 1 Pet. ii. 13, 18.

500. If the command be contrary to the law of God, should we obey? Ans. No.

501. If the command be contrary to the constitution, or fundamental laws of the nation, or kingdom, are the people bound to obey? Ans. No.

502. Why? Ans. Because his command is a violation of the contract under which he holds his office.

503. But still, if such command be only oppressive, but not immoral in the performance, should it not be obeyed, for the time, to prevent anarchy, till an opposition be properly organized? Ans. Yes; and also in order to effect a reformation of the governing power.

504. May we obey the lawful commands of a magistrate, and acknowledge his authority, though his general character, or his administration, be in some things immoral? Ans. Yes. So did Israel in Egypt, and in Babylon; and so did the apostles, under the Roman government.

505. May we support such an immoral government, by paying taxes? Ans. Yes; Rom. xiii. 6, 7; so Israel in Egypt, in Babylon, &c.

§§ XXXVI.—XXXVII.—506. Could the public magistrate in a nation attend to all the minutæ of government, which is necessary in society? Ans. No; the domestic affairs of life render it necessary that there should be domestic government, under the magistracy.

507. How many kinds of domestic or economical government are there? Ans. Four; marital, paternal, herile, and analogic.

508. What is the marital government? Ans. That of a husband over his wife.

509. What is the paternal government? Ans. That of parents over children.

510. What is the herile? Ans. That of masters over servants.

511. What is the analogic? Ans. Such as the government of a guardian over wards, of teacher over pupil, &c.

512. Why called *analogic*? Ans. Because, though it is not properly family government, it bears some analogy to it.

513. Are these lesser forms of government mere devices of men; or are they ordained and regulated of God? Ans. They are ordained of God; as Eph. v. 22, of subjection of wives; vi. 1, 5, 6, of masters and servants; and the analogic is implied in the other forms of government; as Ex. xx. 12.

514. How is the marital authority acquired? Ans. By marriage.

515. Has the husband authority over the wife, by divine law? Ans. Yes; Eph. v. 22, 23.

516. What is the nature of that authority which the husband has over the wife? Ans. It is a real authority, requiring obedience and submission, but governing in love, and for her good and comfort; Eph. v. 22—29.

517. Has the husband authority over the wife's conscience? Ans. No; the rights of conscience are inalienable to every one.

518. Could even the marital state be conducted aright without government and authority, in one of the persons? Ans. No.

519. What is the primary and leading duty of this relation? Ans. Love ; Eph. v. 25—29.

§ XXXIX.—520. Between whom should marriage be? Ans. One man and one woman.

521. Are there any limitations as to the condition of the parties between whom the marriage should be contracted? Ans. Yes; they should be of suitable age to give a judicious consent; and they should not be so related as to involve them in incest.

522. Is bigamy or polygamy forbidden? Ans. Yes.

523. How does this appear, since holy men of old had often a plurality of wives at the same time, and divine laws are given to regulate heirships of children by several wives? Ans. (1.) The original institution of marriage proves that polygamy is forbidden; Gen. ii. 24, compared with Matt. xix. 4—8. (2.) From the creation of but one man and one woman. (3.) The undivided love that the relation requires. (4.) The discord, almost inevitable, in families where there were a plurality of wives. (5.) Plurality of wives possessed by holy men of old, was never approved, and was perhaps always reprov'd, by adverse providences connected with it. (6.) The laws regulating heirship treated things as they were, but did not justify that state of things.

524. Is any number of marriages successively, after the death of the previous wife or husband, lawful? Ans. Yes; Rom. vii. 1—4.

525. If a man justly obtain a divorce, is after marriage lawful? Ans. Yes; Matt. v. 32.

526. Was Adam's expression, Gen. ii. 24, a divine declaration? Ans. Yes; Matt. xix. 4, 5.

527. What did it forbid? Ans. (1.) Polygamy—"shall cleave to his wife," not *wives*. (2.) Adultery—"cleave to *his wife*," not another. (3.) Fornication—"his wife," not a mistress. (4.) Divorce for light causes—"cleave" or *adhere to*. (5.) Incest—"leave father and mother;" that is, former relatives, for the new relative—a wife.

§ XL.—528. What are the ends or designs of marriage? Ans. (1.) Holy propagation of the human race. (2.) Mutual help and comfort. (3.) Suitable education of children. (4.) Avoidance of impurity.

529. Is the marriage of near relations forbidden? Ans. Yes; Lev. xviii. 6—18, xx. 11—21.

530. Is this a primary, or a secondary law of nature? Ans. Secondary; as it was dispensed with, from necessity, at first, and was by special law afterwards.

531. Is the marriage of a deceased wife's sister forbidden? Ans. Yes; Lev. xviii. 16.

532. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) That law, Lev. xviii, forbids marriage among those of near kindred. (2.) It teaches that relation by affinity is as near as by blood; that is, the wife's sister becomes the husband's sister, and the husband's brother becomes the wife's brother. (3.) Lev. xviii. 16, forbids marriage *with*

a brother's wife; and so, reciprocally, it forbids a woman to marry a sister's husband.

533. Obj. (1.) The prohibition, Lev. xviii. 16, is marriage of a brother's wife during the life of that brother? Ans. It would be equally forbidden to marry the wife of any other living man; then why this specification? But, verse 6th, the explanatory introduction to these prohibitions shows that it is kindred that is here intended.

534. Obj. (2.) The term "*uncover*" means illicit connexion, and not marriage? Ans. (1.) Illicit connexion is utterly forbidden, and in all cases; then why these specifications? (2.) *Uncovering* includes marriage, and therefore it forbids it. Uncovering, whether by marriage, or illicitly, is therefore forbidden.

535. Obj. (3.) The judicial law of the Jews required a man to marry his deceased brother's wife, Deut. xxv. 5; and therefore such marriages are not incestuous? Ans. (1.) That law was peculiar to the Jews, for the purpose of keeping up their distinct families and tribes, and the possession of their distinct inheritances; Deut. xxv. 6, 7. (2.) It is true, this law does show that the law prohibiting the marriage of near relations, is not a primary and essential law of morality, but secondary, and such as God can, for important purposes, dispense with; while he never does dispense with an essential law of morality. But, (3.) An exception confirms the rule; and where the exception does not exist, the general law is binding, and the violation of it is a heinous sin.

536. What kind of laws does God ever dispense with? Ans. Those which are not essential laws of morality; as, (1.) Forms and times, or ceremonies of his worship; not the principle or spirit of worship. (2.) Laws founded on relations between man and man; but not laws founded on our relation to God, and essential to that relation.

537. Does a diversity of religion render marriage sinful? Ans. Yes; 2 Cor. vi. 14.

538. But does that difference of religion, however great, nullify the marriage contract? Ans. No; 1 Cor. vii. 12, 14. In such a case, the sin was in contracting the marriage, not in living in that state when married.

539. Should not even minor differences in religion be seriously guarded against, in marriage contracts? Ans. Yes.

540. But does not incest nullify the marriage contract? Ans. Yes; Mark vi. 18.

541. Why is marriage nullified in the one case and not in the other? Ans. Difference of religion is not a nullification of the essentials of the marriage relation; as this relation is a civil and domestic privilege, common to all mankind. But incest is a violation of God's law, which violation continues as long as the connexion continues. It is a violation of the natural law of marriage.

§ XLI.—542. Does marriage effect any peculiar unity or oneness between the parties? Ans. Yes; Gen. ii. 24.

543. Wherein does that oneness consist? Ans. (1.) In affection.

(2.) In interest in each other's person, character, property, and happiness. (3.) In relationship to each other's relatives.

544. Will it not then follow that one of the parties may not marry a relation of the other, when deceased, nearer in blood than [those whom he may marry of] his own? Ans. Yes; Lev. xviii. 16.

545. Should marriage, if possible, be with consent of parents? Ans. Yes; Col. iii. 20, "Children, obey your parents in all things;" and if in other things, surely in this most important step.

546. Does the parents' refusal of consent destroy the validity of marriage? Ans. (1.) The parents' refusal of consent may destroy the validity of the engagement, or promise of marriage; Num. xxx. 3—5. (2.) But if the marriage be consummated, it may not invalidate the marriage itself, as it is not an essential of the marriage relation.

547. Is a divorce ever lawful? Ans. Yes.

548. On what accounts is it lawful? Ans. On three accounts; (1.) Adultery; Matt. v. 32. (2.) Wilful desertion; 1 Cor. vii. 15, Matt. v. 32. (3.) Incapacity; Matt. xix. 9—12.

549. But since our Lord, (Matt. v. 32, xix. 9,) seems to make adultery the only ground of divorce, how can wilful desertion be a ground? Ans. (1.) Our Lord did not say that *actual* adultery was the only ground, but *adultery*, which may be *constructive*. (2.) Therefore that general expression of our Lord he left subject to explanation; which explanation, to some extent, the apostle professes to give, 1 Cor. vii., as in verses 10th and 12th; and he gives an explanation in verse 15th. (3.) If, (as in 1 Cor. vii. 15,) the unbelieving depart, and the brother or sister is not brought into bondage thereby, then the party deserted is free from the obligation of that marriage; for, to be deserted, and yet bound by the violated contract, is bondage. (4.) Desertion is constructive adultery; as it is a violation of the marriage contract in its essentials, and therefore leaves the deserted party free. (5.) In Matt. v. 32, where our Lord limits the grounds of divorce to adultery, he shows that he does include constructive adultery; for he says "he who puts away his wife" without just cause, (and the deserter does so,) "causes her to commit adultery;" that is, he violates the essentials of the marriage contract, as much as actual adultery does, and exposes her to temptation. Therefore, wilful desertion is a just ground of divorce.

550. Can the guilty divorced party lawfully marry again? Ans. No; Matt. v. 32, xix. 9.

551. But did not the Jewish law authorize divorces for lesser matters? Ans. No; it did not authorize but regulated permitted divorcees; as Deut. xxiv. 1, &c.

552. But did not the Jewish law (Deut. xxiv. 2,) allow the divorced to marry again? Ans. Yes; but these were not perhaps guilty persons.

553. Why may not a woman justly divorced marry again, since, by the divorce, the former bond is entirely dissolved? Ans. It is entirely dissolved in reference to the innocent party, but the guilty party is still under the guilt, and not released.

554. But how does it appear that incapacity is a just ground of divorce? Ans. Because such a person has practised a deception against the essential rights of marriage; so Matt. xix. 9—12.

555. How far does the parental power extend? Ans. To educate and to command the child, till maturity.

556. Has the parent power over the conscience of the child? Ans. No.

557. Is there a lawful government of a master over servants? Ans. Yes; Eph. vi. 5—9.

558. May the master restrain the servant's liberty in some things? Ans. Yes; see the fourth commandment.

559. But have we a divine law warranting the master to demand involuntary service, except for crime, or, from necessity, from minors? Ans. No.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

OF GLORIFICATION.

LECTURE XX.—GENERAL REMARKS—PURGATORY, ETC.

§ I.—Q. 1. How many are the states of man? Ans. Four; (1.) Holiness, as at first created. (2.) Fallen. (3.) Restored, in regeneration and sanctification. (4.) Glorification.

2. Is not glory the end of our faith, or its final object? Ans. Yes; 1 Pet. i. 9.

§ II.—3. By what various names is it called in Scripture? Ans. By many names; as *glory*, 1 Pet. i. 7; *salvation*, 1 Pet. i. 9; *honour*, *immortality*, *eternal life*, Rom. ii. 7; *crown of life*, James i. 12; *kingdom of God*, *crown of righteousness*, &c., 2 Tim. iv. 8.

4. Is not a state of regeneration, glory begun? Ans. Yes; because the holiness of the saints shall be an ingredient in their glory, Psa. xvi. 3, xlv. 14.

5. In speaking of glorification, as the final state of the redeemed, should we treat it as the act of God bestowing the favour, or as the favour bestowed? Ans. As the favour bestowed.

§ III.—6. Do the Scriptures warrant us to expect a state of glory? Ans. Yes.

7. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From many promises; Rom. viii. 17; 2 Cor. v. 1—5. (2.) From the glorification of Christ as our Head; 1 Cor. xv. 20—23; Phil. iii. 21. (3.) From the vision of the glory of Moses and Elias; Luke ix. 30, 31.

8. Can the present state of things warrant us to deny this future state, as infidels allege? Ans. No; it even affords some presumption in its favour; as, the desires of more perfect holiness and happiness, in the godly; the imperfection of happiness here; and the imperfect manifestation, in this world, of justice on the ungodly.

§ IV.—9. Is the state of glory perfect, and comprehensive of all good? Ans. Yes.

10. What kinds of good does it include? Ans. (1.) Virtue or

morality. (2.) Honour, or glory. (3.) All that is useful, or the matter of happiness. (4.) Delights; Psa. xvi. 11.

11. Is it also a perfect negative happiness, or freedom from all evil? Ans. Yes; freedom from both moral and natural evil; Rev. xxi. 4; 1 John iii. 2.

12. Would the good be perfect if not eternal? Ans. No.

13. Who alone shall enjoy glory? Ans. The elect believers; Rom. viii. 30.

14. Shall any enjoy glory who are not regenerated in this world? Ans. No; John iii. 3.

15. Is eternal glory bestowed on any of the human family, except through Christ? Ans. No; Rom. vi. 23; John iii. 36.

16. Did God design the glorification of his people to be for the glory of his grace? Ans. Yes; Eph. i. 6.

§ V.—17. When does the glorification of the believer take place? Ans. (1.) At death. (2.) More fully at the resurrection.

18. How does it appear (§ VII.,) that the soul enters on glory at death? Ans. (1.) From the parable of Lazarus and the rich man, Luke xvi. 22. (2.) From Luke xxiii. 43, the thief on the cross. (3.) From 2 Cor. v. 1, 8; Phil. i. 23. (4.) From the believer's claim, through Christ, to the inheritance, when done with this world. (5.) Neither revelation nor reason teach that there is any intermediate place.

19. Obj. (1.) Christ's soul was not left in hell, Acts xvi. 31; and so David's, Psa. xvi. 10; implying that the soul first descends to hell before glory, &c.? Ans. *Soul* is here, as frequently, put for *life*, and *hell* for the *grave*, or rather *the state of the dead*;—not the *soul*, but the *body*, or life of the *body*, in its union with the soul.

20. Obj. (2.) The Scriptures speak of glory, or the inheritance, being given at the last day, and therefore, not at death? Ans. (1.) Such Scriptures refer to the more full and manifest glorification. (2.) They refer to the whole man, soul and body glorified. (3.) They do not, therefore, deny the previous glorifying of the soul at death.

21. Obj. (3.) Things under the earth shall bow their knee to Christ; Phil. ii. 10? Ans. "Things in heaven," are holy angels and glorified saints; "things on earth," are living men, good and bad; "things under the earth," are devils, and the wicked in hell.

22. Obj. (4.) The paradise promised to the thief on the cross, means a separate place from heaven? Ans. (1.) This is a gratuitous assertion. Paradise is represented as a happy place, and with Christ. (2.) Paul, in 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4, represents it as glorious, and the third heaven. (3.) The term is used for heaven, as the antitype of Eden. (4.) Rev. ii. 7, Paradise is where Christ the tree of life is, that is heaven.

§ VI.—23. Does the soul after death possess not only life but activity? Ans. Yes.

24. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From Scripture, as Luke xvi. 25; so it is necessarily implied, 2 Cor. v. 7, 8; Phil. i. 23. There could be no happiness without this—no reason to desire hea-

ven at death, or to prefer death and heaven to the present life. (2.) From the nature of the soul, as active,—activity belonging to its very nature.

25. Obj. (1.) The dead are said to sleep; as John xi. 11, 13, 14? Ans. This expression is metaphorical, and often so used, to signify, (1.) The body at rest. (2.) The person in safety in Christ, in opposition to the torments of the wicked; Isa. lvii. 1, 2. (3.) The person freed from all the troubles of this life.

26. Obj. (2.) Life and operation are ascribed to the whole man, consisting of soul and body; and, therefore, the soul separate from the body does not act? Ans. True; as man is generally spoken of as he is. But, (1.) The body's life depends on its union with the soul; the soul does not so depend on the body. (2.) The acting of the bodily senses depends on the body; but thought, will, &c., depend on the soul.

§ § VIII., IX.—27. What do the Papists hold respecting the state of the believer's soul after death? Ans. That it does not immediately pass to glory, but is detained in some prison, more or less afflictive.

28. What do they hold respecting the souls of believers under the Old Testament? Ans. That till Christ's death and resurrection, they were detained in a certain prison, which they called *Limbus Patrum*—that, with Christ, they were taken to glory.

29. On what grounds do we reject this error? Ans. (1.) Because it is an imagination, and founded on no authority. (2.) Because the notion is contrary to the covenant of grace; which secured salvation to all believers; Matt. xxii. 32. (3.) Because the Fathers of the ancient church are represented as obtaining salvation; Acts xv. 11. (4.) From "Abraham's bosom" being descriptive of heaven, in opposition to hell; Luke xvi. 23; and Abraham, Isaac, &c., represented as in heaven, Luke xiii. 28; and believers sitting down with them; and many other Scriptures; as Isa. lvii. 1, 2. (5.) There is no reason why the Fathers should be excluded; as Christ's atonement was as efficient for salvation, before it was made, as after.

30. Obj. (1.) John iii. 13, denies that any ascended into heaven before Christ? Ans. Our Lord is there speaking of the original knowledge of the will of God; this was given to none but himself. This text must not be construed to contradict the facts of Enoch, Elijah, Abraham, and Moses, in heaven.

31. Obj. (2.) Christ is represented as our forerunner, Heb. vi. 20; and as gone to prepare a place, &c., John xiv. 2, 3. Therefore the Old Testament saints could not enter heaven, till he ascended? Ans. Christ, in respect of dignity, merit, and office, is here spoken of; but he was, in fact, the forerunner to Old Testament saints, before he came into our world, on the foundation of the work to be finished.

32. Obj. (3.) In Heb. ix. 8, it is denied that the way to heaven was manifested till Christ's ascension? Ans. It means that it was not manifested, except by Christ's atonement and ascension. But

Old Testament believers had that manifestation in reality, though not so clearly, on the ground of Christ's atonement to be made.

33. Obj. (4.) Christ descended to hell, to set the fathers at liberty; 1 Pet. iii. 19, iv. 6? Ans. It is a false interpretation. But (1.) Christ acted as Prophet of his church, in the days of Noah; and Noah was his minister, a preacher of righteousness. (2.) Christ, by Noah, preached to the Antediluvians, who are now "spirits in prison." But he did not preach to them while in prison.

34. What place do the Papists assign to departed souls of believers? Ans. A place called *Purgatory*.

35. What use do they assign to Purgatory? Ans. They hold it to be a place of torment, for the purpose of cleansing them from venial sins.

36. Does not this notion deny the perfection of Christ's atonement, and require a measure of atonement to be made by believers themselves? Ans. Yes.

37. Do the Papists allow any other way of redemption from Purgatory, than the soul's suffering for itself? Ans. Yes; they allow prayers and oblations of the living, and indulgences by the priests, to assist.

38. On what grounds should we reject this error? Ans. (1.) It derogates from the perfect atonement of Christ, and substitutes human merit. (2.) Scripture assigns but two places, after this life—heaven and hell. (3.) From those Scriptures which teach the immediate glory of the departed believer; as of Lazarus, Luke xvi. 22; of the thief on the cross, Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. v. 1, 8, &c. (4.) From the plenary justification of believers by Christ; Rom. viii. 1; 1 John i. 7. (5.) From the case of believers found alive at Christ's second coming—changed in a moment, and caught up to be with Christ; 1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 52. (6.) And from the vanity and falsehood of the notion itself; as if some sins were not damning, if not pardoned through Christ; as if human sufferings could make atonement; and as if prayers and masses for the dead were of any avail. It is all a deception, to exalt the Popish priesthood, and obtain money.

§ X.—39. But the Papists pretend to found their doctrine of Purgatory on some passages of Scripture; as, Isa. iv. 4, "purge the blood of Jerusalem, with the spirit of judgment—and burning;" supposed to be the fire of Purgatory? Ans. (1.) This is to be done on the earth; it speaks of the militant church. (2.) The expression is a frequent figure for sanctification by the Spirit; so Matt. iii. 11.

40. They object Zech. ix. 11, "sent forth the prisoners out of the pit," &c.? Ans. (1.) It is by the blood of the covenant, and not by the soul's sufferings. (2.) A state of guilt, and depravity, is here, by metaphor, called a *pit*, so Psa. xl. 2.

41.—Matt. xii. 32, "not be forgiven in this world, or the world to come;" implying that there is a forgiveness in the world to come? Ans. (1.) It does not imply that sins are forgiven in the eternal world, which are not forgiven in this; but that sins forgiven in this

world shall to eternity remain forgiven. But, (2.) The unpardonable sin shall remain unpardoned to eternity.

42.—1 Cor. xiii. 15, "shall be saved, yet so as by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work," &c.; implying a fire of Purgatory which is not in this life? Ans. (1.) God's judgments are often metaphorically called *fire*; so these are fiery trials by persecution, temptation, &c. (2.) God's judgments in this world, and temptations, shall prove the reality or soundness, or unsoundness, of their doctrines. (3.) The believer, though saved, shall, in these judgments and trials, be a loser, so far as he embraced error. (4.) At death, too, he shall be saved, but all his errors shall be condemned of God.

43. It is objected that some, as Lazarus and others, were twice dead, and their souls must have gone to Purgatory? Ans. (1.) This is a foolish and sinful intruding into things not revealed. (2.) These cases were miraculous and extraordinary; and God could dispose of their souls, in the first death, in his wisdom. (3.) Our imaginations, in things not revealed, can be no foundation for a doctrine, and especially for a doctrine contradictory to plain doctrines of the Bible.

44. Obj. To deny a Purgatory, induces carnal security? Ans. God's truth, revealing a heaven and a hell, is the best antidote to carnal security.

LECTURE XXI.—HEAVEN AND HELL—THE RESURRECTION.

§ XI.—45. Is heaven a place? Ans. Yes; although we know not where.

46. How prove it to be a place? Ans. (1.) Finite spirits, who occupy place, are there. (2.) Even human bodies, though glorified, are there.

47. Are the souls of believers in death transferred to heaven—to the place of the blessed? Ans. Yes.

48. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) From Scriptures declaring the immediate enjoyment of heaven after death, as Luke xxiii. 43; and it is implied in the apostle's desire of death, Phil. i. 23; 2 Cor. v. 1. 8.

49. Should not the notions of the insensibility, the sleep of the soul after death, and of the soul's hovering over the body, or wandering in the earth or air, be accounted infidel, and as mere imaginations, and unworthy of our serious regard? Ans. Yes; there is no reason why they should disturb our faith.

§ XII.—50. Do the souls of the wicked, in death, go immediately to hell? Ans. Yes.

51. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) But two places are spoken of in Scripture. (2.) The rich man is represented as in hell after death. (3.) There is neither an intermediate place assigned for the wicked after death, nor is there any reason why there should be.

52. Is hell a place—a definite locality? Ans. Yes.

53. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Finite spirits, who occupy place, are there. (2.) It appears from its names—*a prison, in chains, with the devil*; 1 Pet. iii. 19; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Matt. xxv. 41.

54. Do we know its local situation, or physical condition? **Ans. No.**

55. Are the souls of the wicked, after death, living and active, as well as those of the righteous? **Ans. Yes;** and for similar reasons; as, the nature of the soul, and that they may be capable of suffering.

56. What will be the nature of their punishment? **Ans. Mental;** and bodily, when the soul and body are reunited.

57. Will not the misery, however, be chiefly mental or spiritual? **Ans. Yes;** from sense of divine wrath, and the terrors of Jehovah.

58. But why may we suppose there will be bodily suffering in hell? **Ans. (1.)** Because the body partook of sin, as an instrument. **(2.)** Because the whole man will suffer.

59. Why may we suppose that the torments of hell are so generally represented as by *fire*? **Ans. (1.)** Because of the exquisite torture of fire, it is used as a figure. For this reason, God's judgments are often represented as a fire. **(2.)** Because this figure is expressive of the agonies of mental suffering. **(3.)** Because it is quite probable that the body may suffer by fire.

60. But will not the misery of the wicked be more complete and full, after the final judgment? **Ans. Yes;** as then soul and body will be united in misery.

61. Is there any reason to believe that then their torment of soul will be increased? **Ans. Yes;** (1.) As it appears that fallen angels will then be more miserable than now, as now they are reserved, till the judgment, in chains; and, therefore, by analogy, we may believe that the misery of wicked men will be increased. **(2.)** Because the judgment may give a more comprehensive view of their sins, and guilt, and vileness, and of the holiness and wrath of God.

62. May we expect that the wicked will ever cease from sinning, or their wickedness be abated by suffering? **Ans. No;** suffering cannot change the heart.

§ XIII.—63. Will the believer attain a more full and perfect state of glory at the last day? **Ans. Yes.**

64. Wherein will it be more full? **Ans. In the re-union of soul and body in glory;** Rom. viii. 23.

65. Is not the resurrection of the body, then, necessary to this? **Ans. Yes;** 1 Cor. xv. 26; Phil. iii. 21.

66. Why is the body to be glorified with the soul? **Ans. (1.)** Because the body is a constituent of the person who is redeemed by Christ. **(2.)** Because the whole person is not fully and actually redeemed, till the body is raised from the dead, and re-united to the soul, and glorified; 1 Cor. xv. 26.

67. Does the promise of eternal glory imply the resurrection of the body? **Ans. Yes;** because, (1.) Till the body is raised, Christ has not completely destroyed death; 1 Cor. xv. 26. **(2.)** It is promised that our bodies shall be fashioned like to Christ's glorious body; Phil. iii. 21.

68. Does not this doctrine depend entirely on revelation? **Ans. Yes.**

69. Though the heathen entertained a belief in the immortality

of the soul, did they hope for the resurrection of the body? Ans. No; this was a strange doctrine to them; Acts xvii, 18.

70. Is there anything in nature to produce a resurrection? Ans. No.

71. Does the fact of a resurrection of the body depend entirely on the will of God, and on his power exercised in a supernatural way? Ans. Yes.

72. Does reason, sound reason, condemn the doctrine, or forbid the idea of a resurrection? Ans. No.

73. Does not reason confirm the doctrine, when made known by revelation? Ans. Yes.

74. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) As God created, so he can raise again. (2.) Justice requires that man should suffer as he sinned—in the whole man. (3.) Grace, as given to us in Christ, in the purchase of the whole man, requires that the believer should enjoy happiness in his whole nature.

75. Does the present dispensation and order of things, forbid the idea of a resurrection, as the infidel supposes; 2 Pet. iii. 3, 4? Ans. No.

76. Does it not even require a resurrection? Ans. Yes.

77. How does this appear? Ans. (1.) Present material things are not, in their nature and present condition, eternal. (2.) The present dispensation is not a dispensation of perfect justice.

78. Will, then, good and bad be raised together? Ans. Yes; Dan. xii. 2, John v. 28, 29.

79. Is the doctrine of the resurrection, an important article of faith? Ans. Yes.

80. Of what importance is it to the wicked? Ans. (1.) It is to them a solemn assurance of eternal misery. (2.) It is an assurance of complete misery in soul and body; and therefore, (3.) A warning to them to repent; 2 Cor. v. 10.

81. Of what importance is this doctrine to believers? Ans. (1.) An assurance of eternal happiness, in soul and body, with Christ; Job xix. 27. (2.) An entire victory over death, even in the body; 1 Cor. xv. 26.

82. But what positive evidence have we of the resurrection, from Scripture? Ans. Almost innumerable texts of Scripture, direct and indirect.

83. But it is objected, that though the Scripture often speaks of a resurrection, yet it is beyond the power of nature; it must be a supernatural work; it is plainly used sometimes in a metaphorical, spiritual sense, and ought always to be taken in that sense? Ans. (1.) It is indeed sometimes used in a metaphorical, spiritual sense; as Rom. vi. 5, Col. ii. 12; but it does not follow that it is always used in this sense. (2.) We should always take the expressions of Scripture literally, except there be something in the subject, or the circumstances in which the passage occurs, which compels us to take it figuratively. (3.) The apostle charges Hymeneus and Philetus, as guilty of radical error, in saying that the resurrection was past already; which must have been by taking this expression of Scripture in a metaphorical sense; 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18;

and for which, no doubt, he excommunicated Hymeneus and Alexander; 1 Tim. i. 19, 20. (4.) Many texts teaching this doctrine are clearly literal and unequivocal; some of which we shall notice; As (a.) Job xix. 25—27. (b.) Our Lord's argument with the Sadducees, Matt. xxii. 23—32, is plainly a literal argument for a literal resurrection; because the Sadducees denied a literal resurrection, and he proved the doctrine against them from Exodus iii. 6. (c.) The apostle, 1 Cor. xv., evidently argues for a literal resurrection; as the resurrection of Christ was literal, and from this he argues a corresponding resurrection of Christ's people; verses 12—21. And again, verses 35—49, he shows how the resurrection is to be understood—the body dying must be made alive, and every seed its own body; it goes to the earth in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; sown a natural body, and raised a spiritual body, &c. (d.) Isa. xxv. 8, God "will swallow up death in victory;" this the apostle quotes as declaring a resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 54; because death is not destroyed, but has the victory, unless the body be raised. So we might notice, John vi. 39—44, xi. 24, Acts iv. 2, xvii. 18, xxiii. 6, xxiv. 15.

84. Obj. (1.) Eccl. iii. 19, teaches that there is no difference between the death of man and beasts? Ans. As to outward appearance and outward facts they are alike; and this is what Solomon intended to teach; but not to contradict himself; Eccl. xii. 7; nor other Scriptures.

85. Obj. (2.) Job xiv. 10—12, teaches that man shall not rise till the heavens be no more? Ans. This is our doctrine, which Job rather confirms.

86. Obj. (3.) Nothing can be brought back from total annihilation? Ans. This is true, so far as natural causes, or influences are concerned; but it is not true in reference to the power of God. Besides, the body is not annihilated by death, but dissolved.

87. Will the same body which dies be raised again? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. xv. 38.

88. But will it be raised in the same identical matter, as laid in the grave? Ans. No; 1 Cor. xv. 37.

89. Is the identity of the body, and the identity of the material particles of which it is composed, the same thing? Ans. No.

90. Will the body be raised in the very same nature, and of the same qualities, as that which was laid in the grave? Ans. No; it will be raised a spiritual body; 1 Cor. xv. 44.

91. Can we comprehend this idea yet? Ans. No; having no experience of it.

92. But will the spiritual body be a spirit, or immaterial? Ans. No; our Lord's body, after his resurrection, was spiritual, and yet material; Luke xxiv. 39.

§ XIV.—93. By whose power will the dead be raised? Ans. By the power of God.

94. Is not the work ascribed to the Three-one God? Ans. Yes; it is ascribed to the Father, John v. 21; to the Son, John vi. 39—44; to the Holy Spirit, Rom. viii. 11.

95. Is the resurrection properly a Mediatorial work? Ans.

No; it is connected indeed with mediation, but it is a work of God, equally applicable to saint and sinner. It is indeed the fulfilment of a covenant promise to the believer, but it is, at the same time, a work of God performed on natural things, and producing a physical change.

96. Will there be any instrumentality used in this work? Ans. Yes; there will be the instrumentality of angels; Matt. xxiv. 28. Not as putting forth the power to raise the dead, but as moral instruments, as the apostles were in working miracles. It is also probable that there will be the instrumentality of an articulate voice; 1 Thess. iv. 16.

LECTURE XXII.—THE RESURRECTION, CONTINUED—THE JUDGMENT—THE ETERNAL STATE.

§§ XV., XVI.—97. As the dead will all be raised, what will become of the living? Ans. They shall be changed; 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52.

98. What change will be made on the living? Ans. The same as on the dead; they shall have spiritual, incorruptible bodies; 1 Cor. xv. 52, 53.

99. Will the wicked be furnished with spiritual, incorruptible bodies, as well as the righteous? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. xv.; that spirituality and incorruptibility is necessary to their miserable existence.

100. But Socinians and others deny the resurrection of the wicked, and plead Luke xx. 35, 36, 1 Cor. xv. 20, 22, 1 Thess. iv. 16, as declaring only the resurrection of the righteous? Ans. (1.) The resurrection is declared to be universal; John v. 28, 29. (2.) Expressly is it said that the wicked shall be raised; as Acts xxiv. 15, John v. 29, Dan. xii. 2. (3.) The tenor of Scripture maintains it; for the wicked must be raised to suffer the threatened punishment.

101. Obj. The wicked are threatened with eternal destruction? Ans. Eternal misery is the eternal destruction intended, not annihilation.

102. Obj. Isa. xxvi. 14, denies the resurrection of the wicked? Ans. It is not their resurrection that is denied, but that they shall return to life in this world, or to mingle with the godly; denying that they shall again arise to such power in the world, or in the church, even in their successors.

§ XVII.—103. Is the precise time of the last judgment revealed to us? Ans. No; Matt. xxiv. 42, Mark xiii. 32.

104. Will there not be signs showing when the time is near? Ans. Yes; Matt. xxiv. 29, &c.

105. What kind of signs will signify the approach of that time? Ans. Signs by fulfilment of prophecies respecting church and state; and no doubt some preternatural signs of the dissolution of nature; Matt. xxiv. 29, 30, Luke xxi. 25, 26.

106. How long will the resurrection be in its process? Ans. It will be in a moment.

107. Where will it be? Ans. Wherever the dead are; Matt. xxiv. 28, Luke xvii. 37.

108. Will there be any difference of time in the resurrection of the elect and of the reprobate? Ans. No; 1 Thess. iv. 16, is not a comparison between the resurrection of the elect and that of the wicked, but a statement of order of the resurrection, and of taking the saints up in the clouds, &c.

109. The Jews are of the opinion that the resurrection will be in Judea—the holy land—Is there any reason to believe this? Ans. No.

110. But they allege that this was the reason that Jacob and Joseph wished to be buried in Canaan—Is this a correct view of their wishes? Ans. No; because there was no such thing expressed by them, or by any prophet. They wished this, (1.) To testify their faith in the promise of the land of Canaan; Gen. xlviii. 21, xlix. 29, l. 24, 25. Therefore, (2.) No doubt they wished to lie with their people, in the promised land. (3.) And to testify their faith in the heavenly inheritance, promised under the emblem of the land of Canaan.

§ § XVIII., XIX.—111. What shall follow the resurrection? Ans. The last judgment.

112. But is not God continually judging? Ans. Yes.

113. And does he not pass an unchangeable judgment on every one at death? Ans. Yes.

114. Wherein shall this last judgment differ from these? Ans. It will be open, universal, final, and for the open manifestation of Divine justice.

115. Infidels boast that the apostles expected the last judgment before this time, by calling their times the *last* time; 2 Pet. iii. 3, 4, and 1 John ii. 18? Ans. (1.) The apostles knew that it would not come in their day; 2 Thess. ii. 2, &c. (2.) 2 Peter iii. 3, 4, only warns that in these last days, infidels would say so. (3.) By the *last time*, they meant the last dispensation.

116. Some have denied that there will be a general judgment, because the judgment passed on each one at death, is effectual, and unchangeable; and therefore, a general judgment is useless? Ans. (1.) It is to manifest the particular judgment on individuals. (2.) To exhibit, before all, many things unknown to mankind. (3.) To manifest divine glory.

§ XX.—117. Though the Three-one God will be the Judge, is Christ, in any respect, peculiarly the Judge? Ans. Yes; John v. 22, 27; 2 Cor. v. 10.

118. On what account is Christ peculiarly the Judge at the last day? Ans. "Because he is the Son of man;" John v. 27; that is, because he is the Mediator, he is exalted as King; Phil. ii. 7—10; and therefore, as Judge.

119. But is this any derogation from the glory and authority of the Father and the Holy Spirit in the judgment? Ans. No; (1.) The Three-one God judges in the person of the Son. (2.) The whole plan of redemption, together with the last judgment, is arranged by covenant; and according to that covenant, Christ, the Mediator, judges the world. (3.) It is fit that he who humbled

himself should be exalted before an assembled world. (4.) It is fit that he should acquit his redeemed, punish his enemies, and finish the whole work of salvation to his people, and vengeance on his enemies.

120. Shall not the elect have some share in the judgment? Ans. Yes; 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; Matt. xix. 28.

121. What part can they take in the judgment? Ans. They are assessors with Christ; (1.) They will consent to, and openly approve his judgments. (2.) By their example of faith and holiness, they will condemn the wicked.

122. But shall they not themselves be judged? Ans. Yes; 2 Cor. v. 10.

123. On what ground will they be judged? Ans. (1.) They will be justified and acquitted, on the ground of Christ's righteousness; Phil. iii. 8, 9; Rom. iii. 24. For, on the same ground on which the believer is now justified, he will be justified at last. (2.) Their faith and holiness will be acknowledged as according to the will of God, 2 Cor. v. 10.

124. Have we reason to believe that the righteous shall be first judged before the wicked? Ans. Yes. Matt. xxv. 34—40.

125. Will the righteous and wicked be intermingled in the judgment? Ans. No; they will be separated; Matt. xxv. 32, 33.

126. Have we any knowledge how long the judgment shall continue; or of the manner of its process? Ans. No; it is not revealed.

§ XXI.—127. Who will be judged? Ans. Besides the righteous and the wicked among men, evil angels also shall be judged; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6.

128. May we not expect that the wickedness of devils, and of wicked men, will then be manifested far above our present knowledge and conception? Ans. Yes.

129. Will holy angels be judged? Ans. No; we have no intimation that they will, but only those who kept not their first estate. And the judgment is for the purpose of passing sentence on those who fell, there being no occasion for judging the sinless.

130. May we expect that the believer's sins will be at all noticed in the judgment? Ans. Yes; Eccles. xii. 14; Matt. xii. 36, 37; 2 Cor. v. 10.

131. If the believer is not to be condemned for his sins, why should his sins be noticed? Ans. (1.) It is proper and necessary, in the exercise of justice. (2.) That the sins may be disapproved and condemned. (3.) That the justification of the believer, through Christ's righteousness, may appear, and divine justice be openly honoured, in the judgment and acquittal.*

* Turretine, and others, think that the sins of the righteous will not be exhibited. Witsius declines a positive determination. But Eccles. xii. 14, and 2 Cor. v. 10, seem conclusive. Matt. xxv. 35—40, it is true, only recounts good deeds, but that passage seems to be given to show the evidences of their grace, in contrast with the grounds of condemnation in the wicked, and not intended to exhibit the whole process. We think that the justification of the godly, through Christ, would not be apparent, without a view of their sins.

§ XXII.—132. Although we know not the length of time which the judgment shall continue, nor its process of displaying guilt and righteousness, may we not know the steps of judgment, from revelation given? Ans. Yes.

133. What are the steps of that judgment? Ans. They are five; (1.) Irresistible citation; Matt. xxiv. 31, xxv. 32. (2.) Separation; Matt. xxv. 32, 33. (3.) Examination of the causes; Rev. xx. 12; intimated by the opening of the books—the book of life, or of election and predestination, Phil. iv. 3; the book of the Scriptures, law and gospel; the book of Providence, or Omniscience, Psa. cxxxix. 16; Mal. iii. 16; and the book of conscience, Rom. ii. 15. (4.) Pronouncing the sentence; Matt. xxv. 34, 41. (5.) Execution of the sentence; Matt. xxv. 46.

§ XXIII.—134. Though we know not the time when the judgment will commence, nor its duration, may we know where it will be? Ans. We should be modest in giving an answer to this question; but it would appear to be *in the air*; 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; Matt. xxiv. 30. Some suppose it will be in Canaan, where Christ appeared in humiliation; but this is mere conjecture. Joel iii. 2, 12, speaks of particular judgments; and Acts i. 11, 12, gives no ground to suppose that the place will be Canaan.

§ XXIV.—135. Will the elect enter on their glory immediately after the judgment? Ans. Yes; Matt. xxv. 34, 46.

136. Can we conceive the greatness of that glory? Ans. No; 1 Cor. ii. 9; 1 John iii. 2.

137. But is it not described to us in Scripture, both in express terms, and by figures? Ans. Yes; it is called *a kingdom*, Matt. xxv. 34; *a better country*, Heb. xi. 16; *a city, whose builder is God*, Heb. xi. 10; *mansions in our Father's house*, John xiv. 2; &c.

138. But can it be esteemed as desirable, except by the renewed heart? Ans. No.

§ XXV.—139. In what will the happiness of heaven consist, in general? Ans. In the fruition or enjoyment of God; Gen. xv. 1; Rom. viii. 17.

140. What will be the nature and character of that enjoyment of God? Ans. (1.) Special; not the mere enjoyments of benefits dispensed, and common, in a measure, to all mankind in this world, but of God himself, in his special love. (2.) Immediate; not by faith, but by vision; 1 Cor. xiii. 12, Psa. xvii. 15; nor by mere instrumentalities, as word and ordinances. (3.) Perfect, according to our capacity to enjoy it; 1 Cor. xiii. 10; and without alloy. (4.) Eternal; 1 Cor. iv. 17; liable to no interruptions.

§ XXVI.—141. What particular ingredients in this happiness may be known and stated now, although we know but in part? Ans. (1.) Knowledge of God. (2.) Communion with him. (3.) Capacity for enjoyment, in perfect holiness and incorruptibility. (4.) Less principal;—in communion with angels, and with one another.

142. Will our knowledge of God be a perfect comprehension of him? Ans. No.

143. In what sense may it be said to be perfect; according to 1

Cor. xiii. 10, 12? Ans. (1.) Free from error. (2.) Perfect certainty. (3.) As much knowledge as is necessary to our happiness and duty. (4.) Sensible and experimental—by vision; 1 Cor. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. v. 7, 8.

144. Shall the saints see God with their bodily eyes? Ans. No; he is a Spirit.

145. In what manner shall they see God? Ans. (1.) With the eye of the understanding; with perfect satisfaction. (2.) With a satisfactory sense of his presence.

146. But will there not be a literal and sensible sight of Christ, in the body? Ans. Yes.

147. What will the saints know respecting God? Ans. His nature, his perfections, his will respecting them, their duty and happiness, and his love to them.

148. What kind of communion with God will the saints enjoy? Ans. (1.) God will communicate himself to them, as their God and their portion; Gen. xv. 1. (2.) He will communicate to them his will, so far as they need to know it. (3.) He will communicate to them his love; making it known to their understanding and experience. (4.) He will communicate to them all benefits and comforts; Psa. xvii. 15. (5.) He will receive, in Fatherly kindness, all their communications to him, of gratitude, adoration, &c.

149. Will not perfect holiness and incorruptibility be ingredients in the happiness of the saints? Ans. Yes; they shall thus be free from the bondage of sin, and possess the image of God, and a capability of happiness and duty.

150. Will the saints have communion with holy angels? Ans. Yes; in Rev. iv. 6—11, the four living creatures and the elders are about the throne, and join in adorations; so, v. 11, living creatures, elders, and angels join in praise; and, Eph. i. 10, all in heaven and earth are gathered together in Christ; Eph. iii. 15.

151. Will the saints know one another in heaven? Ans. Yes; (1.) Peter, and James, and John knew Moses and Elias on the mount. (2.) As the happiness of the saints will include the remembrance of the misery from which they were redeemed, (Rev. v. 9,) and of God's dealings of mercy with them in this world, we must suppose they will remember those who were instrumental in their salvation, and who were associates with them in this wilderness journey.

§ XXVII.—152. Is it probable that there will be different degrees of glory in heaven? Ans. Yes; Dan. xii. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 40—42.

153. Is it probable that there will be different degrees of happiness in heaven? Ans. Yes; not by any sensible defect, but by different capacities.

154. May not the different degrees of sanctification, and of sufferings for Christ's cause, in this world, and different degrees of punishment in hell, corroborate this doctrine? Ans. Yes.

155. But how would such different degrees of glory and of happiness, consist with perfect happiness in heaven? Ans. (1.) Each,

possessing all glory and happiness of which he is capable, has nothing further to desire. (2.) Perfect holiness, and perfect acquiescence in the will of God, will render every one perfectly contented, and banish all envy and pride. (3.) Holy angels, still a higher rank of beings than man, even when glorified, will produce, in holy minds, no discontent or envy.

156. Obj. (1.) The same glory is, in Scripture, attributed to all the redeemed; as Matt. xiii. 43, xx. 12? Ans. The happiness and glory are the same substantially, though different in degree.

157. Obj. (2.) Election and justification are equal? Ans. These may be equal, and yet the persons may not be elected to the same capacities of happiness.

158. Obj. (3.) Infinite and full glory does not admit of degrees? Ans. (1.) A glorified saint is still finite, and his glory, subjectively, cannot be infinite. (2.) Fulness of glory is according to the capacity of the subject.

159. Obj. (4.) The righteousness of Christ is the sole foundation of the saints' glory and happiness; and it is the same to all the redeemed; and how can their glory and happiness be different. Ans. (1.) The righteousness of Christ is the one only foundation of believers' sanctification and communion with God in this world, yet believers possess these in different degrees here. (2.) The atonement of Christ procures the same salvation, but may not procure the same capacity in the persons redeemed.

§ XXVIII.—160. Will the saints enjoy their eternal happiness in heaven above, or in this world, as regenerated by fire? Ans. We prefer to say it will not be on this earth, but in heaven above.

161. Why, then, will there be "a new heavens and a new earth, in which dwelleth righteousness;" 2 Pet. iii. 13? Ans. (1.) The new earth will be free from the curse, and from all the fruits of it; there will be no unrighteousness in it. (2.) This will be to the glory of God, and for the happiness of the redeemed.

§ XXIX.—162. Will the wicked be sent to hell, when the righteous are taken to glory? Ans. Yes; Matt. xxv. 46.

163. Will their hell be on this earth? Ans. No; in this earth will dwell righteousness; and, Rom. viii. 21, the creature, the earth, &c., shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption.

164. Shall their punishment be eternal? Ans. Yes; Isa. lxvi. 24; Matt. xxv. 46; Mark ix. 44, &c.

§ XXX.—165. What will be done with this world, at the judgment? Ans. It shall be burned; 2 Pet. iii. 7, 10—12.

166. Will it be annihilated by fire? Ans. No; 2 Pet. iii. 13; but renovated and changed.

167. Of what use will be the renovated earth? Ans. To the glory of God, and the happiness of the redeemed.

168. May we not hope to know these things better hereafter? Ans. Yes; especially if we attain that eternal glory.

THE END.